# A study on the governance network in tourism development

Exam number : Y3834293

Department of Politics

Master of Public Administration

2015/2016

Word Count : 10,770

***Abstract***

*Recently tourism has become a chief policy area as a key industry for economic growth in many country. In addition, the advent of new ideologies such as globalization and informatization has promoted the growth of governance to engage the various stakeholders in the policy process. In these situations, particularly the tourism policy influences enormous effects on many aspects of society, including economic, social and environmental area, because tourism brings lots of effects such as job creation, cultural heritage preservation, and environmental development to a society, particularly a local society. Therefore, a tourism governance in which these stakeholders involve can play a crucial role in local tourism development. This paper will analyze the impact of local governance network being consisted of various stakeholders in tourism development through cases of three cities utilizing the six parameters for effectiveness of governance, and propose some suggestions for improving the effectiveness of governance. Although there are not the perfect governance network for all policy situations, this paper will help a local government to organize proper forms of governance for its policy environment and to achieve its policy goal.*

# Table of Contents

# 1. Introduction

Emerging in the twenty-first century as the internal and external environment surrounding tourism improved through the rapid progress of transportation including aviation technology, economic improvement and increasing needs for tourism, the tourism industry became a major driving force of economic development in many countries (Göymen, 2000). According to the united nations world tourism organization(UNWRO, 2009), tourism is described as one of the world's largest industries because it contributes to global gross domestic product (GDP), provides people with numerous jobs and transports a number of people all around the world. Therefore, there is continuous interest in tourism development considering culture and environment rather than hasty development to attract tourists for a short period of time due to social, cultural and environmental influences of the tourism industry. Move to this sustainable tourism development requires consideration with local residents, long-term strategy and careful development. In addition, the will of tourism-related officials who participate directly in the development of tourist areas is an important part to support tourism development plans (Graci & Dodds, 2010). In relation to this trend, the unwto emphasizes the partnership and harmony of the private and public spheres to strengthen the sustainability of the tourism industry (Foggin & Munster, 2003). As tourism has comprehensive aspects that encompass complex interactions among various stakeholders (Darbellay & Stock, 2012.), its influence is not merely confined to tourism itself. That is, tourism can be explained as a network which includes these complex situations because it is a phenomenon which can influence

organizations, enterprises, and people in public and private areas relating either directly or indirectly to tourism. Therefore, tourism is recognized as a complex and multi-sector policy area that has a wide variety of goals and objectives relating to a number of stakeholders in the public and private sectors. This means that there can be various interest groups within the industry, for example aviation companies, big and small hotels, and the local community which get economic benefits or disadvantages from tourism (Shaw and Williams, 2004). Owing to these reasons, achieving cooperation, collaboration and integration between the public and private sectors is a major concern for policy makers as well as stakeholders and local communities relating to tourism.

With the increasing importance of the tourism industry, significant changes such as globalization and neo-liberalism are transforming the policy process of governments (Bevir, 2011) and, as a result, the relationship between the public and private sectors in the policy process needs to be closer than before. The authority of bureaucracy and the centralization of decision-making from the central government has been considered as an obstacle to effective governance in many countries (Tosun, 2000). Thus, the central government has often been required to switch its functions relating to provision of public services to other public agencies or lower authorities (Rondinelli et al, 1989). In tourism policy, as large-scale tourism development at the central government level has failed in converging the diverse needs of the local community, the role of local government and local communities in tourism development and decision-making has been further increased (Kim and Kim, 2007).

As mentioned above, as tourism includes interactions among public, private and local communities, governance is increasingly vital in tourism policy. In addition, as there are many industries using a network form of governance to coordinate and resolve complex issues in uncertain policy environments both internally and externally (Jones et al, 1997), a network in local governance is also important in tourism development. Thus, the main aim of this paper is to analyze the effect of governance networks on local tourism development and to propose several suggestions for the formation of effective local governance networks in this area.

To conduct this study, this paper will explore the governance networks of three cities which have fostered tourism as a major industry through analysis of the effectiveness of the governance networks utilizing six parameters of good governance. Consequently, several suggestions regarding how to increase the effectiveness of local tourism governance will be made through practical case studies as well as theoretical analysis based on related literature.

This report is organized into the following five sections. The first section will present the background and direction of this paper and the second section explains the theoretical framework of this paper, which contains definitions of governance and network and the relationship between tourism and governance. The third part will analyze three governance network forms showed in cities in the Netherlands, Australia and South Korea to determine their influence on tourism development in terms of effectiveness of governance. Subsequently, this paper will propose several suggestions to improve the effectiveness of local tourism governance based on the results of the

above analysis. In the final chapter, this paper will provide a summary of its contents and concludes with some implications for Seoul Metropolitan Government.

## 2. Theoretical framework

### 2-1. Governance

During the twenty-first century, the paradigm of state government has transformed government to governance. As the state is no longer an exclusive provider of policy, its roles and functions have been transferred to local communities and private sectors and state affairs are managed on the basis of cooperation with markets and civil society (Yu, 2008). In other words, the dominant forms of state administration have changed from a hierarchy of government where policies are determined by top-down decision making to a network of governance, where policy actors with relatively comparable power determine and implement policies in cooperation with each other. Of course, this does not mean that the transition to governance from government involves changing the state roles of the government; the key role of government both now and in the past is to solve the problems faced by society and satisfy social needs. Therefore, the government plays a role in achieving the collective goals of society to lead the economy and society. However, whereas the state was previously centralized in policy-making and the only provider of public services with the authority and resources of administration and politics, globalization and informatization meant that

new approach to government became necessary to satisfy a variety of administrative needs. A new pattern of government (Bevir, 2010) emerged alongside a network in which public issues are solved through state, market and non-government organization (NGO) collaboration; thus, governance has become an important form of state administration through decentralization, local government and the expansion of civil society participation.

Pierre and Peters (2000) argue that governance is led by an increased need to involve the private sector in public policy, the advent of new public management (NPM), and the institutionalized participation of individuals and groups that wish to influence policy processes for the successful implementation of policies. With respect to the emergence of governance, through a comparative study of metropolitan governance in Europe Salet et al (2003) also argue that although central government was responsible for protecting the national economy and public goods supply in the European welfare state model in the past, institutional changes have occurred since the 1980s due to economic globalization, market liberalization and diversification of relations between central and local governments. Hood (1995) also considered this change as a practical effect on public organizations due to the emergence of new concepts such as NPM. In particular, NPM is more welcomed in the tourism policy sector because it not only means increased government assets but also affects government development and marketing through the introduction of NPM in public area (Hall and Jenkins, 2004). In addition, Yu (2010) argues that governance environment is improved through the activation of NGOs and Non-Profit Organizations (NPO), positive participation of

local residents in local issues, and the expansion of means of involvement. As shown above, the breakdown of traditional boundaries between citizens, governments and community organizations has established a more collaborative and complex policy structure as well as unintended outcomes in terms of in public policy of tourism.

Meanwhile, discussion on governance is conducted under the heading mainly from hierarchy to network or from government to governance. Although governance is defined as a network in a narrow sense, governance includes various concepts proposed by many scholars (Gross, 2001: Rhodes, 1997). Kooiman (1993) argues that governance is a network in which the relationship between government and society has changed from unilateral to interactive and considers dynamism, complexity and diversity as its major concepts. Moreover, Jessop (1998) showed governance as an autonomous, horizontal and complex structure between interdependent actors including the state, market and civil society, and Lynn et al (2001) point out that governance is a form emphasizing social adjustment by voluntary collaboration between autonomous individuals and organizations. Peter (2001) presents that governance is a type of public decision-making which solves public issues and takes responsibility for them by involving stakeholders such as the state, local government, citizens and functional groups, thus creating an institutionalized policy community. Furthermore, Rhodes (1997) argues that governance refers to the transition from traditional governing methods on the basis of hierarchical and formal authority to a network composed of various entities including the government, civil society and markets acting in a self-organizing manner and emphasizing good governance. To

conclude the above discussions, governance means social adjustment relating to public issues in a broad sense and can be defined as a network of institutions and procedures to exercise rights with regard to the public interest, to suggest public opinion and to make decisions in a narrow sense. After all, governance is an act of governing (Pierre and Peters, 2000, 2005; Kooiman, 2003) and has also been increasingly used as a concept within the tourism public policy. Considering the background and definitions of governance discussed above, it is not a new phenomenon but rather one that has existed for a long time because resolving conflicts in policy and decision-making is a function that anyone can perform. Only the organizational structure and management style utilized in the process of performing and the subjects performing these functions have changed. With respect to the diversification of the actors in governance, the mode of governance has changed from hierarchy via the market to a network (Rhodes, 1997). In these modes of governance, the subject of hierarchy, market, and network means a structure or organization that is utilized in the process of adjusting to conflict and solving policy problems. Pollitt and Boeckaert (2004) have classified the evolution of the public sector since the 1950s into three periods: a hierarchy network in the 1950s, market governance between 1980 and 1995, and network governance since 1995. In other words, the hierarchy was a dominant governance form until the 1980s followed by market governance in the 1980s, while the network system has emerged more recently.

## 2-2. Network

Rhodes (1997) argued that a network is a series of formal and informal social relations which shape collaborative actions among governments, enterprises, and civil society. The network theory encompasses relationships between governments, businesses and civil society and demonstrates how these relationships shape issue identification, communication, resource sharing and collective action (Marsh, 1998). Therefore, it helps to understand the informal and formal organizational structure encompassing public and private sectors and directing collective actions (Dredge, 2006). A policy network is how the concept is introduced in the network theory and the concept has been variously defined according to the viewpoints of different scholars. In the view of Kenis and Schneidr (1991), a policy network is a form of governance; they argue that it is a set of stable relationships that are non-hierarchical and interdependent in nature in which various actors exchange resources to pursue common interests with regard to a single policy. Rhodes (2007) defined governance as a formal and informal relationship network between government and actors with interests relating to policy decisions and implementation. In modern society, policy-making is the result of interaction between the various entities involved in the policy process; they have diverse interests and goal and there is not a unilateral decision from the government. Thus, network concerns have been growing many stakeholders are integrated into the policy process and decisions are made through complex and diverse interactions.

From this point, the importance of networks in connecting the public and private

sectors is progressively increasing in tourism development policy, which spans a wide range of industries. Many countries have already organized tourism governance by utilizing network theory in tourism policy. In these tourism governance systems, the roles, influences and interactions of various actors in the network can be understood as providing an important context in tourism development (Saxena, 2005).

## 2-3. Governance network in tourism

Meanwhile, studies related to governance network in the tourism policy have been conducted in various fields such as specific regions, innovation, sustainable tourism, conservation and management, and tourism events.

Bell (2004) argued that the effectiveness of governance depends on institutional structure and process, available resources and the effectiveness of the numerous stakeholders who participate in the network. He also argued that this governance is usually a public-private partnership (PPP) arrangement in which local government is not a neutral participant but instead is actively involved in shaping these structures via decisions on financial support, knowledge construction and learning, and building industry capacity in the increasingly networked world of tourism. Therefore, these organizations are not stable or transparent and change continuously in response to both inside and outside information. In relation to this point, Pearce (2001) argues that tourism governance is a structure which harmonizes with appropriate people and appropriate skills and does not have any clear structure and process. Meanwhile, there

are lots of terms such as tourism policy, policy planning and formation, and tourism destination management which are also used in tourism or related studies. There are not only some differences but also overlapping portions in various parts among these terms and actions related to tourism; however, the term governance includes all of these terms and the actions (Bramwall and Lane, 2011). As the process of tourism governance includes institutions, policy making, and various mechanisms relating to actions such as governing, adjustment and regulations, tourism governance encompasses the hierarchical actors including the official government, network actors over government, the local community, and the market (Hall, 2011a).

## 2-4. Local governance and tourism development

Local governance is viewed as the lower level of the central or state governance. However, it is promoted from the reduced role of central government and the expansion of its role and authority in terms of decentralization into local government. This trend influences the governing form of local government and means that it is transformed from the regional administration of the central government to local government. In addition, it is natural that the relationship between central and local government changes from the traditional form of central management to local governance due to the expansion of decentralization (So and Yu, 2005). Furthermore, even if the local government governs a local area, this results in interactive governance due to the above mentioned changes from government to governance in

state administration. Therefore, local governance can be considered as the concept of leading the region through a partnership involving the local government, local businesses, local communities and local residents based on cooperation and interdependence.

The World Tourism Organization (1993) has defined environmental protection advocates, local communities and local government as key partners for sustainable tourism development. This definition demonstrates that it is meaningful to apply network governance that embraces a variety of actors; these include the local community and local government playing roles in tourism to analyze the relationship among varied stakeholders and complex economic, cultural and environmental issues. Public actors get the opportunity to understand the private sector's needs and interests and to reflect them in tourism policy, while private actors have the opportunity to influence policy formulation and decision-making by applying these governance networks within the tourism sector. Therefore, there are benefits for both sectors.

There are a number of studies emphasizing the importance of local governance in local tourism. Vernon et al (2005) have emphasized that local collaboration is crucial in promoting the practical and theoretical understanding of governance in order to achieve sustainable tourism development and, in particular, the role of the public sector is vital in promoting policy innovation. These authors also argue that this collaboration can identify and resolve obstacles that affect the implementation of tourism policy. In the process of collaboration, the public sector has to guarantee the same level of commitment to cooperation and participation as continuous promotion

for the purposes of community and the change in the perception of the role of the partners can facilitate tourism development and innovation in the public sector. Horwich et al (1993) argue that all sections of the community should be recognized as equal partners in the development of all aspects, including the provision of broad and legal authority to local residents in the process of development at local level; furthermore, Brandon (1993) has defined the participation of the local community by local residents and leaders in local communities as one of the most important factors for successful tourism development.

Through a case study of reservation at the border between Columbia and Peru, Wunder (2000) asserted that political and institutional environments such as local government and community groups as well as unique natural and cultural resources play important roles in the sustainable development of tourism. He also argued that the members of the local community are not excluded in the policy process. As is evident from lots of studies, desirable governance must clearly outline the roles of the region, province and state and collaborate with local community in order to mitigate opposition in tourism development and to maximize profits. Consequently, governance is the key in implementing sustainable tourism development and the policy environment needs to be considered, for example historical experience, market and economic-socio impact, and politics or laws (Trousdale, 1999).

As shown in the above studies, the importance of governance in tourism development is gradually growing. One of the important goals of tourism governance is to achieve economic development through tourism and to improve the quality of life of the local

community surrounding tourism destinations. Therefore, it needs to respond sensitively to the needs of the community in order to achieve these goals (Fredline and Faulkner, 2000). In this sense, tourism policy requires collaborative policy-making among stakeholders with an interest in tourism development such as local communities, local government and local businesses. Understanding stakeholders who can influence local tourism development and communicating with them therefore becomes the base of governance and plays a significant role in local tourism development.

## 2-5. Tourism governance of York City (case study)

The importance of local governance in the tourism sector can be found in tourism governance of York City in the UK. The change in the governance that has taken place in the development of York as a major tourist attraction in the UK shows that as mentioned above various participants in the governance play crucial role in tourism development.

York is one of the major tourist destinations in the UK with many medieval heritage. Old wooden buildings and winding alleys of York lead tourists to medieval Europe in the 14th century, making York the most well-preserved medieval city in Europe. York minster which renowned for its largest gothic cathedral in northern Europe and Jorvik center which retain the remains of the Viking Era are also major attractions which have regional and cultural characters in York. Based on these charming characteristics, York has developed into one of the most popular tourist destinations in the UK. York

City can be an interesting example of how tourism governance influences the development of the tourism industry. As the tourism industry becomes a major industry in this city, it is necessary to understand the role of governance and the direction that tourism governance pursue in changing process.

At first, York City launched a department of tourism led by a high-ranking local government official in 1969, which was facilitated by a group of tourism businessmen with the prospect that York could revive through tourism industry. This department focused on marketing to attract more tourists until the early 1980s. However, as it was influenced by the interest of tourism business, York City could not contribute to improving negative impacts on poor conditions of employment associated with tourism industry and environmental disbenefits caused by increasing tourists. Tourism governance based on policy making and policy implementation by chiefly government and tourism operators has shown its limitation that it is difficult to expect the positive development of the tourism industry. York City which lacks close communication with the local community and the private sector requires an organization with new directions and forms for tourism development.

In 1985, York City set up a new tourism policy that would create tourism jobs having similar quality to other industries in the region, influence local communities and local industries effectively and balance between the costs and benefits in tourism industry. With the establishment of new policy direction, the York City Government has greatly

reduced the role of the existing tourism department and a new York Visitors Conference Bureau (YVCB) which was led by the private sector was founded in 1987. The YVCB refused support from local governments and received financial support from local business such as Terry's or Rowntree's in the York region. It was in 1994 that the YVCB, which had been operated as a private company, began to make meaningful relations with the city government. As the confectionery industry which had previously played main role in industries of York began to decline, the city government recognized the economic value of the tourism industry and became aware of the need for cooperation between local governments and tourism industry.

Unlike 10 years ago, when focused exclusively on promoting York as a tourist destination, York City began to capitalize York's cultural environment and made it a priority to provide good quality products to tourists. The partnership between the York City and the YVCB (first stop york partnership) to carry out this purpose has become a useful channel for municipal and public sector agencies to carry out various projects related to tourism, including marketing and research as well as tourism events. In addition, it introduced resident first week and provided the opportunity to experience various visitor attractions free of charge to local residents. It provided residents with an opportunity to develop their interest in tourism, to understand the role of tourism which contributes to local industry development and to provide a forum for the unity of local communities, local governments and local businesses which are stakeholders in tourism industry. The YVCB played a key role in the execution of these various projects and also obtained operating rights the York tourist information center from

York City. The partnership between York City and the private sector which was recognized for its effectiveness was funded by Yorkshire Forward, a tourism support organization in Yorkshire, and was launched as a new organization. Although York Visitors Conference Bureau was started with partnership and financial support only among tourism providers to escape interference of local government, it also recognized various effects of the tourism industry from support of public sector and roles of the private sector on policy implementation and delivery. The establishment of Visit York followed by YVCB showed that the public and private sectors recognize the need for each other and the process of forming a new partnership of governance.

Visit York is an independent public-private partnership and registered as a company limited by guarantee. Visit York was responsible for establishing and implementing the tourism strategy of York City and operated by financial support from the public sector, profit from business activities in the private sector, and income from the operation of the York tourist information center. Visit York is made up of 14 committees, consisted of members form the York City Council, tourist business operators such as hotels, restaurants and other and advisors. Its role is to determine the strategy, to monitor the delivery and performance of the strategy, and to guarantee legally the company's business. There are five departments in Visit York, which is consisted of visitor services, PR, marketing, business engagement, and external relations. What distinguishes is the business engagement, which operates a membership system called York Partners that has allowed various tourism-related

businesses to participate in implementing tourism strategies. As a result, their membership network became a facilitator in implementing various strategies for tourism development in Visitor York and became a vehicle for effectively connecting tourists as the clients of tourism services, and businesses as providers of tourism services. These activities were also effective in driving close collaboration with a range of stakeholders such as the York City Council. In other words, by collecting opinions from the tourism industry and making proposals for necessary policies, it was able to link its business with municipal plans or public investment issues in comprehensive prospective.

As seen above, York City's tourism organization, which originated at First Stop York and evolved into Visit York, gave positive prospects and confidence in York's tourism development. In this process, York City has been able to convince tourism as a major industry in York, and made York one of the most popular tourist destinations in the UK through partnerships with various stakeholders in the tourism business. In the case of York City, local government-led organization had limitation in reflecting various opinions and ideas of the private sector, and private sector-led organization also requires participation of public sector to support social infrastructure such as transportation or to draw understanding of local residents to tourism. Therefore, it is clear that governance based on cooperation between the private and public sectors plays a crucial role in tourism policy.

There are several implication for effective governance through the York City case. Firstly, it is the operation of cooperative governance. Tourism industry is not limited to only tourism. It has a comprehensive character that connects all areas of society such as transport, culture, history and environment and influences to lots of other industries. Therefore, it is necessary for various levels of actors from various areas to participate in the process for tourism development. There can be various cooperation partners including not only the government departments but also the private sector such as private institutions, individual tourism companies, and local residents. In addition, the involvement of the affiliated organizations in the field of tourism, which is the result of the proliferation of the NPM, is also important. Cooperation with private institutions and private companies plays a very important role, as the government cannot make and carry out all the policies of the tourism sector. In the case of York City, the tourism organization led by either the government or the private sector showed some limitations. However, Visit York beginning from the cooperation of the private and public sectors leads York City to one of the most popular tourist destinations in the UK.

Secondly, it is necessary to participate in governance from the stage of policy forming. In decision-making process, the government usually plays a leading role in determining polices with restricted participation of private sector. However, it is necessary to ensure the participation of private actors from formation of policy. In other words, participation of various actors should be guaranteed. The government should play a role of coordinator among the various subjects in the policy process to

produce effective policies that can leverage the capabilities of the various actors forming the governance and make full use of them. The cooperative governance starts from this process and it can lead to successful policy implementation. In York City, Visit York has functioned in establishing and implementing a tourism strategy of York that reflects the views of the private sector. The members of the committee, which run the Visit York, are composed of members from tourism-related industries. In other words, Visit York has a structure in which private sector's participation is guaranteed from establishment to implementation of tourism strategy.

The tourism governance of York City shows the necessity and effectiveness of governance through the transition process of tourism organizations in York City. Governance is basically based on cooperation between the public and private sectors. It showed that effective polices cannot be accomplished without the cooperation of the public sector as policy provider and the private sector as recipient of policy. The change process in tourism organizations of York City illustrates the development of partnerships between the private sector and the public sector in the tourism industry which close cooperation between the private and public sectors is essential. In the process, it showed the limitations of local government-led organization which could not recognize the need for tourism policy of private sector. It also has a limitation that could not respond effectively to the changes of tourism industry due to lack of cooperation with private sector. Although new organization centered on private companies was formed to overcome these limitations, it also showed a limitations that tourism could not developed without the cooperation of government supporting the

various infrastructure required for tourism development. As a result, it confirmed that cooperation with the government and participation of private businesses and organizations could contribute to tourism development in a series of process such as policy formation, implementation and financial support.

Consequently, it shows that the formation of cooperative network between public sector and private sector, ensuring participation of various private sector and reflecting their opinions from planning to implementation of tourism strategy are necessary processes for the successful tourism governance.

## 3. Tourism governance network case study

Local tourism policy-making can be characterized by structures and practices with values and meanings that become regimes of power and knowledge, which operate to filter, prioritize and promote particular local tourism policy actions and initiatives over time (Dredge and Jenkins, 2007). Therefore, an appreciation of the way local policy governance networks operate is crucial for the design of more targeted and effective tourism management structures and practices (Beaumont and Dredge, 2010). The effectiveness of local tourism governance depends on the effectiveness of institutional structure and process and the relational resources and skill sets available for achieving the goals of stakeholders within the network (Bell, 2004). Accordingly, analysis of tourism governance is useful to ascertain which factors can improve the effectiveness of tourism development.

Provan and Kenis (2007) classified the governance network forms with three types: network administrative organization networks, participant governed networks, and lead organization governed networks. Firstly, the network administrative organization network is a form that is operated by a separate administrative actor who plays a key role in coordinating and maintaining the network. Secondly, the participant governed network is the simplest network form led by members of the network with no separate administrative entity. Finally, the lead organization governed network means that a single participating member coordinates all activities and decisions.

This paper analyzes how these networks influence tourism development through studying the tourism governance of three cities. Various parameters have been used to evaluate the effectiveness of governance in many studies (Dredge and Pforr, 2008, good governance advisory group, 2004; Vernon et al., 2005) and this paper will utilize the parameters specified by Beaumont and Dredge (2010). The parameters are as follows:

- Positive cultures, constructive communication and engaged communities

- Transparency and accountability

- Vision and leadership

- Acceptance of diversity and the pursuit of equity and inclusiveness

- Developing knowledge, learning and sharing expertise

- Clear roles and responsibilities for participants and clear operational structures
   and processes within the network

This paper will analyze three cities: Redland City in Australia, Amsterdam in the Netherlands and Seoul in South Korea. In particular, this paper focuses on finding implications for effective governance formation and management by focusing on limitations in the governance network of Seoul in comparison with the other two cities.

## 3-1. Redland City in Australia: administrative organization network

Beaumont and dredge (2010) have explored the local governance networks that have been established in Redland City in Australia for sustainable tourism development. The three forms of governance network which are mentioned are evident in Redland City. This case provides an opportunity to look at the pros and cons of each of three networks, showing the impacts on tourism development through a comparison of the three types in a single region. However, this paper focuses on the Network Administrative Organizations (NAOs) of the three network types in this case. The NAO network is set up to govern the organization from outside the network, i.e. The NAO is not a member of the network which interacts with other members within the network (Provan and Kenis, 2007). However, the network is centralized around the NAO because the NAO plays a key role in managing and sustaining the overall system. According to Provan et al (2004), the NAO network is set up to govern the organization from the outside of network interacting with other members within the network and has a board structure in which members of the network participate. The NAO is not a member of the network which provides its own service. However, the

network is centralized around the NAO because the NAO plays a key role in managing and sustaining the network. Gebauer et al (2005) also argue that NAOs are established locally to achieve broad goals such as regional economic development. The Local Tourism Organization (LTO) shown in the Redland City case is an example of the NAO network form. Redland City council is located south-east of Brisbane in the state of Queensland, Australia, and encompasses mainland coastal areas adjacent to Moreton Bay and a number of Southern Moreton Bay islands. Redland City is a tourist destination because of its sandy beaches, sand dunes and freshwater lakes. Therefore, there are lots of small-sized restaurants, hotels and cafes which provide services to both residents and tourists in Redland City.

Redland City government needs to play a role in and have responsibility for sustainable tourism development, but since the mid 1990s, the government has outsourced tasks relating to the tourism market and the operation of tourist information centres to the Local Tourism Organization (LTO), which is composed of members of local companies relating to regional tourism. The LTO, an incorporated association, has grown into a stable organization and has had about 150 members since 1994. As mentioned above, as a form of NAO, the LTO was originally operated by the board which was composed of Redland City council, members representing the tourism industry and two non-voting members; there was also a general manager responsible for the day-to-day operations. In 2004 the LTO expanded its activity to a wider area, including tourism marketing and visitor information provision and developed a close relationship with stakeholders in local tourism industry. Although

the LTO receives financial support from Redland City council, it has played an important role in the local tourism sector by interacting with tourism stakeholders in the region and raising funds through building up revenue, for example its booming agency business. As the LTO became increasingly important in the local tourism industry, the council-appointed consultant pointed out that the LTO represents only the opinions of the LTO's members rather than the entire tourism sector. Therefore, Redlands City council established the Redland Tourism Advisory network as an informal governance body to represent the opinions of the entire region. However, despite such containment of local government, the LTO contributes to sustainable tourism development of Redland City through broad activities ranging from tourism information services to environmental problems such as the destruction of natural resources caused by tourism development. As mentioned above, Beaumont and Dredge (2010) suggest six parameters of good local governance through extensive reviews in order to analyze the effectiveness of governance networks. The following section will analyze the effectiveness of the LTO network of Redland City by applying these parameters.

### 3-1-1. Positive cultures, constructive communication and engaged communities

The LTO in Redland City communicates closely with its members because they shared common goals and their business is closely related with the tourism industry. Moreover, it responds immediately to the interests and needs of its members because it has accumulated lots of experience in the tourism sector. In this governance, the

general manager, who operates day-to-day tasks, plays a crucial role in establishing a good governance structure which connects members' interests with opportunities in the industry. Although the role of the LTO is restricted within the organization because the organization is operated by its membership, it can handle varied opportunities for local tourism development through active communication with other organizations.

### 3-1-2. Transparency and accountability

The LTO has well defined discipline and procedures and operates by clearly applying these rules, so it shows high transparency and accountability to its members. In addition, it also demonstrates accountability to local constituents because it receives public funding from Redland City, although there are some differences between the LTO and the city council regarding the extent of its accountability.

### 3-1-3. Vision and leadership

This LTO network shows strong leadership to its members because they share common goals through tourism development and a clear vision regarding a wide range of activity areas; these include financial issues which help to operate the organization as well as environmental issues which have to be considered for sustainable tourism. Although there has been criticism over there being too much focus on its members composing the network as an recipient of public funds from Redland City council, the

general manager of the LTO has overcome this criticism by presenting a vision that encompasses every aspect of tourism.

### 3-1-4. Acceptance of diversity and the pursuit of equity and inclusiveness

The LTO of Redland City is composed of small and medium-sized business companies to get benefits from tourism development. However, the environmental and socio-cultural importance of tourism is important so the LTO is also interested in various aspects influenced by tourism development. In particular, the general manager of the organization is an important facilitator of local tourism governance, showing broad understanding and insight over various tourism issues and in particular collaborating with other governances.

### 3-1-5. Developing knowledge, learning and sharing expertise

As it is based on members, the LTO has extensive knowledge and understanding regarding tourism and the local community. In addition, it shares information and data for tourism development and demonstrates characteristics as an open network by sharing its marketing expertise and statistical data with external organizations and consulting with other tourism organizations.

### 3-1-6. Clear roles and responsibilities of participants and clear operational structures and processes of the network

As an incorporated association of businesses engaged in tourism industry, the LTO is aware of its role and responsibility in local tourism, which brings benefits to its members and also contributes to regional development. In particular, the leadership general manager plays an instrumental role in achieving these purposes.

The LTO in Redland City was initially launched with public funding from city council. Therefore, there have been some conflicts with city council over its role and accountability as recipient of public funding. However, based on its business-oriented members the LTO could contribute to the development of tourism because the network has well-defined communities of interest with respect to their membership and a stable structure with consistent and reliable leadership. Although there is also an advisory committee led by city council and grass-roots tourism organizations as other local tourism governances in Redland City, the LTO plays a leading role in local tourism development based on management with expertise, participation of key stakeholders with a clear vision and interactive communication among the participants.

## 3-2. Amsterdam in the Netherlands: participant-led network

Erkuş öztürk (2011) has analyzed the cases of Amsterdam, the Netherlands and Antalya, Turkey to define the influence of state type on the mode of governance. This paper refers to the case of tourism governance in Amsterdam to explore the effectiveness of participant-led governance networks. Amsterdam is the largest city in

the Netherlands and is a popular tourist destination due to the rich cultural resources and canals of the city. Tourism policies of Amsterdam are coordinated by the city's department of economic affairs (EZ) without any separate tourism department. Therefore, Amsterdam's tourism policies have a keen interest in policies that can attract more tourists to promote economic development. The EZ has formed a partnership with local tourism organizations such as the Amsterdam tourism and conference bureau (ATCB), the Amsterdam tourism board (ATB) and Amsterdam partners (AP). The ATCB, as the chief tourism organization in Amsterdam, is partially funded by the EZ and conducts research on tourism and strategy production for tourism development as there is not department specializing in tourism in the city. Therefore, the ATCB plays a leading role in Amsterdam's tourism development and its units, which are created for its tourism business, also play important roles in implementing the tourism strategy of Amsterdam in their respective areas. Through this role, the ATCB has another goal of developing Amsterdam as an international convention city through organizing various conferences at the international and national levels. The ATCB consists of large tourism businesses which operate transport companies and large hotels and are notable players in terms of financial support for tourism development. Therefore, it plays a significant role in governance structure due to the financial support and the large number of member companies. It is thus an important participant in tourism sector and the governance is led directly through the ATCB. There are several partners in Amsterdam's tourism governance besides the ATCB. The Amsterdam partners (AP), which was initiated by the city

government, plays a focal role in attracting the associated actors for marketing the city. It has created "I Amsterdam" representing the city in collaboration with the ATCB and has promoted "vision for tourism development in the eastern inner-city" to expand its influence to the area east of this project. The HOtels, REstaurants and CAfes organization (HORECA) is another important organization which participates in Amsterdam's tourism governance. It consists of small restaurants, cafes and hotels business operators and cooperates with Amsterdam and the ATCB on issues relating to tourism. As an association of small businesses, the HORECA points out the difficulty in becoming a member of the ATCB due to the high membership fees and argues that the ATCB cannot protect the interests of small businesses. Therefore, it is more interested in relations between employers and labour unions in the tourism industry.

As discussed above, the ATCB leads Amsterdam's tourism governance and produces tourism development strategies. Moreover, Amsterdam City Government considers that projects related to tourism are a chance for tourism companies to increase their interests and therefore the important roles in the governance for tourism development of Amsterdam are given to the ATCB as it is composed of major tourism stakeholders. Relatively minor roles are given to other associations such as the HORECA. This governance demonstrates a network form in which participants in the tourism industry lead the governance and this network sets up Amsterdam's tourism strategy and adjusts various projects through financial support from the city government and self-financing.

### 3-2-1. Positive cultures, constructive communication and engaged communities

Since the ATCB consists of tourism-related business operators, it has sense of belonging to organizations and a high level of participation. Therefore, the members of the ATCB participate in conferences on a regular basis, share information and promote lots of projects for tourism development. These projects are invariably related to their own interests. In the process, participants in the governance show a high level of communication and engagements with communities because there are common goals among the members.

### 3-2-2. Transparency and accountability

It is not easy to evaluate the degree of transparency and accountability within the ATCB because it was initiated among interested members related to the tourism industry. In addition, it is a semi-private company and as a result official transparency and accountability is not a prerequisite for establishing the organization. Compared with the LTO-led governance network in Redland City, Amsterdam City Government does not require strict transparency and accountability regarding the financial assistance for governance because the local governments recognize the role of tourism sector governance differently.

### 3-2-3. Vision and leadership

The ATCB is composed of large business associates with interests in the tourism

industry and has a common vision of improving profits through tourism development; it has launched the 'vision for tourism development in the eastern inner-city' project in collaboration with Amsterdam partners and the city government. However, its leadership is only demonstrated within the limits of the organization, so it lacks effective collaboration with other organizations such as HORECA.

### 3-2-4. Acceptance of diversity, pursuit of equity and inclusiveness

There are a variety of organizations such as the ATCB, AP and the HORECA in Amsterdam's tourism governance. Although the ATCB occupies the mainstream of the tourism industry as a leading organization in this system, it has limitations in terms of encompassing and recognizing the diversity of the different organizations. For an example, the high membership fee of the ATCB is an obstacle to small and medium-sized tourism businesses which would like to participate in this leading organization.

### 3-2-5. Developing knowledge, learning and sharing expertise

The ATCB has broad knowledge regarding the tourism environment of Amsterdam based on its membership and shares this information and expertise with its members through various educational programs. This feature of the ATCB also helps it to occupy a leading position in tourism development.

### 3-2-6. Clear roles and responsibilities of participants and clear operational structures and processes of the network

The ATCB is an organization which is composed of massive companies such as transportation businesses and the largest hotels which form the infrastructure of the Amsterdam tourism industry. Since they perceive that tourism development influences their businesses directly, they clearly recognize the role of the ATCB in promoting Amsterdam's tourism industry. In addition, the ATCB shows a clear operational structure and procedures by arranging sub-organizations based on a variety of activities such as tourism marketing and cultural projects.

The participant-led governance network, the Amsterdam tourism conference bureau, has identified its vision of local tourism development and performed a range of actions that focus on its leading role within the private sector with recognition from the local government. Although it does not include more varied stakeholders such as small-scale tourism businesses because of the characteristics of an organization consisting of relatively large-scale businesses, the governance can contribute to achieving economic development based on the active involvement of its participants in leading the local tourism industry.

## 3-3. Seoul in South Korea: lead organization network

The number of tourists visiting South Korea has increased sharply since 2012, when the number exceeded 12 million (KCTI, 2015). In particular, as the capital city of South Korea, Seoul has become an international tourism destination with ten million

visitors each year. Therefore, Seoul Metropolitan Government (SMG) has established a variety of tourism policies in order to link the increase in tourists with economic growth. This section will analyze the storytelling resources excavation policy of the SMG that has been promoted to overcome the limitations of tourism resource development within urban areas and take advantage of the intangible tourism resources. Seoul is a great city, which not only has a resident population of over ten million but also has history of over 600 years. However, it has been developed with an emphasis on urban construction without careful consideration of the historical and cultural heritage, so there are not sufficient resources for tourist attractions. In addition, developing large scale tourism resource requires long-term investment and institutional maintenance due to tangled interests within the urban areas. Under these circumstance, as the tourism trend has changed from visiting traditional tourist attractions such as museums and cultural heritage sites into experiencing the diverse culture of tourist destinations, it is necessary to develop story resources showing the living culture and customs of the tourism destination. In respond to this change, the SMG has laid out tourism resource development policies utilizing various stories of Seoul to meet the diverse experiential needs of tourists. The main policy is to discover the various stories which have been passed down from ancient times through modern times to the present-day in which Seoul has changed and to produce new tourism resources, for example visible tourism resources such as sculptures, performances and exhibitions using these stories (SMG, 2014).

When the tourism development policy to discover Seoul's hidden stories was initiated in 2012, the project was entrusted to private companies with expertise in a variety of performances based on stories. However, the first year's results showed the project's limitations as it did not reflect the long-term perspective on the availability of discovered stories (SMG, 2014). In addition, there were some criticisms of the policy process from tourism experts including tourism business operators and researchers in the private sector as it was led by the SMG. The SMG recognized that using a contract with a private company did not produce its vision regarding tourism resource development and realized that the participation of private companies that concentrate only on discovering stories could not produce the necessary impact. Accordingly, in 2013, the SMG established the Seoul Storytelling Advisory Committee (SSAC) for tourism resource development; this is composed of experts with broad experience within tourism sector such as travel agents, airlines, hotels, the concert industry, tourism institutions and tourism research organizations. The director of the tourism department of the SMG is also involved. The SSAC is an example of the lead organization governed network outlined by Provan and Kenis (2007); in other words, this is a government-led network because the director of tourism department of the SMG played a leading role in this governance. This governance has played an advisory role in tourism resource development policy by utilizing the hidden stories of Seoul. However, as it was not established on an institutional foundation, there is no obligation that the decision of the committee should be reflected in the policies. In the SMG, the committees which participate in the policy process are divided into two

types. One is a committee based on the relevant laws and institutions of the local government, and the other is a committee to obtain the advice of experts and the private sector for the promotion of individual projects in each department. In the former, the composition and tenure of a committee and which committee decisions should be reflected in policy are defined in the act, whereas in the latter case there is no obligation to accept the decision of the committee or legal basis for its composition since it is established optionally depending on the needs of the policy. Since the SSAC is not a statutory committee based on the law because it belongs to the latter, it does not have the formal power to demand that its decisions be reflected in policy. In other words, it exists as an informal consultative group established to meet the needs of the SMG. The role of the committee does not function actively due to this background and the tourism department of the SMG is dominant within the committee. In tourism resource development, the SSAC plays a role in advising on plans relating to the SMG's tourism resource development each year, selecting a private company to perform story excavation projects through evaluation and advising on the tasks of the selected private company. According to its role, the SSAC acts as advisory group through regular meetings in promoting the SMG's story excavation policy.

### 3-3-1. Positive cultures, constructive communication and engaged communities

The SSAC is a comprehensive governance system which is composed of experts in various areas relating to the tourism industry to represent broad private sector opinions in the policy process. However, while the SMG sets up a tourism development

strategy at the beginning of every year, the SSAC starts operating after this point. Therefore, the input of the SSAC cannot be reflected in this strategy. This shows that the engagement of the SSAC cannot play a meaningful role in tourism policy making.

### 3-3-2. Transparency and accountability

Transparency and accountability are important criteria that help to form trust and confidence among the participants (Mulgan, 2000) since it can allow the members of a network to feel that their opinions are worthy and to accept decisions based on transparency and accountability. The transparency and accountability of the SSAC led by the SMG is difficult to measure because it did does not have any available budget and authority to demand policy making to reflect its opinions. Therefore, the members also have little awareness of transparency and accountability in governance.

### 3-3-3. Vision and leadership

When some criticisms were raised regarding the practical effectiveness of the tourism resource development policy, the city government launched the SSAC to take advantage of the expertise within the private sector in tourism industry and to show the role of the city government in this policy. Although the organization's tourism development vision has been shown through resource development, the leadership of the network has not been meaningful because the informality of this governance has prevented it from playing an active role in tourism sector.

### 3-3-4. Acceptance of diversity, pursuit of equity and inclusiveness

Healey (2005) insists that respecting and accepting difference helps in building cooperation and consensus. Thus, the SMG tried to embrace the various opinions of stakeholders from different parts of the tourism industry through the governance of the SSAC. However, the SSAC has not been able to promote its diversity and equity actively as its role is confined to the informal advisory function. Moreover, it does not encompass stakeholders from the economic, cultural, or environmental sectors which can influence tourism policy making.

### 3-3-5. Developing knowledge, learning and sharing expertise

The SSAC shares a variety of knowledge and information on tourism because it is led by the tourism department of the SMG; this department is interested in and affected by tourism and the SSAC is composed of stakeholders with broad experience of the tourism industry. In addition, it is able to develop and share its knowledge and information with external tourism groups through a range of meetings such as forums or conferences on tourism issues.

### 3-3-6. Clear roles and responsibilities of participants and clear operational structures and processes of the network

The SSAC was established to increase the effectiveness of tourism policy by reflecting the various opinions of the private sector. However, there are limitations in clarifying the roles and responsibilities of participants due to the nature of informal

organizations without any institutional foundation. Moreover, it does not have any formal authority to perform its decisions in the policy process, meaning there is a lack of a clear process or structure in the governance.

The SSAC of Seoul is an example of lead organization governance where the local government plays a leading role. This governance is centralized into the SMG, so the purpose of governance is aligned with the goals of the SMG. However, it cannot play an active role in forming tourism policy making and performing because it lacks the institutional foundation as a leading governance participant in the public sector. Therefore, the governance is merely an ancillary role, showing the participation of the private sector within the tourism policy of the SMG.

## 4. Recommendation

This paper has analyzed three modes of tourism governance according to the parameters of the effectiveness of governance. The first two cases of network represent the LTO-led network and participant-led network respectively and the final case shows the lead organization network. The three cases have different structures spearheaded by different leading organizations and show that they have their own characteristics influencing the effectiveness of governance. Unlike the previous two cases, the lead organization network of the SMG shows some limitations in terms of effectiveness. Although the SMG intended to increase the effectiveness of tourism

resource development through governance consisting of various participants from the tourism industry, they could not expect the effect of governance due to the limitation as an informal organizations in the public area. Therefore, this paper proposes several suggestions to promote the effectiveness of the tourism resource development policy of the SMG through comparing Redland City, Amsterdam and Seoul.

Firstly, it is necessary to clarify the role and structure of the network depending on the nature of the policy. This means that the governance must be based on a clear institutional foundation in order to have a clear structure and well defined roles. The network structures of Redland City and Amsterdam show that the various stakeholders in the tourism sector form the governance and play leading roles in promoting their plans. They have a common vision that can be attained through tourism development among the participants and a clear structure, which becomes the foundation of governance. These networks also present clear accountability for the role in the governance organization to achieve their goals, which helps to create a more efficient system. On the other hand, the SSAC is an informal organization established by the needs of the local government, so it did not have an institutional framework for its activities. The institutional foundation also needs to coordinate some conflicts among members of the governance; there have been some conflicts among the participants in the SSAC because this organization is made up of participants from diverse areas relating to the tourism industry. Participants such as professionals and researchers do not receive any direct benefits from the tourism industry, while direct stakeholders such as tourism business operators are influenced directly by tourism issues. The

direct stakeholders insist on their own economic interests in the SMG's policy, whereas indirect stakeholders consider the socio-cultural and environmental influence of tourism more seriously. Thus, it is necessary for the SSAC to clarify its role and responsibility as a governance network through the formation of a clear structure and institutional foundation for resolving these conflicts and promoting the effectiveness of tourism resource development.

Secondly, the governance needs to recognize the diversity of participants and interactive communication between participants for successful governance. In Redland City, the LTO-led governance network has limitations as it is unable to represent the interests of the entire city because it is limited to a part of the city geographically. In the case of Amsterdam, the ATCB is operated by infrastructure operators such as transportation businesses or large hotels, so it is difficult for small businesses to participate. In the case of Seoul, the SSAC is composed of experts from various tourism sectors to reflect their opinions to policy but it is difficult to reach agreement due to the differing opinions regarding tourism issues. Since there are some differences in how researchers consider the social and cultural influence of tourism business operators, it can be seen that there is insufficient awareness of the diversity in governance. Therefore, it is necessary to recognize the diversity between participants and understand others' perspectives through interactive communication.

Thirdly, public institutions need to participate at various levels relating to tourism due to the influence of the tourism industry on other industries. Rhodes (1997) emphasizes that governance is a way to achieve goals by configuring a network consisting of a

wide range of participants such as the central government, the civilian government, civil society organizations and the market. In the case of Amsterdam, there is not a separate tourism department in the city government and tourism policy is dealt with as a part of the economic department. However, the city government understands that tourism development is the responsibility of the private sector as it benefits from tourism directly; therefore, it can be seen that tourism is considered as a part of economic department due to the wide-ranging effect it has. In addition, the ATCB could have even greater achievements in tourism development through the cooperation with the National Tourism and Conference Bureau (NTCB) at national level in Amsterdam city government. On the other hand, the SMG has limitations as the members of the governance only consist of those within tourism because the borders of tourism resources development policy are limited to the tourism industry. Thus, it lacks collaboration with other departments of the government or the private sector regarding the use of tourism resources such as story performance and story sculptures, which were created as a result of the storytelling resource excavation project. As a result, this point is not helpful in maximizing the effectiveness of governance. From this respective, the Korean Culture and Tourism Institute (2012) also argues that governance for local tourism development is not yet completed in South Korea, which could be impeding the development of local tourism. Therefore, a range of actors surrounding the policy need to be considered and local governance needs to encourage their participation in the establishment of tourism policy.

## 5. Conclusion

There are lots of stakeholders in relation to tourism due to the varied effects the tourism industry has on the economic and environmental aspects. Moreover, the emergence of new ideologies such as globalization, informatization and neo-liberalism have encouraged changes in governing forms from government to governance with various stakeholders involved in the process. Consequently, the governance in tourism sector is intertwined with the interests of various stakeholders and has played a crucial role for tourism development. This is because the tourism industry has played an important role in economic development due to the economic benefits tourism brings. In particular, the nature of tourism relating to diverse areas such as the economy, culture and the environment require the participation of not only the public sector but also a wide range of other stakeholders including the private sector or civil society. Thus, this paper proposes several suggestions to enhance the effectiveness of governance in local tourism development through a comparison of the tourism governance networks of Redland City in Australia, Amsterdam in the Netherlands, and Seoul in South Korea. In order to compare the effectiveness of the governances of these three cities, this paper has utilized some criteria which are used in judging good local tourism governance.

In the case of the LTO-led governance of Redland City in Australia, the local tourism organization in which local tourism business operators participate as members leads the governance. Therefore, there are clear structures and procedures within the network and the LTO plays a leading role in local tourism development based on

management with expertise, participation of key stakeholders with a clear vision and interactive communication among the participants.

In Amsterdam, tourism business is dealt with as one of the economic department tasks without a separate organization related to tourism. Thus, Amsterdam city government has little involvement in tourism development and tourism policy process is primarily overseen by the ATCB, which is operated by tourism infrastructure providers. The tourism governance of Amsterdam shows a governance network led by participants involved in the tourism industry such as transportation operators and hotels; this means they share a vision as stakeholders that are associated with tourism directly and could contribute to tourism development through a clear understanding of their roles and visions.

The SMG case demonstrates a lead organization governance network where the government configures and operates the governance of the tourism resources development. However, as it does not have any institutional foundation in the constitution and operation of governance and the government has no obligation on the performance of the decisions of the governance, the governance activities are little more than advisory make little contribution to tourism development.

Through the comparison of the above three cases, this paper has analyzed the effectiveness of governance networks by applying the parameters of good governance. As a result, this report has proposed several suggestions for improving the effectiveness of Seoul's tourism resources development governance. Firstly, the role and structure of governance need to be clearly defined. It is also important to set up an

institutional foundation because this can help to ensure the strategy of the governance is performed in practice. Secondly, there are needed diversity of participants of governance and interactive communication among participants. As mentioned before, as the tourism industry influences a variety of fields including the economy, culture and the environment, it is particularly important for tourism governance to involve various stakeholders and to promote communication among participants. Thirdly, it is important to involve broad sections of the public sector as well as the private sector. Involving the public authorities at national and local level in the governance can improve the performance of governance in terms of dealing the complex issues of tourism.

Tourism is a policy area that is intertwined with more stakeholders than any other area. Therefore, it is important to form a governance system in which various stakeholders cooperate to ensure an effective policy process. Although it is difficult to assert what the most effective or superior governance mode for improving the effectiveness of governance is, it is clear that the institutional foundation can be an important factor in enhancing the effectiveness of governance because it provides the members in the governance with a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities and encourages them to perform governance activities responsively.

# Bibliography

Baggio, r. And cooper, c. (2010). Knowledge transfer in a tourism destination: the effects of a network structure. The service industries journal,30(10), 1757-1771.

Beaumont, n. And dredge, d. (2010). Local tourism governance: a comparison of three network approaches. Journal of sustainable tourism,18(1), 7-28.

Bell, s. (2004). Appropriate policy knowledge, and institutional and governance implications. Australian journal of public administration, 63(1), 22-28.

Bevir, m. (2011). Governance and governmentality after neoliberalism. Policy & politics, 39(4), 457-471.

Bevir, m. Ed. (2010). The sage handbook of governance. Sage.

Bramwell, b. And lane, b. (2011). Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. Journal of sustainable tourism, 19(4-5), 411-421

Brandon, k., et al. (1993). Basic steps toward encouraging local participation in nature tourism projects. Ecotourism: a guide for planners and managers, 134-151

Darbellay, f. And stock, m. (2012). Tourism as complex interdisciplinary research object. Annals of tourism research, 39(1), 441-458.

Dodds, r., & graci, s. (2012). *Sustainable tourism in island destinations*. Routledge.

Dredge, d. (2004). Policy networks and the local organization of tourism. Tourism management, 27

Dredge, d. (2006). Networks, conflict and collaborative communities. Journal of sustainable tourism 14, no. 6 (2006), 562.

Dredge, d. And jenkins, j.m. (2007). Tourism planning and policy.

Dredge, d., et al. (2006). Achieving sustainable local tourism management: phase 1-practitioners guide.

Foggin,t., & münster, d. O. (2003). Finding the middle ground between communities and tourism. *Africa insight*, *33*(1/2), 18-22.

Erkuş-öztürk, h. (2011). Modes of tourism governance: a comparison of Amsterdam and antalya. Anatolia, 22(3), 307-325.

Farmaki, a. (2015). Regional network governance and sustainable tourism. Tourism geographies, 17(3), 385-407.

Fredline, e. And faulkner, b.(2000). Host community reactions: a cluster analysis. Annals of tourism research, 27(3), 763-784.

Gebauer, a., nam, c.w. and parsche, r. (2005). Regional technology policy and factors shaping local innovation networks in small german cities 1.european planning studies, 13(5), 661-683.

Göymen, k. (2000). Tourism and governance in turkey. Annals of tourism research, 27(4), 1025-1048.

Hall, c. (1999). Rethinking collaboration and partnership: a public policy perspective. Journal of sustainable tourism 7, 274–289.

Hall, c.m. and jenkins, j. (2004). Tourism and public policy. A companion to tourism, 525-540.

Hall, c.m. (2008). Tourism planning: policies, processes and relationships (2nd ed.). Pearson education.

Hall, c.m. (2010). Power in tourism: tourism in power. In d. Macleod &j. G. Carrier (eds.), tourism, power and culture: anthropological insights. Bristol: channel view publications.

Hall, c.m. (2011a). A typology of governance and its implications for tourism policy analysis. Journal of sustainable tourism, 19(4–5), 437–457.

Hall, c.m. (2011b). Policy learning and policy failure in sustainable tourism governance: from first- and second-order to third-order change? Journal of sustainable tourism, 19(4–5), 649–671.

Healey, p. (2005). Place, identity and governance, habitus: a sense of place, 189–218.

Heeley, j. (2011). *Inside city tourism*. Channel view publications.

Horwich, r.h., et al. (1993). Ecotourism and community development: a view from belize. Ecotourism: a guide for planners and managers, 152-168

Jessop, b. (1998). The rise of governance and the risks of failure: the case of economic development. International social science journal, 50(155), 29-45.

Jones, c., hesterly, w.s. and borgatti, s.p. (1997). A general theory of network governance: exchange conditions and social mechanisms. Academy of management review, 911-945.

Kang, s.k. (2005). Ecotourism development and community interests. Journal of rural tourism 12(2): 63-71.(in korean)

Kenis, p. And schneider, v. (1991). Policy networks and policy analysis: scrutinizing a new analytical toolbox. Policy networks: empirical evidence and theoretical considerations, 25-59.

Kim n.j., et al. (2015). Policy network analysis in the process of governance formation in local tourism development, korea academic society of tourism management.(in korean)

Kim, j.d. and kim, n.j (2007). Formation elements of local tourism governance as local tourism collaboration system. Korea tourism research, 32(3).(in korean)

Kooiman, j. (2003). Governing as governance. Sage.

Korea culture and tourism institution. (2012). Economic effect of tourism industry. (in korean)

Korea culture and tourism institution. (2015). Field survey on the foreign tourists. (in korean)

Kwon, s.i. (2012). A study on the influential factor in forming tourism governance in region, hanyang university press.(in korean)

Lynn jr, l.e., heinrich, c.j. and hill, c.j. (2000). Studying governance and public management: why? How. Governance and performance: new perspectives, 1-33.

Marsh, d.(1998). Comparing policy networks. Open university press.

Mulgan, r. (2000). Accountability : an ever-expanding concept?. Public administration, 78(3), 555-573

Pearce, d.g. (2001). Tourism, trams and local government policy-making in christchurch, new zealand. Current issues in tourism, 4(2-4), 331-354

Peter, j. (2001). Local governance in western europe. Sage.

Pierre, j. (2000). Debating governance: authority, steering, and democracy. Oxford: oxford university press.

Pollitt, c. And bouckaert, g. (2004). Public management reform: a comparative analysis. Oxford university press, usa.

Powell, w.w. (1990). Neither market nor hierarchy: network forms of organization. Research in organizational behavior,12, 295-336.

Provan, k.g. and kenis, p. (2008). Modes of network governance: structure, management, and effectiveness. Journal of public administration research and theory, 18(2), 229-252.

Provan, k.g., isett, k.r. and milward, h.b. (2004). Cooperation and compromise: a network response to conflicting institutional pressures in community mental health. Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly, 33(3), 489-514

Rhodes, r.a.w. (1997). Understanding governance: policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability. Buckingham, philadelphia: open university press.

Rhodes, r. A. W.(2007). Understanding governance: ten years on. Organization studies. 28(8), 1243-1264.

Rondinelli, d.a., mccullough, j.s. and johnson, r.w. (1989). Analyzing decentralization policies in developing countries: a political-economy framework. Development and change, 20(1), 57-87.

Salet, w., thornley, a., & kreukels, a. (2003). Institutional and spatial coordination in european metropolitan regions. Metropolitan governance and spatial planning: comparative case studies of european city-regions, 3-19

Shaw, g. And williams, a.m. (2004). Tourism and tourism spaces. Sage.

Saxena, g. (2005). Relationships, networks and the learning regions :case evidence from the peakdistrict national park. Tourism management, 26, 277-289.

Seoul metropolitan government. (2014). White paper on tourism attraction development project through storytelling.(in korean)

So, s.c. and yu, j.w. (2005). A study on local governance in the policy process empathizing on the policy actors, korea society and administration study.(in korean)

Tosun, c. (2000). Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries. Tourism management, 21(6), 613-633.

Trousdale, w.j. (1999). Governance in context: boracay island, philippines.annals of tourism research, 26(4), 840-867.
United nations world tourism organisation (unwto) (2009). World tourism barometer.

Vernon, j., essex, s., pinder, d. And curry, k. (2005). Collaborative policymaking: local sustainable projects. Annals of tourism research, 32(2), 325-345.

World tourism organization. (1993). Sustainable tourism development guide for local planners. Spain: wto publication.

Yu, j.w. (2008). The study on the relationship between network governance and partnership for sustainable tourism development. Tourism research, 32(3). (in korean)

Zahra, a.l. (2011). Rethinking regional tourism governance: the principle of subsidiarity. Journal of sustainable tourism, 19(4-5), 535-552.