University of Massachusetts Amherst

ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst

Tourism Destination Governance: A Systematic Literature Review and Future Research Agenda

Huiying Zhang
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Xi Y. Leung
University of North Texas

Billy Bai
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Tourism Destination Governance:
A Systematic Literature Review and Future Research Agenda

Introduction

The concept of governance is originated from public sector reforms in the 18th century (Ruhanen et al., 2010) and is generally defined as the means by which a system strives to fulfill its functions, such as decision making, communication, and performance evaluation (Laws et al., 2011). Due to the increasingly large economic volume, tourism is regarded as one of the most novel and contemporary fields of governance research and practices (Richter, 1983).

In tourism academia, efforts to define, assess, and explore destination governance have mainly been made in political science and business disciplines (Laws et al., 2011). Destination governance is generally defined as "the rules and mechanism for developing policies and business strategies which could combine all the organizations and individuals" in tourism destinations (Zhang & Zhu, 2014, p.125). However, destination governance demonstrates a more complicated nature, characterized by a multitude of stakeholders, strong resource interdependencies, and bundled tourism products (Candela & Figini, 2012; Raich, 2006).

Destination government has been greatly influenced by theories from corporate governance in its analyses (Beritelli et al., 2007). Different from the hierarchical intra-firm environment, destination governance adopts a much "softer" and more complicated manner to collaborate and coordinate with internal and external stakeholders in the tourism context (Baggio et al., 2010; Nordin et al., 2019; Nordin & Svensson, 2007). Destination governance also involves high degree of relevance to the context (Laws et al., 2011), which is shown from the fact that a large number of research findings are generated from case studies and highly pertinent to the specific settings of studies (i.e., Dawkins & Colebatch, 2006; Halkier, 2014; Wiwin et al., 2020). Such reliance determines destination governance to evolve along with the changing environment and context (Laws et al., 2011).

The effectiveness of destination governance is highly related to the successes of local tourism development, responses to crises or disaster, and well-being of local communities (Bichler, 2021; Çakar, 2018). With years of development, the context of tourism destinations has revolutionarily changed. The rising applications of technologies in tourism scenarios, ranging from information communication technologies (ICTs) to big data (Ivars-Baidal et al., 2019; Li et al., 2018), have radically transformed governance practices in destinations. In 2020, the unprecedented COVID-19 pandemic not only alters the interdependent environment for destinations but also calls for their swift transformation, adaption, and recoveries in the face of crises (Vargas, 2020). Dramatic changes in the context force researchers to rethink and reflect on the knowledge in destination governance.

Despite the complex nature and changing context of destination governance, research in this area is mostly fragmented, lacking synergies in current literature regarding its definition, scope, and dimensions (Ruhanen, 2013). The only two literature review studies conducted on this topic (i.e., Ruhanen, 2013; Zhang & Zhu, 2014) failed to address new changes, such as the massive collaboration among stakeholders, evolving technology development, unpredictable crisis, and rising competition from other destinations. To address the identified gaps in the literature and respond to the urgent request from the practice, this study aims to critically summarize and synthesize the existing literature in tourism destination governance by employing a systematic review approach. This study contributes to the current literature by summarizing significant

aspects, discussing incongruity issues, identifying research gaps, and highlighting future research directions. In addition, consider the contextual feature of destination governance, the study findings will provide insights for destination management organizations (DMOs) to enhance governance practices.

Methodology

A systematic quantitative review is a method to investigate the status quo of knowledge in the chosen field and address future research gaps (Vada et al., 2020). This method is featured with an explicit, comprehensive, and systematic process (Le et al., 2019) and has been widely applied in social science research (Pickering & Byrne, 2014). Recent tourism scholars have also used this approach to synthesize findings, map boundaries, and explore emerging trends in literature review studies on tourist well-being (Vada et al., 2020), tourism risk and gender (Yang et al., 2017), and virtual reality development in tourism practices (Yung & Khoo-Lattimore, 2019). Aligned with the research objectives, a systematic approach to review literature on destination governance is appropriate for this study.

This study adopts a revised 5-step systematic literature review method (i.e., Khoo-Lattimore et al., 2019; Le et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2017). The five steps are summarized as: (1) Determining review objectives and formulating research questions; (2) Setting review protocol (i.e., keywords, databases, selection criteria); (3) Screening search results from pre-defined databases and refining inclusion and exclusion conditions; (4) Extracting remain literature for summary tables in relevant topics; and (5) Analyzing contents, identifying gaps, synthesizing information, and reporting findings.

Based on the research objectives identified in the introduction, the study develops a review protocol to guide the literature search. The two-term combinations of "destination" and "governance" or "governing," "tourism," and "governance" or "governing" were used as search keywords. Researchers first search four keyword combinations in seven academic databases identified from prior tourism literature review studies, including Google Scholar, Scopus, EBSCO Host, Science Direct, Emerald, Web of science, and Sage (Le et al., 2019). Researchers then manually check each record, ensuring such papers focus on destination level and avoid enrolling irrelevant records. Only peer-reviewed journal articles written in English and published until 2020 will be included for further analysis, because they were examined through a review process that reduced flaws and enhanced quality (Feldman, 2016).

During the search, an initial of 144 records were identified, and 26 records were removed for duplicating results. Also, fourteen non-journal publications (i.e., book chapters, reports, and conference papers) were excluded; two articles with no full texts were removed; three articles without destination foci (i.e., tourism value chain governance) were also eliminated. Thus, a total of 99 eligible records and their reference list were cross-checked for additional relevant articles. The list of 99 selected articles was documented and can be provided upon request.

The study will conduct an inductive content analysis on the identified 99 articles to summarize bibliographic details and synthesize information into themes. The review will conclude selected articles' bibliographic details (i.e., publication years, country), theoretical framework applied, research subjects, methodological frameworks (qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-method), research context, and samples with summary tables. Based on the study results, a framework will be developed to map the existing literature and guide future research directions in destination governance.

References

Baggio, R., Scott, N., & Cooper, C. (2010). Improving tourism destination governance: A complexity science approach. *Tourism Review*, *65*(4), 51–60. https://doi.org/10.1108/16605371011093863

Beritelli, P., Bieger, T., & Laesser, C. (2007). Destination Governance: Using Corporate Governance Theories as a Foundation for Effective Destination Management. *Journal of Travel Research*, *46*(1), 96–107. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287507302385

Bichler, Bernhard Fabian. (2021). Designing tourism governance: The role of local residents. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 19, 100389. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.100389

Kadir Çakar. (2018). Critical success factors for tourist destination governance in times of crisis: a case study of Antalya, Turkey. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 35*(6), 786.

Connelly, G. (2007). Testing Governance—A Research Agenda for Exploring Urban Tourism Competitiveness Policy: The Case of Liverpool 1980–2000. *Tourism Geographies*, *9*(1), 84–114. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616680601092931

Dawkins, J., & Colebatch, H. K. (2006). Governing through institutionalised networks: The governance of Sydney Harbour. *Land Use Policy*, *23*(3), 333–343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2004.09.006

Feldman, D. C. (2016). Being a developmental reviewer: Easier said than done. *Journal of Management, 30*(2), 161–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2003.09.002

Guido Candela & Paolo Figini. (2012). *The Economics of Tourism Destinations*. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-20874-4_4

Halkier, H. (2014). Innovation and Destination Governance in Denmark: Tourism, Policy Networks and Spatial Development. *European Planning Studies*, *22*(8), 1659–1670. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2013.784609

Ivars-Baidal, J. A., Celdrán-Bernabeu, M. A., Mazón, J.-N., & Perles-Ivars, Á. F. (2019). Smart destinations and the evolution of ICTs: A new scenario for destination management? *Current Issues in Tourism*, *22*(13), 1581–1600. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2017.1388771

Khoo-Lattimore, C., Mura, P., & Yung, R. (2019). The time has come: A systematic literature review of mixed methods research in tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *22*(13), 1531–1550. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2017.1406900

Laws, E., Richins, H., & Agrusa, J. F. (2011). *Tourist Destination Governance: Practice, Theory and Issues*. CABI.

Le, T. H., Arcodia, C., Novais, M. A., & Kralj, A. (2019). What we know and do not know about authenticity in dining experiences: A systematic literature review. *Tourism Management*, *74*, 258–275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.02.012

Li, J., Xu, L., Tang, L., Wang, S., & Li, L. (2018). Big data in tourism research: A literature review. *Tourism Management*, *68*, 301–323. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.03.009

Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & Group, T. P. (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLOS Medicine*, *6*(7), e1000097. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097

Nordin, S., & Svensson, B. (2007). Innovative Destination Governance: The Swedish Ski Resort of Åre. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, *8*(1), 53–66. https://doi.org/10.5367/000000007780007416

Nordin, S., Volgger, M., Gill, A., & Pechlaner, H. (2019). Destination governance transitions in skiing destinations: A perspective on resortisation. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, *31*, 24–37. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2019.03.003

Pickering, C., & Byrne, J. (2014). The benefits of publishing systematic quantitative literature reviews for PhD candidates and other early-career researchers. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *33*(3), 534–548. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2013.841651

Raich, F. (2006). *Governance räumlicher Wettbewerbseinheiten: Ein Ansatz für die Tourismus-Destination*. Springer-Verlag.

Richter, L. K. (1983). Tourism politics and political science. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *10*(3), 313–335. https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(83)90060-9

Ruhanen, L. (2013). Local government: Facilitator or inhibitor of sustainable tourism development? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *21*(1), 80–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2012.680463

Ruhanen, L., Scott, N., Ritchie, B., & Tkaczynski, A. (2010). Governance: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Tourism Review*, *65*(4), 4–16. https://doi.org/10.1108/16605371011093836

Vada, S., Prentice, C., Scott, N., & Hsiao, A. (2020). Positive psychology and tourist well-being: A systematic literature review. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, *33*, 100631. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2019.100631

Vargas, A. (2020). Covid-19 crisis: A new model of tourism governance for a new time. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, *12*(6), 691–699. https://doi.org/10.1108/WHATT-07-2020-0066

Wiwin, W., Ardika, W., & Putra, N. (2020). Collaborative Governance: As a Conceptual Model of Destination Management in the Besakih Temple Area, Karangasem Regency, Bali Province. *journal of tourism and hospitality management*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.15640/jthm.v8n1a8

Yang, E. C. L., Khoo-Lattimore, C., & Arcodia, C. (2017). A systematic literature review of risk and gender research in tourism. *Tourism Management*, *58*, 89–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.10.011

Yung, R., & Khoo-Lattimore, C. (2019). New realities: A systematic literature review on virtual reality and augmented reality in tourism research. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *22*(17), 2056–2081. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2017.1417359

Zhang, H., & Zhu, M. (2014). Tourism Destination Governance: A Review and Research Agenda. *International Journal of E-Education, e-Business, e-Management and e-Learning*, *4*(2). https://doi.org/10.7763/IJEEEE.2014.V4.315