sustainability

MDPI

Article

Is There a Good Model for Implementing Governance in Tourist Destinations? The Opinion of Experts

María de la Cruz Pulido-Fernández and Juan Ignacio Pulido-Fernández * ![ORCID]

Laboratory of Analysis and Innovation in Tourism (LAInnTUR). Department of Economics, University of Jaén, 23071 Jaén, Spain; macupulido@gmail.com
* Correspondence: jipulido@ujaen.es

![check for updates]

Abstract: The scientific literature and reports by international bodies recognise the importance of governance in tourism. This is a process whereby different stakeholders interact in order to solve problems and find opportunities for the different sectors involved. For the purposes of this article, different approaches have been analysed with the aim of understanding the full governance process among stakeholders. In order to validate the main findings, a panel of experts was set up to establish the characteristics a model should have when implementing the principles of good governance as a key tool for managing tourist destinations. This model is aimed at guaranteeing the sustainable development of tourism and enhancing competitiveness. There is a great consensus about how governance must be applied, establishing an open and participatory model which must be transparent and effective, capable of attracting the participation, coordination and collaboration among stakeholders using a clear methodology divided into different stages: diagnosis, planning and strategy, execution and monitoring, and evaluation.

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to identify the desired characteristics of the methodology used to implement the concept of governance as a tool for the sustainable management of tourist destinations anywhere in the world. Tourism is one of the most important productive activities in the global economy, and its development must be achieved sustainably. However, the need to share responsibilities, to have more instruments, to improve competitiveness, to have a greater capacity to achieve the goals set out when developing tourism within a destination, and the need for this tourism development to be effective and sustainable, make it essential to use the concept of governance in the sustainable development of any destination [1].

Thus, the application of governance is considered a key factor in the achievement of sustainability, since it entails fostering the intervention of the public and private sectors, as well as political will and civil society [1–5]. It also responds to growing demands for information and to involve society in its management, and, therefore, offers a response to the increasing complexity of destination management [6–9].

Every day, tourist destinations are facing an increasing number of challenges and opportunities. Governance is essential in terms of increasing cooperation between all parties interested in their management; which allows them to expand their scope and make the most of the opportunities offered by the market, thereby increasing their competitiveness, whilst respecting their sustainable development [10–13].

However, the valid application of governance to achieve sustainability within a tourist destination depends on the efficacy of formal and informal structures created for its organisation, as well as

the available resources and capabilities [3,14,15]. Hence, the great complexity of relations between the different stakeholders involved in destination management requires a consistent framework that would enable the achievement of the objectives [3,13,16,17]. Further, there is a requirement for a long-term and strategic orientation, together with multiple stakeholder participation in the planning and decision-making process [5] (p. 81).

Hence, effective tourism governance must be established, which would involve all the tourism stakeholders within a given territory, where they share their knowledge, ideas and aspirations, and as well as action plans for the development of tourism within the territory from the perspective of sustainability [18].

However, in reality, there is no method in place for the application of this concept [14,19,20]. Hence, the aim of this paper is to establish the characteristics of a tourist destination management model, which takes account of the principles of good governance, in all strategies implemented therein, thereby ensuring sustainable development and enhancing competitiveness. It would be a process in which different stakeholders would interact in order to resolve problems and find opportunities for the different populations involved. To this end, a panel of experts was set up to evaluate all the proposed stages for this methodology, as well as actions to be developed in each of them. This has allowed the authors to validate scientifically the methodology proposed, which can be adapted in line with the characteristics of each territory and each tourist destination that wishes to implement tourism governance.

2. Theoretical Framework

Tourism governance can be defined as "a measurable practice of governance, which aims to manage tourism effectively at the different levels of governance, through forms of coordination, collaboration and/or cooperation that are effective, transparent and accountable, which will help to achieve the collectively shared objectives shared by stakeholder networks involved in the sector, with a view to developing solutions and opportunities through agreements based on recognition of interdependencies and shared responsibility" [21] (p. 22).

Tourism governance is the coordinated participation of all stakeholders in the tourist destination with a view to achieving shared goals [3,8,10,21–24], based on a more effective use of resources (tangible, intangible, human, etc.), thus fostering different forms of commitment, synergy and collaboration between the different stakeholders [25], and fostering the sustainability thereof [14]. This involves dialogue and the on-going involvement of all destination stakeholders, which fosters negotiation, consensus, commitment, knowledge exchange and agreement between all public and private stakeholders [1,7,10,13,15].

It is important to point out that in tourism destination management, several conflicts can emerge even when common agreements are in pursuit and all the stakeholders are following the same goal. According to [26], pressures from the actors with a higher economic power can emerge when managing, in this case, a tourism resource, which can lead to a lack of consensus and, in extreme cases, to arbitrary decision making by public entities that are part of the stakeholders' group.

Hence, the application of governance in tourist destinations involves the achievement of agreed solutions regarding the model of tourism employed and specific actions to be developed. Furthermore, stakeholders will interact in order to design and modify the rules, within the framework of these relationships [6,27,28]. It is presumed that since all stakeholders are involved, decisions are adopted with greater acceptance and social legitimacy, and these decisions are more opportune, given that they will be well informed and will be more beneficial to all stakeholders, favoring the conditions for these to be recognised and assimilated en masse [3].

On the other hand, destinations that are looking to promote sustainable tourism are more successful if they are effectively managed [27,29,30], and that effectiveness will be real if, in the destination management, the principles of good governance can be identified: Participation, rule of law,

transparency, response capacity, orientation towards consensus, efficacy and efficiency, accountability and strategic vision [15,16,20,30,31].

These principles must guarantee that [32,33]:

- All stakeholders are represented and assimilate the role corresponding to each of them.
- Stakeholders have the capabilities required to make the decisions that concern them.
- These decisions can be made.

Furthermore, Farmaki [30] signals that the aim of good governance is to improve the use of space, resources and services, producing fewer conflicts and greater effectiveness in decision-making and innovation in destinations. The main objective of good governance is to produce fewer conflicts, and also to protect those spaces where a fragile environment exists, such as endangered species or unique nature places. In this way, governance can be set as the best tool for communities if supported by legislative and administrative frameworks [34]. Nowadays, this topic is becoming more relevant as at the same time, awareness for climate change is increasing. To this point, Sheppard and Fennell [35] state that policies have changed during the last thirty years, including animals and environmental protection, alongside economic issues. Therefore, they consider animals as stakeholders instead of resources because of their importance in adding value to a tourism destination.

On the other hand, Haseeb et al. [36] point out that a direct relation exists between good governance and environment sustainability. However, it must be clarified that the management of financial resources in governance, when they stem from public funding, can generate a top-down process, and in order to avoid that, the participation of all stakeholders is needed to ensure the efficient use of these resources, resulting in a holistic view in tourism destination management [37]. The input of financial resources is not only the main cause of top-down processes in management, but also the lack of communication among stakeholders when it comes to managing a problem, which means governing in a traditional government way.

Ultimately, governance entails a new operational model for stakeholders and decision-making processes [38]. The application of tourism governance implies rolling out innovative approaches to planning and management. Through governance, stakeholders seek solutions to the problems that emerge, looking to create opportunities and reach agreements to set up joint activities in the management of the destination, decreasing the potential negative impacts of said actions and achieving benefits for society as a whole [7,39]. Furthermore, when an improvement for the whole society is sought, unattainable goals may be set, which involves an increasing uncertainty and the incredibility of the proposed measures. Therefore, clear and real objectives are preferred and focusing on strategies set to achieve them, although it supposes a slower process [40]. Other than that, these objectives that are focused on the whole society would be easier to reach if local population was taken into consideration by institutions when making decisions, due to their strong engagement to their culture and their territorial knowledge [41]. Furthermore, local population involvement may assist with destinations which are in a process of change, like smart destinations [42].

Finally, the peculiarity of the tourism destination structure results in stakeholders' coopetition. If this term is understood, it will be easier to achieve objectives through governance. On one hand, they must understand that cooperation will be required to reach a common goal, drawing tourists, and, on the other hand the competition which will have to be kept apart from governance processes [43]. Once this has been assimilated by stakeholders, complex relationships can be stablished which result in networks of work with shared goals and, therefore, the development of a more sophisticated governance can ease the decision-making process in a complex environment where actors will be the main pillar in the operation of tourism destinations [44].

The key lies in determining how this process is put into practice: Signaling the stakeholders who are in each specific destination, indicating the resources available, establishing instructions to manage them, and setting out strategies to resolve any problems that might arise. The research conducted here aims to answer these questions, among others.

3. Methodology

Tourism research involves "the formulation of questions, the systematic gathering of information to answer these questions, and the organisation and analysis of data in order to spots behavioural patterns, links and trends that facilitate understanding of the system, decision-making or forecasting within the various alternative future scenarios" [45] (p. 4). Bearing this in mind, and considering the novelty of the issue examined here, which makes it necessary to share the opinions of a group of experts about the use of a series of strategies to apply governance as a tourist destination management tool, this study chose to use mixed methodological techniques in this research, in other words, qualitative and quantitative.

Hence, the research process was developed in two different stages. The first stage entailed examining the existing literature, focusing on the application of governance and its importance in the sustainable management of tourist destinations among the literature reviewed, this study found, for sustainable tourism, [46–53] among others; for governance [21,31,33,54–62], among others; for good governance [16,31,32,63,64], among others; and for tourism governance [27,35,65–68], among others. This review highlighted the need to involve all stakeholders (public and private) when promoting a tourist destination, implying that one element deemed to be essential when it comes to making a destination more sustainable is governance. This is understood as a means of organisation that allows all stakeholders in a destination to make decisions and establish strategies to achieve sustainable tourism development.

Furthermore, the aim was, on the one hand, to determine whether the principles of good governance were taken into account in the management of tourist destinations [19]. This analysis concludes that, although in some cases the scientific literature talks about governance within tourist destinations, or that certain international spheres reward initiatives that are classed as good governance practices, the application of governance as a tool in destination management is still very limited. And, on the other, to identify possible strategies and objectives that should be taken into account when formulating an intervention methodology that facilitates the implementation of governance as a tool for the sustainable management of tourist destinations. The in-depth literature review conducted determined that there is no single model that all destinations can apply [69]. Rather, each destination must be managed in accordance with its needs, its environment and its specific social, political and economic circumstances.

In the second stage, a panel of experts was set up in order to compile the opinions of a group of expert researchers and professionals through questionnaires, regarding the application of the principles of good governance to the management of tourist destinations. These data would provide a foundation to establish the strategies and objectives that should guide the model for applying governance in the management of tourist destinations. These strategies and objectives are based on the nine fundamental principles that should be applied in relation to good governance (participation, rule of law, transparency, response capacity, orientation towards consensus, equity, efficacy and efficiency, accountability and strategic vision).

A panel of experts can be defined as a group of independent specialists with experience in the subject being evaluated. They are asked to issue an opinion or judgement about said subject which they are in agreement [36,70,71].

The advantages of this method lie fundamentally in the experts' in-depth knowledge of the subject at hand, which saves considerable time and money, and offers greater credibility to the conclusions and a greater capacity to adapt to the different situations that might emerge during its development.

The limitations of applying this method include the possibility that older or higher ranking experts may impose their opinions over others, and that the consistency of the results with other data in relation to the variable studied is not guaranteed [36]. Specifically, in this case, it has been difficult to put together the group of experts. On the one hand, because of the need for the group to be made up of expert researchers in the subject matter (tourism governance) and, on the other, owing to the fact that the subject to be evaluated is complex, and there are few international studies about it, hence, the group

is small. The majority of the participants who met the inclusion criteria to be a member of the panel of experts are people who work within the sphere of higher education, although members of business organisations and public administrations linked with tourism were also contacted. In total, 20 experts were invited to participate, and 13 agreed. However, these drawbacks are attenuated by the important information and results obtained when using this methodology, which favours the participation and interaction of different researchers, hence, its use is very enriching for the research conducted [72].

The expert group that participated in this research consisted of 13 people, including: 1 member from business organisations and/or institutions related to tourism; 1 qualified technical expert from public administrations linked to tourism; 11 university lecturers familiar with the research and who were specialised in different areas of knowledge (anthropology, sociology, ecology and economics) related to governance and sustainability. The participating experts are of different nationalities and have experience in the planning and management of tourist destinations in different parts of the world (Europe, USA, Latin America, China and Australia). Therefore, there were close links between the professional, institutional and/or research activities of the experts invited to collaborate and the subject matter studied, and this positively influenced the achievement of the results. The condition sine qua non established was that the participating experts had to be people with renowned knowledge in the subject matter they were to be evaluating, in other words governance, and especially its specification in the sphere of tourism.

With regard to the final number of experts who took part in this research, it is important to bear in mind the indications given by Martínez [73] (p. 254) who, following [74,75], signals that between 10 and 30 people can take part in a panel of experts, depending on the objectives and conditions under which each study is developed. The number of members must be broad enough to allow for a diversity of opinions. There is no ideal number of participants, but instead the panel should be tailored to the specificity of the research. For this research project, and bearing in mind the added difficulty of finding experts in the subject matter, the number of experts taking part in this panel was felt to be appropriate, even though it was small. Given that studies and research into the issue being evaluated are still recent and burgeoning, there are few experts available to consult about this subject in Spain with sufficient knowledge to respond reliably to the extensive questionnaires administered.

In this study, the questionnaire was the chosen medium used to compile information from the group of experts. The degree of knowledge that, a priori, it was assumed that the members invited to take part on the panel would possess (and which they demonstrated throughout the process). The quality of their responses justified sending out a questionnaire to each of the participants regarding the strategies and objectives to take into account, in order subsequently to establish a model for applying governance in the management of tourist destinations.

When designing the questionnaire, the authors took into account the complexity of the subject matter to be evaluated by the experts and its suitability in terms of [36] objectivity (the researcher did not influence the response given by the experts), clarity (the language used was easily assimilated by the experts), precision (avoiding ambiguity in order to obtain only the information required), appropriateness (avoiding questions that, owing to their content or language, might upset the experts), and limited duration (summarised questions were formulated, avoiding excessively long questions that might cause fatigue among the experts).

4. Results and Discussion

Once the panel of experts had concluded its work, the results obtained were analysed and evaluated, following the sequenced marked by the structure of the questionnaire itself that, as explained in Table 1, was divided into five blocks.

Table 1. Basic characteristics of the panel of experts.

Characteristics of the questionnaire	⇨ The questionnaire was structured in five sections. The first (questions 1 to 4) referred to basic questions about the application of governance to the management of tourist destinations. The second section (questions 5 to 9) referred to the first phase of the application of governance to the management of tourist destinations, the diagnosis phase. The third section (questions 10 to 19) gathered the experts' opinions regarding the organization phase and the establishment of strategies for the application of governance to the management of tourist destinations. The fourth (question 20) referred to the execution and monitoring phase and, lastly, the fifth section (questions 21 to 23) referred to the evaluation phase.
Completion of the questionnaire	⇨ A pre-test was performed with a small group of experts prior to circulating the questionnaire. This was to verify that the drafting was clear and comprehensible, that the judgements included did not condition the opinions of the experts and that there were no misleading statements. In this way, the content of the questionnaire was validated. ⇨ A direct invitation was sent to each of the experts selected to participate by completing the questionnaire, explaining its purpose. Subsequently, the questionnaire was distributed by e-mail. ⇨ There was then a personalized follow-up by means of telephone calls and e-mails. Since the subject is very specific and complex, the responses of the selected experts were received between May and September 2013, even though the group was small in number.
Statistical variables used	⇨ Regarding the processing of data, the allocation of numerical values to the response options included in the questionnaire allowed us to transform the qualitative assessment of each response into a quantitative assessment, making it possible to obtain different statistical data and the mean values per section. To this end, the statistical package SPSS, version 21.0 was used. ⇨ Depending on the cases, the arithmetical mean -the sum of the values divided by the number of values- and the median (Q2) -the central tendency most used for group opinions- were used as statistical measures of concentration of the opinions of the experts. The mean is the average measure most commonly used, since it takes into account all of the opinions, giving a more exact value, but it may be affected by the "asymmetry" of the distribution of observations with respect to a central value and which may arise as a result of extreme values which distort significance. The median is therefore used when the arithmetical mean is excessively distorted by the existence of extreme values. ⇨ The standard deviation has been used as a measure of statistical dispersion when the concentration variable was the mean, and the interquartile range when it was the median. This measure represents "*the range of the middle half of the scores*" [76]. It is calculated by ordering the data in descending order, showing the difference between the value placed on the left by 75% of the ordered responses (third quartile, Q3) and the value placed on the left by 25% (first quartile, Q1). The lower the range, the greater the stability of the responses and the consensus between the opinions. ⇨ Lastly, the measure used to evaluate the statistical significance of the agreement between the experts in the responses to the questionnaires was the Pearson coefficient of variation, which expresses the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean, $$v_x = \frac{s}{|\bar{x}|}$$ So that the greater the value of V_x, the greater heterogeneity of the opinions of the experts. For these purposes, it was considered that consensus had been achieved when the level of agreement over the mean was statistically significant (that is, $V_x \leq 0.3$).
Criteria for the analysis of results	⇨ Questions 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22 of the questionnaire were asked in several sections which contained items with a response on a graduated numerical scale, scored from 1 to 7, in which the expert assigned a score to the element under consideration. The Likert scale was used, allowing the experts to express a degree of agreement or disagreement with the statements contained in both questionnaires, ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7). In this way, the completion of the questionnaire was intended to be quicker and the analysis of the results easier.

Source: Authors' own.

The first part of the questionnaire included four questions referring to basic and initial aspects that must be taken into consideration when applying governance to the management of tourist destinations. A broad consensus was achieved among the experts consulted with regard to the need to apply governance in processes of destination management through the consolidation of an open and participatory management model (84.6%) [77] which is: Advised and supported by impartial and qualified professionals (92.3%) [48]; under public, transparent and effective leadership (77.5%), which, as indicated by the scientific literature, is capable of attracting the participation, coordination and collaboration of all the destination's stakeholders in order to establish the objectives and strategies

to be developed [35,78,79]; and following a clear methodology divided into different stages (69.2%), taking into account the methodology established by [80] when researching governance in the field of health, and which [81] proposes using to examine governance within the field of tourism.

The second part of the questionnaire, pertaining to the first stage to be taken into account when applying governance to the management of tourist destinations, the diagnosis stage, is structured into five questions. Broad agreement was also reached by all the experts consulted, noting that this must be based on a detailed economic and social study of the territory to determine the baseline reality, in order to take these circumstances into account when establishing strategies and pursued goals in the relevant destination (76.9%), particularly highlighting the tourist sector and its possibilities (92.3%) [82].

Regarding the information that should be compiled in relation to the resources available to the tourist destination, Table 2 shows that there was a high level of agreement among the experts regarding the need to compile information about all the aspects indicated therein, with an average score of 7 (except for item 3, which had a median score of 6 and an interquartile range of 2) and a V_x of 0.09 (items 2 and 4), of 0.1 (items 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11) and 0.2 (item 9). Hence, it has been considered that the items have been broadly accepted.

The last two items shown in Table 2, marked in italics, have been excluded by one of the experts when responding to the questionnaire. This suggests the need to have information about the demand currently attracted by the resource and also about the existing tourist and non-tourist services, which would benefit from the resource about which information is being obtained.

Table 2. Information that must be gathered regarding the destination's tourism resources.

Information about Tourism Resources	Mean	Standard Deviation	Q1	Q2 Median	Q3	I.R.	V_x
1. Characteristics.	6.2	1	5	7	7	2	0.1
2. Level of conservation.	6.4	0.6	6	7	7	1	0.09
3. Need for reform.	6	1.1	5	6	7	2	0.1
4. Location.	6.5	0.6	6	7	7	1	0.09
5. Possibilities of use within the sphere of tourism.	6.5	0.7	6	7	7	1	0.1
6. Problems for its development.	6.5	0.9	6	7	7	1	0.1
7. Benefits obtained from its development or improvements if it is already being used as a tourism resource.	6.2	0.9	5	7	7	2	0.1
8. Difficulties entailed by the resource if it is already being used as a tourism resource.	6.3	1.1	6	7	7	1	0.1
9. Potential disadvantages of its development.	6.4	1.7	6	7	7	1	0.2
10. Necessary budget for its utilisation.	6.4	0.8	6	7	7	1	0.1
11. Stakeholders related with said resource.	6.3	0.7	6	7	7	1	0.1
Current demand attracted.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tourist and non-tourist services that currently benefit from said resource.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: I.R. = Interquartile Range. Source: Authors' own.

In relation to the stakeholders who might participate in the management of the tourist destination, 100% of the experts consulted thought that they should be identified and their characteristics determined [55,78,80,82–85]. Table 3 shows the level of consensus reached by the experts consulted regarding the information that should be gathered to characterise the stakeholders who will be involved in managing the tourist destination.

Table 3. Information that should be gathered regarding the characteristics of the stakeholders who will be involved in managing the tourist destination.

Information about the Characteristics of the Stakeholders in the Destination	Mean	Standard Deviation	Q1	Q2 Median	Q3	I.R.	V_x
1. Nature (public, private, business, association, …).	6.8	0.5	7	7	7	0	0.07
2. Mode of organisation.	6.2	1.2	6	7	7	1	0.2
3. Scope of their intervention (local, provincial, national, international).	6.6	0.6	6.25	7	7	0.75	0.09
4. Sector of activity in which they operate.	6.6	0.6	6.25	7	7	0.75	0.09
5. Interests of the stakeholders and their position regarding participating in the project in question.	6.4	0.8	6	7	7	1	0.1
6. Possible difficulties that might impede their participation.	6.3	1.1	6.2	7	7	0.75	0.1
7. Resources utilised by stakeholders (financial, cultural, …) and their capacity to mobilise them.	6.3	0.7	6	6.5	7	1	0.1
8. Map that reflects the existing relationships between the different stakeholders in the tourist destination.	6.4	0.9	6.25	7	7	0.75	0.1
9. Stakeholders' level of training and the suitability of this training with regard to the functions they perform in their sphere of action.	5.7	1.4	5.2	6	7	1.75	0.2
10. Reflection of possible conflicts between the different stakeholders.	6.1	1.2	6	6.5	7	1	0.2
11. Benefits that they would obtain from their participation in the process.	5.9	1	6	6	6.7	0.75	0.1
12. Negative aspects the stakeholders perceive regarding their participation in the process.	5.9	1.1	5.2	6	7	1.75	0.1
13. In the case of citizens, determine who has legitimacy to represent them.	5.8	1.8	5.2	7	7	1.75	0.3
14. Special attention to socially excluded groups: ethnic minorities, etc., whose participation would be conducted through legitimate representation.	6	0.9	6	6	7	1	0.1

Note: I.R. = Interquartile Range. Source: Authors' Own.

In short, broad agreement was reached among all the experts consulted regarding the steps that should be taken in the diagnosis stage.

The third part of the questionnaire, pertaining to the organisation stage and the establishment of strategies, encompassed ten questions, and yielded a consensus of 84.6% of the experts consulted, who believe that it is necessary, having identified and analysed the resources and stakeholders who will be involved in the management of the tourist destination, to establish a formal participation structure for them all [86,87]. Table 4 shows the degree of agreement reached by the experts consulted regarding the opportunities available to each of the stakeholders to get involved in the development of this model of governance, by virtue of their power or prestige in the system. Some of the experts consulted consider that not all stakeholders have the same resources, capacities and interests in doing so, making it difficult to maintain continual participation.

Table 4. Opportunities available to each stakeholder to get involved in the development of the governance model for managing the tourist destination (%).

Tourists									
Social representatives									
Other stakeholders									
Tourism product and service providers									
Universities, research and advisory bodies									
Residents									
Tourism intermediaries									
Non-tourism business owners									
Public and para-public bodies									
Contribution of information	63.6	82	91	82	73	82	54.5	91	63.6
Contribution of opinions	63.6	91	82	82	73	82	63.6	82	91
Contribution of knowledge	63.6	63.6	73	63.6	63.6	82	45.4	73	9
Decision-making	73	63.6	36.3	73	46.4	63.6	18.2	63.6	18.2
Involvement in the execution of actions to be developed	73	63.6	63.6	63.6	73	73	46.4	46.4	9
Contribution of finance	80	60	50	30	20	70	40	40	30

Source: Authors' own.

On the other hand, 100% of the experts consulted consider that all stakeholders in the tourist destination must have clear and concise information about the management process to be developed [55,82,85]. Furthermore, this information must be available to all and, at certain times, it must be detailed. Different instruments would be used to get this information out to all stakeholders, and a high level of agreement was also achieved in this regard, as shown in Table 5. Furthermore, the experts consulted proposed other methods of information that could be used (shown in italics in Table 5).

Table 5. Means used to get information about managing the tourist destination to the different stakeholders involved.

Means Used to Get Information to Stakeholders	Mean	Standard Deviation	Q1	Q2 Median	Q3	I.R	V_x
1. Sending reports to the different stakeholders.	6.3	0.9	6	6.5	7	1	0.1
2. Specific and individual meetings with each of the stakeholders in order to set out the situation and answer any questions.	6.2	0.7	6	6	7	1	0.1
3. Joint meetings with all stakeholders in order to bring them closer together if there is no close relationship previously.	6.6	0.7	6.2	7	7	0.75	0.1
4. Utilisation of new technologies	6.6	0.6	6.2	7	7	0.75	0.09
5. Communication media.	6	0.7	5.2	6	6.7	1.5	0.1
6. Any other means available in the tourist destination in question: webpage of the tourist destination, local newspaper, etc.	6	0.8	5.2	6	6.7	1.5	0.1
Working groups for each subject/action to follow up, monitor and report to the other stakeholders.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Informative talks, workshops about the actions to be developed.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Volunteering to participate in actions.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Visits, open days.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social media to follow up on the execution of projects.	-	-	-	-	—	-	-

Note: I.R. = Interquartile Range. Source: Authors' Own.

Another important step in the methodology to be used is the establishment of common objectives shared by all the stakeholders who will be involved in managing the tourist destination. These shared goals are used when establishing destination management (consensus among 91.6% of the experts

consulted) and setting the role to be played by each stakeholder, which must be clear and differentiated in order to avoid the generation of conflicts (consensus among 84.6% of the experts consulted).

Furthermore, the stakeholders who will be involved in managing the tourist destination will establish rules to govern their relations by adopting agreements and the way they will proceed when managing the destination (consensus among 93.2% of the experts consulted) [55,78,80,82,83,85]. There was broad consensus among the experts regarding the rules to be established (Table 6).

Table 6. Rules to be established by the different stakeholders involved in managing the tourist destination.

Rules to be Established for the Management of the Tourist Destination	Mean	Standard Deviation	Q1	Q2 Median	Q3	I.R.	V_x
1. Establishment of spaces for consultation and the adoption of agreements.	6.7	0.4	6.2	7	7	0.75	0.06
2. Establishment of the minimum number of participants required in order to consider any decisions adopted to be valid.	6.3	0.8	6	6.5	7	1	0.1
3. Establishment of rules for the adoption of agreements.	6.2	1.06	6	6.5	7	1	0.1
4. Establishment of rules to avoid corruption and discrimination in the development of the process.	6.4	0.9	6	7	7	1	0.1
5. Establishment of mechanisms for the resolution of conflicts.	6.5	0.9	6	7	7	1	0.1
6. Establishment of rules for accountability.	6.7	0.4	6.2	7	7	0.75	0.06
7. Determination of the means of information to be used to develop the process: email, webpage, number of meetings, letters, communication media to be used.	6.1	1.6	6.2	7	7	0.75	0.2
8. Establishment of the means whereby the local population can become directly involved in managing the destination: opinion surveys, through the webpage, specific meetings about a certain subject.	6.6	0.6	6.2	7	7	0.75	0.09
9. Determination of mechanisms that allow stakeholders and the local population to lodge complaints and claims, as well as the means for their swift and easy resolution.	6.7	0.6	6.2	7	7	0.75	0.09
10. Establishment of criteria in order to determine the importance and urgency of the strategies and projects to be developed.	5.9	1.1	5.2	6	7	1.75	0.1
11. Establishment of the source of finance to be used.	6.1	1.2	5.2	6.5	7	1.75	0.2
12. Establishment of training programmes aimed at participating stakeholders.	6.3	0.8	6	6.5	7	1	0.1
13. Establishment of procedures to evaluate the application of governance to the management of the tourist destination.	6.8	0.6	7	7	7	0	0.09
Establishment of 'penalty' criteria if agreements are broken.	-	-	-	-	–	-	-

Note: I.R. = Interquartile Range. Source: Authors' own.

Table 6 shows that one of the experts consulted introduced a new item, which makes reference to possible penalisation that should be carried out if any of the participating stakeholders should breach the agreements reached.

In relation to the mechanisms to be established for the resolution of any conflicts that emerge among the different stakeholders involved in the management of the tourist destination, broad consensus was reached among the different experts consulted regarding the steps to be followed in order to find said resolution, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Steps to be followed for the resolution of conflicts by the different stakeholders involved in the management of the tourist destination.

Steps to be Followed to Establish the Conflict Resolution Process	Mean	Standard Deviation	Q1	Q2 Median	Q3	I.R.	V_x
1. Detect the stakeholders affected by the conflict that has arisen.	6.4	0.6	6	6.5	7	1	0.09
2. Constitution of a conflict resolution committee made up of stakeholders affected by the conflict that has arisen.	5.5	1.5	5.2	6	6.7	1.5	0.2
3. Determination of the criteria followed by the stakeholders involved in such actions.	5.3	1.4	4.2	5.5	6.7	2.5	0.2
4. Identification of the conflicts that have arisen.	6.6	0.4	6	7	7	1	0.07
5. Determine whether there are restrictions (legal, economic, political or in terms of resources) to achieve the solutions proposed.	6.1	0.7	6	6	6.7	0.7	0.1
6. Proposal of solutions to said conflicts.	6.6	0.7	6.2	7	7	0.7	0.1
7. Establishment of strategies to achieve the solutions proposed.	6.5	0.7	6	7	7	1	0.1
8. Specification of said strategies through projects, tasks and actions.	6	1.1	5.2	6.5	7	1.7	0.1
9. Execution of projects, tasks and actions according to the general timeline established.	5.9	1.1	5.2	6	7	1.7	0.1
10. Evaluation of the process.	5.9	1.4	6	6.5	7	1	0.2
Ensure that the solution chosen is the most effective way of resolving the conflict.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ensure that the actions defined effectively resolve the conflict.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Evaluate the resolution of the conflict (not only the process).	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Identify reasons as to why the conflict was not foreseen and introduce corrections.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: I.R. = Interquartile Range. Source: Authors' own.

The last four items have been included in the questionnaires sent by the experts surveyed when completing them.

Furthermore, 69.2% of the participants agreed that there is a need for stakeholders who are involved in managing the tourist destination to initiate negotiations with a view to establishing strategies to follow in said management [21,78]. There is also broad consensus among the experts regarding the majority of aspects to be taken into account during such negotiations, a consensus that is shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Aspects to be taken into account during negotiations to establish the strategies to be followed when managing the tourist destination.

Aspects to be Taken into Account during Negotiations to Establish Strategies to be Followed when Managing the Tourist Destination	Mean	Standard Deviation	Q1	Q2 Median	Q3	I.R.	V_x
1. Whether or not it affects the common interest.	6.7	0.3	6.7	7	7	0.2	0.05
2. Establishment of different opinions based on innovation and creativity.	6.2	0.7	5.7	6.5	7	1.2	0.1
3. Analysis of actions contemplated previously and implemented with low results in order to avoid making the same mistakes.	6.3	0.4	6	6	7	1	0.07
4. Existing capacities to implement the strategy in question.	6.2	0.9	5.7	7	7	1.2	0.1
5. Resources affected and their possibility of mobilisation by the stakeholders who control said resources.	5.6	1.5	4.7	6.5	7	2.2	0.2
6. Strategy execution timeframe and time required to glimpse its impact.	6	1	5.5	6.5	7	1.5	0.1
7. Degree of conflict or synergy with other possible strategies.	6.3	0.6	6	6.5	7	1	0.1
8. Possible restrictions to achieve the strategy proposed and actions necessary to deal with them.	6.3	0.8	6	7	7	1	0.1
9. Finance to implement the strategy.	6.3	0.6	6	6.5	7	1	0.1
10. Cost of executing the strategy.	6.3	0.8	6	7	7	1	0.1

Note: I.R. = Interquartile Range. Source: Authors' own.

Finally, this third stage will encompass the programming of projects, tasks and activities on the basis of the strategies selected [82]. The levels of consensus achieved by the experts regarding the aspects to be taken into account in this process are shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Aspects to be taken into account in the programming of projects, tasks and activities to be established when managing the tourist destination.

Aspects to be Taken into Account when Establishing Projects, Tasks and Activities	Mean	Standard Deviation	Q1	Q2 Median	Q3	I.R.	V_x
1. Projects to be carried out in each strategy.	6.6	0.4	6	7	7	1	0.07
2. Objectives to be pursued when carrying out the project.	6.7	0.6	6.2	7	7	0.75	0.09
3. Brief description of the project.	6.7	0.4	6.2	7	7	0.75	0.06
4. Availability of material, human and financial resources for its execution.	6.6	0.6	6	7	7	1	0.09
5. Stakeholders involved in its execution and the role that each of them plays in the development of the project.	6.6	0.4	6	7	7	1	0.07
6. Tasks to be carried out by each of the stakeholders involved and their commitment in the execution of the project.	6.7	0.4	6.2	7	7	0.7	0.06
7. Timing.	6.5	0.4	6	6.5	7	1	0.07

Note: I.R. = Interquartile Range. Source: Authors' own.

Regarding the execution and monitoring stage, this section contained just one question in the survey (number 20), reflecting the steps to be taken into account in the methodology stage for the application of governance in tourist destinations [82,83,85], which are set out in Table 10, together

with the level of consensus achieved by the experts. There is one item proposed by one of the experts consulted when completing the questionnaire.

Table 10. Steps to be taken into account during the execution and monitoring stage.

Steps to be Taken into Account during the Execution and Monitoring Stage	Mean	Standard Deviation	Q1	Q2 Median	Q3	I.R.	V_x
1. Negotiation regarding the priority of project execution.	6.5	0.6	6	7	7	1	0.09
2. Establishment of the basic aspects of projects.	6.6	0.6	6.2	7	7	0.7	0.09
3. Establishment of the tasks to be carried out by the stakeholders involved in the management of the tourist destination.	6.6	0.6	6.2	7	7	0.7	0.09
4. Creation of project monitoring committees.	6.1	0.8	5.2	6	7	1.7	0.1
5. Consultation of stakeholders and the local population in the tourist destination.	6.5	0.6	6	7	7	1	0.09
6. Accountability.	6.6	0.6	6.2	7	7	0.7	0.09
Mechanisms to include the results of consultation in the execution and monitoring processes.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: I.R. = Interquartile Range. Source: Authors' Own.

Finally, the evaluation stage encompassed three questions (21 to 23). As recognised by the experts, in this stage, a series of steps must be followed (question 21) in relation to which the experts consulted achieved a high level of consensus (Table 11), with a median of between 7 (items 1 and 3) and 6.5 (items 2 and 4), an interquartile range of between 0.7 (items 1 and 3), 1 (item 2) and 1.7 (item 4) and V_x between 0.09 (items 1 and 2) and 0.1 (items 3 and 4).

Table 11. Steps to be taken into account during the evaluation stage.

Steps to be Taken into Account in the Evaluation Stage	Mean	Standard Deviation	Q1	Q2 Median	Q3	I.R.	V_x
1. Choice of indicators to be analysed by all stakeholders involved in the management of the tourist destination.	6.6	0.6	6.2	7	7	0.7	0.09
2. Evaluation meetings. Measurement of the governance process using indicators.	6.4	0.6	6	6.5	7	1	0.09
3. Extraction of results and creation of supporting documentation reflecting the practice of the good governance process.	6.4	0.9	6.2	7	7	0.7	0.1
4. Establishment of future actions.	6.2	0.8	5.2	6.5	7	1.7	0.1

Note: I.R = Interquartile Range. Source: Authors' own.

Questions 22 and 23 make reference to matters related with the general methodology proposed in this research, and are not specific to any stage in particular. In relation to these questions, a series of clarifications need to be made when setting out the results obtained.

Question 22 is aimed at consulting the experts regarding whether, in their opinion, the principles of good governance are respected or not in the different stages of the methodology proposed. Question 23 makes reference to the percentage they believe must be obtained with regard to each principle in order to consider that there is good governance.

Regarding question 22, it must be remembered that, in certain cases, principles do not achieve high percentages due to the fact that it is not necessary for all of these principles to appear in all the stages. Rather, this will depend on the nature of each stage.

The principle of equity gives rise to the greatest level of disagreement between the experts consulted, which is reflected in the results obtained in questions 22 and 23. This is due to the great

complexity of this principle. Hence, some of the experts consulted indicate that the relationship between the principle of equity and governance is indirect and is not guaranteed.

According to this principle, all members of a society must understand that they are part of that society, and all groups must have the same opportunities to improve and maintain their situation of wellbeing, without feeling excluded. It includes the equality of opportunities between women and men. They must all participate in the decision-making processes, in the same way that accountability must be applied to all citizens, men and women, equally [55,56]. Hence, some of the experts consulted believe that achieving this principle in modern society is not possible.

In this regard, Berggruen and Gardels [63] indicate that our systems of governance have not thus far achieved a society that works for everyone, since there are still major inequalities, widespread illiteracy, and thousands of people who live in poverty and lack basic freedoms.

Furthermore, according to [8], the right to participate and legitimacy in decision-making is difficult to put into practice. Equally, the level of complexity increases when there are different sources of power that are in the hands of different stakeholders, such as the power of authority, the power of social action, the power of relations, and the power of public opinion [15,88]. On the other hand, there are signals that there is an ethical framework in public policies that does not assure the application of this principle. Rather, at times, the decisions made are a barrier to the application of the principle of equity.

However, within the scope of this research, is it possible to establish tactics that help to achieve the principle of equity? Some research [89] indicates that governance is a social construction project that includes the goals of social inclusion, equity and equality.

According to [56], this principle must be an integral part of all components of a society, both in its elements and in its processes. Following the indications of [90], equity does not imply equality in performance, but rather involves giving equality of opportunities to all stakeholders to develop their potentialities so that they can make better productive use of them. Further research, Dourojeanni [82] points out that, in order to achieve equity, the relationships between the participating stakeholders must take place within a framework of democratic agreement, in which these stakeholders have clear knowledge of the effects of each their decisions in relation with the pursued goals. This means that these stakeholders must be informed about the effects of their decisions to ensure that they are adequate.

Therefore, strategies can be established that allow stakeholders to have equal opportunities to access sources of information and knowledge, which will qualify them to make the appropriate decisions. There must be mutual cooperation between all those who, although spurred by different interests, are pursuing the same goal. It is possible to manage a tourist destination by working together, sharing knowledge, overcoming conflicts and sharing costs and benefits in a fair way, instead of being based on disputes in order to achieve greater competitiveness.

This is ultimately the aim of this article through the development of the methodology proposed: to establish a basic model to be followed according to the different situations that exist. The basic model will enable the achievement of cooperation and collaborative work between all the participating stakeholders, overcome conflicts and take into account the different interests, with a view to achieving a common goal. That is the development of a tourist destination, whilst also attaining greater competitiveness and sustainable development, considering the wellbeing of present and future generations.

Taking into account the clarifications established previously, the different results obtained through questions 22 and 23 of the questionnaire are set out below.

As indicated previously, question 22 is aimed at ascertaining whether the experts believe that the principles of good governance are or are not respected in the different stages of the methodology proposed. The responses of only nine of the experts consulted were considered to be valid since, owing possibly to the ambiguous wording of the question, some of them did not understand it and did not answer the question correctly. However, a broad consensus was observed between the nine experts.

With regard to the planning and strategy stage, Table 12 shows the percentage of consensus achieved by the experts regarding the principles respected in this stage of the methodology proposed.

Table 12. Percentage of the principles respected in the planning and strategy stage of the methodology proposed.

Principles of Good Governance	Yes	No
Participation	89%	11%
Rule of Law	67%	33%
Transparency	78%	22%
Response Capacity	78%	22%
Orientation towards Consensus	88%	11%
Equity	56%	44%
Efficacy and Efficiency	89%	11%
Accountability	78%	22%
Strategic Vision	100%	0%

Source: Authors' own.

Regarding the execution and monitoring stage, Table 13 shows the percentage of consensus achieved by the experts in terms of the principles respected in this stage of the methodology proposed.

Table 13. Principles respected in the execution and monitoring stage of the methodology proposed.

Principles of Good Governance	Yes	No
Participation	100%	0%
Rule of Law	78%	22%
Transparency	78%	22%
Response Capacity	89%	11%
Orientation towards Consensus	100%	0%
Equity	67%	33%
Efficacy and Efficiency	100%	0%
Accountability	100%	0%
Strategic Vision	89%	11%

Source: Authors' own.

Regarding the evaluation stage, Table 14 shows the percentage of consensus achieved by the experts regarding the principles respected in this stage of the methodology proposed.

Table 14. Consensus of experts consulted regarding the principles respected in the evaluation stage of the proposed methodology.

Principles of Good Governance	Yes	No
Participation	100%	0%
Rule of Law	78%	22%
Transparency	89%	11%
Response Capacity	89%	11%
Orientation towards Consensus	89%	11%
Equity	67%	33%
Efficacy and Efficiency	78%	22%
Accountability	100%	0%
Strategic Vision	89%	11%

Source: Authors' own.

Finally, question 23 makes reference to the estimated percentage that must be achieved with regard to each principle in order to talk about the existence of good governance. To analyse this question, eleven responses have been considered valid, since two of the experts consulted did not answer this question, one of whom indicated that it is not so much a case of percentages but rather that these principles are truly reflected in the management of the tourist destination.

Table 15 shows the levels of consensus achieved among the experts consulted regarding the percentage that needs to be attained regarding the existence of these principles for there to be good governance.

Table 15. Percentages estimated by the experts consulted that must be achieved regarding the principles for there to be good governance.

% Required P.G.G.	% Experts											
	100	90	85	80	75	70	60	50	25	30	10	0
Participation	72.7	9.1					9.1	9.1				
Rule of Law	72.7			9.1				9.1	9.1			
Transparency	72.7					9.1		18.2				
Response Capacity	45.4	18.2	9.1	18.2				9.1				
Orientation towards Consensus	36.4	18.2		18.2	9.1			9.1		9.1		
Equity	36.4	18.2						9.1		9.1	9.1	18.2
Efficacy and Efficiency	54.5	18.2		9.1			9.1		9.1			
Accountability	90.9							9.1				
Strategic Vision	63.6	9.1					9.1	9.1	9.1			

Note: P.G.G. = Principles of good governance. Source: Authors' own.

In short, the aim of this last question was to identify the minimum percentage required in the opinion of the experts consulted in order to consider that the principles of good governance have been achieved in the management of the tourist destination. These principles offer a tool to assess whether the application of governance has been achieved in said management. The experts consulted consider that all the principles are significantly important, since they are weighted above 80%, except, as indicated previously, for the principle of equity.

The experts consulted do not weight these principles in the same proportion, since they understand that some are more important than others, as shown in Table 16.

Table 16. Weighting of the different principles of good governance.

Principles of Good Governance	Percentage
Participation	90.9
Rule of Law	86.8
Transparency	88.2
Response Capacity	88.6
Orientation towards Consensus	81.3
Equity	60.9
Efficacy and Efficiency	85.9
Accountability	95.4
Strategic Vision	84.1

Source: Authors' own.

5. Conclusions

In order to talk about sustainability with regard to the management of tourist destinations, there must be broad and committed participation from all stakeholders in decision-making, in their practical application and in the results obtained, demanding greater coordination and greater dialogue between all of them. Governance is the most suitable instrument to achieve this.

However, currently, there is no methodology that allows governance to be applied to the management of tourist destinations. In this paper, a panel of experts determined the required characteristics of the said methodology and that it must be based on negotiation between the participating stakeholders and respect for the principles of good governance.

The use of this methodology entails a series of limitations. For example, the task of putting together the group of experts consulted was difficult. On the one hand, because of the need for the group to be made up of expert researchers in the subject matter (tourism governance) and, on the other, owing to the fact that the subject to be evaluated is complex and there are few international studies about it, hence, the group is small. However, all these drawbacks are palliated by the important information and results obtained when using this methodology, which favours the participation and interaction of different researchers, hence, its use is very enriching for the research conducted.

Through the panel of experts, it has been determined that, in processes of destination management, governance must be applied through the consolidation of an open and participatory management model, which will have the most appropriate juridical formula in accordance with the pursued goals.

Furthermore, this model should be advised and supported by impartial and qualified professionals, under public, private or mixed leadership. It must be transparent and effective, and capable of attracting the participation, coordination and collaboration of all the destination's stakeholders, using a clear methodology divided into different stages: Diagnosis, planning and strategy, execution and monitoring, and evaluation.

Furthermore, there must be common collective goals in the management of the destination, and a will to negotiate and participate in a common plan to achieve sustainable development of the tourist destination in question. A system of organisation, management, functions and process will be established that will allow the proposed objectives to be achieved, which maximises the harnessing of all resources, both human and financial. The aim, therefore, is to achieve a balance between all the existing interests represented by the different stakeholders.

Furthermore, throughout the entire implementation of the methodology, the principles of good governance must be respected and applied, since they must all be included to a certain degree in order to ensure good governance, and it is not sufficient for just some of them to be present [16,56].

Finally, the application of governance must be evaluated throughout the entire process, allowing the stakeholders taking part in managing the destination to ascertain the following: What they are getting right and wrong; whether the work being carried out and the evolution is generating in the destination; shoring up the key aspects that allow the process of governance to be consolidated in the management of that tourist destination; affirming the bases of said process and allowing the steps required for future actions to be established.

Ultimately, through the application of governance to the tourist development of a destination, all the stakeholders will intervene, making decisions, establishing strategies and adequate channels for the resolution of conflicts that might arise, thereby fostering the sustainability of said development.

Furthermore, the methodology proposed will take into consideration the diversity, dynamics and complexity of the different types of tourist destinations in which the application of governance could be implemented. As there is no single model that all tourist destinations can apply, each destination will be managed depending on its needs, its environment and its political, social and economic circumstances. Bearing all this in mind, one future strand of research could involve analysing the results obtained once the methodology proposed in this research has been implemented, along with the implications. Some issues to be addressed are as follows: How the different stakeholders act with regard to the negotiation of interests to be taken into account; how any conflicts that arise are resolved and the formulas used reduce the number of conflicts; the different forms of accountability, etc. This could lead to the possible creation of partnerships between the different tourist destinations where the concept of governance is being applied in the management thereof. The aim of this would be to join forces and establish shared learning actions, exchange knowledge and good practices, and to enhance the management of these destinations. Furthermore, this would allow for the development of training and promotion actions for the model proposed, which would lead to the establishment of a true model of sustainable tourism. Finally, in future works, applying this model to case studies could prove its efficiency and could generate new knowledge about the governance processes and the benefits it brings to the community.

References

1. Pulido, M.C.; Pulido, J.I. Implementing Governance in Tourism Destinations: A Methodological Proposal. *Int. J. Tour. Policy* **2016**, *6*, 273–298. [CrossRef]
2. Amore, A.; Hall, C.M. From governance to metagovernance in tourism? Re-incorporating politics, interests and values in the analysis of tourism governance. *Tour. Recreat. Res.* **2016**, *41*, 109–122. [CrossRef]
3. Ledesma, O. La gobernanza como reto para la renovación de los destinos turísticos del litoral. In Proceedings of the Tendencias y Retos de Los Procesos de Renovación de Las Áreas Turísticas del Litoral: Nuevos Conceptos, Nuevos Espacios Turísticos, Tiempos de cambio en Turismo, Adeje, Tenerife, Spain, 16–18 November 2016.
4. Ruhanen, L.; Scott, N.; Ritchie, B.; Tkaczynski, A. Governance: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Tour. Rev.* **2010**, *65*, 4–16. [CrossRef]
5. Ruhanen, L. Local government: Facilitator or inhibitor of sustainable tourism development? *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2013**, *21*, 80–98. [CrossRef]
6. Baggio, R. Improving tourism destination governance: A complexity science approach. *Tour. Rev.* **2010**, *65*, 51–60. [CrossRef]
7. Islam, M.W.; Ruhane, L.; Ritchie, B. Adaptive co-management: A novel approach to tourism destination governance? *J. Hosp. Tour. Manag.* **2018**, *37*, 97–106. [CrossRef]
8. Queiroz, F.; Rastrollo, M.A. El estado del arte en gobernanza de destinos turísticos. *Tour. Manag. Stud.* **2015**, *11*, 45–55. [CrossRef]
9. Muñoz, A.; Velasco, M. Colaboración y gobernanza para el desarrollo turístico. Aranjuez como estudio de caso. *Cuad. Tur.* **2015**, *35*, 311–334. [CrossRef]
10. Fernández, A.; Foronda, C.; Galindo, L.; García, A. Developing a system of territorial governance indicators for tourism destinations. *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2017**, *25*, 1275–1305. [CrossRef]
11. Fyall, A.; Garrod, B.; Wang, Y. Destination collaboration: A critical review of theoretical approaches to a multi-dimensional phenomenon. *J. Destin. Mark. Manag.* **2012**, *1*, 10–26. [CrossRef]
12. Velasco, M. Gestión pública del turismo. La Gobernanza. In *Gestión Estratégica Sostenible de Destinos Turísticos*; Pulido, J.I., López, Y., Eds.; UNIA: Sevilla, Spain, 2013; pp. 469–520.
13. Simancas, M. Cuando falla la gobernanza turística: Análisis del conflicto de la renovación del hotel Maspalomas Oasis. *Rev. Atlántida* **2015**, *6*, 37–67.
14. Albrecht, J. Networking for sustainable tourism—Towards a research agenda. *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2013**, *21*, 639–657. [CrossRef]
15. Beaumont, N.; Dredge, D. Local tourism governance: A comparison of three network approaches. *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2010**, *18*, 7–28. [CrossRef]
16. Pulido, J.I.; Pulido, M.C. Proposal for an Indicators System of Tourism Governance at Tourism Destination Level. *Soc. Indic. Res.* **2018**, *137*, 695–743. [CrossRef]
17. Valente, F.; Dredge, D.; Lohmann, G. Leadership and governance in regional tourism. *J. Destin. Mark. Manag.* **2015**, *4*, 127–136. [CrossRef]
18. Pulido, J.I.; Pulido, M.C. ¿Sigue vigente el paradigma del turismo sostenible? Reflexiones a la luz de la literatura reciente. *PASOS Rev. Tur. Patrim. Cult.* **2015**, *13*, 1315–1335. [CrossRef]
19. Pulido, M.C.; Pulido, J.I. ¿Existe gobernanza en la actual gestión de los destinos turísticos? Estudio de casos. *PASOS Rev. Tur. Patrim. Cult.* **2014**, *12*, 685–705. [CrossRef]
20. Zhang, H.; Zhu, M. Tourism destination governance: A review and research agenda. *Int. J. e-Educ. e-Bus. e-Manag. e-Learn.* **2014**, *4*, 125–128. [CrossRef]
21. United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). *Proyecto de Gobernanza Para el Sector Turismo*; UNWTO: Madrid, Spain, 2010.
22. Dredge, D.; Whitford, M. Event tourism governance and the public sphere. *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2011**, *19*, 479–499. [CrossRef]
23. Simancas, M.; Ledesma, O.; Peñarrubia, M.P. Análisis desde la perspectiva de la gobernanza del conflicto generado por la presión urbanística-turística en el Parque Natural de Corralejo (Fuerteventura, España). In *Gobernanza y Participación en la Gestión Sostenible de Destinos Turísticos, XX Congreso Internacional de Turismo Universidad Empresa*; López, D., Ed.; Tirant lo Blanch: Valencia, Spain, 2017; ISBN 13: 9788490536452.
24. Torres, P. Índice de éxito turístico en ciudades destino. *Estud. Perspect. Tur.* **2018**, *27*, 431–445.

25. Presenza, A.; Abbate, T.; Micera, R. The Cittaslow Movement: Opportunities and Challenges for the Governance of Tourism Destinations. *Tour. Plan. Dev.* **2015**, *12*, 479–488. [CrossRef]

26. Simancas, M.; Ledesma, O. El papel de los stakeholders en los procesos de gobernanza y renovación de las áreas turísticas del litoral. *Estud. Perspect. Tur.* **2017**, *26*, 348–369.

27. Bramwell, B.; Lane, L. Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2011**, *19*, 411–421. [CrossRef]

28. World Bank. *The Governance and the Law*; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development: Washington, DC, USA, 2017; ISBN 978-1-4648-0950-7.

29. Bramwell, B. Governance, the state and sustainable tourism: A political economy approach. *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2011**, *19*, 459–477. [CrossRef]

30. Farmaki, A. Regional network governance and sustainable tourism. *Tour. Geogr.* **2015**, *17*, 385–407. [CrossRef]

31. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). *Good Governance-and Sustainable Human Development*; El Buen Gobierno y de Desarrollo Humano Sostenible: New York, NY, USA, 1994.

32. Cerrillo, A. La gobernanza hoy: Introducción. In *La Gobernanza Hoy: 10 Textos de Referencia*; Cerrillo, A., Ed.; Instituto Nacional de Administración Pública: Madrid, Spain, 2005; ISBN 84-7351-239-1.

33. Pulido, M.C.; López, Y.; Pulido, J.I. Methodological Proposal for the Incorporation of Governance as a Key Factor for Sustainable Tourism Management: The Case of Spain. *Int. J. Hum. Soc. Sci.* **2013**, *3*, 10–24.

34. De Lorenzo, J.; Techera, E.J. Ensuring good governance of marine wildlife tourism: A case study of ray-based tourism at Hamelin Bay, Western Australia. *Asian Pac. J. Tour. Res.* **2018**, *24*, 121–135. [CrossRef]

35. Sheppard, V.A.; Fennell, D.A. Progress in tourism public sector policy: Toward an ethic for non-human animals. *Tour. Manag.* **2019**, *73*, 134–142. [CrossRef]

36. Haseeb, M.; Hassan, S.; Azan, M.; Suryanto, T. The dynamics of governance, tourism and environmental degradation: The world evidence. *Int. J. Glob. Environ. Issues* **2018**, *4*, 342–362. [CrossRef]

37. Kwiatkowski, G.; Hjalager, A.; Liburd, J.; Saabye, P. Volunteering and collaborative governance innovation in the Wadden Sea National Park. *Curr. Issues Tour.* **2019**, 1–9. [CrossRef]

38. Farinós, J. Nuevas Formas de Gobernanza para El Desarrollo Sostenible del Espacio Relacional. *Eria* **2005**, *67*, 219–235.

39. Duran, C. *Governance for the Tourism Sector and Its Measurement*; UNWTO Statistics and TSA Issue Paper Series; UNWTO: Madrid, Spain, 2013; pp. 1–34.

40. Cooper, C.; Betbesé, D.; Klintbom, B.; Pérez-Aguilar, B. Case Studies in Tourism Governance. In *The Future of Tourism*; Fayos-Solà, E., Cooper, C., Eds.; Instituto Nacional de Administración Pública: Madrid, Spain, 2018; ISBN 978-3-319-89940-4.

41. Storlazzi, A.; Lunic, D.; Micera, R. Collective Action for Territorial Identity in Tourism. *Emerg. Issues Manag.* **2017**, *3*, 81–96.

42. Errichiello, L.; Micera, R. Smart tourism in destination governance. In *Culture, Innovation and Entrepreneurship: Connecting the Knowledge Dots*; Spender, J., Shiuma, G., Alvino, V., Eds.; Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche: Bari, Italy, 2015; ISBN 978-88-96687-07-9.

43. Damayanti, M.; Scott, N.; Ruhanen, L. Coopetition for Tourism Destination Policy and Governance: The Century of Local Power. In *The Future of Tourism*; Fayos-Solà, E., Cooper, C., Eds.; Instituto Nacional de Administración Pública: Madrid, Spain, 2018; ISBN 978-3-319-89940-4.

44. Pittman, J.; Armitage, D. Network Governance of Land-Sea Social-Ecological Systems in the Lesser Antilles. *Ecol. Econ.* **2019**, *157*, 61–70. [CrossRef]

45. Sancho, A. *Apuntes de Metodología de la Investigación en Turismo*; UNWTO: Madrid, Spain, 2001; ISBN 978-92-844-0488-9.

46. AIEST. *41° International Association of Scientific Experts in Tourism Conference*; AIEST: Mahé, Seychelles, 1991.

47. Buckley, R. Sustainable tourism: Research and reality. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2012**, *39*, 528–546. [CrossRef]

48. Hall, C.M. *Tourism Planning. Policies, Processes and Relationships*, 1st ed.; Prentice Hall: Harlow, England, UK, 2000; ISBN 0-582-32028-3.

49. Hall, C.M. Changing paradigms and global change: From sustainable to steady-state tourism. *Tour. Recreat. Res.* **2010**, *35*, 131–143. [CrossRef]

50. Ivars, J.A.; Vera, J.F.; Juárez, C.; Ramón, A.; Torres, F.J.; Navalón, M.R.; Such, M.P.; Baños, C.; Martínez, J.E. *Planificación y Gestión del Desarrollo Turístico Sostenible: Propuestas Para la Creación de un Sistema de Indicadores*; Vera-Rebollo, J.F., Ed.; Proyecto METASIG: Alicante, Spain, 2001; ISSN 1578-679X.

51. World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). *Código Ético Mundial Para el Turismo*; World Tourism Organization: Madrid, Spain, 1999.

52. World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). *Survey of Destination Management Organizations Report*; UNWTO: Madrid, Spain, 2004.

53. Ritchie, J.R.B.; Crouch, G.I. The competitive destination. A sustainable perspective. *Tour. Manag.* **2000**, *21*, 1–7. [CrossRef]

54. Barbini, B.; Biasone, A.M.; Cacciutto, M.; Castellucci, D.I.; Corbo, Y.A.; Roldán, N.G. Gobernanza y turismo. Análisis del estado del arte. In Proceedings of the Simposio Internacional Gobernanza y Cambios Territoriales: Experiencias de migración de amenidad en las Américas, Pucón, Chile, 20–22 October 2011.

55. Calabuig, C. *Agenda 21 Local y Gobernanza Democrática Para el Desarrollo Humano Sostenible: Bases para una Gestión Orientada al Proceso*; Universidad Politécnica de Valencia: Valencia, Spain, 2008.

56. Edgar, L.; Marshall, C.; Bassett, M. *Partnerships: Putting Good Governance Principles in Practice*; Institute on Governance: Ottawa, ON, Canada, 2006; pp. 1–19.

57. Natera, A. *La Noción de Gobernanza Como Gestión Pública Participativa y Reticular*; Universidad Carlos III de Madrid: Getafe, Spain, 2004; ISSN 1698-2894.

58. Rojo, A. La gobernanza. Un modelo alternativo de gestionar el conflicto. *Rev. Pensam. Eixo Atlántico* **2005**, *8*, 5–30.

59. Song, H.; Liu, J.; Chen, G. Tourism value chain governance: Review and prospects. *J. Travel Res.* **2013**, *52*, 15–28. [CrossRef]

60. Velasco, M. El papel del conocimiento en los nuevos modelos de gobernanza turística regional y local. In Proceedings of the Conocimiento, Creatividad y Tecnología para un Turismo Sostenible y Competitivo, Actas del XII Congreso de la Asociación Española de Expertos Científicos en Turismo, Tarragona, Spain, 12–14 December 2010.

61. Vera, J.F.; López, F.; Marchena, M.; Antón, S. *Análisis Territorial del Turismo y Planificación de Destinos Turísticos*; Tirant lo Blanch: Valencia, Spain, 2011; ISBN 978-84-9004-228-1.

62. Whittingham, M.V. Aportes de la teoría y la praxis para la nueva gobernanza. In Proceedings of the VII Congreso Internacional del CLAD Sobre la Reforma del Estado y de la Administración Pública, Lisboa, Portugal, 8–11 October 2002.

63. Berggruen, N.; Gardels, N. *Gobernanza Inteligente Para el Siglo XXI. Una vía Intermedia Entre Occidente y Oriente*, 1st ed.; Penguin Random House: Madrid, Spain, 2012; ISBN 6071121930, 9786071121936.

64. Pascual, J.M.; Godás, X. *El Buen Gobierno 2.0. La Gobernanza Democrática Territorial. Ciudades y Regiones por la Cohesión Social y una Democracia de Calidad*; Tirant lo Blanch: Valencia, Spain, 2010; ISBN 9788498768510.

65. Arcarons, R.; Capellà, J.; Gonzáles, F.; Pallàs, J.M.; Miralbell, O. *Gestión Pública del Turismo*, 1st ed.; UOC: Barcelona, Spain, 2010; ISBN 978-84-9788-028-2.

66. Lanquar, R.; Rivera, M. El proyecto "Tres" y la "Declaración de Córdoba" España: Una apuesta por la articulación de estrategias de turismo responsable y solidario desde Europa. *PASOS Rev. Tur. Patrim. Cult.* **2010**, *8*, 673–687. [CrossRef]

67. Yüksel, F.; Bramwell, B.; Yüksel, A. Centralized and decentralized tourism governance in Turkey. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2005**, *32*, 859–886. [CrossRef]

68. Zunino, H.; Vera, B. La sociedad Post-industrial, crisis y migraciones por estilo de vida entre el paraíso buscado y el paraíso encontrado. In *La Sombra del Turismo. Movilidades y Desafíos de los Destinos Turísticos con Migración de Amenidad*; Otero, A., Gonzalez, R., Eds.; Universidad Nacional del Comahue: Neuquén, Argentina, 2012; pp. 61–88.

69. Echebarríal, K. Objetivar la gobernanza: Funciones y Metodología. Una aproximación a la objetivación del análisis institucional a través de indicadores de gobernabilidad. In Proceedings of the IX Congreso Internacional del CLAD sobre la Reforma del Estado y de la Administración Pública, Madrid, Spain, 2–5 November 2004; pp. 1–32.

70. Berg, B.L. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*, 4th ed.; Allyn and Bacon: Needham Heights, MA, USA, 2001; ISBN 0-205-31847-9.

71. Bogdan, R.; Taylor, S.J. *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: A Phenomenological Approach to the Social Sciences*; Wiley: New York, NY, USA, 1975; ISBN 0471085715, 9780471085713.

72. Gordon, T.J. The delphi method. *Futures Res. Methodol.* **1994**, *2*, 1–30.

73. Martínez, E. La técnica Delphi como estrategia de consulta a los implicados en la evaluación de programas. *Rev. Investig. Educ.* **2003**, *21*, 449–463.

74. Ruiz, J.I.; Ispizua, M.A. *La Descodificación de la Vida Cotidiana*; Deusto: Bilbao, Spain, 2010; ISBN 84-7485-126-2.

75. Fernández-Ballesteros, R. *Evaluación de Programas: Una Guía Práctica en Ámbitos Sociales, Educativos y de Salud*, 1st ed.; Síntesis: Madrid, Spain, 1995; ISBN 10: 8477383111.

76. Johns, N.; Lee-Ross, D. *Research Methods in Service Industry Management*, 1st ed.; Cengage Learning EMEA: Andover, UK, 1998; ISBN 13: 978-0304335121.

77. Secretaría General de Turismo. *Modelos de Gestión Turística Local. Principios y Prácticas*; Federación Española de Municipios y Provincias y Secretaría General de Turismo: Madrid, Spain, 2008; ISBN 978-84-87432-96-05.

78. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). *Agenda para el Fortalecimiento de la Gobernabilidad Local en América Latina*; UNDP: Bogotá, Colombia, 2004; ISBN 958-97447-3-7.

79. Pulido, J.I.; Sánchez, M. *Análisis Dinámico de la Sostenibilidad Turística en España Desde una Perspectiva Regional*; Universitat de les Illes Balears: Palma de Mallorca, Spain, 2010; ISBN 978-84-8384-202-7.

80. Hufty, M.; Báscolo, E.; Bazzani, R. Gobernanza en salud: Un aporte conceptual y analítico para la investigación. *Cuad. Saúde Pública* **2006**, *22*, S35–S45. [CrossRef]

81. Velasco, M. Gestión de destinos: ¿Gobernabilidad del turismo o gobernanza del destino? In *Actas de XVII Simposio Internacional de Turismo y Ocio*; ESADE: Barcelona, Spain, 2008.

82. Dourojeanni, A. *Procedimientos de Gestión para el Desarrollo Sustentable*; CEPAL, Naciones Unidas: Santiago de Chile, Chile, 2000; ISBN 92-1-321637-8.

83. Galdámez, E. *Guía Metodológica Básica para la Planificación Participativa del Desarrollo Local, Basada en los Objetivos del Desarrollo del Milenio*; UNDP: San Salvador, El Salvador, 2007; ISBN 978-99923-55-16-9.

84. Merinero, R.; Pulido, J.I. Desarrollo turístico y dinámica relacional. Metodología de análisis para la gestión activa de destinos turísticos. *Cuad. Tur.* **2009**, *23*, 173–193.

85. Peris, J.; Acebillo, M.; Calabuig, C. *La Agenda 21 Local Como Instrumento para la Gobernanza Democrática Local*; Colección Avances de Investigación, núm.21, Fundación Carolina; CeALCI: Madrid, Spain, 2009.

86. Bertucci, G. Strengthening local governance in tourism-driven economies. In Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Regional Governance and Sustainable Development in Tourism-driven Economies, Cancun, México, 20–22 February 2002; pp. 1–7.

87. Pulido, J.I. Las partes interesadas en la gestión turística de los parques naturales andaluces. Identificación de interrelaciones e intereses. *Rev. Estud. Reg.* **2010**, *88*, 147–175.

88. Flores, W. Los principios éticos y los enfoques asociados a la investigación de la gobernanza en los sistemas de salud: Implicaciones conceptuales y metodológicas. *Rev. Salud Púb.* **2010**, *12*, 28–38. [CrossRef]

89. Mukhopadhyay, M. (Ed.) *Governing for Equity. Gender, Citizenship and Governance*; Royal Tropical Institute (KIT): Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2003.

90. Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (CEPAL). *Equidad, Desarrollo y Ciudadanía*; Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean: Santiago, Chile, 2000; ISBN 9213216289.