

1 **Introduction**

2

3 DMOs currently face remarkable challenges in local, regional, national and
4 international contexts (Pearce & Schänzel, 2013). DMOs were originally defined as
5 organisations closely associated with the *promotion of destination* amenities (Pike,
6 2007). However, in light of recent developments, it may be more appropriate to
7 define DMOs as management-focused organisations (Harrill, 2009) assuming
8 greater resource management and leadership roles in destinations (Volgger &
9 Pechlaner, 2014). English destinations and DMOs were once heavily dependent on
10 the public purse, mainly through regional government support (Fyall, Fletcher, &
11 Spyriadis, 2009). The *2011 UK Government Tourism Policy* proposed replacing
12 existing tourism management and support structures on a regional level, namely
13 Regional Tourist Boards (RTBs) and Regional Development Agencies (RDAs), in
14 favour of more locally-positioned DMOs and Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs)
15 (Kennell & Chaperon, 2013). These reshaped DMOs are expected to have sole
16 responsibility for ensuring long-term financial sustainability of their organisations
17 whilst also exercising strategic destination decision-making (Coles, Dinan, &
18 Hutchison, 2012).

19

20 Increasingly, DMOs are attempting to accomplish these tasks as part of a network
21 involving businesses, government and civil society (Beritelli, Bieger, & Laesser,
22 2007). By linking these differing organizations, DMOs seek to establish a network
23 identity (Huemer, Becerra, & Lunnan, 2004), in which members adopt roles that
24 include responsibility for sharing information and encouraging collective action. The
25 resulting inter-organizational knowledge interactions (Hristov & Ramkissoon, 2016)
26 can support development and implementation of collective activities that help
27 achieve an intended outcome of financial sustainability (Beritelli, Buffa, & Martini,
28 2015).

29

30 Tourism network literature has grown rapidly over the past decade (Williams,
31 Inversini, Ferdinand, & Buhalis, 2017) and is increasingly applied to examine DMOs
32 and destinations (Reinhold, Laesser, & Beritelli, 2015). Existing work, however,
33 tends to use networks as a metaphor for understanding organisations and

1 organisational behaviour (Merinero-Rodríguez & Pulido-Fernández, 2016), including
2 relational dynamics (Tran, Jeeva, & Pourabedin, 2016). These studies were able to
3 identify individuals and organizations that may be influential, but were not able to
4 determine the extent of this influence. Whilst an emerging stream of tourism
5 research has begun to employ inferential techniques, such as the Quadratic
6 Assignment Procedure (Liu, Huang, & Fu, 2017), most Social Network Analysis
7 (SNA) research relies on descriptions of networks to explain relationships among
8 entities (Shumate & Palazzolo, 2010). However, these approaches do not enable
9 researchers to determine if patterns identified in networks could have occurred by
10 chance (Hunter & Handcock, 2006). Researchers have raised concerns when
11 attempting to infer network characteristics from descriptive metrics; for example,
12 clustering coefficient values, which indicate that entities or actors are important in
13 networks, can be observed in randomly created networks (Newman, Strogatz, &
14 Watts, 2001) . This suggests these metrics will require additional qualitative or
15 quantitative data about network actors or characteristics in order to support robust
16 research.

17
18 The aim of this paper is to examine the emergent network identity in a DMO network
19 by identifying relational and node property influences on the structure of a
20 communications network in a DMO. Using data collected from the Destination Milton
21 Keynes initiative, the communication network of a DMO was modelled using an
22 Exponential Random Graph approach. These models identified the extent to which
23 node (organizational characteristics) and structure influence the distribution of
24 communication ties in the network.

25 26 ***Literature Review***

27 Network theory (Granovetter, 1973) and the analytical approach of SNA can
28 be used to examine the arrangement of relationships between interacting entities,
29 such as individuals, groups and organisations (Wang & Xiang, 2007). In the tourism
30 and management domain, this perspective advocates that organisations no longer
31 act solely as individual entities but through relational networks where value is
32 created by initiating and nurturing collaboration (Fyall et al. 2009). SNA examines
33 structural and relational properties of networks, such as density (Table 1), to identify
34 patterns that can be used to explain social behaviour (Prell, 2012). SNA literature in

1 business and management (Borgatti & Foster, 2003) seeks to demonstrate how the
 2 concept is able to visualise otherwise invisible social networks. Once depicted,
 3 invisible social networks, such as communication structures, may be leveraged for
 4 visible results in organisations (Conway, 2014).

5
 6 However, to date, little research has been undertaken to examine communication
 7 among destination organizations, particularly through the lens of SNA (Asero,
 8 Gozzo, & Tomaselli, 2016). SNA has often been perceived as a network tool that
 9 produces largely descriptive data without providing deeper insights (Prell 2012).
 10 Within this context, scholars have argued that social network studies often over-
 11 emphasise the quantity of network relationships and interactions rather than their
 12 quality (Conway 2014).

13

14 **Table 1: SNA Terms**

Term	Description
Node	Entity in a network which can be human or non-human actors
Edge	A tie from one node to another which can be an interaction, relationship or shared property
Attribute	Node characteristic which is independent of ties to other nodes
Communication network	Network where ties are communications between entities
Degree centrality	Number of ties nodes have with other nodes in the network.
Density	The ratio of actual ties in the network to potential ties
Authority	This metric is an indicator of the extent to which information from the node is valued by other nodes in the actor
Closeness centrality	This metric is an indicator of the relative distance information from a given node will have to travel to reach others in the network
Betweenness centrality	This metric identifies the extent to which a given node is a member of the path information has to travel from one part in the network to another.
Transitivity	The tendency for a given node to be connected by edges if it shares a mutual partner
Exponential random graph model (ERGM)	A group of approaches to perform inferential statistical analysis of networks

1 Adapted from Krivitsky (2012)

2

3 ***Network Theory and SNA Adopted in DMO Research***

4 DMOs often represent a number of key destination management and
5 leadership-interested actors in their respective destinations (Ness, Aarstad,
6 Haugland, & Grønseth, 2014). Extant SNA literature in the DMO domain has focused
7 largely on how inter-organizational linkages can influence governance of these
8 institutions including related domains, such as knowledge management, policy
9 formulation and cooperation (Czernek, 2013). Network theory has been used to
10 examine DMOs as complex systems (Pforr, 2006) . Studies have examined network
11 collaboration and knowledge-sharing practices in public, private (Longjit & Pearce,
12 2013)or mixed network clusters (Del Chiappa & Presenza, 2013) within specific
13 geographic boundaries (Baggio & Cooper 2008).

14

15 For DMOs, the shift from marketing to management implies the need to engage with
16 a network of stakeholders for an expanded range of activities. The extent to which
17 the DMO can influence network interactions, such as communication between
18 members, has not yet been identified (van der Zee & Vanneste, 2015). Researchers
19 have determined previously that organizations can establish a collaborative “network
20 identity” in which members are viewed by their relational roles and positions
21 (Huemer et al., 2004). This emergent, jointly-held perception can indicate the ability
22 to contribute (Anderson, Håkansson, & Johanson, 1994), forming the basis for
23 interaction within the network and the benefits derived from membership (Astley &
24 Zammuto, 1992). Whilst individual organizations may adopt particular roles, the focal
25 or initiating organization has an opportunity to shape overall interactions and, hence,
26 the nature of the collective network identity (Ellis, Rod, Beal, & Lindsay, 2012). The
27 network identity framed by this organization helps define the nature and volume of
28 activities with which members are involved (Gadde, Huemer, & Håkansson, 2003).

29 To date, network identity has been explored by inductive examination of member
30 discussions, most notably by the International Marketing and Purchasing group
31 (Morlacchi, Wilkinson, & Young, 2005). Research has examined the influence of
32 network identity on interactions in supplier, project and creative inter-organizational
33 networks. Research has not yet examined the structure of relationships in these

1 networks which may provide insight into the nature of and extent to which network
2 identity can influence interactions such as communications between organizations.

3 Research has explored the influence of relational properties on communication
4 processes in the DMO network of bodies involved in strategic destination decision-
5 making (Baggio, 2017). Network structure influences the rate or efficiency of
6 communication and knowledge-sharing in destination networks (Argote & Ingram,
7 2000). High density networks can provide a large number of potential contacts to
8 members, supporting rapid knowledge diffusion (Gloor, Kidane, Grippa, Marmier, &
9 Von Arb, 2008). They can help in adaptation to a changing environment through
10 efficient information exchange of practices, techniques and market requirements
11 among members. Network structure can also influence the pattern of diffusion of
12 knowledge, enabling innovation by exposing actors to differing perspectives (Chen &
13 Hicks, 2004). Previous research on the destination of Elba suggests that DMO
14 communication networks are sparse with low levels of local collaboration and
15 cooperation (Baggio & Cooper, 2010). Since communication can underpin activities,
16 such as resource sharing and activity coordination in a DMO network, there is a
17 need to understand the patterns of communication between members. An
18 examination of these interactions using SNA can provide an opportunity to
19 understand the nature and extent of identity in DMO networks.

20 *Inferential Network Analysis with Exponential Random Graph Models (ERGM)*

21

22 Statistical approaches to SNA in the form of Exponential Random Graph Models
23 (ERGM) (Wasserman & Pattison, 1996) have been developed to enable prediction of
24 relationship patterns (van Duijn & Huisman, 2011). ERGM linkages or ties between
25 entities, along with entity attributes, are used to predict network characteristics
26 (Krivitsky, 2012). ERGMs take the perspective that relationship creation among
27 actors in a network is a temporal process. The goal of ERGM analysis is to identify a
28 specific model of relationships among a set of actors similar to the observed network
29 resulting from this temporal process (Broekel, Balland, Burger, & van Oort, 2014).
30 The approach is model-based rather than sample-based and inferences based on
31 the analysis relate to the observed network only. Calculations are performed using
32 Markov Chain Monte Carlo Maximum Likelihood Estimation, which requires

1 creation of a distribution of random graphs from an initial set of network parameter
2 values. These are then evaluated by comparison with the observed or real world
3 graph in an interactive manner until the model converges; that is, the parameters
4 stabilize.

5
6 ERGMs have particular strengths in determining how a real world network varies
7 from a random graph (Rivera, Soderstrom, & Uzzi, 2010). In real world networks,
8 actors or entities will not have the same ability to form ties. These networks may
9 exhibit homophily, which is the tendency of entities with similar attributes to form ties
10 preferentially with each other (Cross, Laseter, Parker, & Velasquez, 2006). This
11 property suggests that differences among actors will result in clusters or subgroups
12 within networks. Communication in networks across different subgroups based on
13 actor types can be slower as there are fewer connections among them.

14
15 Early studies have identified homophily in social groups by utilising demographic
16 characteristics, such as age, background and gender (Loomis, 1946), using
17 qualitative techniques. Later work adopted quantitative research to analyse networks
18 in social institutions, such as schools (Shrum, Cheek & Hunter, 1988) which enabled
19 examination of multiple dimensions of homophily at the same time. Subsequent in
20 this area has identified the influence of homophily on organizational development
21 and innovation (Aldrich, Reese, & Dubini, 1989). Current research in this area
22 attempts to identify homophily by similarities in network position (Mittleness, DeJordy,
23 Ahuja, & Sudek, 2016). This body of research proposes that actors with shared
24 characteristics, such as beliefs or behaviours, are more likely to interact with each
25 other and occupy similar network positions (Kwon, Stefanone, & Barnett, 2014).
26 Researchers have found organizations exhibit homophily by geography, industry and
27 capabilities (Cowan, 2005). At the organizational level, this property has been used
28 to explain why firms with similar network positions are also more likely to engage in
29 joint activities, such as alliances (Brass, Galaskiewicz, Greve, & Tsai, 2004). Entities
30 not sharing these characteristics are “peripheral” and possess no influence
31 (Boschma, 2005).

32
33 Real world networks may also exhibit higher levels of transitivity than random
34 networks (Louch, 2000). This tendency of nodes to cluster in these networks has

1 been found to be greater than expected when compared to a random network with a
2 similar degree distribution (Newman & Park, 2003). To capture these properties,
3 Hunter and Handcock (2006) proposed geometrically-weighted, edgewise, shared
4 partnerships (GWESP), which capture transitivity characteristics in real world
5 networks, such as clusters of nodes more highly connected to each other than the
6 rest of the network. This measure assumes two actors share a partner if both have
7 edges connecting with the same partner. These shared partners form a triangle if the
8 original two actors are connected to each other. The shared partner count is
9 measured by each edge in the network and the resulting distribution is used to
10 estimate transitivity in the network.

11

12 Interpreting the statistics of ERGMs is similar to binary logistics regression. Network
13 linkages or ties are the outcome to be predicted and network structures help to
14 explain the probability of these linkages (Hunter, Goodreau, & Handcock, 2008).
15 ERGMs have been used in domains, such as politics, to examine alliances or
16 conflicts (Cranmer, Desmarais, & Kirkland, 2012). However, little effort has been
17 made thus far to apply these approaches to examine tourism-related phenomena,
18 such as communication in destination networks.

19

20 **Research Propositions**

21 Communication and interconnections between tourism stakeholders is a
22 frequently examined phenomenon. Previous researches have analysed the
23 linkages between websites of destination stakeholders, along with connections
24 between actors (Baggio, Scott, & Cooper, 2010). However, whilst empirical
25 research in other domains has examined how real world networks differ from
26 random networks (Shumate & Palazzolo, 2010), tourism research has not yet
27 confirmed that connections in observed networks could not have arisen by chance.
28 Verification that networks are not random can support inferences made by
29 examination of network metrics, such as centrality. The first research proposition is
30 therefore:

31

32 *Proposition 1: Communication relationships in a DMO network did not arise in a*
33 *random fashion.*

1

2 Network structures have been found to influence the nature of collaboration and
3 therefore the effectiveness of DMO networks (van der Zee & Vanneste, 2015).
4 Research in economic geography has indicated that homophily, or the tendency to
5 form connections preferentially, can be observed in members of a policy group
6 (Hazir & Autant-Bernard, 2014). If a network identity was established, members of
7 the DMK initiative should communicate preferentially with each other. Proposition 2
8 is therefore:

9

10 *Proposition 2: Members exhibit homophily by membership in the DMK initiative.*

11

12 Past research has indicated that members of networks have exhibited homophily
13 through shared attributes, such as age, race and gender (van Duijn & Huisman,
14 2011). However, it is not yet known if the same effect could be observed in tourism
15 organizations operating in the same industry. Proposition 3 is therefore:

16

17 *Proposition 3: Members of the DMK network exhibit homophily by industry*

18

19 **Research Setting: The DMK Network of DMO Member Organisations**

20 Destination Milton Keynes (DMK) was established in 2006 by 13 founding
21 organisations representing local authorities, businesses, sustainability trusts and
22 community organisations acting as the official provider of tourist information services
23 for Milton Keynes; thus, exercising marketing functions predominantly (Hristov &
24 Zehrer, 2015). As the political and economic context changed (Coles, Dinan, &
25 Hutchison, 2014), DMK was expected to take on board a wider array of
26 responsibilities. Currently, DMK functions as an independent, not-for-profit company
27 and its funding structure includes a mixture of membership fees, grants from Milton
28 Keynes Council and commissions from its members (Hristov & Zehrer, 2015). DMK
29 is an official DMO network of key destination businesses, the council and other
30 public bodies, along with a diverse mix of not-for-profit and community organisations.
31 Having clear geographic boundaries, the DMK network covers 70 member
32 organisations located in central Milton Keynes and the surrounding market (Hristov
33 & Zehrer, 2015). Among the core objectives of DMK are to encourage inward
34 investment, to promote Milton Keynes as a viable visitor destination and to explore

1 opportunities for developing further business, leisure, heritage and other types of
2 urban and rural destination products.

3

4 Such activities are expected to be carried out under the guidance of Destination
5 Management Plans (DMPs) and by involving key interested destination actors who
6 serve businesses, local government and third sector organisations. DMPs are an
7 expression of a government-mandated, current policy-driven approach to guiding the
8 work of private-led DMOs in England.

9

10 DMK and the UK is not a unique case but its relevance and applicability spreads
11 across a number of countries with tourism sectors. DMOs face an increasingly
12 networked environment and significant changes in their funding and governance
13 (Coles, Dinan and Hutchison 2014). Such disruptions to the operational environment
14 for DMOs are evident in a number of countries, such as Switzerland (Beritelli, Bieger
15 & Laesser 2014), Australia (Pforr, Pechlaner, Volgger, & Thompson, 2014) China
16 (Wang & Ap 2013) and the UK (Hristov & Zehrer 2017).

17

18 In the case of Switzerland, Pietro, Thomas & Christian (2013) highlighted that many
19 Swiss DMOs have to restructure into networks that engage a wider range of
20 stakeholders in order to demonstrate value for money and to diversify their funding
21 streams. Similarly, in Australia, Pforr, Pechlaner, Volgger & Thompson (2014)
22 concluded DMOs are increasingly being confronted with limited funds and
23 organisations often need to incorporate input from the private sector in order to offer
24 a continued justification for their existence. In the case of China, DMOs or Tourism
25 Administrative Organizations (TAOs) restructured their operations to support similar
26 transformations to network tourism governance (Wang & Ap, 2013) . Equally, in the
27 case of the UK, DMOs have been under increased scrutiny within a new funding and
28 governance landscape, resulting in a focus on the distribution of leadership and the
29 pooling of knowledge and resources (Hristov & Zehrer, 2017).


30

31 **Research Methods**

32 The research method adopted a four-step process, as seen in Figure 1

33

1 **Figure 1: Research Process**



2 *1) Define Network Boundaries*

3 Network research aims to study whole populations, individuals, organisations or
4 entities in a given cohort (Galaskiewicz & Wasserman, 1993). Researchers need to
5 determine the extent or boundary of networks, which then shapes subsequent data
6 collection (Laumann, Marsden, & Prensky, 1989). Collecting network data thus
7 implies that network actors are not independent units of analysis (Scott, 1988), but
8 rather embedded in a myriad of social relations, as in the case of this study, in which
9 all target organisations are members of DMK.

10

11 When conducting studies investigating large networks, the collection and subsequent
12 analysis of network data often becomes unmanageable (Conway 2014). This study
13 overcomes such complexities by applying a rule of inclusion (Murty, 1998) that limits
14 the data collection organizations involved with the DMK DMO post-2011 in a
15 Government Tourism Policy context. For this research, data was collected from a
16 network of 70 member organisations on board DMK. They included businesses
17 representing a number of sectors of the economy related to Milton Keynes, as well
18 as local authorities, such as Milton Keynes Council, and a range of not-for-profit
19 organisations.

20

21 *2) Data Collection*

22 Network survey questionnaires facilitate the task to construct collectively and depict
23 the investigated network subsequently (Moody, McFarland, & Bender-deMoll, 2005)
24 by using binary network data. For the purpose of network data collection, the study
25 used a web-based platform, Organisational Network Analysis (ONA) Surveys, which
26 is available on <https://www.s2.onasurveys.com> on a subscription basis. The survey
27 content and structure were initially developed in MS Word, which allowed the
28 researcher the opportunity to visualise the full survey prior to embedding it in ONA

1 Surveys. Once agreed, the content and structure of the DMO network survey was
2 embedded in ONA Surveys and tested with the assistance of DMK management.
3 Then, names and contact details of those testing the survey were replaced with
4 Destination Milton Keynes's full network of member organisations. The full member
5 list was collected from the DMK official website on 1 July 2014 and research was
6 undertaken in order to identify senior prospects within DMK's member organisations.

7
8 To ensure ethical data collection and to minimize potential risk, it was made clear in
9 the survey introduction that the study was only interested in existing links within the
10 complete network of DMK member organisations. As such, the study does not
11 extend beyond DMK's membership network to capture any private networks of
12 individual DMO member organisations. Respondents were required to provide data
13 concerning the nature of their relationships with other DMK member organisations,
14 such as the frequency of information-sharing and the impact of developmental
15 resource-sharing between respondent organisations.

16

17 *3) Descriptive Statistics of Network Characteristics*

18 Gephi (Gephi.org) was employed to perform initial exploratory analysis and
19 visualisation of the communication network (Cherven, 2015). Gephi has a number of
20 network and actor-level measures that target structural and relational properties of
21 networks. Gephi also provides a range of network layout algorithms used for
22 transforming network data into network depictions.

23

24 *4) Exponential Random Graph Modelling*

25 Modelling was conducted using the statnet package in R. Four models were
26 developed:

27

28 *1: Edges only model.* The purpose of this model is to determine if the distribution of
29 edges in the observed network differs significantly from a random network (Research
30 proposition 1). This model is known as the the Bernoulli or Erdos-Reyni model and is
31 useful as it helps determine if the patterns of relationships in the communication
32 network identified by the descriptive statistics could have arisen by chance.

33

1 *2: Edges and the actor property of membership in DMK.* The purpose of this model is
2 to identify homophily by DMK membership; that is, network members communicate
3 with each other more than they do with non-members (Research proposition 2).

4 *3: Edges, membership and the network property of GWESP.* This model
5 incorporates a network statistic that identifies how the transitivity of the
6 communication network varies from random distribution of edges.

7

8 *4: Edges, GWESP, actor properties of membership and industry background.* The
9 purpose of this model is to identify homophily by Industry membership (Research
10 proposition 3).

11

12 The fit of all models will be assessed by the Akaike information criterion (AIC) and
13 Bayesian information criterion (BIC) (Akaike, 1992). Whilst they have no direct
14 interpretation, they serve as a means for comparing differing models and lower
15 values are preferred.

16

17 **Results**

18 The membership portfolio of DMK consists of founding (corporate) and non-
19 corporate members. Founding (corporate) members initially established the DMO in
20 2006 and member organisations joined later; i.e. post-2006 until January 2014 when
21 this study was conducted. Corporate members represented 18.5% of the overall
22 DMO membership network, whilst non-corporate members accounted for 81.5% of
23 the DMO membership base. The investigated network itself is diverse; i.e. a number
24 of key sectors of the economy are represented on board (Table 2) and hospitality
25 establishments and not-for-profit organisations are dominant stakeholder groups
26 (sectors defined as per the above classification) at 24.7% and 18.5%, respectively.

27

1 **Table 2: DMK Network by Sector (from January 2014)**

Type of organisation	Network share (%)
Hospitality Sector	24.7
Not-for-Profit	18.5
Conferences and Events	14.8
Retail and Services	13.6
Evening Economy	9.9
Attractions and Activities	8.6
Local Government	6.2
Higher Education	2.5
Transportation	1.2

2

3 Within the context of communication patterns and exchange of information, edge
4 colours correspond to the colour of source nodes to depict the initiators of this
5 communication; i.e. network actors who reported a link with other DMK member
6 organisations. Edge (communication flows) corresponds to the colour of source; i.e.
7 identifying key communicators. The thicker a link, the higher the frequency of
8 communication and knowledge exchange between the source and target nodes.

9

10 Figure 2 provides a view of all interaction flows related to communication and
11 exchange of information across the DMK network.

12

1

Figure 2: DMK Network Information Flows



2

3 An examination of the metrics for 5 firms with the highest scores in the network
4 indicates they are service providers. Further, the highest score for degree and
5 centrality belongs to a higher education firm. Firms with these scores will be more
6 likely to be involved in communications across the entire network than other firms.
7 The reason for this may be that service providers work with a large number of
8 network entities as part of their operations. In this way, they become network “hubs”
9 that connect otherwise isolated firms to each other.

10

1 **Table 3: Network Metrics (all numbers except degree are normalized)**


<i>Company Type</i>	<i>Degree</i>	<i>Authority</i>	<i>Hub</i>	<i>Closeness centrality</i>	<i>Harmonic closeness centrality</i>	<i>Betweenness centrality</i>
Higher Education	28	0.300301	0.300301	0.634409	0.728814	0.204854
Not-for-Profit	22	0.274315	0.274315	0.584158	0.672316	0.073002
Evening Economy (Entertainment)	21	0.278143	0.278143	0.578431	0.663842	0.062341
Conferences & Events	20	0.263588	0.263588	0.561905	0.649718	0.052777
Not-for-Profit	19	0.219769	0.219769	0.556604	0.641243	0.054806

2

3 Furthermore, examination of the distribution of normalized network metrics indicates
 4 they fall within a narrow range with a few outliers for harmonic centrality. Whilst large
 5 networks may exhibit a power law or exponential distribution, smaller networks may
 6 have a less extreme distribution of metrics. This finding indicates that no single firm
 7 holds disproportionate control over communication in the network.

8

9 **Figure 3**



10

1 After mapping and visualizing the network, exponential random graph modelling was
 2 carried out to determine the network and node properties that influenced
 3 communication ties. Four models were developed:

- 4 1: A simple edges only model
- 5 2: Edges and the actor property of membership in DMK
- 6 3: Edges, membership and the network property of GWESP
- 7 4: Edges, GWESP, actor properties of membership and industry background.

8

9 **Model 1**

10

11 The first model examines if the network's observed structure of ties could
 12 have been produced from a random process. The section below presents the output
 13 of R analysis for Model 1 in Table 4 below:

14

15 **Table 4: Model 1 (Edges only)**

	Estimate	Std. Error	MCMC %	p-value
Edges	-1.99904	0.06981	0	<1e-04 ***
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1				
Null Deviance: 2795 on 2016 degrees of freedom				
Residual Deviance: 1515 on 2015 degrees of freedom				
AIC: 1517 BIC: 1523 (Smaller is better.)				
Formula: y ~ edges				
Iterations: 5 out of 20				

16

17 Findings from the analysis indicated the network was not random at a significance
 18 level of .001. The probability of ties in the observed network can be determined as
 19 $\exp(-1.99904)/(1+\exp(-1.99904)) = 0.1193$, which corresponds to the density of the
 20 observed network. The model fit shows the result is significant at the 0.001 level,
 21 indicating that the edges in the network were not randomly distributed. This finding
 22 provides some support for the validity of the hubs and metric distributions identified
 23 by the previous analysis in Table 3 and Figure 3.

24 **Model 2**

25

26 In model 2, an actor property, membership in the DMK network, was added to
 27 identify its impact on the probability of ties in the network. This identifies if a network
 identity was established. The R output is presented below in Table 5:

1
2

Table 5: Model 2 (Edges and Membership)

	Estimate	Std. Error	MCMC %	p-value
Edges	-1.94246	0.11736	0	<1e-04 ***
Nodematch.Members	-0.08656	0.14600	0	0.553
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1				
Null Deviance: 2795 on 2016 degrees of freedom				
Residual Deviance: 1515 on 2014 degrees of freedom				
AIC: 1519 BIC: 1530 (Smaller is better.)				
Formula: $y \sim \text{edges} + \text{nodematch}(\text{"Members"})$				
Iterations: 5 out of 20				

3

4 The findings suggest that the Association Membership property was not a significant
5 determinant of ties in the network. AIC and BIC are similar to Model 1, indicating this
6 model does not provide an improved basis for explaining the distribution of ties in the
7 network.

8 **Model 3**

9 The third model adds the clustering tendency in the form of the Geometrically-
10 Weighted Edgewise Shared Partner (GWESP) parameter to determine if the
11 transitivity patterns exhibited in the DMK communication network could have
12 occurred randomly.

13 **Table 6: Model 3 (Edges, Membership and Transitivity)**

	Estimate	Std. Error	MCMC %	p-value
Edges	-4.1177	0.2743	0	<1e-04 ***
Nodematch.Members	-0.0498	0.1168	0	0.67
GWESP.fixed.0.25	1.4988	0.1943	0	<1e-04 ***
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1				
Null Deviance: 2795 on 2016 degrees of freedom				
Residual Deviance: 1403 on 2013 degrees of freedom				
AIC: 1409 BIC: 1426 (Smaller is better.)				
Formula: $y \sim \text{edges} + \text{nodematch}(\text{"Members"}) + \text{gwesp}(0.25, \text{fixed} = \text{TRUE})$				
Iterations: 3 out of 20				

14

1 The findings indicate GWESP is significantly different from a random network and
 2 helps to predict the probability of ties in the DMK network. The GWESP figure
 3 suggests the network is robust with multiple redundant ties among members.
 4 Communication in this network will therefore be rapid as information can be shared
 5 quickly. This model is a stronger basis for explaining the distribution of ties in the
 6 network as AIC and BIC are lower than in Model 1 or 2.

7

8 **Model 4**

9 The final model adds the actor term of sector membership, which enables the
 10 comparison of sector identity with network identity.

11 **Table 7: Model 4 (Edges, Membership, Sector and Transitivity)**

	Estimate	Std. Error	MCMC %	p-value
Edges	-4.1244	0.2781	0	<1e-04 ***
Nodematch.Members	-0.1145	0.1197	0	0.3387
Nodematch.Sector	0.4147	0.1695	0	0.0145 *
GWESP.fixed.0.25	1.4878	0.1973	0	<1e-04 ***
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1				
Null Deviance: 2795 on 2016 degrees of freedom				
Residual Deviance: 1398 on 2012 degrees of freedom				
AIC: 1406 BIC: 1428 (Smaller is better.)				
Formula: y ~ edges + nodematch("Members") + nodematch("Sector") + gwesp(0.25, fixed = TRUE)				

12

13 The findings indicate sector or industry membership is a significant property
 14 influencing the distribution of network ties and, hence, the structure of the
 15 communications network in a DMO. This indicates that network members display
 16 homophily by sector, meaning actors in the DMK network have a higher tendency to
 17 form ties with the same sector than those from other sectors. Communication will
 18 therefore be higher between same sector members than with members representing
 19 other sectors in the network. A goodness-of-fit (GOF) test was performed to identify
 20 the extent to which the estimates reproduce the terms in the model. A significant
 21 difference would indicate errors in the estimation process. The model below and the
 22 boxplot indicate the estimates were an accurate reproduction of the terms in the
 23 model. The mean figures of the simulated model closely match the observed

1 statistics for the properties of edges, members, sector and GWESP, indicating the
 2 models proposed in this study were a good fit.

3

4 **Table 4: Goodness-of-Fit for Model Statistics**


5

	obs	min	mean	max MC	p-value
Edges	233.0000	178.0000	235.2300	296.0000	0.98
Nodematch. Members	150.0000	104.0000	149.8400	205.0000	1.00
Nodematch. Sector	44.0000	25.0000	44.4700	64.0000	1.00
GWESP.fixed. 0.25	254.8915	181.4986	258.4607	340.1921	0.92

6

7 **Figure 5: Goodness-of-Fit for Model Statistics**

8



9

10

11 **Discussion**

12 DMOs have recognised the need to adopt a more inclusive approach to
 13 destination management (Morgan, 2012) y linking government, businesses and civil
 14 society. Whilst the focus of destination marketing has been considered *outward* (e.g.
 15 establishing links with different markets with the purpose to attract visitors),
 16 destination management, requires incorporation of a more *inward* focus – it is
 17 interested in the operations and experience of the destination (Scott & Marzano,
 18 2015). DMOs are now expected to be at the forefront of destination management

1 and leadership activities with little or no support from the public sector (Coles et al.
2 2014). Cooperation between member organizations is therefore critical for
3 destination governance (Laesser & Beritelli, 2013).

4
5 Earlier literature on destination governance in the marketing paradigm focuses on
6 the steering and controlling destinations by norms, structures and processes (Bieger,
7 & Laesser 2007). DMOs are increasingly expected to manage the complex system
8 of relationships at a destination (Volgger & Pechlaner, 2014) In this new scenario,
9 DMOs are expected to create structures that define the boundaries of the network
10 and articulate a vision for empowering members to participate as well as facilitate the
11 pooling of resources and sharing of expertise to continuously develop a tourism
12 product (Beritelli et al. 2015).

13
14 However, while DMOs may have a degree of formal authority , governance of a
15 network requires engaging with members to negotiate outcomes jointly (Pechlaner &
16 Volgger, 2013) . Communication forms a key part of the process for engaging
17 network members to ensure there is a mix of destination actors in terms of sectorial
18 diversity and organisation size and scope. The development of a collaborative
19 network identity can support this engagement process, enabling members to
20 determine the potential benefits of collaborating with an exchange partner within a
21 network (Anderson et al. 1994).

22
23 The focal organization, DMK, engaged in the process of establishing a collective
24 network identity that could have influenced perceptions at the individual member,
25 intra member and non-members. This collective network identity could then facilitate
26 communication and alignment of activities (Öberg, 2016). The development of these
27 identities is not a deterministic, lifecycle process (Beech & Huxham, 2003). When a
28 focal organization attempts to create a collaborative network, potential tendencies
29 towards homophily and existing relationships (Newman & Dale, 2007) will need to
30 be adjusted. The reshaped relationships introduce new activities, resources and
31 relationships that change practices of members mutually (Brown & Starkey, 2000).
32 Existing network identity studies have used inductive or quantitative survey-based
33 approaches to examine the benefits and challenges of a collaborative network
34 identity. However, these studies are based on the implicit assumption that a network

1 exists and exerts influence on member organizations. Unlike existing network identity
2 research, a combined descriptive and inferential network analysis approach was able
3 to verify that the distribution of ties in the network was not random and therefore a
4 network exists (Research Proposition 1). Subsequent analyses (Research
5 propositions 2-4) were able to examine the extent to which this identity influenced
6 communication within members.

7

8 Transitivity has been extensively examined as a network characteristic in social
9 networks as it can indicate the influence of a node. Nodes having a high degree of
10 transitivity have multiple links to other nodes and can be more influential than nodes
11 with fewer connections. GWESP findings suggest the transitivity differs from random
12 networks and is a significant property of the DMK communication network.
13 Communication connections within this network are “strong” where members have
14 redundant connections with each other (Granovetter, 1973) . The outcome is typical
15 of networks in which members meet frequently with each other and have established
16 multiple points of contact (Beritelli & Laesser, 2011). Actors in the DMK network are
17 in closely linked clusters (Guzman, Deckro, Robbins, Morris, & Ballester, 2014),
18 indicating that the DMK project established a robust communication network that is
19 difficult to disrupt and may persist over time. This communication network can
20 underpin future activities and initiatives, contributing to the development of the
21 region.

22

23 The findings indicate that while the DMK network is robust, distribution of ties in the
24 DMK network are significantly influenced by industry membership. These nodes
25 demonstrate homophily by industry type, which is a powerful network property that
26 influences decision-making, leadership, activity and, now, communication. Prominent
27 organizations in industry clusters can act as bridges within their immediate network
28 communities, facilitating communication in the group. This distribution of
29 relationships may act as an enabler of consensus because communication is rapid
30 within industry groups in the network (Louch, 2000). However, it can constrain
31 innovation as there are fewer inter-industry ties in the network bringing in new ideas
32 and bridging differing social worlds and industry contexts.

33

1 Network membership was not found to be a significant influence on the formation of
2 ties in the DMC communication network. The findings of this research are similar to
3 Volgger and Pechlaner (2014), who suggested DMOs face difficulty in implementing
4 the above strategies successfully. Communication was not influenced by operating
5 under the common brand of DMK and homophily (shared properties) by membership
6 is not present. Organizations may be members of the DMO network but that does
7 not influence communication interactions, suggesting a network identity was not
8 established. The creation of a joint brand in the form of DMK may be useful as an
9 administrative construct for external stakeholders but this did not influence the
10 creation of ties among members.

11
12 The relatively poor linkages across industries within the examined DMO may be of
13 concern as ties between dissimilar actors help information flow across the network.
14 New ideas may not enter since there are few weak ties (Granovetter, 1973)
15 connecting different types of members. Homophily and clustering by industry
16 suggests that members are focused more on activities in their own sub-groups than
17 the network as a whole (Beimborn, Jentsch, & Lüders, 2015).

18
19 Focal organizations may invest in network level processes, such as member
20 associations that establish to encourage adoption of network level communication
21 mechanisms to create an identity based on group-sharing (Dyer & Nobeoka, 2000).
22 Once established, the benefits from identity can be enhanced by creating group-level
23 routines that identify, filter and integrate knowledge. By establishing these routines,
24 the lead firm creates a net benefit to network membership that differentiates it from
25 non-members and encourages a shift from current groups (Kogut & Zander, 1992).
26 If successful, these routines are self-reinforcing and create a collective network
27 identity in which members' alignment of activities and sharing of knowledge continue
28 to provide benefits to members and attract new members. This collective identity
29 helps define membership, create joint strategies, cooperation and learning.
30 Research on network identity in supplier networks indicate that routines for collective
31 learning are particularly valuable for the development of network norms (Dyer &
32 Hatch, 2004). These are routines for the development and dissemination of explicit
33 knowledge that is either network-specific, such as coordination within the network, or
34 resides in several member firms, such as activity improvement.

1

2 However, formal mechanisms identified for establishing a network identity in
3 manufacturing supply chains may need to be adapted to the characteristics of DMO
4 members. Tourism organizations can be service SMEs who may not have a high
5 level of explicit knowledge to share within the network (Durst & Runar Edvardsson,
6 2012). These organisations also experience seasonal variations in demand, unlike
7 manufacturing/supply chain organizations that experience consistent levels of
8 demand. These conditions do not support the development of significant levels of
9 codified, explicit knowledge that can be transferred via formal knowledge-exchange
10 mechanisms. Sharing tacit knowledge requires strong ties that may exist within the
11 industry groups identified in this study but not across them.

12 In these conditions, the lead organization may need to leverage existing intra-group
13 ties held by service and educational firms to facilitate tacit knowledge exchange.
14 When joining a network, each member brings their history or accumulated
15 experience of not just internal work practices but also collaboration. Organizations
16 who may have contracted relationships as a main mode of operation, such as the
17 service organizations in this study, can have a higher accumulated experience of
18 collaboration and are used to adapting their activities to the requirements of other
19 organizations (Hietajärvi & Aaltonen, 2018). These firms therefore establish and
20 maintain a number of linkages with organizations in the network, resulting in their
21 central position in the network, a finding from the descriptive statistics. Research has
22 suggested these organizations can create temporary flexible groups by selectively
23 activating and terminating ties (Ibarra, Kilduff, & Tsai, 2005), enabling a higher level
24 of collaboration than other firms. The ties managed by these firms can support the
25 development of integrating routines by the lead firm which can deliver the benefits of
26 a collaborative network identity.

27

1 **Implications**

2 This paper makes an early contribution as it identifies homophily in destination
3 networks by using an inferential statistical approach. An ERGM approach is valuable
4 as it can advance analysis of tourism network research from descriptive to
5 prescriptive. Specifically, ERGM analysis was able to identify network and node
6 properties that influence communication ties in organizations in this research.

7

8 The findings indicate a network identity may not be established by the formation of
9 an initiative as communication was not influenced by membership in the DMK.
10 Instead, industry sector membership was an influence on communication, possibly
11 because it is a historical attribute that would have built a range of inter- and intra-
12 organizational connections over time (Moody et al., 2005). Whilst organizations may
13 join the initiative, it may take some time before historical patterns of communication
14 within industry group sectors change to reflect membership in the initiative.

15

16 This suggests that future research seeking to understand the impact of interventions,
17 such as the formation of DMKs, should examine the link formation processes in
18 networks, either by using longitudinal or multiple repeated observations of ties
19 between organizations. Research can also identify the processes leading to the
20 emergence nodes that link differing groups (Clauset, Newman, & Moore, 2004). In
21 this network, these nodes were non-profit and service organizations that held
22 multiple connections across industry boundaries. DMO managers may seek to work
23 with the intra-industry relationships already established by these organizations to
24 encourage members to change historical patterns of communication and to establish
25 a network identity.

26

27 Inferential network analysis works alongside descriptive statistics to enhance DMO
28 research. Descriptive statistics identify key actors and inferential statistics can verify
29 the validity of these findings. These metrics can be used to measure the health of
30 network initiatives beyond membership figures. Destination development capacity-
31 building policy instruments can propose initiating a network or association as an
32 explicit goal (Lynch, Holden, & O'Toole, 2009). Inferential network analysis can be a
33 useful tool for evaluating the effectiveness of these policies. This approach enhances
34 existing DMO research to go beyond the identification of important entities to

1 examine the combined influence of relationships. It suggests that organizations
2 seeking to support these networks need to incorporate network measures as an
3 evaluation tool. Particularly in the area of policy evaluation (DeLeon & Varda, 2009),
4 these metrics may indicate the health of the network and can support the design of
5 interventions to ensure planned benefits are realised.

6 The concept of network identity can be useful for DMOs in the new funding
7 landscape where they are required to be hubs that coordinate activities rather than
8 disburse state funding. Future work could examine temporal or situational influences
9 on network identity. Events and festivals have been viewed as experience-
10 production systems (Ferdinand & Williams, 2013) where loosely connected firms
11 align activities at particular times to deliver an annual experience. This suggests that
12 network identities may be dynamic and situational and can shift as circumstances
13 dictate.

14

15

REFERENCES

- 1
2
3 Akaike, H. (1992). Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle.
4 In *Breakthroughs in statistics* (pp. 610-624): Springer.
- 5 Aldrich, H., Reese, P. R., & Dubini, P. (1989). Women on the verge of a breakthrough:
6 Networking among entrepreneurs in the United States and Italy. *Entrepreneurship &*
7 *Regional Development*, 1(4), 339-356.
- 8 Anderson, J. C., Håkansson, H., & Johanson, J. (1994). Dyadic business relationships within a
9 business network context. *The Journal of Marketing*, 1-15.
- 10 Argote, L., & Ingram, P. (2000). Knowledge transfer: A basis for competitive advantage in
11 firms. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 82(1), 150-169.
- 12 Asero, V., Gozzo, S., & Tomaselli, V. (2016). Shaping and Re-Shaping Tourism Areas: A
13 Network Approach. *Handbook of Research on Holistic Optimization Techniques in the*
14 *Hospitality, Tourism, and Travel Industry*, 305.
- 15 Astley, W. G., & Zammuto, R. F. (1992). Organization science, managers, and language
16 games. *Organization science*, 3(4), 443-460.
- 17 Baggio, R. (2017). Network science and tourism—the state of the art. *Tourism Review*, 72(1),
18 120-131.
- 19 Baggio, R., & Cooper, C. (2010). Knowledge transfer in a tourism destination: the effects of a
20 network structure. *The Service Industries Journal*, 30(10), 1757-1771.
21 doi:10.1080/02642060903580649
- 22 Baggio, R., Scott, N., & Cooper, C. (2010). Network science: A Review Focused on Tourism.
23 *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(3), 802-827.
24 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2010.02.008>
- 25 Beech, N., & Huxham, C. (2003). Cycles of identity formation in interorganizational
26 collaborations. *International studies of management & organization*, 33(3), 28-52.
- 27 Beimborn, D., Jentsch, C., & Lüders, P. (2015). Measuring Outsourcing Relationship Quality:
28 Towards a Social Network Analysis Approach.
- 29 Beritelli, P., Bieger, T., & Laesser, C. (2007). Destination governance: Using corporate
30 governance theories as a foundation for effective destination management. *Journal*
31 *of Travel Research*, 46(1), 96-107.
- 32 Beritelli, P., Buffa, F., & Martini, U. (2015). The coordinating DMO or coordinators in the
33 DMO?—an alternative perspective with the help of network analysis. *Tourism Review*,
34 70(1), 24-42.
- 35 Beritelli, P., & Laesser, C. (2011). Power dimensions and influence reputation in tourist
36 destinations: Empirical evidence from a network of actors and stakeholders. *Tourism*
37 *Management*, 32(6), 1299-1309. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.12.010>
- 38 Borgatti, S. P., & Foster, P. C. (2003). The network paradigm in organizational research: A
39 review and typology. *Journal of management*, 29(6), 991-1013.
- 40 Boschma, R. (2005). Proximity and innovation: a critical assessment. *Regional studies*, 39(1),
41 61-74.
- 42 Brass, D. J., Galaskiewicz, J., Greve, H. R., & Tsai, W. (2004). Taking stock of networks and
43 organizations: A multilevel perspective. *Academy of management journal*, 47(6),
44 795-817.
- 45 Broekel, T., Balland, P.-A., Burger, M., & van Oort, F. (2014). Modeling knowledge networks
46 in economic geography: a discussion of four methods. *The annals of regional science*,
47 53(2), 423-452.

- 1 Brown, A. D., & Starkey, K. (2000). Organizational identity and learning: A psychodynamic
2 perspective. *Academy of management review*, 25(1), 102-120.
- 3 Chen, C., & Hicks, D. (2004). Tracing knowledge diffusion. *Scientometrics*, 59(2), 199-211.
- 4 Cherven, K. (2015). *Mastering Gephi network visualization*: Packt Publishing Ltd.
- 5 Christof, P., Harald, P., Michael, V., & Graham, T. (2014). Overcoming the Limits to Change
6 and Adapting to Future Challenges: Governing the Transformation of Destination
7 Networks in Western Australia. *Journal of Travel Research*, 53(6), 760-777.
8 doi:10.1177/0047287514538837
- 9 Clauset, A., Newman, M. E. J., & Moore, C. (2004). Finding community structure in very large
10 networks. *Physical Review E*, 70(6), 066111.
- 11 Coles, T., Dinan, C., & Hutchison, F. (2012). May we live in less interesting times? Changing
12 public sector support for tourism in England during the sovereign debt crisis. *Journal*
13 *of Destination Marketing & Management*, 1(1), 4-7.
- 14 Coles, T., Dinan, C., & Hutchison, F. C. (2014). Tourism and the public sector in England since
15 2010: a disorderly transition? *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(3), 247-279.
- 16 Conway, S. (2014). A cautionary note on data inputs and visual outputs in social network
17 analysis. *British Journal of Management*, 25(1), 102-117.
- 18 Cowan, R. (2005). Network models of innovation and knowledge diffusion. *Clusters,*
19 *networks and innovation*, 29-53.
- 20 Cranmer, S. J., Desmarais, B. A., & Kirkland, J. H. (2012). Toward a network theory of alliance
21 formation. *International Interactions*, 38(3), 295-324.
- 22 Cross, R., Laseter, T., Parker, A., & Velasquez, G. (2006). Using social network analysis to
23 improve communities of practice. *California Management Review*, 49(1), 32-60.
- 24 Czernek, K. (2013). Determinants of cooperation in a tourist region. *Annals of Tourism*
25 *Research*, 40, 83-104.
- 26 Del Chiappa, G., & Presenza, A. (2013). The use of network analysis to assess relationships
27 among stakeholders within a tourism destination: An empirical investigation on
28 Costa Smeralda-Gallura, Italy. *Tourism Analysis*, 18(1), 1-13.
- 29 DeLeon, P., & Varda, D. M. (2009). Toward a theory of collaborative policy networks:
30 Identifying structural tendencies. *Policy Studies Journal*, 37(1), 59-74.
- 31 Durst, S., & Runar Edvardsson, I. (2012). Knowledge management in SMEs: a literature
32 review. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 16(6), 879-903.
- 33 Dyer, J. H., & Hatch, N. W. (2004). Using supplier networks to learn faster. *MIT Sloan*
34 *Management Review*, 45(3), 57.
- 35 Dyer, J. H., & Nobeoka, K. (2000). Creating and managing a high-performance knowledge-
36 sharing network: the Toyota case. *Strategic management journal*, 345-367.
- 37 Ellis, N., Rod, M., Beal, T., & Lindsay, V. (2012). Constructing identities in Indian networks:
38 Discourses of marketing management in inter-organizational relationships. *Industrial*
39 *Marketing Management*, 41(3), 402-412.
- 40 Ferdinand, N., & Williams, N. L. (2013). International festivals as experience production
41 systems. *Tourism Management*, 34, 202-210.
- 42 Fyall, A., Fletcher, J., & Spyriadis, T. (2009). 2 Diversity, devolution and disorder. *Advances in*
43 *tourism destination marketing: Managing networks*, 15.
- 44 Gadde, L.-E., Huemer, L., & Håkansson, H. (2003). Strategizing in industrial networks.
45 *Industrial marketing management*, 32(5), 357-364.
- 46 Galaskiewicz, J., & Wasserman, S. (1993). Social network analysis: Concepts, methodology,
47 and directions for the 1990s. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 22(1), 3-22.

- 1 Gloor, P. A., Kidane, Y. H., Grippa, F., Marmier, P., & Von Arb, C. (2008). Location matters?
2 Measuring the efficiency of business social networking. *International Journal of*
3 *Foresight and Innovation Policy*, 4(3-4), 230-245.
- 4 Granovetter, M. (1973). The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6),
5 1360-1380. doi:citeulike-article-id:99857
6 doi: 10.2307/2776392
- 7 Guzman, J. D., Deckro, R. F., Robbins, M. J., Morris, J. F., & Ballester, N. A. (2014). An
8 Analytical Comparison of Social Network Measures. *IEEE Transactions on*
9 *Computational Social Systems*, 1(1), 35-45.
- 10 Harrill, R. (2009). Destination management: New challenges, new needs. *The Sage handbook*
11 *of tourism studies*, 448-464.
- 12 Hazir, C. S., & Autant-Bernard, C. (2014). Determinants of cross-regional R&D collaboration:
13 some empirical evidence from Europe in biotechnology. *The Annals of Regional*
14 *Science*, 53(2), 369-393.
- 15 Hietajärvi, A.-M., & Aaltonen, K. (2018). The formation of a collaborative project identity in
16 an infrastructure alliance project. *Construction Management and Economics*, 36(1),
17 1-21.
- 18 Hristov, D., & Ramkissoon, H. (2016). Leadership in destination management organisations.
19 *Annals of Tourism Research*. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2016.08.005
- 20 Hristov, D., & Zehrer, A. (2015). The destination paradigm continuum revisited: DMOs
21 serving as leadership networks. *Tourism Review*, 70(2), 116-131.
- 22 Hristov, D., & Zehrer, A. (2017). Does distributed leadership have a place in destination
23 management organisations? A policy-makers perspective. *Current Issues in Tourism*,
24 1-21. doi:10.1080/13683500.2017.1364715
- 25 Huemer, L., Becerra, M., & Lunnan, R. (2004). Organizational identity and network
26 identification: relating within and beyond imaginary boundaries. *Scandinavian*
27 *Journal of Management*, 20(1), 53-73.
- 28 Hunter, D. R., Goodreau, S. M., & Handcock, M. S. (2008). Goodness of fit of social network
29 models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103(481), 248-258.
- 30 Hunter, D. R., & Handcock, M. S. (2006). Inference in curved exponential family models for
31 networks. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 15(3), 565-583.
- 32 Ibarra, H., Kilduff, M., & Tsai, W. (2005). Zooming in and out: Connecting individuals and
33 collectivities at the frontiers of organizational network research. *Organization*
34 *science*, 16(4), 359-371.
- 35 Kennell, J., & Chaperon, S. (2013). Analysis of the UK Government's 2011 tourism policy.
36 *Cultural Trends*, 22(3-4), 278-284.
- 37 Kogut, B., & Zander, U. (1992). Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities, and the
38 replication of technology. *Organization science*, 3(3), 383-397.
- 39 Krivitsky, P. N. (2012). Exponential-family random graph models for valued networks.
40 *Electronic journal of statistics*, 6, 1100.
- 41 Kwon, K. H., Stefanone, M. A., & Barnett, G. A. (2014). Social network influence on online
42 behavioral choices: exploring group formation on social network sites. *American*
43 *Behavioral Scientist*, 58(10), 1345-1360.
- 44 Laesser, C., & Beritelli, P. (2013). St. Gallen consensus on destination management. *Journal*
45 *of Destination Marketing & Management*, 2(1), 46-49.
- 46 Laumann, E. O., Marsden, P. V., & Prensky, D. (1989). The boundary specification problem in
47 network analysis. *Research methods in social network analysis*, 61, 87.

- 1 Liu, B., Huang, S., & Fu, H. (2017). An application of network analysis on tourist attractions:
2 The case of Xinjiang, China. *Tourism Management*, 58(Supplement C), 132-141.
3 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.10.009>
- 4 Longjit, C., & Pearce, D. G. (2013). Managing a mature coastal destination: Pattaya, Thailand.
5 *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 2(3), 165-175.
- 6 Loomis, C. P. (1946). Political and occupational cleavages in a Hanoverian village, Germany:
7 A sociometric study. *Sociometry*, 9(4), 316-333.
- 8 Louch, H. (2000). Personal network integration: transitivity and homophily in strong-tie
9 relations. *Social networks*, 22(1), 45-64.
- 10 Lynch, P., Holden, M. T., & O'Toole, T. (2009). Developing a rural innovation network in the
11 Irish tourism sector (RIKON Group).
- 12 Merinero-Rodríguez, R., & Pulido-Fernández, J. I. (2016). Analysing relationships in tourism:
13 A review. *Tourism Management*, 54(Supplement C), 122-135.
14 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.10.010>
- 15 Mitteness, C. R., DeJordy, R., Ahuja, M. K., & Sudek, R. (2016). Extending the role of
16 similarity attraction in friendship and advice networks in angel groups.
17 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 40(3), 627-655.
- 18 Moody, J., McFarland, D., & Bender-deMoll, S. (2005). Dynamic network visualization.
19 *American journal of sociology*, 110(4), 1206-1241.
- 20 Morgan, N. (2012). Time for 'mindful' destination management and marketing. *Journal of*
21 *Destination Marketing & Management*, 1(1), 8-9.
- 22 Morlacchi, P., Wilkinson, I. F., & Young, L. C. (2005). Social networks of researchers in B2B
23 marketing: A case study of the IMP Group 1984–1999. *Journal of Business-to-*
24 *Business Marketing*, 12(1), 3-34.
- 25 Murty, S. A. (1998). Setting the boundary of an interorganizational network: An application.
26 *Journal of social service research*, 24(3-4), 67-82.
- 27 Ness, H., Aarstad, J., Haugland, S. A., & Grønseth, B. O. (2014). Destination development:
28 The role of interdestination bridge ties. *Journal of Travel Research*, 53(2), 183-195.
- 29 Newman, L., & Dale, A. (2007). Homophily and agency: creating effective sustainable
30 development networks. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 9(1), 79-90.
- 31 Newman, M. E. J., & Park, J. (2003). Why social networks are different from other types of
32 networks. *Physical Review E*, 68(3), 036122.
- 33 Newman, M. E. J., Strogatz, S. H., & Watts, D. J. (2001). Random graphs with arbitrary
34 degree distributions and their applications. *Physical review E*, 64(2), 026118.
- 35 Pearce, D. G., & Schänzel, H. A. (2013). Destination management: The tourists' perspective.
36 *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 2(3), 137-145.
- 37 Pechlaner, H., & Volgger, M. (2013). Towards a comprehensive view of tourism governance:
38 Relationships between the corporate governance of tourism service firms and
39 territorial governance. *International journal of globalisation and small business*, 5(1-
40 2), 3-19.
- 41 Pforr, C. (2006). Tourism policy in the making: An Australian network study. *Annals of*
42 *Tourism Research*, 33(1), 87-108.
- 43 Pforr, C., Pechlaner, H., Volgger, M., & Thompson, G. (2014). Overcoming the Limits to
44 Change and Adapting to Future Challenges: Governing the Transformation of
45 Destination Networks in Western Australia. *Journal of Travel Research*, 53(6), 760-
46 777. doi:10.1177/0047287514538837

1 Pietro, B., Thomas, B., & Christian, L. (2013). The New Frontiers of Destination Management:
2 Applying Variable Geometry as a Function-Based Approach. *Journal of Travel*
3 *Research*, 53(4), 403-417. doi:10.1177/0047287513506298

4 Pike, S. (2007). *Destination marketing organisations*: Routledge.

5 Prell, C. (2012). *Social network analysis: History, theory and methodology*: Sage.

6 Reinhold, S., Laesser, C., & Beritelli, P. (2015). 2014 St. Gallen Consensus on destination
7 management. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 4(2), 137-142.

8 Rivera, M. T., Soderstrom, S. B., & Uzzi, B. (2010). Dynamics of dyads in social networks:
9 Assortative, relational, and proximity mechanisms. *annual Review of Sociology*, 36,
10 91-115.

11 Scott, J. (1988). Social Network Analysis. *Sociology*, 22(1), 109-127.
12 doi:10.1177/0038038588022001007

13 Scott, N., & Marzano, G. (2015). Governance of tourism in OECD countries. *Tourism*
14 *Recreation Research*, 40(2), 181-193.

15 Shrum, W., Cheek, N. H., & Hunter, S. (1988). Friendship in school: Gender and racial
16 homophily. *Sociology of Education*, 227-239.

17 Shumate, M., & Palazzolo, E. T. (2010). Exponential random graph (p*) models as a method
18 for social network analysis in communication research. *Communication Methods and*
19 *Measures*, 4(4), 341-371.

20 Tran, M. T. T., Jeeva, A. S., & Pourabedin, Z. (2016). Social network analysis in tourism
21 services distribution channels. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 18(Supplement
22 C), 59-67. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2016.01.003>

23 van der Zee, E., & Vanneste, D. (2015). Tourism networks unravelled; a review of the
24 literature on networks in tourism management studies. *Tourism Management*
25 *Perspectives*, 15, 46-56. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2015.03.006>

26 van Duijn, M., & Huisman, M. (2011). Statistical models for ties and actors. *The SAGE*
27 *handbook of social network analysis*, 459-483.

28 Volgger, M., & Pechlaner, H. (2014). Requirements for destination management
29 organizations in destination governance: Understanding DMO success. *Tourism*
30 *Management*, 41, 64-75.

31 Wang, D., & Ap, J. (2013). Factors affecting tourism policy implementation: A conceptual
32 framework and a case study in China. *Tourism Management*, 36, 221-233.

33 Wang, Y., & Xiang, Z. (2007). Toward a theoretical framework of collaborative destination
34 marketing. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(1), 75-85.

35 Wasserman, S., & Pattison, P. (1996). Logit models and logistic regressions for social
36 networks: I. An introduction to Markov graphs and p. *Psychometrika*, 61(3), 401-425.

37 Williams, N. L., Inversini, A., Ferdinand, N., & Buhalis, D. (2017). Destination eWOM: A
38 macro and meso network approach? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 64, 87-101.

39 Öberg, C. (2016). What creates a collaboration-level identity? *Journal of Business Research*,
40 69(9), 3220-3230. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusres.2016.02.027>

41