

From governance to meta-governance in tourism?: Re-incorporating politics, interests and values in the analysis of tourism governance

Alberto Amore^a and C. Michael Hall^{a, b, c, d *}.

a. Department of Management, Marketing & Entrepreneurship, University of Canterbury, Private Bag 4800, Christchurch, New Zealand 8140

b. Department of Geography, University of Oulu, Oulu, Finland

c. Linnaeus University School of Business and Economics, Linnaeus University, Kalmar, Sweden

d. School of Tourism and Hospitality, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa

Alberto Amore: alberto.amore@canterbury.ac.nz

C. Michael Hall: michael.hall@canterbury.ac.nz

From governance to meta-governance in tourism?: Re-incorporating politics, interests and values in the analysis of tourism governance

Abstract

Despite its theorization in the political and policy sciences in the early 1990s, the concept of metagovernance has gained relatively little recognition in tourism studies. Nevertheless, its significance in the political sciences and policy literature, especially as a result of the perceived failure of governance systems following the recent global financial crisis, has only served to reinforce its relevance. Metagovernance addresses some of the perceived failures of traditional governance approaches and associated interventions, and has enabled the understanding of central-state led regimes of shadowed hierarchical authorities and local-level micropractices of social innovation and self-government. In contrast, tourism studies has tended to restrict study of the political dimension of tourism governance and the role of the state under the traditional parallelism between government and governance.

Examination of the how governance is itself governed enables a better understanding of the practices of planning and policy-making affecting tourism and destinations. In particular, the application of concepts of governance are inextricably linked to a given set of value assumptions which predetermine the range of its application. A short example of the application of the metagovernance paradigm is provided from the New Zealand context. It is concluded that governance mechanisms are not value-neutral and instead serve to highlight the allocation of power in a destination and the dominance of particular values and interests.

Keywords: metagovernance, destination governance, crisis, the state, neoliberalism, post-disaster governance,

Introduction

Since the work of Greenwood (1993), the concept of governance has steadily gained interest from students of tourism studies. Tourism researchers have come to utilise approaches and models from established literatures on governance in business studies, political sciences, public policy and the wider social sciences (e.g. Beritelli, Bieger, & Laesser, 2007; Bramwell, 2011; Pechlaner et al., 2015; Pechlaner & Volgger, 2013; Ruhanen, Scott, Ritchie, & Tkaczynski, 2010). Nevertheless, tourism studies has “generally remained stuck in examining the traditional models of governing and governance” (Jenkins, Hall, & Mkono, 2014, p.542). One dimension of this is that much governance related tourism scholarship has missed the substantial interest in ‘metagovernance’ in political administration, public policy and planning theory (Allmendinger & Haughton, 2009; Jessop, 2011; Meuleman, 2008).

The purpose of this article is to explain and review the significance of metagovernance for tourism research and examine some of its potential implications. Metagovernance is simultaneously both a critical approach to the study of governance and a way of thinking about how governance is structured and applied. As a result metagovernance reflects the idea that interventions and policies are reflections of theories (Pierre & Peters, 2000; Stoker 1998). In the case of governance such, often implicit, theories usually cover both theories of

the role of the state and the proper actions of government and theories of social interaction and change in social systems. Every mode of policy intervention has implicit assumptions about the role of the state and how societies and the organisations and individuals within them work (Hall, 2013). The importance of this for understanding tourism governance and policy making cannot be overstated. As Hall (2011a, p.438) argued:

the ways in which policies are designed to act have implicit theoretical foundations and hence assumptions about, for instance, the appropriate role of the state; the relationship between the state and individual policy actors (businesses, associations, individuals); their responsibilities; and how they are supposed to act politically.

Conceptualised as “the governance of governance” (Jessop, 2011, p.106) metagovernance developed as a critique of perceived analytical and empirical weaknesses in the governance literature (Whitehead, 2003). Metagovernance attracted considerable interest as a result of the financial and economic crisis affecting most of the OECD countries and the associated perceived failure of existing governance regimes and the neoliberal project (e.g. Harvey, 2005b; Jessop, 2002, 2003, 2004; Klein, 2007; Kooiman, 2003). Meta-governance is a concept that therefore explicitly questions the values, norms, principles and paradigms/ideologies that underpin governance systems and governing approaches (Kooiman & Jentoft, 2009). This includes the assumptions that shape the application and promotion of different forms of intervention (Hall, 2013), and how political authorities promote and guide the ‘self-organisation of governance’ systems through the ‘rules of the game’, organizational knowledge, institutional tactics and other political strategies (Jessop, 1997). Following Whitehead (2003, p.7) among others (e.g. Swyngedouw, 2005; Allen & Cochrane, 2007; Kooiman & Jentoft, 2009), a metagovernance frame

1. enables the political and economic changes associated with governance to be positioned within the context of changes of state power, strategy and intervention; and
2. tends to break down the arbitrary divide that is sometimes constructed between government and governance.

This paper highlights the importance of metagovernance issues with respect to multi-stakeholder decision-making and planning practices at destination and national scales. An example is provided from a post-disaster destination context and reflects how metagovernance questions the notion of resilience “as the basis for a new sustainability approach” (Lew 2014, p.17) in tourism planning and policy, by highlighting assumptions regarding the role of the state and individual and collective actions, responsibilities and rights, and the consequent implications. Therefore this paper also provides new insights from the so-called “political science tradition” (Pechlaner & Volgger, 2013, p.7) of tourism governance literature, as exemplified by the work of authors such as Hall and Jenkins (1995), Hall (2007), Dredge and Pforr (2008), Bramwell (2011), and Dredge and Jenkins (2011), among others. It does this by illustrating the theoretical and conceptual advancements in governance studies and the recent turn towards the metagovernance paradigm before focussing specifically on the tourism governance literature. The paper potentially provides insights into the often fragmented insights on the processes of tourism destination governance while overlooking ‘episodes’ (Healey 2004, 2005) and micropractices that would allow a deeper understanding of the “patterns of relations within

the processes of development” (Clarke & Raffay 2011, p.318). In addition, it acknowledges the existence of significant theoretical fragmentation in studies of governance in tourism due to the persisting divergence between the business and political sciences literatures (Pechlaner & Volgger, 2013; Ruhanen et al., 2010). It is therefore suggested that greater recognition of the metagovernance paradigm would potentially enable students of tourism to better understand and make overt the often implicit assumptions regarding the roles of the state, business, civic society and individuals in tourism governance and associated tourism policy and planning interventions.

Governance and Metagovernance

Governance is an extremely popular yet disputed concept among academic and international institutions and non-government organizations (Hewitt de Alcántara, 1998). “Governance is defined in dozens of different and in some respects contrasting ways” (Meuleman, 2008, p.11) in fields such as political sciences, public administration, geography and sociology (Bevir, 2011). At the most general level, governance is a “complex pattern of consumer-oriented public policies” (Salet, Thorney, & Kreukels, 2003, p.3) that emerge from governing activities of social, political and administrative actors” (Kooiman, 1993, p.2) in the context of ‘state disarticulation’ (Frederickson & Smith, 2003) {also referred to as ‘roll-back neoliberalism’ (Peck & Tickell, 2002, p.384) or the ‘hollowing out’ of the state (Jessop, 1994; Milward, 1996)}. Governance was initially conceived as a new form of public management structured along market and quasi-market organizational models (Rhodes, 1996, 1997). This meant that governance was understood as a process whereby formal governing structures were no longer focused primarily on the traditional roles of public sector government, but instead increasingly incorporated a range of interests drawn from the private sector and civil society (Whitehead, 2003) through public-private partnerships and the privatisation of public sector activities. From this grounding, both state and policy actors, as well as researchers, started to address the partnerships between public sector, business interests and societal actors through the network paradigm (Castells, 2010). Interest in direct democratic practices at local and neighbourhood level in many Western societies was also integrated with recognition of the significance of social capital (Putnam, 2000; Putnam & Gross, 2002) and of community driven social innovation (Moulaert, Martinelli, Swyngedouw, & Gonzalez, 2010; Vicari Haddock & Moulaert, 2009; Vitale, 2009). The important point here being that governance is simultaneously used as both an account of “contemporary state adaptation to its economic and political environment” (sometimes termed ‘new governance’), as well as “the conceptual and theoretical representation of the role of the state in the coordination of socioeconomic systems” (Hall, 2011a, p.440). Consequently, those working on governance have consistently emphasized the role of networks (Rhodes, 1997), associations (Streeck & Schmitter, 1985), regimes (Stone, 1989), growth coalitions (Harvey, 1989), and entangled hierarchies of power and the associated processes of ‘negotiated co-ordination’ (Scharpf, 1994), in the organization of political and economic activity (Hall, 2011a; Whitehead, 2003).

Central to the study of governance in most OECD countries was the devolution of authority to regional and local government bodies throughout the late 1980s, 1990s and early 2000s (Jones & MacLeod, 1999; OECD, 2005; Pike, Rodríguez-Pose, & Tomaney, 2006). Initially, research on this shift in the scale of policy regimes was focussed on the horizontal and

vertical linkages between governance actors. However, scales began to be conceived as “the product of economic, political and social activities and relationships” (Smith, 1995, p.61) among different stakeholders (Jessop, Brenner, & Jones, 2008; Tewdwr-Jones, 2012). While the existence of uneven forms of governance between supranational stakeholders and local actors is widely acknowledged (e.g. Hajer & Wagenaar, 2003; Sørensen & Torfing, 2005), more recent contributions suggest the adoption of concepts such as ‘soft spaces’ and ‘fuzzy’ boundaries (Allmendinger & Haughton, 2009; Kettl, 2015) to illustrate the sometimes unclear (Meuleman, 2008) yet highly dynamic and fragmented governance environment. However, while the conceptualization of polycentricity (Rodriguez, Williams, & Hall, 2014) and fuzzy boundaries “allows for a much richer range of governance combinations” (Meuleman, 2008, p.viii), it can “lead to contentions locally over who should set visions and directions for change” (Tewdwr-Jones, 2012, p.47).

Meuleman (2008) indicated an array of ideal types and hybrid forms of governance that coalesce around the key paradigms and concepts of hierarchies, networks, markets and communities (Pierre & Peters, 2000; Thompson, Frances, Levačić and Mitchell 1991; Treib, Bähr, & Falkner 2007; Hall 2011a) (**Error! Reference source not found.**). However, this framework does not adequately address issues of scale, which has clear importance for public policy and implementation (Healey, 2006). Moreover, the application of concepts of governance are inextricably linked to a given set of value assumptions which predetermine the range of its application. Many accounts of governance and policy intervention, including in tourism, fail to acknowledge that different conceptualisations reflect particular sets of values and ideologies with respect to the appropriate role of the state and the rights and responsibilities of the state and the individual. This has meant, for example, that the impacts of neoliberalization and neoliberal hegemony on planning, policy and governance activities may be underestimated or even unrecognised (Allmendinger & Haughton, 2012; Hall, 2013; Olesen, 2014; Tewdwr-Jones, 2012).

<INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE>

What currently exists in many developed countries, therefore, is a complex network of hybrid and multijurisdictional forms of governance (Bevir, 2011). Governance has become “a complex, multi-actor and multi-level process” (Paavola, Gouldson, & Klavánková-Oravská, 2009, p.150) through which the state, policy actors, private interests and civic society aims at resolving “societal problems or creating societal opportunities” (Meuleman, 2008, p.11). This is particularly appropriate for the study of tourism destinations given the complex interrelations between different stakeholders “with diverse and often divergent goals and objectives” (Laws, Argusa, Richins, & Scott, 2011, p.1). However, the presence of different and potentially conflicting governance mechanisms imply practical problems in addressing issues (Meuleman, 2008) and “an underlying uneasiness with the ways in which planning and planners seek to unify such diversity in to a plan” (Allmendinger, 2009, p.172). This is because different interventions lead to different winners and losers in the policy process and reinforce the dominance or hegemony of different values.

Despite the seeming dominance of new public management thinking with its emphasis on polycentric approaches to policy making and planning and the significance of the public-private partnerships and the role of the market, questions are increasingly raised as to

whether traditional modes of governance can still provide appropriate responses to societal issues (Ágh, 2010; Bell & Hindmoor, 2009; Torfing, 2014). Crises often play an important part in policy learning and paradigm change (Hall, 2011b). During the recession of the 1970s, the perceived failings of hierarchical approaches “led to public sector reforms intended to advance marketization” (Bevir, 2011, p.6). Similarly, the failure of neoliberalized governance modes via financial deregulation, marketization, and public-private partnerships that frame current economic and environmental crises are feeding demands for another paradigm shift in policy learning and policy-making (Hall, 2011b). However, policy learning and change is extremely difficult when operating in a supposedly ‘depoliticized’ climate in developed countries, when paradigms and approaches which lie beyond the pale of existing socio-technical systems are “doomed to be forever marginal no matter how ... policy-engaged their advocates might be. To break through this log jam it would be necessary to reopen a set of basic questions about the role of the state” (Shove, 2010, p.1283), and accordingly, require a re-conceptualization and re-theorization of governance.

Metagovernance

From an etymological perspective, metagovernance refers to what is after governance (from the Greek μετά, "beyond", "upon" or "after"). The conceptual origins of metagovernance can arguably be tracked back to the works of Kooiman (1993) and Dunsire (1993) on third-order change and collibration (Jessop, 2011). As well as providing a philosophical umbrella for governance activities, meta-governance is also a response to the perception that the state is withdrawing from governance, whereby political authorities at national and other levels are regarded as encouraging the self-organisation of partnerships, networks and governance regimes, Yet as Jessop (1997) highlights, the state continues to

provide the ground rules for governance; ensure the compatibility of different governance mechanisms and regimes; deploy a relative monopoly of organisational intelligence and information with which to shape cognitive expectations; act as a ‘court of appeal’ for disputes arising within and over governance; seek to rebalance power differentials by strengthening weaker forces or systems in the interests of system integration and/or social cohesion; try to modify the self-understanding of identities, strategic capacities and the interests of individual and collective actors in different strategic contexts and hence alter their implications for preferred strategies and tactics; and also assume political responsibility in the event of governance failure (Jessop, 1997, p.575).

Metagovernance focuses explicitly on the practices and procedures that secure governmental influence, command and control within governance regimes with its originality derived from its emphasis on relationality and negotiated links between government and governance, whereas governance draws attention to the processes that dislocate political organization from government and the state (Whitehead, 2003). The notion of metagovernance as self-regulating governance is derived from the ‘German school’ of governance (Enroth, 2011), particularly from the works of Mayntz (1993) and Scharpf (1994), which is primarily concerned with how coordination can be achieved despite the potential limits of vertical hierarchical power (governments, the state, the firm) and horizontal networks of self-coordination (governance, regimes, clans) (Whitehead, 2003).

Sørensen (2006) and Jessop (1997, 2002, 2003, 2011), who are key influences in the role of metagovernance as a response to the perceived failure of governance modes (Allmendinger & Haughton, 2009; Meuleman, 2008; Tewdwr-Jones, 2012), draw heavily on the German school and, particularly, what Scharpf (1994, p.36) describes as “structurally embedded self-co-ordination”. Scharpf’s (1994) identification of the importance of the relationships between vertical structures and horizontal networks of self-coordination provides two significant advantages for understanding governance (Whitehead, 2003). First, political hierarchies are recognised “as important arenas within which the negotiations and political struggles associated with governance are played out, without necessarily ascribing a deterministic logic to the exercise of hierarchical power” (Scharpf, 1994, p.40). Second, it helps reveal the interdependencies between hierarchical intervention and local political coordination: “just as hierarchical power is realized in and through local political practices and negotiations, so too is the effective coordination capacity of local political networks and clans enhanced by virtue of their ‘embeddedness’ within hierarchical structures” (Scharpf, 1994, p.40).

Sørensen (2006) highlights the potentialities of metagovernance as a self-regulating model of representative democracy “through which a range of legitimate and resourceful actors aim to combine, facilitate, shape and direct particular forms of governance” (Sørensen & Torfing, 2009, p.245). This, in turn, stimulates collaboration among stakeholders towards a shared goal under the guide of capable metagovernors that legitimate their decisions by devolving competence and authority to governance networks (Sørensen & Torfing, 2005, 2009). However, Jessop (2011) refers to metagovernance as a description of a ‘counter-tendency’ in “the organization of the conditions of self-organization” (Jessop, 2002, p.241). According to Jessop (2011), metagovernance represents a response to the failure of complex multi-institutional governance modes and suggests that conceptualising governance as hierarchies, markets, networks and/or communities have flaws that inexorably lead their failure (see also Hall, 2011a) (Table 1). Metagovernance is therefore conceived as a reflexive reframing in response to economic inefficiency, excessive managerialism and policy ineffectiveness, fragmented communication and mistrusted behaviours of key actors (Jessop, 2011).

<INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE>

Calls for new modes of governance in public administration beyond the new public management started to emerge in the mid-2000s (Hall & Zapata Campos, 2014), when Dutch public managers and regional authorities argued that shifting between and combining hierarchies, markets and networks modes of governance were the best ways of co-operation in the event of disasters and subsequent recovery (Meuleman, 2008). Focusing on the UK context, policy-makers and scholars acknowledged the rise of challenges of effective policy-making as result of the so-called ‘third way’ and the subsequent devolution of legislative power to regional and metropolitan authorities (Allmendinger & Haughton, 2009; Heley, 2013; Heley & Moles, 2012; Tewdwr-Jones, 2012). In Denmark Lund (2009), demonstrated how metagovernance modes for effective environmental conservation and stakeholder participation were hindered by the pressure of national bodies and of conservation authorities in particular. Outside the EU, interest in metagovernance has also focussed on regional environmental issues. For example, forest-based communities in

British Columbia (Canada) pursued institutional innovations and metagovernance modes to cope with the mountain pine beetle epidemic (Parkins, 2008).

Nevertheless, metagovernance is not designed to replace theories of governance. Instead, it is premised on better contextualising the different regimes of governance, which is also where much emphasis has been placed in tourism studies (Hall, 2011a), and explores how changes in governmental hierarchies can facilitate, via command and control activities, the proliferation of more devolved governance practices (Whitehead, 2003). In other words devolved governance activities exist as the result of state action not instead of state action. Rather than being a substitute for state control, governance practices are instead interpreted from a meta-governance perspective as new articulations of state power and become, as Scharpf (1994, p.41) states, the persistent 'shadow of hierarchical authority.' This is also regarded as an important component of critiques of the impact of neoliberalism on state activity because, as Davies (2013, p.4), observed, there is a "persistence of hierarchy, especially coercion, in the governing system" that strengthens neoliberal hegemony. For example, the recent financial and economic crisis affecting the Eurozone led to a hybrid regime that combines hierarchical and networked modes of governance at supranational level (Jessop, 2013), with key country members and EU authorities imposing austerity measures and neoliberal restructuring agendas on weaker member states within a technocratic and 'depoliticized' institutional void.

Tourism governance

As a subject, tourism studies has come relatively late to the literature on governance. As of late 2015 more than 75% of the contributions on tourism and governance were written from 2008 onwards and are marked by a plethora of conceptualizations and approaches. For example, Ruhanen et al. (2010) concluded that there were at least 72 different dimensions of governance available in tourism studies, with definitions mainly derived from business, health and political sciences. However, a simple divide is that tourism scholars tend to distinguish between corporate (private) governance and the political dimension of public governance (Hall, 2011a; Pechlaner & Volgger, 2013; Ruhanen et al., 2010). Nevertheless, other key themes with respect to tourism governance can be identified. Moscardo (2008, 2011a, 2011b), highlights the importance of knowledge and empowerment in community-based tourism approached. Network approaches to tourism governance are also regarded as significant for destination management and marketing organisations, and regional and sectoral innovation and product systems (e.g. Baggio, Scott, & Cooper, 2011; Dredge & Pforr, 2008; Pavlovich, 2008; Scott, Baggio, & Cooper, 2008). For example, Beritelli et al. (2007, p.96) note, "the systemic nature of tourism products generates the need for a broad involvement of destination stakeholders in the destination management organization's (DMO) activities and makes destination governance, defined as the setting up and developing of rules and mechanisms for business strategies by involving destination stakeholders".

Tourism planning and policy are inextricably interrelated with territorial tourism governance (Dredge & Jenkins, 2007; Hall, 2008; Pechlaner & Volgger, 2013). Studies of governance in tourism have tended to focus on different modes (e.g. d'Angella, De Carlo, & Sainaghi, 2010; Dredge & Jamal, 2015; Hall, 2011a; Meuleman, 2008; Wan & Bramwell, 2015; Zapata & Hall,

2012) and scales (e.g. Hall, 2008; Smith, 1995). Nevertheless, much of the writing on governance in tourism reflects something of the “haphazard shopping list” of all possible dimensions of governance that Treib et al. (2007, p.5) identified in the political science and public policy literature. This has meant that the “conceptual and theoretical representations of the role of the state in the co-ordination of socio-economic systems” (Hall, 2011a, p.440) have generally not been noted, along with the different modes of “contemporary state adaptation to its economic and political environment” (Hall, 2011a, p.439) which, in political science, are acknowledged as essential reflexive dimensions of metagovernance (Meuleman, 2008). In other words, much of the work related to governance in tourism has managed to define the state out of governance processes or at least minimise its role in comparison to emphasising market (business), network (voluntary self-organisation) or community (local) approaches.

The dominant approaches to governance in the tourism literature reflect Rhodes’ (1996, pp.652-653) conceptualization of governance as a new process of governing “a changed condition of ordered rule [and] a new method by which society is governed”. For example, the conceptualization of governance as network is useful to analyse “complex sets of relationships [...] that cross functional, hierarchical or geographic boundaries” (Baggio, Scott, & Cooper, 2008, p.3) and to discuss themes such as bargaining, the role of interest groups and the influence of constraints (Hall, 2011a). Community-based governance emphasises local participatory initiatives for direct democracy, with an historical focus on the importance of community interests and decision-making and more recent attention to “the significance of social capital in community and economic development” (Hall, 2011a, p.447). Governance via the market emphasizes the state “restructuring, rescaling, and reordering” (Jessop, 2002, p.452) and the adoption of market-led approaches to efficiently allocate resources, e.g. using tourism as a commercial mechanism to facilitate biodiversity conservation. In contrast, governance as hierarchy distinguishes between the private and public sectors by focussing on the key roles of government authorities.

The adoption of governance concepts has had substantial influence on tourism destination planning and policy (Hall, 2011a). Tourism planning and policy strategies have gained increased commercial relevance since the radical restructuring of public agencies from the late 1980s on (Dredge & Jenkins, 2007; Hall, 1999, 2008; Hall & Jenkins, 1995). Nevertheless, institutions with jurisdiction on trade, environment, culture and economic development arguably have a greater impact on tourism flows than the dedicated tourism authorities (Hall, 2008). Moreover, the tourism private sector at large is often characterized by internal parochialisms and lack of collaboration with public authorities and the local community (Zahra 2011), with sections of the latter often ignored or defined out of decision-making processes policies and destination strategies meant to increase the visitor economy are challenged (Higgins-Desbiolles 2011). Therefore, it is not surprising that contributions with respect to tourism destination planning often stress the need of involving public and private actors to gather consensus and to make stakeholder strategies converge towards the same goals in the interests of tourism (Bramwell and Lane, 2000; Jamal and Getz, 1999; Gill and Williams, 1994). Yet, as Goymen (2000, p.1027) stated “participation is easier advocated than achieved.”

Governance modes are not panaceas to resolve the problems of effective, long-standing and collaborative tourism planning. Public-private partnerships in tourism are usually expressions of market interests (Hall, 1999; Zapata & Hall, 2012), community-led governance and so-called bottom-up initiatives may never be effective where social capital is low or where there are vested networked relations (Costa, 2013; Jamal & Getz, 1999) that override some community interests. The restructuring of public management can also increase fragmentation rather than promote intra-institutional cohesion (Zahra, 2011). Moreover, as the political science literature highlights, governance modes are prone to fail (Jessop, 2002), particularly in the event of crises (Hall, 2010). Therefore, a stronger appreciation of the assumptions and values that underlie hierarchies, networks, markets and communities, particularly with respect to the role of the state, may help make governance regimes more effective and transparent and lead to the improved governance of governance. In other words, metagovernance.

Metagovernance in tourism studies

According to Jenkins, Hall, and Mkono (2014, p.549) “there is a wide range of tourism metagovernance practice in operation” which has been overlooked in the literature, partly due to the predominant governance paradigm in tourism planning and policy. Recent reviews of the tourism literature suggest the need of moving beyond “old ways of knowing” (Dredge & Jenkins, 2011, p.5), often by embracing post-structural (Dredge & Jamal, 2015) and/or post-disciplinary paradigms (e.g. Coles, Hall, & Duval, 2006, 2016). In the case of sustainable tourism this has also been described as the need to bring about ‘third-order change’ (Hall, 2011b), i.e. a paradigm change that occurs when a new goal hierarchy is adopted by policymakers because the coherence of the existing policy paradigm has been undermined, rather than changes in government instruments and techniques (second-order change), or incremental change in the settings of policy instruments (first-order change).

Major global issues (e.g. financial and economic crisis, economic inequality, climate and environmental change, and refugee flows), and the “increasing normalisation of neoliberal practices and concepts” (Olesen, 2014, p.292) in political economy (e.g. Hall, 2016a), have had a considerable impact on tourism at national, regional and local scales (Giovanelli, Rotondo & Fadda, 2015; Hall, 2010). However, the challenges to tourism governance in regions with a strong economic and employment dependence on visitors are more than just an artefact of change in the external environment. Rather, it is often failures in destination governance and the inability of stakeholders to acknowledge the importance of developing participation consensus (Costa, 2013; Spyriadis, Buhalis & Fyall 2011), that is increasingly centred on the development of more ‘resilient’ destinations and associated planning strategies (Lew, 2014; Hall, 2016b).

The heterogeneity of stakeholder objectives suggests that successful tourism destination governance in terms of legitimate consensus generation is often hard to achieve, particularly in addressing the problematic issue of sustainability (Bramwell, 2011). For example, there is often a basic conflict between stakeholders and interests that coalesce around sustainability while others focus on continued growth in visitor arrivals (Gössling et al., 2015). A number of authors, including Wan and Bramwell (2015) in examining tourism policy in Hong Kong; Giovanelli, Rotondo and Fadda (2015) in the study of tourism networks

in Sardinia, and Lamers et al. (2014) with respect to conservation tourism partnerships in Kenya, have noted the concept of metagovernance as a way of understanding how the policy system is 'steered', while Bregoli (2013) has utilised it with respect to coordination of destination brand identity in Edinburgh. Spyriadis et al. (2011) also examine the dynamics of destination governance via the lenses of governance and metagovernance. Nevertheless, the extent of engagement with the metagovernance literature in tourism remains relatively weak. Although the importance of the governance of governance in tourism is often invoked, its implications remain little examined. For example, Spyriadis et al. (2011) quote Sørensen's (2006) political science article on metagovernance with respect to its meaning "the organization of the conditions in terms of their structurally inscribed strategic selectivity, i.e. of their asymmetrical privileging of some outcomes over others" (Sørensen 2006, p.108), and then go on to suggest:

From this perspective, DMOs have an important role to play as vehicles of metagovernance... the role of the DMO is central in coordinating and integrating the development and implementation of policies and strategies at intersectoral (across sectors) and intergovernmental (across the levels of government) levels (Spyriadis et al., 2011, p.198).

However, as with many accounts of governance in tourism, they fail to acknowledge either the asymmetrical privileging of some outcomes over others (i.e. winners and losers in the governance process) or the "tangled hierarchies" (Sørensen, 2006, p.108) of governance. It should therefore be no surprise that Spyriadis et al. (2011, p.198) claim that, "[e]ssentially, destination metagovernance relates to the need of the destination actively to form governance structures and manage their mechanisms, conflict and tensions" without recognising that DMOs are themselves embedded within hierarchies of governance; and that their role and decisions not only favour certain interests over others but also certain values. This is why the notion of metagovernance is potentially so valuable to tourism research. Theories of metagovernance suggest that both the motivational impetus to collaborate, coordinate and integrate and the subsequent management of the motivational frameworks associated with governance (e.g. strategic plans) are not exclusively situated in local/destination political agreements, concessions and compromises, but are also driven by the hierarchical power of the state and government operating over a range of different spatial scales (Whitehead 2003). Indeed, as noted above, what becomes important from a meta-governance perspective is the extent to which governance practices are articulations of state power and become, to use Scharpf's (1994, p.41) term again, the persistent 'shadow of hierarchical authority'. Unfortunately, much of the work in tourism has failed to recognise these shadows – the actual political practices, techniques and punitive actions of the state – because it labours under the notion that much of what is discussed is somehow 'objective', 'rational' and 'apolitical' or is at least presented as such. These are illustrated in the following brief example of Christchurch in New Zealand, where the local level is being shaped via central state actions.

Metagovernance in post-earthquake Christchurch, New Zealand

New Zealand was one of the first countries to employ a neoliberal agenda centred on a streamlined state intervention and reliance on market drivers. Initially, this was to cope with

the oil crises and the loss of the UK as the primary export market in the 1970s (Easton, 1989), but more recently this has become part of a drive towards 'balanced budgets', and market-led economic growth following the effects of the 2007-2008 financial crisis and the impacts of Canterbury earthquakes of 2010 and 2011 (Hall, Malinen, Vosslamber, & Wordsworth, 2016).

The national government agenda is strongly focussed on using state intervention to further embed the economy in international markets. Tourism is an important dimension of this strategy not only with respect to attracting international tourists, especially from the increasingly important Chinese market, but also with respect to national branding. As Lewis (2011, p.280) commented, "Economic nationalism, which reduces national identity building to a calculus of economic success in the global from the edge, is deeply embedded. it is cultivated by popular media, industry actors, education curricula, science funding, and even domestic art, as well as national development agencies". An important element of promoting New Zealand is the role of New Zealand Inc/NZ Inc (New Zealand Incorporated), which is referred to in many government reports. For example, the *2013/14 Annual Report of New Zealand Trade and Enterprise (NZTE)* states under "Our purpose": "We work with international investors to identify business opportunities in New Zealand, focused on target industries and regions that need capital and connections to grow, and, alongside our NZ Inc partners (within government and the business community), to build credibility in our national brand" (NZTE, 2014, p.4).

This national account of contemporary governance in New Zealand is important because it frames what happens at a regional destination level, especially in a highly centralised unicameral political system where local and regional government powers are weak, and with no codified constitution and no house of review as in other Westminster style democracies (it was abolished in 1950). The 'shadow of hierarchical authority' (Scharpf, 1994, p.41) is seen in the notion of NZ Inc. as it embraces not just a 'whole of government' approach to governance and branding, but also the inclusion of corporate partners in the development of economic policies and branding strategies. NZ Inc reflects an approach where the country is run like a business with the prime minister as its chief executive and the voters as the profit-maximising stockholders looking for the best possible return from the national enterprise (McCrone, 2012a). In order to achieve this the John Key led National Party's neoliberal economic model is highly centralised and highly interventionist with "one people united under a single business plan" (McCrone, 2012a, p.C4), and brand. For example, the government sought to create, with mixed success, new metropolitan-wide authorities in Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch in order to reduce the number of councils so as to make them more internationally competitive and attract capital and tourists (McCrone, 2012b). However, as the concept of metagovernance stresses, branding and coordination strategies are not value-free tools. The NZInc model is one of state intervention to maximise economic growth accompanied by its framing in terms of national wellbeing and presented as a 'necessity' for a resilient economy and society rather than an explicit ideology (Hall, 2016a). As Lewis (2011) commented with respect to Brand New Zealand, and branding New Zealand, it is about more than brand awareness, value adding and linking firms to markets, it "is a calculated and calculating entanglement of territory, imaginary, measurement, technology, practice and identity building" and "is far from politically, culturally, socially or economically innocent" (Lewis, 2011, pp.282, 283).

From September 2010 to the end of 2011 the city of Christchurch, the second biggest city in the country and main gateway for the South Island of New Zealand, was struck by a major earthquake sequence causing loss of life and substantially affecting the city's CBD with approximately 70% of buildings being lost. These shocks greatly affected the tourism sector (CERA, 2012). The damage to attractions, image and infrastructure in the aftermath of the earthquakes resulted in a drastic drop of international arrivals and overnight stays in Christchurch (Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism, 2013).

In response the Canterbury region and Christchurch city have been at the forefront of a national government "roll-with-it neoliberalization" (Keil, 2009, p.232) experiment, from which the notion of the region as a tourist destination and hence destination management and marketing cannot be divorced. In order to achieve its aims the National Party led central government have three primary governmental mechanisms for asserting control over the local state: strategic frameworks and guidance, monitoring and assessment measures, and fear and discipline (Table 2).

<INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE>

In jurisdictions such as New Zealand the capacities, directions and trajectories of DMOs is set as much by the actions of the state as it is by any internal decision-making and marketing logic. DMOs act and operate in specific spaces of metagovernance. For example, the power of the state to discipline destinations and the organisations within them can be undertaken via both financial and legislative means. At its most extreme it can mean dissolution of an organisation or a reduction in its powers. Crises, including natural disasters, provide significant rationale for such actions, what Klein (2007) described as "disaster capitalism" where changes in governance are justified as essential or unavoidable in order to ensure greater regional or destination 'resilience'. In March 2010, the Ministry of the Environment dissolved the democratically elected Canterbury District Council (ECan) which has primary responsibilities for environment and resource management because the authority could not reach a decision on the water management in the region favourable to farming interests. A fully democratic regional council will not be elected again until 2019. Similarly, following the severe February 2011 earthquake which damaged much of the central city the national government via the promulgation of Orders in Council, along with the establishment of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA) in April 2011, overrode established legislative procedures for resource consent, in order to boost the construction and real estate development sector and seek to attract foreign direct investment in the rebuild (Amore & Hall, 2016; Hayward, 2013).

The creation of specific legislative and institutional powers also makes it easier for the central state to structure strategic frameworks and guidance at the destination level. For example, CERA oversaw the implementation of a land use recovery plan in which "cultural assets and strategic commercial buildings" (CERA 2013) are considered as strategic features of the city. The zoning of the CBD as illustrated in the Christchurch Central Development Unit (CCDU) *Central City Recovery Plan* and the amendments to the previous district plan set the basis for the development of large scale retail and hospitality developments. The rebuild protocol culminated with the release of the Central City Rebuild Plan (CCDU, 2012), which

foresees the building of key tourism and leisure 'anchor projects', such as a new stadium and a convention centre, for international sport events and business tourism (CCDU, 2014). Importantly, these initiatives were followed even though many of the elements in the plan were not ones identified as significant from earlier public consultation by local government (Amore & Hall, 2016). As Hayward (2013), in commenting on the Christchurch earthquakes, observed

...the rhetoric of resilience is used to justify authorities making decisions quickly and measuring their impact on recovery by the speed with which the city returns to a 'new normal' or experiences 'certainty' as firm centralized decision making... the drive for efficiency is all too frequently used to justify expert command-and-control decision making with little or no meaningful local scrutiny or community leadership in decision making.

Overall, these destination level approaches underpin the wider NZ Inc. pro-development agenda of central government in New Zealand (McCrone, 2012a; Hall, 2016a; Hayward, 2013). The illustrative points being that the understanding of governance in tourism at the destination level is incomplete without understanding the actions (and inactions) of the state and how a seemingly depoliticised or 'value-free' notion such as 'resilience' can be used to justify a range of hierarchically imposed central state actions that overwhelm community governance approaches. Metagovernance necessitates a perspective that understands tourism governance within a much wider set of horizontal and vertical linkages and relationships as well as the relationship between governmental techniques and ideologies and values (Hall, 2013). The capacities and strategies of tourism governance require the acquiescence and, in some cases, the direct involvement of the state that lead to tourism governance and development moving along some trajectories and not others. A focus on metagovernance therefore seeks to make governance more transparent and raises questions as to why some strategies are employed and not others and who wins and who loses in decision-making, especially with respect to the values and interests in what is an overtly political context.

Conclusions

This article sought to further link the domain of political sciences with that of tourism policy and planning in order "to contribute to broader debates on governance" (Hall, 2011, p.451). In doing so it has drawn on the notion of metagovernance to highlight how many studies of governance in tourism have tended to focus on the techniques or methods of governance rather than the values that may underlie the selection of particular interventions (Hall, 2013, 2015). In particular, it has emphasised how the governance of governance is not just a 'technical' issue, instead metagovernance illustrates how the shadow of hierarchical power serves central state and other interests (and their values), is connected to power relationships at various scales, and provides for different sets of winners and losers depending on the intersection between growth interests and central government. The state sets the 'rules of the game' of governance. All of these elements affect what happens in destination governance. These issues are not new, but there is a need to ensure that the lack of ideological or distributional neutrality of governance modes and policy interventions is made explicit. As Majone (1989) recognised:

The choice of policy instruments is not a technical problem that can be safely left to experts. It raises institutional, social, and moral issues that must be clarified.... The naive faith of some analysts in the fail-safe properties of certain instruments allegedly capable of lifting the entire regulatory process out of the morass of public debate and compromise can only be explained by the constraining hold on their minds of a model of policymaking in which decisions are, in James Buchanan's words, "handed down from on high by omniscient beings who cannot err" (Majone, 1989, p.143).

Destination management and marketing, while serving some interests, may simultaneously be acting to reduce the power of others who do not share the supposed 'consensus' on the value of tourism as an economic enterprise. For example, Hall (2011b, p.665) argued, "Far too much attention has been given to the assumption that a well-designed institution is 'good' because it facilitates cooperation and network development rather than a focus on norms and institutionalisation as first and necessary steps in the assessment of what kind of changes institutional arrangements are promoting and their potential outcomes". As Malpas and Wickham (1995) have noted, all forms of governance fail in some ways, although "different forms of governance fail in different ways" (Jessop, 2011, p.113). This is not to suggest that activities such as coordination and networking are without value, far from it, but it is to suggest that the values and interests of those who promote tourism and the organisational means by which it is brought into effect, including those within the academy, require far greater scrutiny and transparency than what has hitherto usually been the case in the tourism governance literature.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge the invaluable comments of the reviewers. The usual caveats apply.

References

- Ágh, A. (2010). The renewal of the EU democracy: from multilevel governance to global governance. *Journal of Comparative Politics*, 3(1), 4-20.
- Amore, A. & Hall, C.M. (2016). 'Regeneration is the focus now': Anchor projects and delivering a new CBD for Christchurch. In C.M. Hall, S. Malinen, R. Vosslamber & R. Wordsworth (Eds.), *Business and post-disaster management: Business, organisational and consumer resilience and the Christchurch earthquakes* (pp.181-199). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Allen, J., & Cochrane, A. (2007). Beyond the territorial fix: regional assemblages, politics and power. *Regional Studies*, 41(9), 1161-1175.
- Allmendinger, P. (2009). *Planning theory* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Allmendinger, P., & Haughton, G. (2009). Soft spaces, fuzzy boundaries, and metagovernance: the new spatial planning in the Thames Gateway. *Environment and Planning A*, 41(3), 617-633.
- Allmendinger, P., & Haughton, G. (2012). Post-political spatial planning in England: a crisis of consensus? *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 37(1), 89-103.

- Baggio, R., Scott, N., & Cooper, C. (2008). Introduction. In N. Scott, R. Baggio & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Network analysis and tourism: from theory to practice* (pp.1-8). Clevedon: Channel View.
- Baggio, R., Scott, N., & Cooper, C. (2011). Design of tourism governance networks. In E. Laws, H. Richins, J. Argusa & N. Scott (Eds.), *Tourist destination governance: Practice, theory and issues* (pp.159-172). Wallingford: CABI.
- Bell, S., & Hindmoor, A. (2009). *Rethinking governance: The centrality of the state in modern society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beritelli, P., Bieger, T., & Laesser, C. (2007). Destination governance: using corporate governance theories as a foundation for effective destination management. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(1), 96-107.
- Bevir, M. (2011). Governance as theory, practice, and dilemma. In M. Bevir (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of governance* (pp.1-15). London: Sage.
- Bramwell, B. (2011). Governance, the state and sustainable tourism: a political economy approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4-5), 459-477.
- Bregoli, I. (2013). Effects of DMO coordination on destination brand identity: A mixed-method study on the City of Edinburgh. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(2), 212-224.
- Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA). (2012). *Canterbury economic recovery dashboard - December 2012*. Christchurch: Author.
- Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA). (2013). Built environment. He whakatika i ngā mea hanga. Retrieved from: <http://cera.govt.nz/recovery-strategy/built-environment>.
- Castells, M. (2011). *The rise of the network society: The information age: Economy, society, and culture* (Vol. 1) (2nd ed.). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism (2013). *Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism annual report for the year ending June 2013*. Christchurch: Author.
- Christchurch Central Development Unit (CCDU). (2012). Christchurch central recovery plan. Te mahere 'maraka ōtautahi. Christchurch: Author. Retrieved from <https://ccdu.govt.nz/sites/default/files/documents/christchurch-central-recovery-plan-march-2014-a4-pages-version.pdf>.
- Christchurch Central Development Unit. (2014). *Convention Centre Precinct Announcement*. Christchurch: Author. Retrieved from <http://vimeo.com/102805014>.
- Clarke, A., & Raffay, A. (2011). The Introduction of tourism destination management organizations in Hungary: Top-down meets bottom-up. In D. Dredge & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Stories of practice: Tourism policy and planning* (pp.311-334). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Coles, T., Hall, C.M., & Duval, D.T. (2006). Tourism and post-disciplinary enquiry. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9(4-5), 293-319.
- Coles, T.E., Hall, C.M. & Duval, D.T. (2016). Tourism and post-disciplinarity: back to the future? *Tourism Analysis*, in press.
- Costa, N. (2013). The applied sociology of tourism. The up skills of the facilitator in the Italian hospitality industry. *Advances in Applied Sociology*, 3(1), 1-12.
- d'Angella, F., De Carlo, M., & Sainaghi, R. (2010). Archetypes of destination governance: a comparison of international destinations. *Tourism Review*, 65(4), 61-73.
- Davies, J.S. (2013). Whatever happened to coercion? A Gramscian critique of metagovernance theory. Paper presented at the Political Studies Association Conference, Cardiff, 25th – 27th March 2013.
- Dredge, D., & Jamal, T. (2015). Progress in tourism planning and policy: A post-structural perspective on knowledge production. *Tourism Management*, 51, 285-297.

- Dredge, D., & Jenkins, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Tourism planning and policy*. Milton: John Wiley.
- Dredge, D., & Jenkins, J. (2011). New spaces of tourism planning and policy. In D. Dredge & J. M. Jenkins (Eds.), *Stories of Practice: Tourism Policy and Planning* (pp.1-12). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Dredge, D., & Pforr, C. (2008). Policy networks and tourism governance. In N. Scott, R. Baggio & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Network analysis and tourism: From theory to practice* (pp. 58-78). Clevedon: Channel View.
- Dunsire, A. (1993). *Manipulating social tensions: Collibration as an alternative mode of government intervention*, MPIfG discussion paper, No. 93/7.
- Easton, B. (1989). *The making of Rogernomics*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Enroth, H. (2011). Policy network theory. In M. Bevir (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of governance* (pp.19-35). London: Sage.
- Thompson, G., Frances, J., Levačić, R., & J. Mitchell, J. (Eds.). (1991). *Markets, hierarchies, and networks: the coordination of social life*. London: Sage.
- Frederickson, G.H., & Smith, K. (2003). *The public administration theory primer*. Boulder: Westview.
- Giovanelli, L., Rotondo, F., & Fadda, N. (2015). The evolution of governance networks in a time of crisis. Evidence from the Italian tourism sector. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research*, 7(4), 76-88.
- Greenwood, J. (1993). Business interest groups in tourism governance. *Tourism Management*, 14(5), 335-348.
- Gössling, S., Ring, A., Dwyer, L., Andersson, A-C., & Hall, C.M. (2015). Optimizing or maximizing growth? A challenge for sustainable tourism, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Online first. DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2015.1085869.
- Hajer, M.A., & Wagenaar, H. (Eds.). (2003). *Deliberative policy analysis: understanding governance in the network society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, C.M. (1999). Rethinking collaboration and partnership: A public policy perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7(3-4), 274-289.
- Hall, C.M. (2007). Tourism, governance and the (mis-)location of power. In A. Church & T. Coles (Eds.), *Tourism, Power and Space* (pp.247-269). London: Routledge.
- Hall, C. M. (2008). *Tourism planning: policies, processes and relationships* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Pearson.
- Hall, C.M. (2010). Crisis events in tourism: Subjects of crisis in tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 13(5), 401-417.
- Hall, C.M. (2011a). A typology of governance and its implications for tourism policy analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4-5), 437-457.
- Hall, C.M. (2011b). Policy learning and policy failure in sustainable tourism governance: From first and second to third order change? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4-5), 649-671.
- Hall, C.M. (2013). Framing behavioural approaches to understanding and governing sustainable tourism consumption: Beyond neoliberalism, 'nudging' and 'green growth'? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(7), 1091-1109.
- Hall, C.M. (2015). Intervening in academic interventions: Framing social marketing's potential for successful sustainable tourism behavioural change. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Online first. DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2015.1088861.

- Hall, C.M. (2016a). 100% directed capitalism: Brand New Zealand, new thinking, new stories, neo liberalism, pure inc. In L. White (Eds.), *Commercial nationalism: Selling the national story in tourism and events*. Bristol: Channel View.
- Hall, C.M. (2016b). Putting ecological thinking back in to disaster ecology and responses to natural disasters: Rethinking resilience or business as usual? In C.M. Hall, S. Malinen, R. Vosslander & R. Wordsworth (Eds.), *Post-disaster management: Business, organisational and consumer resilience and the Christchurch earthquakes* (pp.269-292). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hall, C. M., & Jenkins, J. (1995). *Tourism and public policy*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, C.M., Malinen, S., Vosslander R. & Wordsworth, R. (Eds.) (2016). *Post-disaster management: Business, organisational and consumer resilience and the Christchurch earthquakes*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hall, C.M., & Zapata Campos, M.J. (2014). Public administration and tourism: International and Nordic perspectives, *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*, 14(1), 3-17.
- Harvey, D. (1989). From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, 71, 3-17.
- Harvey, D. (2005a). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2005b). *Spaces of neoliberalization: towards a theory of uneven geographical development* (Vol. 8). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Hayward, B.M. (2013) 'Rethinking resilience: Reflections on the earthquakes in Christchurch, New Zealand, 2010 and 2011', *Ecology and Society*, 18(4), 37.
- Healey, P. (2004). The treatment of space and place in the new strategic spatial planning in Europe. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28(1), 45-67.
- Healey, P. (2005). Place, identity and governance: transforming discourses and practices. In J. Hillier & E. Rooksby (Eds.), *Habitus: A sense of place* (pp.173-201). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Healey, P. (2006). *Urban complexity and spatial strategies: towards a relational planning for our times*. London: Routledge.
- Heley, J. (2013). Soft spaces, fuzzy boundaries and spatial governance in post-devolution Wales. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(4), 1325-1348.
- Heley, J., & Moles, K. (2012). Partnership working in regions: Reflections on local government collaboration in Wales. *Regional Science Policy & Practice*, 4(2), 139-153.
- Hewitt de Alcántara, C. (1998). Uses and abuses of the concept of governance. *International Social Science Journal*, 50(155), 105-113.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2011). Death by a thousand cuts: Governance and environmental trade-offs in ecotourism development at Kangaroo Island, South Australia. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4-5), 553-570.
- Jamal, T., & Getz, D. (1999). Community roundtables for tourism-related conflicts: The dialectics of consensus and process structures. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7(3-4), 290-313.
- Jenkins, J. M., Hall, C.M., & Mkono, M. (2014). Tourism and public policy: Contemporary debates and future directions. In A. Lew, C.M. Hall & A. Williams (Eds.), *Companion to tourism* (pp.542-555). Malden: Wiley Blackwell.
- Jessop, B. (1994). Post-Fordism and the state. In A. Amin (Ed.), *Post-Fordism: a reader* (pp. 251-279). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Jessop, B. (1997). Capitalism and its future: remarks on regulation, government and governance. *Review of International Political Economy*, 4, 561-581.

- Jessop, B. (2002). Liberalism, neoliberalism, and urban governance: a state–theoretical perspective. *Antipode*, 34(3), 452-472.
- Jessop, B. (2003). Governance and metagovernance: On reflexivity, requisite variety, and requisite irony. In H.P. Bang (Ed.), *Governance, as social and political communication* (pp. 142-172). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Jessop, B. (2004). Multi-level governance and multi-level metagovernance. In I. Bache & M. Flinders (Eds.), *Multi-level governance* (pp.49-74). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jessop, B. (2011). Metagovernance. In M. Bevir (Ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Governance* (pp.106-123). London: SAGE.
- Jessop, B. (2013). Dynamics of regionalism and globalism: a critical political economy perspective. *Ritsumeikan Social Science Review*, 5, 3-24.
- Jessop, B., Brenner, N., & Jones, M. (2008). Theorizing sociospatial relations. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 26, 389-401.
- Jones, M., & MacLeod, G. (1999). Towards a regional renaissance? Reconfiguring and rescaling England's economic governance. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 24(3), 295-313.
- Keil, R. (2009). The urban politics of roll-with-it neoliberalization. *City*, 13(2-3), 230-245.
- Kettl, D. (2015). *The transformation of governance: Public administration for the twenty-first century* (2nd ed.). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Klein, N. (2007). *The shock doctrine: the rise of disaster capitalism*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Kooiman, J. (Ed.). (1993). *Modern governance: new government-society interactions*. London: Sage.
- Kooiman, J. (2003). *Governing as governance*. London: Sage.
- Kooiman, J., & Jentoft, S. (2009). Meta-governance: values, norms and principles, and the making of hard choices. *Public Administration*, 87(4), 818-836.
- Lamers, M., van der Duim, R., van Wijk, J., Nthiga, R., & Visseren-Hamakers, I. (2014). Governing conservation tourism partnerships in Kenya. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 48, 250-265.
- Laws, E., Argusa, J., Richins, H., & Scott, N. (2011). Tourist destination governance: Practice, theory and issues. In E. Laws, H. Richins, J. Argusa & N. Scott (Eds.), *Tourist destination governance: practice, theory and issues* (pp.1-16). Wallingford: CABI.
- Lew, A.A. (2014). Scale, change and resilience in community tourism planning. *Tourism Geographies*, 16(1), 14-22.
- Lewis, N. (2011). Packaging political projects in geographical imaginaries: The rise of nation branding. In A. Pike (Ed.), *Brands and branding geographies* (pp.264-288). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Lund, D. (2009). Metagovernance of the national park process in Denmark. *Local Environment*, 14(3), 245-257.
- Majone, G. (1989). *Evidence, argument and persuasion in the policy process*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Malpas, J., & Wickham, G. (1995). Governance and failure: on the limits of sociology. *Journal of Sociology*, 31(3), 37-50.
- Mayntz, R. (1993). Governing failures and the problem of governability: some comments on a theoretical paradigm. In J. Kooiman (Ed.), *Modern governance: New government-society interactions* (pp.9-20). London: Sage.
- McCrone, J. (2012a, 8 September). The business of NZ Inc., *The Press*, p. C4

- McCrone, J. (2012b, 28 April). What now, ECan?, *The Press*, p. C4.
- Meuleman, L. (2008). *Public management and the metagovernance of hierarchies, networks and markets: the feasibility of designing and managing governance style combinations*. Amsterdam: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Milward, H.B. (1996). Symposium on the hollow state: Capacity, control, and performance in interorganizational settings. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 6(2), 193-195.
- Moscardo, G. (2008). *Building community capacity for tourism development*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Moscardo, G. (2011a). Exploring social representations of tourism planning: issues for governance. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4-5), 423-436.
- Moscardo, G. (2011b). The role of knowledge in good governance for tourism. In E. Laws, H. Richins, J. Agrusa & N. Scott (Eds.), *Tourist destination governance. Practice, theory and issues* (pp.67-80). Wallingford: CABI.
- Moulaert, F., Martinelli, F., Swyngedouw, E., & Gonzalez, S. (Eds.). (2010). *Can neighbourhoods save the city? Community development and social innovation*. London: Routledge.
- New Zealand Trade and Enterprise (NZTE) (2014). *Annual Report 2013/2014*. Wellington: NZTE.
- Office of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (2005). *Building competitive regions: strategies and governance*. Paris: Author.
- Olesen, K. (2014). The neoliberalisation of strategic spatial planning. *Planning Theory*, 13(3), 288-303.
- Paavola, J., Gouldson, A., & Kluvánková-Oravská, T. (2009). Interplay of actors, scales, frameworks and regimes in the governance of biodiversity. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 19(3), 148-158.
- Parkins, J. (2008). The metagovernance of climate change: institutional adaptation to the Mountain Pine Beetle epidemic in British Columbia. *Journal of Rural and Community Development*, 3(2), 7-26.
- Pavlovich, K. (2008). Network governance and connectivity: A case study. In N. Scott, R. Baggio & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Network analysis and tourism: from theory to practice* (pp.79-95). Clevedon: Channel View.
- Pechlaner, H., Beritelli, P., Pichler, S., Peters, M., & Scott, N. (Eds.) (2015). *Contemporary destination governance: A case study approach*. Bingley: Emerald.
- Pechlaner, H., & Volgger, M. (2013). Towards a comprehensive view of tourism governance: Relationships between the corporate governance of tourism service firms and territorial governance. *International Journal of Globalisation and Small Business*, 5(1/2), 3-19.
- Peck, J., & Tickell, A. (2002). Neoliberalizing space. *Antipode*, 34(3), 380-380.
- Pierre, J., & Peters, B.G. (2000). *Governance, politics and the state*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Pike, A., Rodríguez-Pose, A., & Tomaney, J. (2006). *Local and regional development*. New York: Routledge.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Putnam, R., & Gross, K. (2002). Introduction. In R. Putnam (Ed.), *Democracies in flux: The evolution of social capital in contemporary society* (pp.3-21). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Rhodes, R. (1996). The new governance: governing without government. *Political Studies*, 44(4), 652-667.
- Rhodes, R. (1997). *Understanding governance: policy networks, governance, reflexivity, and accountability*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Rodriguez, I., Williams, A., & Hall, C.M. (2014). Tourism innovation policy: implementation and outcomes. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 49, 76–93.
- Ruhanen, L., Scott, N., Ritchie, B., & Tkaczynski, A. (2010). Governance: a review and synthesis of the literature. *Tourism Review*, 65(4), 4-16.
- Salet, W., Thorney, A., & Kreukels, A. (2003). Institutional and spatial coordination in European metropolitan regions. In W. Salet, A. Thorney & A. Kreukels (Eds.), *Metropolitan governance and spatial planning. Comparative case studies of European city-regions* (pp.3-17). London: Spon Press.
- Scharpf, F.W. (1994). Games real actors could play positive and negative coordination in embedded negotiations. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 6(1), 27-53.
- Scott, N., Baggio, R., & Cooper, C. (Eds.) (2008). *Network analysis and tourism: from theory to practice*. Bristol: Channel View.
- Shove, E. (2010). Beyond the ABC: climate change policy and theories of social change. *Environment and Planning A*, 42, 1273-1285.
- Smith, N. (1995). *Remaking scale: competition and cooperation in prenational and postnational Europe* *Competitive European Peripheries* (pp.59-74). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Sørensen, E. (2006). Metagovernance: The changing role of politicians in processes of democratic governance. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 36(1), 98-114.
- Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2005). Network governance and post-liberal democracy. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 27(2), 197-237.
- Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2009). Making governance networks effective and democratic through metagovernance. *Public Administration*, 87(2), 234-258.
- Spyriadis, T., Buhalis, D., & Fyall, A. (2011). Dynamics of destination governance: Governance and metagovernance in the composite industrial environment of destinations. In E. Laws, H. Richins, J. Argusa & N. Scott (Eds.), *Tourist destination governance: Practice, theory and issues* (pp.187-202). Wallingford: CABI.
- Streeck, W. & Schmitter, P. (1985). Community, market, state - and associations? *European Sociological Review*, 1, 119-138.
- Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: Five propositions. *International Social Science Journal*, 50(155), 17-28.
- Stone, C. (1989). *Regime politics: the governing of Atlanta 1946-1988*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.
- Swyngedouw, E. (2005). Governance innovation and the citizen: the Janus face of governance-beyond-the-state. *Urban Studies*, 42(11), 1991-2006.
- Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2012). *Spatial planning and governance. Understanding UK planning*. New York: Palgrave.
- Torfing, J. (2014). The democratic accountability of collaborative innovation in the public sector. In B. Isakhan & S. Slaughter (Eds.), *Democracy and crisis: Democratizing governance in the twenty-first century* (pp.44-67). New York: Palgrave.
- Treib, O., Bähr, H., & Falkner, G. (2007). Modes of governance: towards a conceptual clarification. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 14(1), 1-20.
- Vicari Haddock, S., & Moulaert, F. (Eds.) (2009). *Rigenerare la città. Pratiche di innovazione sociale nelle città europee*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

- Vitale, T. (2009). L'impatto istituzionale dell'innovazione sociale. In S. Vicari Haddock & F. Moulaert (Eds.), *Rigenerare la città. Pratiche di innovazione sociale nelle città europee* (pp.163-197). Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Wan, Y., & Bramwell, B. (2015). Political economy and the emergence of a hybrid mode of governance of tourism planning. *Tourism Management*, 50, 316-327.
- Whitehead, M. (2003). 'In the shadow of hierarchy': meta-governance, policy reform and urban regeneration in the West Midlands. *Area*, 35(1), 6-14.
- Zahra, A. (2011). Rethinking regional tourism governance: the principle of subsidiarity. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4-5), 535-552.
- Zapata, M.J., & Hall, C.M. (2012). Public-private collaboration in the tourism sector: balancing legitimacy and effectiveness in Spanish tourism partnerships, *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 4(1), 61-83.