

A.T. Niyazbayeva, A.S. Yessengeldina

*Academy of Public Administration under the President
of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: aliya_amore@inbox.ru)*

Analysis of theoretical concepts of tourism industry management

In modern conditions, categorical variables in the tourism industry management, their interrelation between state intervention and self-regulation, as well as the relationship between policy actors and steering modes are developed. Targeted and effective governance is a key requirement for implementing competitive tourism industry. It can facilitate democratic processes, guide and offer the means to make practical progress. The article presents the results of the analysis and systematization of theoretical approaches of foreign authors to the tourism industry management: from the point of view of the government approach, collaboration, public and private partnership, the theory of clusters, political networks and stakeholders theory. It is revealed that there are conceptual problems associated with the analysis of the theoretical foundations of management and tourism policy in general. The role of the central government in the development of a coherent and effective policy in the field of tourism is defined. Four modes of coordination in the tourism industry management are identified: hierarchies, markets, networks and communities.

Keywords: tourism management, government approach, theory of stakeholders, destination management, public and private partnership, political networks, cluster approach

Tourism is recognized as a complex multisectoral activity with multiple stakeholders and different and often divergent goals and objectives. Achieving cooperation, collaboration and integration between government organizations involved in various aspects of tourism, between public and private sector enterprises and the interests of society are the main challenges for policy makers, industry leaders, members of society and scientists. In this regard, effective governance, which requires transparency, accountability, the rule of law, as well as efficient and effective institutions, is considered to be one of the most important conditions for economic development, while poor governance can inhibit economic growth even in the most dynamic systems.

According to the opinion of authoritative foreign scientists over the past four decades, during which a formal study of tourism develops, there are conceptual problems associated with the analysis of the theoretical foundations of management and tourism policy in general. Thus, back in 1975, H. Matthews noted the extreme lack of political research in tourism [1], and 20 years later C. Hall wrote that the study of the political aspects of tourism is in a relatively poor condition [2]. In the early 2000s W. Kerr suggested that most of the research on policy in the field of tourism are insufficiently developed, in terms of frameworks, approaches and theories to accurately illustrate tourism policy [3]. In many ways, this is surprising, given L. Richter's compelling and controversial comments that where tourism succeeds or fails is largely dependent on political and administrative action and is not a function of economic or business expertise [4]. Perhaps because of this, ten years after comments of V. Kerr, there has been a marked acceleration in the pace of tourism policy and policy research [5]. This positive dynamics is also confirmed by the results of the content analysis of the literature in the field of tourism management conducted by W. Chang and J. Katrichis [6]. This analysis was conducted in five online electronic databases, such as Science Direct, Emerald, SAGE, Wiley and Taylor & Francis from 1990 to 2013. Based on 773 articles, W. Chang and J. Katrichis found that the number of publications in the field of tourism has increased significantly since 2000, indicating a steady growth since 2008. Thus, if in the period of 90s there were only 57 articles on tourism management (7.37 % of the total), then for the next 10 years there were 374 articles (48 % of the total), and from 2010 to 2013 there were 342 publications (44.3 % of the total and 80 % of the total for 20 years). These articles were published in 196 journals, however, the majority of them, which is 44.8 % of the total number placed in 11 academic journals (Table 1).

Table 1

Top 11 tourism management journals (1990–2013)

1	Tourism Management (Elsevier/England)	70
2	International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management (Emerald/England)	54
3	Journal of Sustainable Tourism (Channel view publications/England)	45
4	Tourism Review (Emerald/England)	31
5	International Journal of Tourism Research (Wiley-Blackwell/England)	28
6	International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research	24
7	Current Issues in Tourism (Taylor & Francis/England)	23
8	Annals of Tourism Research (Elsevier/USA)	20
9	Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing (Taylor & Francis/USA)	19
10	Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes (Emerald/England)	16
11	Journal of Vacation Marketing (Sage/London)	16

Note. Compiled from source [6].

Of the 11 best magazines, Tourism Management and the International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management are the only management-oriented journals to have published 124 articles (35.8 % of the total). Other magazines are specific in pursuit of the broader objectives and in the aggregate amounted to 187 articles (54 % of the total).

V. Chang and J. Katrichis also identified the top 10 countries that attracted the attention of researchers as a tourist destination. Thus, the experience of tourism development in Australia was studied in 42 articles of various researchers, occupying an honorable first place in the ranking. The UK (41 articles) and the USA (28 articles) are in second and third place, and the seventh place with the same results is taken by 6 countries — Thailand, Portugal, Austria, Turkey, Canada and Norway (Table 2).

Table 2

Top 10 countries that attracted the attention of researchers and their competitiveness (1990–2013)

Rank	Country	Amount of articles	Competitiveness of tourism and travel
1	Australia	42	11
2	Great Britain	41	5
3	USA	28	6
4	China	21	45
5	Spain	17	4
6	Taiwan	16	33
7	Thailand	13	43
7	Portugal	13	20
7	Austria	13	3
7	Turkey	13	46
7	Canada	13	8
7	Norway	13	22

Note. Compiled from source [6].

Analyzing the data presented in the table, the following features can be identified: first, there is no relationship between the development of the tourism industry and the geographical area of the country. The smallest country in the ranking of Taiwan is the same sixth place along with one of the largest country in the area of Canada. Second, there is a strong link between the tourism industry and the ocean. Thus, all 10 leading countries are close to the ocean, with the exception of Austria, which has no access to it. Third, 1/3 of the top 10 countries are in the Asia-Pacific region.

Thus, it can be noted that in recent years there has been a positive trend in the development of research in the field of tourism management, which in turn is the basis for the development of a conceptual theoretical framework.

The results of the analysis of foreign works in the field of tourism management revealed different conceptual approaches to research: from the point of view of the government approach, the theory of clusters, collaboration, public-private partnership, the theory of stakeholders and political networks.

The role of the central government in developing coherent and effective tourism policies is vital. In this regard, public tourism administrations at the national and subnational levels play a fundamental role and their leadership positions according to the report of the OECD Tourism Committee should be strengthened. Since the absence of leadership in the vast majority of cases makes it difficult for them to play the role of the main center of state political networks, able to coordinate platforms for discussion, analysis and negotiations on issues affecting the development of tourism.

This is partly due to the fragmented nature of tourism, which requires public tourism administrations to perform a variety of functions in response to political, social, environmental and technological trends affecting tourism. Thus, the authorities in the field of tourism coordinate work in various fields, including marketing and promotion, infrastructure development, border security, transport policy, territorial planning, financial issues, employment, etc. In this regard, in order to implement an integrated and effective tourism policy, it is necessary to coordinate horizontal and vertical levels of management, a common understanding of the goals and objectives of all stakeholders, the ability to develop effective and integrated policy solutions. The government approach to tourism management also requires effective alignment with regional policies and government priorities and actions at the subnational level.

The concept of cluster approach to tourism industry management explains the changed role of the destination and shows how to date within the global economy, companies are constantly creating competitive advantages due to the benefits that bring the proximity to interconnected firms. The cluster concept focuses on the relationships and interdependencies between the actors of the supply chain in the production of products, services and innovation. Clusters differ from other forms of cooperation and networks in that the actors involved in a cluster are linked in a value chain. Thus, the cluster concept goes beyond «simple» horizontal networks, in which firms operating in the same end-product market and belonging to the same industry group cooperate on aspects such as R&D, demonstration programs, collective marketing or procurement policies. Clusters are often cross-sector (vertical and / or lateral) networks consisting of heterogeneous and complementary firms specializing in a particular link or knowledge base in the supply chain, which in turn contributes to the process of innovation and economic growth.

Collaboration in the field of tourism management is associated with the concept of communicative actions, which implies a seamless connection between tourism entities, which in turn provides a common understanding, agreement of compromises and consensus. This approach reflects the relationship between stakeholders seeking to solve a common problem within an agreed set of rules and regulations. In the tourism literature, scholars suggest applying the theory of collaboration to promote sustainable tourism policy and planning, as well as marketing development. In the scientific literature, there are also negative aspects of the collaboration. Thus, the personal interests of stakeholders can restrain the innovations needed to solve problems, and influential stakeholders can dominate the joint tourism planning processes.

Over the last two decades the development of the tourism policy was dominated by the partnership between the public and private sectors. During this period, there was a transition from a centralized form of government (from top to bottom) to decentralized (from bottom to top) [7]. J. Vernon, S. Essex, D. Pinder and C. Curry found that within the framework of this partnership, the public sector justifies itself in the dominant role of the initiator, organizer and supplier of resources, promoting strategic leadership and innovation when working with the fragmented tourism industry. They also found that the role of partners does not remain static over time and may vary depending on the ability of individual partners to influence outcomes [8]. However, public-private partnerships are criticized for their narrow interest and institutional framework [9].

The cluster approach, collaboration and public-private partnerships include stakeholder theory, which in turn is characterized by the control and management of the organization and the recognition of the reciprocity of rights and responsibilities based on economic, social and political integration. This theory has been considered in various contexts of tourism: in the development and management of coastal tourism, management of protected areas, planning of tourist destinations, where stakeholders play a key role because they provide or facilitate financing, create a tourism product, participate in state and regional development programs and influence the management [10, 11]. The founder of the theory R. Freeman defines a stakeholder as «any group or individual that can influence the achievement of the corporation's goal or is

influenced by the corporation». It is obvious from this definition that the types of stakeholders are diverse and go beyond those that have exclusively formal, formal or contractual relations with the organization [12].

Networks are groups of formal and informal social relationships that form collaborative actions between government, business and civil society. The transition to governance, in which policy-making responsibilities include the public and private sectors, has helped to increase interest in networks as an organizing concept to promote collective action. B. Bramwell and B. Lane suggests that neoliberal reforms initiated in the 1980s and 1990s led to a shift from hierarchical bureaucracy to greater use of networks as well as markets and quasi-markets, changing the rules of the game in the global economy [13]. D. Harvey also analyzes the decisive turn to neoliberalism with the least participation of the government in his work, describing it as «the maximization of entrepreneurial freedoms within the institutional structure characterized by private property rights, individual freedom, unencumbered markets and free trade» [14]. In the tourism literature, there has been a steady increase in the use of network theory to understand some aspects of development and management of destinations. First, there is a growing number of publications investigating the strategic network organization of firms, as well as how the nature of social transactions and resource exchange affects product innovation, complementarity and economic efficiency. Secondly, a certain part of the research is devoted to the study of the network nature of public-private interest structures and the impact of these networks on the development and implementation of tourism policy.

Based on the above concepts, scientists are developing different typologies of management of the tourism industry. Categorical variables are developed on the basis of the relationship between state intervention and self-regulation, as well as the relationship between policy actors and governance regimes.

The importance of understanding the above conceptual approaches to tourism management is emphasized in the study of the authoritative scientist C. Hall [15]. Creating a typology of tourism industry management, it shows that the tourism literature does not pay enough attention to understanding management concepts. He advocates for a broad view of tourism management and identifies four modes of coordination: hierarchies, markets, networks and communities. In hierarchical management C. Hall highlights the primary role of the state in international relations, the development of institutions that ensure international and supranational law and the importance of legislation and regulation in the implementation of state control. In this typology, the management of the tourism industry is a traditional model of public administration and is defined as an idealized model of democratic governance and public bureaucracy carried out by vertically integrated state structures. However, this approach, in his opinion, was weakened by changes in the state environment, globalization and the growth of political forces of local authorities.

The use of markets as a management mechanism of the tourism industry is considered as one of the effective and fair instruments of resource allocation and is characterized by the appropriate level of state intervention in socio-economic systems, for example, corporatization and privatization of tourism functions, which were previously the area of the state, the provision of state subsidies and tax incentives for certain types of tourism activities. However, according to C. Hall due to self-regulation, market failures and its limitations as a form of governance is increasingly recognized for its inability to achieve the desired results, especially in terms of policy equity and more sustainable forms of tourism.

C. Hall defines the concept of networks in the tourism industry as a means of potential integration of various political actors. It presents a variation of political networks according to their degree of cohesion, ranging from «sub-governments», «iron triangles» (a term used by political scientists to describe partnerships of interest groups that come together for mutual support, usually composed of politicians, government regulators and industry groups) and coherent political communities through the creation of specific coalitions. Despite this variability in its organization, network management is often seen as a «middle way» or «third way» between hierarchical and market-based approaches to tourism management. Despite the effectiveness of this type of management, it is noted that networks serve personal interests more than collective interests, which create serious problems in their effectiveness as a strategic tool.

The fourth conceptualization of management according to C. Hall is public administration. This approach is characterized by a significant degree of influence of communitarianism and more direct participation of citizens in governance. Communitarianism suggests that large-scale government should be replaced by smaller spatial units of government that are closer to the community. Although the structure has been criticized as overly idealistic and exaggerating the benefits of the consensus being adopted, community participation and control over planning and decision-making play an important role in tourism policy planning and development and have become fundamental in thinking about local governance regarding

volunteer tourism and the management of conservation and promotion of tourism initiatives in less developed countries.

Analyzing various concepts of tourism management, it should be noted that the majority of authoritative foreign studies are formulated within the framework of the terms «tourism destination management». According to W. Framke [16], scientists and various subjects of the tourism industry interpret the significance of a tourism destination in different ways, which in turn creates confusion, not clarity, since there are certain systematic internal contradictions in its use. Thus, a tourism destination is defined as a set of attractions; as a geographical unit; as an empirical relationship; as a marketing object; as a place where tourism takes place; as a production system; as an information system, etc. Each of these approaches tends to determine the tourism destination in its own way, emphasizing only one aspect without interest in the other. In the opinion of W. Framke himself, the totality of interests, activities, infrastructure and attractions create the identity of the place — a tourism destination.

According to T. Bornorst, B. Ritchie and L. Sheehan, a tourism destination is a geographic region that contains quite a critical mass of attractions in order to provide tourists with impressions of visiting [17]. R. Sainaghi and R. Baggio, given the fragmented structure of the tourism destination and the presence of many actors, describe the tourism destination as a complex network system in which local actors (public and private) and organizations are nodes and the relations between them are links. In their opinion, both elements are crucial: the nodes represent resources and services, and the relationship allows you to mobilize these resources to create tourism destination products [18].

Based on the definition of the Center for European Policy Studies, P. Beritelli, T. Bieger and C. Laesser [19] indicate that management refers to a whole set of internal and external mechanisms of power, process and control in order to protect stakeholders. Therefore, destination management refers to the rules and mechanisms for developing policies and business strategies that can unite organizations and individuals.

S. Nordin and B. Svensson [20] put forward a conceptual framework for the study of destination management, taking management as a self-organizing inter-organizational network. In this network, all participants are interdependent, automatically share their resources, following the rules that are established by negotiation and have autonomy powers. In their opinion, the tourist destination, which includes a large number of participants, is distinguished by its complexity. In a destination, the public sector and private organizations interact with each other and they are all interdependent in terms of resources. These three aspects — complexity, the relationship between the public and private sectors and resource interdependence can be three dimensions for a destination management study.

P. Eagles [21] argues that governance is the process by which a society or organization decides who takes responsibility for the choice and who pays the costs. Governance refers to three dimensions: political, economic and administrative which include government, enterprises, non-governmental organizations and individuals.

Despite the fact that scientists have not reached a consensus on the definition of destination management, L. Ruhanen and others identify three general characteristics:

1. Management is a guide and rules of the game;
2. Governance implies less government control, and predictability is characterized by the absence of obvious leadership and the absence of hierarchy;
3. Management includes many stakeholders [22].

Thus, within the framework of this article the key theoretical concepts of tourism management over the past 40 years have been studied. The role of state tourism administrations in the development of a coherent and effective policy in the field of tourism is studied. The features and advantages of the cluster approach concept are studied. The concepts of collaboration, partnership and diversity of stakeholders and participants with unequal skills, responsibilities and resources are analyzed. The strengths and weaknesses of the theory of political networks and public administration in the field of tourism are investigated.

References

- 1 Matthews, H.G. (1975). International tourism and political science research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 2, No. 4, 195–203.
- 2 Hall, C.M., & Jenkins, J.M. (1995). *Tourism and public policy*. London: Routledge. [books.google.kz](https://books.google.kz/books?id=hGDIFsD058sC&printsec=frontcover&dq=Tourism+and+public+policy.+hall&hl=ru&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Tourism%20and%20public%20policy.%20hall&f=false). Retrieved from https://books.google.kz/books?id=hGDIFsD058sC&printsec=frontcover&dq=Tourism+and+public+policy.+hall&hl=ru&sa=X&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Tourism%20and%20public%20policy.%20hall&f=false.

- 3 Kerr, W.R. (2003). Tourism public policy and the strategic management of failure. Pergamon, Oxford. *ipaa.ir*. Retrieved from http://ipaa.ir/files/site1/pages/tourism_public_policy_and_the_strategic_management_of_failure.pdf.
- 4 Richter, L.K. (1989). The politics of tourism in Asia. University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, HI. *books.google.kz*. Retrieved from <https://books.google.kz/books?id=YMEt8oGY6fEC&printsec=frontcover&dq=The+Politics+of+Tourism+in+Asia&hl=ru&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwieqTX-7DWAhXFFJoKHdjDNwQ6AEIJDA#v=onepage&q=The%20Politics%20of%20Tourism%20in%20Asia&f=false>.
- 5 Airey, D., & Ruhanen, L. (2014). Tourism policy-making in Australia: a national and state perspective. *Tourism Planning and Development, Vol. 11, No. 2*, 149–162.
- 6 Chang, W., & Katrichis, J.M. (2016). A literature review of tourism management (1990–2013): a content analysis perspective. *Current Issues in Tourism, Vol. 19*, 791–823.
- 7 Eagles, P.F.J. (2009). Governance of recreation and tourism partnerships in parks and protected areas. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol. 17, Issue 2*, 231–248.
- 8 Vernon, J., Essex, S., Pinder, D., & Curry, K. (2005). Collaborative policymaking: Local sustainable projects. *Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 32, Issue 2*, 325–345.
- 9 Hall, D. (2014). Why public-private partnerships don't work the many advantages of the public alternative. Public Services International Research Unit University of Greenwich, UK. *world-psi.org*. Retrieved from http://www.world-psi.org/sites/default/files/rapport_eng_56pages_a4_lr.pdf.
- 10 Caffyn, A., & Jobbins, G. (2003). Governance capacity and stakeholder interactions in the development and management of coastal tourism: Examples from Morocco and Tunisia. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol. 11, Issue 2–3*, 224–245.
- 11 Yuksel, F., Bramwell, B., & Yuksel, A. (1999). Stakeholder interviews and tourism planning at Pamukkale, Turkey. *Tourism Management, Vol. 20, Issue 3*, 351–360.
- 12 Sheehan, L., & Ritchie, R. (2005). Destination Stakeholders Exploring Identity and Salience. *Annals of Tourism Research, Volume 32, Issue 3*, 711–734.
- 13 Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2011). Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol. 19, Nos. 4–5, May-June 2011*, 411–421.
- 14 Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 610, Issue 1*, 21–44.
- 15 Hall, C. M. (2011). A typology of governance and its implications for tourism policy analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol. 19, Issue 4–5*, 437–457.
- 16 Framke, W. (2002). The Destination as a Concept: A Discussion of the Business-related Perspective versus the Socio-cultural Approach in Tourism Theory. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, Vol. 2, Issue 2*, 92–108.
- 17 Bornhorst, T., Ritchie, B., & Sheehan, L. (2010). Determinants of tourism success for DMOs & destinations: An empirical examination of stakeholders' perspectives. *Tourism Management, Vol. 31, Issue 5*, 572–589.
- 18 Sainaghi, R., & Baggio, R. (2017). Complexity traits and dynamics of tourism destinations. *Tourism Management, Vol. 63*, 368–382.
- 19 Beritelli, P., Bieger, T., & Laesser, C. (2007). Destination governance: using corporate governance theories as a foundation for effective destination management. *Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 46, No. 1*, 96–107.
- 20 Nordin, S., & Svensson, B. (2007). Innovative destination governance: then Swedish ski resort of Are. *Entrepreneurship and Innovation, Vol. 8, No. 1*, 53–66.
- 21 Eagles, P.F.G. (2009). Governance of recreation and tourism partnerships in parks and protected areas. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol. 17, No 2*, 231–248.
- 22 Ruhanen, L., Scott, N., Ritchie, B., & Tkaczynski, A. (2010). Governance: a review and synthesis of the literature. *Tourism Review, Vol. 65, Issue 4*, 4–16.

Ә.Т. Ниязбаева, А.С. Есенгельдина

Туризм индустриясын басқарудағы теориялық концепцияларды талдау

Заманауи жағдайда туризм индустриясын басқарудағы категориялық айнымалылар мемлекеттің араласуы мен өзін-өзі реттеу, сондай-ақ саясат субъектілері мен басқару режимдері арасындағы қатынастар мен өзара байланыстан дамиды. Мақсатты және тиімді басқару бәсекеге қабілетті туризм индустриясын қамтамасыз ету үшін негізгі талап болып табылады. Ол демократиялық үдерістерге ықпал ете алады, тәжірибелік ілгерілеуге қажетті әдістерді ұсынып, бағыттап алады. Мақалада шетелдік авторлардың туризм индустриясын басқарудағы теориялық көзқарастарын талдау және жүйелеу нәтижелері берілген: үкіметтік көзқарас, коллаборация, мемлекеттік-жеке меншік әріптестік, кластерлер теориясы, саяси желілер және стейкхолдерлер теориясы. Туризм саласындағы басқарудың теориялық негіздерін және жалпы саясатты талдауға байланысты тұжырымдамалық мәселелер бар екені анықталды. Орталық үкіметтің туризм саласындағы келісілген және тиімді саясатты әзірлеудегі рөлі анықталды. Туризм индустриясын басқарудағы төрт үйлестіру тәртіптемесі бөліп көрсетілген: иерархия, нарықтар, желілер мен қауымдастықтар.

Кілт сөздер: туризмді басқару, үкіметтік тәсіл, стейкхолдерлер теориясы, дестинацияны басқару, мемлекеттік-меншік әріптестік, саяси желілер, кластерлік тәсіл.

А.Т. Ниязбаева, А.С. Есенгельдина

Анализ теоретических концепций управления индустрией туризма

В современных условиях категориальные переменные в управлении индустрией туризма развиваются из взаимосвязи между вмешательством государства и саморегулированием, а также отношениями между субъектами политики и режимами управления. Целенаправленное и эффективное управление является ключевым требованием для обеспечения конкурентоспособной индустрии туризма. Оно может способствовать демократическим процессам, направлять и предлагать средства для достижения практического прогресса. В статье представлены результаты анализа и систематизации теоретических подходов зарубежных авторов к управлению индустрией туризма: с точки зрения правительственного подхода, коллаборации, государственно-частного партнерства, теории кластеров, политических сетей и теории стейкхолдеров. Выявлено, что существуют концептуальные проблемы, связанные с анализом теоретических основ управления и в целом политики в сфере туризма. Определена роль центрального правительства в разработке согласованной и эффективной политики в области туризма. Выделены четыре режима координации в управлении индустрией туризма: иерархии, рынки, сети и сообщества.

Ключевые слова: управление туризмом, правительственный подход, теория стейкхолдеров, управление дестинацией, государственно-частное партнерство, политические сети, кластерный подход.