IRIS AperTO

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Knowledge sharing for coopetition in tourist destinations: The difficult path to the network.

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1685446 since 2021-08-28T20:32:49Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1007/s11846-018-0322-z

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

13 October 2026

Knowledge sharing for coopetition in tourist destinations: The difficult path to the network

Abstract

Innovation within the tourism industry is crucial to respond to tourists' changing needs and to thereby guarantee the economic sustainability of tourist destinations. From this perspective, a network approach is increasingly adopted because of its capacity to orchestrate economic actors and their resources in a way that reaps large benefits for all parties. Knowledge is a pivotal resource for creating innovation through a network approach in the tourism sector, and the implementation of ICT-based tools is a key support for collecting information and obtaining further understanding of the tourism market. This paper analyzes factors that disrupt the implementation of a system of data collection in tourist destinations by examining a longitudinal case study of ski resorts that shows which barriers and difficulties impeded the creation of a network of local stakeholders despite their sharing of common goals.

Keywords

tourist destination; network; knowledge; value creation; information communication technology

Introduction

Tourism is one of the most important global economic sectors (Petrevska, 2017; WTTC, 2017). Although it is constantly growing and constitutes an opportunity for actual and sustainable development (UNWTO, 2017; Dwyer and Kim 2003), this industry faces many challenges that affect its competitiveness. The traditional consumer segmentation appears to be obsolete since the current boundaries between the usual categories are labile: touristic consumption is a "hybrid" that depends on the context, estimates of the best value for money, and the emotional evaluation of more and more tailored experiences (Serna et al. 2016; Boztug et al. 2015; Ehrnrooth and Gronroos 2013; Novelli et al. 2006; Bieger and Laesser 2002). Therefore, the definition of *tourist destination* as "a commercial junction based on tourist visits" (Framke 2002:93) where an "empirical relationship" (MacCannell 1976:41) between destination and consumers is created only proves true if it also entails a consistent response to consumers' changing needs.

The European tourism market is characterized by the predominance of micro-, small, and medium-sized enterprises (European Parliament, 2011). These enterprises play a pivotal role in providing adequate products and services to tourists and, consequently, in maintaining the competitiveness of both the destination and the individual economic actors. Since the scale of micro-, small, and medium-sized enterprises does not allow for sustainable, persistent development in isolation, the tourism industry is increasingly characterized by a network approach (van der Zee and Vanneste 2015; Halme 2001). Indeed, the performance of the destination—which depends on tourist satisfaction—is created through a multifaceted, constantly renewed offering that comprises an assemblage based on the relationships and links between touristic actors (particularly enterprises), local authorities, and policymakers as well as on the mutual understanding between providers and customers (Briassoulis 2017; Novani et al. 2015; Presenza and Cipollina 2010).

To achieve the goal of bringing together this assemblage, tourist destinations must be managed as integrated coproducing networks: as systems combining individual companies' resources (especially intangible ones), products, and services (Haugland et al. 2011; Rodríguez-Díaz and Espino-Rodríguez, 2008). Among the intangible, combinable resources in these tourist networks, the first and most important is knowledge, acquired by collecting, monitoring, and analyzing information flows. Knowledge represents a shared source of great potential success for both tourist networks and individual economic actors when it takes the form of a highly accurate understanding and projection of emerging needs and trends, demand forecasts, and strategies (Zhang and Song 2017; Anderson and Hardwick 2017; Souto 2015; Hjalager 2010; Halme 2001). The interconnected structure of the network facilitates inter-member interactions and provides channels for the exchange of knowledge (Inkpen and Tsang 2005).

Information and communications technology (ICT) can speed up the flow of knowledge by favoring fundamental links among stakeholders for big data creation and exchange and, ultimately, for analyzing and utilizing information collected from customers (Schmidt et al. 2017; Song and Liu 2017; Hsu et al. 2017; Lopez-Nicolas and Soto-Acosta 2010). This data processing is *de facto* the antecedent and the starting point of value creation as it allows firms, policymakers, and destination management organizations (DMOs) to respond to user preferences and needs through dynamic and ever more aligned offerings (McKercher 2017; Höpken et al. 2018; Yoon et al. 2016).

The present paper synthesizes a two-year study of the main ski tourist destinations involved in the XX Olympic Winter Games in the Piedmont region of Italy. The study was conducted with the aim of proposing the renewal of business models and the introduction of new ones that target local development and value creation and are based on network activation and digital implementation in such areas. Surprisingly, the research did not produce the expected results in terms of participation, understanding, or growth at various levels. That was when the authors shifted the focus of the study to try to comprehend the intrinsic and structural barriers to cooperation, network formation, and new project development. This led to a case study that, at this stage, includes antecedents, explanations, and suggestions that must be understood to even attempt the abovementioned types of projects.

The aim of this paper is to analyze the factors disrupting the constitution of an actual effective tourist network and, accordingly, of the tailored design and implementation of a data collection system. The disrupting factors are rooted in an understanding and awareness of the benefits to be obtained from the creation of a network of local enterprises and institutions directed at generating shared value through maintaining existing businesses and developing new innovative ones in response to customers' emerging needs.

The paper contributes to the literature on the topic by emphasizing the role of a network approach in the tourism sector and highlighting the absence of knowledge sharing as a limiting factor for the constitution and implementation of a network. The managerial implications are related to the crucial preventative estimation of relationships between stakeholders in order to create a work climate favorable to mindset change, network construction, and knowledge sharing.

The originality of the paper lies in the empirical evidence that emerges from the structural conditions that the researchers first underestimated and that they were then able to investigate to provide useful insights into network constitution and knowledge creation as strategic factors of competitiveness.

To achieve the research goals, the remainder of the paper unfolds as follows: the first section analyses the theoretical background of a network approach, of value co-creation, and of knowledge acquisition and renewal; the method section reports on the context of the research, data collection, and analysis; next, the findings of the case study are described and discussed; and finally, the conclusions, limitations, and future implications of the study are presented.

Theoretical background

Company networks need certain conditions to obtain in order to be operational. In particular, the presence and effective combination of different types of capital may favor the conditions under which companies may operate. Specifically, renewal capital has been analyzed in terms of a company's attitude towards renewing its knowledge through learning. This renewal is possible through both the acquisition of new skills and the changing of the company's operations (Kianto 2018). Linked to renewal capital, trust capital refers to the trust embedded in the company's internal and external relationships as it operates in a wide context that requires relationships of trust between partners. Scholars have also focused on the role of entrepreneurial capital, especially referring to entrepreneurial activities within the company (Erikson 2002; Mayer et al. 1995). Relational capital must also be considered from the point of view of relationships with various stakeholders; this type of capital could be split into internal and external typologies (Inkinen et al. 2014). Lastly, certain orientations of human resource management practices are a fundamental way of influencing the level of human capital in the company (Lepak and Snell 2002; Yamao et al. 2009; Youndt and Snell 2004). The combination of renewal, entrepreneurial, human, and relational capital is certainly relevant in the context of business networks. Indeed, due to their interrelated nature, a shared sense of these types of capital among actors when engaged in making arrangements and solving problems may improve network-evolving dynamics. (Ferraro et al. 2015; Wooten and Hoffman 2008). Within this context, cognitive capital plays a crucial role in the company's accumulation of structural and relational capital. This leads to an approach focused on cognitive-capital-based resource management, in which communication, knowledge, relationships, and learning are linked and operate together. In this way, learning acquired from partners permits a better understanding of the dynamics of knowledge and, consequently, a combination of different company resources, thereby improving the company's performance (Wang and Fesenmaier 2007; Roussel and Deltour 2012; Schildt et al. 2012).

Scholars have also been examined the role of networks and relations in social and economic development. The motivation of individuals and companies to take a proactive approach towards a network could favor organized cooperation, resource exchange, and knowledge accumulation (Favre-Bonté and Thevenard-Puthod 2013; Fang et al. 2010; Adler and Kwon 2002; Hassan, 2000). According to van der Zee and Vanneste (2015), "Networks are proposed to function as systems which

can organize and integrate tourism destinations, cause benefits for participating tourism firms, enhance destination performance and quality and stimulate the provision of 'wholesome and memorable experiences' for tourists." Therefore, collaborative business networks, along with knowledge management, may be sources of competitive advantage for tourism destinations (Barney et al. 2011; Dwyer et al., 2009).

Within the context of a company's network, the cooperation and the exchange of knowledge between different partners are influenced by factors such as closeness and trust (Fukuyama 1995). To achieve cooperation and exchange throughout the network, the trust between different parties must be widespread. At the same time, power is crucial in networks; that is, an effective combination of power and trust may be a prerogative for sharing tacit knowledge, therefore favoring value creation through business models (Richter, 2015), product and service renovation, and innovation (Anderson and Hardwick 2017; Geneste and Galvin 2015; Ritala et al. 2015; Le Dain and Merminod, 2014). To permit the integration of each company's resources, a widespread integrated system approach must be used (Rodríguez-Díaz and Espino-Rodríguez, 2008). Through such an integrated approach, a tourism destination becomes a complex coproducing network in which the challenge of developing strategies involves several companies and other stakeholders, such as local and regional authorities, in a logic of coopetition in which "tourism competitors develop cooperation in their marketing and management activities in the same destination while competing in some business activities in the same business context" (Fong et al. 2018:245; Haugland et al. 2011). A common strategy permits these companies to orchestrate the reaching of their common goals by means of the implementation of actor coordination or integration mechanisms (Peters et al. 2011). When a destination is characterized by network collaboration, it is better able to cope with external influences. Indeed, networks provide economies of scale for small and medium-sized companies, and in addition, networked collaboration promotes the increased resilience of the stakeholders involved (Luthe et al. 2012). An innovative offering may be developed by a networked collaboration of stakeholders (McCabe et al. 2012; van der Zee and Vanneste 2015). In this sense, interfirm collaborations help tourism organizations remain competitive (Liu, 2018; Liu et al. 2017; van der Zee and Vanneste 2015; Albrecht 2013; Wang and Fesenmaier 2007; Lavie 2006).

The implementation of ICT would impact the success of a tourist destination, as it depends on the "seamless coordination of the players comprising the tourism value chain" (Zach and Racherla 2011), and thus impacts a company's competitive advantage (Denicolai et al. 2010). ICT is also crucial for orchestrating value co-creation as customers and providers first co-experience the service process and then co-define a shared internal model through mutual understanding (Novani et al. 2015). In fact, the Web permits customers to declare their expectations and provide feedback (Höpken et al. 2018). Tourism literature focuses on a tourism experience that is a "lengthy process that is made up of the inputs of numerous services and interaction between provider and consumer" (Hayslip et al. 2013). With this in mind, emotional responses may be collected through websites while researching markets (Szopiński, 2017; Serna et al. 2016; Boztug et al. 2015). ICT makes it possible to combine services and products to deliver the specific experience that tourists seek by promoting existing clusters and implementing the potential of newly established ones (Michael 2003; Nordin 2003).

Method

The authors employed a longitudinal case study (Ridder 2014; Yin 2013) to supply "empirical descriptions of particular instances of a phenomenon" (Eisenhardt and Graebner 2007: 25) for investigation. The case study is based on the unfortunate results that emerged from the 10 meetings held during the two years of research, results that the researchers had predicted as a worst-case-scenario outcome. These meetings happened from September 2015 to October 2017 and simultaneously involved the economic actors—entrepreneurs and operators in general—of three ski

resorts among those hosting the XX Olympic Winter Games (Piedmont region, Italy), as well as local authorities and representatives of the ski industry.

Over the course of these meetings, the authors and other members of the research group collected incrementally declarations and evidence of a widespread negative attitude against the proposal of implementing an ICT-based tool aimed at identifying and developing new business models in tourist destinations. During the first year of the study, when theoretical proposals were revealed and discussed, great attention was paid to the project. However, during the second year, when proposals were about to transform into practical tool development through testing, improvement, and implementation, the participation in meetings dramatically decreased, and some criticalities arose.

At this stage, the authors realized that the reasons behind the failure of the original research aims and plans were, in fact, of critical and crucial importance for practitioners as well as for academics, especially considering that the erroneous idea for the project was the responsibility of a plurality of actors, including the university. The researchers, from their side, had underestimated the importance of creating preconditions that would allow and favor the kind of dialogue required for the original project; thus, the new object of the research became the conditions limiting all the other groups of stakeholders from fully participating in the project. To develop the longitudinal case study, the authors analyzed the flow of events related to the attempt to implement the tool and collected related emergent critical issues. The findings that emerged were triangulated with a literature review, going back and forth from the collected data to the theoretical background (Stake 2013; Cook and Campbell 1979).

Case study

In 2006, the city of Turin and the neighboring ski resort hosted the twentieth edition of the Winter Olympic Games. This represented a milestone in a process that, over the years, had transformed the Piedmont capital from an industrial city linked to the car company FIAT (subsequently renamed FCA) to a city with a cultural and tourist-oriented role and vocation. During the two months of the Games, the event recorded a +52.3% increase in attendance and a +145.1% increase in overnight stays of foreign tourists. The event radically changed the perception of Turin and the region as a destination, especially at the international level (Ontit 2016). Yet, the positive impacts echoing through the subsequent 10 years did not release the ski resort from the necessity of continuous improvement of its destinations in terms of competitiveness based on the innovation of touristic product services. It was in this context that the research started in September 2015 with the aim of studying the potential of these destinations as touristic innovation labs.

The first meeting of the research group, the economic actors of the involved ski resorts, and the representatives of the ski industry was organized in order to present and propose a managerial tool based on evidence from the scientific literature and on best practices gleaned from similar Italian and European tourist regions. The researchers explained the shared benefits deriving from the constitution of a network of local actors operating with the common goal of maintaining the competitiveness of both the destination and economic actors as individuals. These benefits would be made possible, it was explained, through the implementation of a system for collecting and monitoring user-generated content, that is, content produced by tourists, to compile along with tourist flows and other data both formally and informally collected by DMOs, local institutions, and enterprises such as hotels, restaurants, and other services. This would allow the creation of an ICT-based participatory approach providing useful managerial results, such as a heat map produced by mobile big data describing customer concentrations and tourist behaviors within a destination. It would also provide a real-time, in-progress picture of tourist sentiment as well as tourists' emergent needs and would allow post-tourist-season exploration of trends and the promotion of product and service renovation and/or innovation. The researchers introduced their proposal by illustrating the findings of another study conducted in the previous year, which revealed a trend of decreasing consumption of core products and services among ski resorts: 50% of the people interviewed stated that their presence

at the destination was not related to skiing. It was clear that renewal and innovation of the area's offerings were not only necessary but mandatory.

The enthusiasm for the proposal was very high during the first five meetings, allowing the stakeholders to deepen the possible interactions between the proposed ICT-based tool and other traditional systems of local information. At the same time, there was great interest in structuring custom interfaces for data evaluation according to the needs of various economic actors and local policymakers.

Despite this early enthusiasm, implementing the hypothesis during the 2016 ski season was not achievable due to the emergence of some slowdowns in the process caused by the considerable workload and necessary organization in preparation for the start of tourism activities. Furthermore, during the following meetings, there was a progressive decline in participation and interest, and most pertinently, a widespread feeling of disaffection emerged with respect to the project. In fact, it was considered subordinate to the more traditional daily activities. The intense, time-consuming pressure that was evident in the management of relationships inside various ski resorts also highlighted a potential internal controversy among the operators. The concern had to do with the supposed achievement of greater advantages for some of them and potential disadvantages for others. At this point, the researchers' objective was to once more illustrate and clarify the common benefits presented at the start of the project. They emphasized and underlined the achievement of shared goals as an advantage to individuals as well as organizations since a one-to-one correspondence occurs where common goals are concerned.

Discussion during the following meetings therefore aimed to bring out the factors limiting the formation of a network, albeit an informal one, that was in line with the proposed logic and through which the ICT-based model could be tested. The researchers tried to identify the reasons behind the problems highlighted by stakeholders, grouping them by category, to understand the most perplexing instances and to try to draw a detailed picture of organizational and managerial characteristics and criticalities in the context of destinations. Clearly, this was not at all easy because the real motivation of behavior did not always emerge directly; instead, operational, financial, and managerial reasons and difficulties were officially provided, which concealed real doubts or fears.

Discussion

Some interesting results emerged from the study—considering the variation with respect to the objectives initially set. First, difficulties manifested themselves in the constitution of the network that were related to trust among the potential members, which is the basic factor in the network approach. This, of course, confirmed the background literature that identifies trust as a vital factor for the formation and success of such a network (van der Zee et al. 2017; Geneste and Galvin 2015). In the analyzed case, the notion of trust was linked to the evaluation of the potential competitive advantage generated for the individual—"the other" among the network's partners—which seemed to threaten all the other players. This clearly reveals a paradox: the advantage and potential value generated by a supporting tool—for example, the proposed ICT-based network—is always and most certainly viewed as relevant to the partner, who is also considered a competitor. But, at the same time, it is deemed uncertain and secondary, even costly and time-consuming, when a firm is required to apply the tool to its own scenario. There is a significant gap between this approach and the approach of coopetition (Cortese, 2018; Fong et al. 2018; Kraus et al., 2018; Ritala et al., 2016; Novelli et al. 2006), in which a clear view of partners as competitors remains, even if the services offered by other companies are complementary and do not constitute a threat. Trust is fundamental in knowledge sharing as a strategic factor for innovation and economic sustainability.

Second, a deep-rooted cultural attitude emerged that was linked to an entrepreneurial approach and that would be difficult to change over time. The increase in entrepreneurial capital was not considered strategic, and the possibility of capital proliferation represented by the enhancement of

relational capital at the base of the network was not considered (Inkinen et al. 2014; Erikson 2002; Mayer et al. 1995). Therefore, there was a tendency to close off possibilities and conserve the *status quo*, even if the entrepreneurial approach was no longer successful. (Wang and Fesenmaier 2007; Roussel and Deltour 2012; Schildt et al. 2012).

Third, far from being considered a resource to be shared to create a common competitive and inimitable advantage as well as a robust entry barrier (Anderson and Hardwick 2017; Favre-Bonté and Thevenard-Puthod 2013), knowledge appeared instead as a factor of division, an obstacle to collaboration, and an object of jealousy, paradoxically, even if data or knowledge were related to different and complementary (i.e., non-competing) services in the supply chain.

Trust, entrepreneurial orientation, and knowledge were transformed from network activators and triggers for local sustainability into disruptive and destructive factors: the misinterpretation of such elements reverses their positive role as accelerators and turns them into negative ones with limiting and dampening effects.

Conclusions

Capturing market opportunities in the tourism industry—particularly for ski destinations—means adopting a countertrend-oriented approach to knowledge-based business model renewal and welcoming constantly updated products and services provided by a plurality of actors with common goals who are moving in a shared direction (Liu et al. 2017; Presenza and Cipollina 2010). In the analyzed case, the orchestration of value co-creation (Novani et al. 2015) remained a distant goal, and the need to underline the territorial potential emerged. Destination valorization is possible only by sharing individual "instruments" and resources that can then activate "choral" results that are definitely more incisive than those obtained by the individual. In a heavily knowledge-based industry, it is in fact necessary to share knowledge as it is the primary intangible resource that allows the sustainability of the sector (Briassoulis 2017; van der Zee and Vanneste 2015; Halme 2001). The central condition and crucial factor that will allow that to happen is the existence or creation of prerequisites in terms of trust, dialogue, and an awareness of the shared benefits that derive from cooperation and coopetition (Cortese, 2018; Fong et al. 2018; Kraus et al., 2018; Ritala et al., 2016; Favre-Bonté and Thevenard-Puthod 2013). In mature sectors such as tourism and the local ski industry, this is even more difficult due to deep-seated cultures that lead to the isolation of the players and a lack of collaboration with neighboring territories and other actors. Such rootedness and isolation derive, of course, from previous market rents and from the natural and physical location of destinations. This is reflected in the mentality and attitude of entrepreneurs and policymakers. This posture and its roots stand in contrast to an increasingly globalized tourism industry in which products must be customized with respect to the needs of tourists (Serna et al. 2016; Boztug et al. 2015; Ehrnrooth and Gronroos 2013). The growing mobility in this sector influences consumers' loyalty with respect to destinations in such a way that loyalty is based more and more on satisfaction with the experience itself and dictates or justifies any movement away from destinations previously considered natural places for holidays.

The results of this study derive from a variance from the objectives set in the first instance, but at the same time, they report some interesting topics to consider for further future exploration and testing. Our findings have theoretical implications that contribute to the literature: this research emphasizes the role of a network approach in the tourism sector and how it could be beneficial to adopt because of how it orchestrates different economic actors and their resources in the pursuit of common goals. Within this context, knowledge represents a relevant resource for the creation of innovation through a network approach, and the implementation of ICT-based tools—which was not possible in this specific case—could be a key factor in collecting information and attaining further understanding of consumer trends in tourism. In addition, the research has very important practical implications for the management of further research. Clearly, the upstream estimation of relationships between economic actors and the creation of a work climate favorable to change and sharing are

essential. These are probably only possible if all the actors understand the benefits of participation and if the active and factual involvement of some economic actor—i.e., through a "testimonial" on other initiatives or as a local first-experimentation volunteer—is able to render the proposal clearer and more comprehensible.

The findings that emerged can be verified in other geographical areas characterized by similar physical or territorial configurations or even in tourism sectors marked by the same life-cycle stages. The limitations of the study are linked to the specific geographic area and, in addition, to the small sample. Regarding the research method, our research has not been empirically tested on a wider sample to allow for comparison with different areas or countries.

We propose that future developments of research in this area be based, with regard to the analyzed destinations, on identifying organizational and managerial solutions that respond to and solve emerging needs and requests. Furthermore, a systematization through additional applications should be carried out to validate in practice the conclusions of this case study with respect to the scientific literature.

References

Adler PS, Kwon SW (2002) Social capital: prospects for a new concept. Acad Manag Rev 27(1):17–40

Albrecht JN (2013) Networking for sustainable tourism—towards a research agenda. J Sustain Tour 21(5):639–657

Anderson AR, Hardwick J (2017) Collaborating for innovation: the socialised management of knowledge.
Int Entrep Manag J 13(4):1181–1197

Barney JB, Ketchen DJ Jr, Wright M (2011) The future of resource-based theory: revitalization or decline? J Manag 37(5):1299–1315

Bieger T, Laesser C (2002) Market segmentation by motivation: the case of Switzerland. J Travel Res 41(1):68–76

Boztug Y, Babakhani N, Laesser C, Dolnicar S (2015) The hybrid tourist. Ann Tour Res 54(1):190–203

Briassoulis H (2017) Tourism destinations as multiplicities: the view from assemblage thinking. Int J Tour Res 19(3):304–317

Cook TD, Campbell DT, Day A (1979) Quasi-experimentation: design and analysis issues for field settings, vol 351. Houghton Mifflin, Boston

Denicolai S, Cioccarelli G, Zucchella A (2010) Resource-based local development and networked core-competencies for tourism excellence. Tour Manag 31(2):260–266

Dwyer L, Kim C (2003) Destination competitiveness: determinants and indicators. Curr Issues Tour 6(5):369–414

Dwyer L, Edwards D, Mistilis N, Roman C, Scott N (2009) Destination and enterprise management for a tourism future. Tour Manag 30(1):63–74

Ehrnrooth H, Gronroos C (2013) The hybrid consumer: exploring hybrid consumption behaviour. Manag Decis 51(9):1793–1820

Eisenhardt KM, Graebner ME (2007) Theory building from cases: opportunities and challenges. Acad Manag J 50(1):25–32

Erikson T (2002) Entrepreneurial capital: the emerging venture's most important asset and competitive advantage. J Bus Ventur 17(3):275–290

European Parliament (2011) Regulation (EU) no 692/2011 of the parliament European and of the council of 6 July 2011 concerning European statistics on tourism and repealing council directive 95/57/EC

Fang YH, Chiu CM (2010) In justice we trust: exploring knowledge-sharing continuance intentions in virtual communities of practice. Comput Hum Behav 26(2):235–246
Favre-Bonté V Thévenard-Puthod C (2013) The role of resources and skills transfer in the performance of acquisitions: the acquired firm's perspective (2013)
Ferraro F, Etzion D, Gehman J (2015) Tackling grand challenges pragmatically: robust action revisited. Organ Stud 36(3):363–390
Fong VHI, Wong IA, Hong JFL (2018) Developing institutional logics in the tourism industry through coopetition. Tour Manag 66(1):244–262
Framke W (2002) The destination as a concept: a discussion of the business-related perspective versus the socio-cultural approach in tourism theory. Scand J Hosp Tour 2(2):92–108
Fukuyama F (1995) Trust, the social virtues and the creation of prosperity (No. D10 301 c. 1/c. 2). Free Press Paperbacks
Geneste L, Galvin P (2015) Trust and knowledge acquisition by small and medium-sized firms in weak client–firm exchange relationships. Int Small Bus J 33(3):277–298
Halme M (2001) Learning for sustainable development in tourism networks. Bus Strategy Environ 10(2):100–114
Hassan SS (2000) Determinants of market competitiveness in an environmentally sustainable tourism industry. J Travel Res 38(3):239-245
Haugland SA, Ness H, Grønseth BO, Aarstad J (2011) Development of tourism destinations: an integrated multilevel perspective. Ann Tour Res 38(1):268–290
Hayslip TB, Gallarza MG, Andreu L (2013) Service-dominant logic and value in tourism management: a qualitative study within Spanish hotels managers. J Bus Theory Pract 1(2):303–328
Hjalager A-M (2010) A review of innovation research in tourism. Tour Manag 31(1):1–12
Höpken W, Eberle T, Fuchs M, Lexhagen M (2018) Search engine traffic as input for predicting tourist arrivals. In: Information and communication technologies in tourism 2018. Springer, Cham, pp 381–393
Hsu AYC, King B, Wang D, Buhalis D (2017) Entrepreneurship in the contemporary tourism ecosystem: the case of incoming tour operators in Taiwan. In: Information and communication technologies in tourism 2017. Springer, Cham, pp 101–113
Inkinen H, Kianto A, Vanhala M, Ritala P Intellectual capital and performance: empirical findings from Finnish firms. In: International forum on knowledge asset dynamics (IFKAD), pp 11–13 (2014)
Inkpen AC, Tsang EW (2005) Social capital, networks, and knowledge transfer. Acad Manag Rev 30(1):146–165
Kianto A (2018) Intellectual capital profiles and financial performance of the firm. In: Guthrie J, Dumay J, Ricceri F, Nielsen C (eds) The Routledge companion to intellectual capital. Routledge, London
Kraus S, Meier F, Niemand T, Bouncken RB, Ritala P (2018) In search for the ideal coopetition partner: an experimental study. Rev Manag Sci 12(4):1025-1053
Lavie D (2006) The competitive advantage of interconnected firms: an extension of the resource-based view. Acad Manag Rev 31(3):638–658
Le Dain MA, Merminod V (2014) A knowledge sharing framework for black, grey and white box supplier configurations in new product development. Technovation 34(11):688–701
Lepak DP, Snell SA (2002) Examining the human resource architecture: the relationships among human capital, employment, and human resource configurations. J Manag 28(4):517–543
Liu CHS (2018) Examining social capital, organizational learning and knowledge transfer in cultural and creative industries of practice. Tour Manag 64(1):258–270
Liu B, Huang SS, Fu H (2017) An application of network analysis on tourist attractions: the case of Xinjiang, China. Tour Manag 58(1):132–141
Lopez-Nicolas C, Soto-Acosta P (2010) Analyzing ICT adoption and use effects on knowledge creation: an empirical investigation in SMEs. Int J Inf Manag 30(6):521–528

Luthe T, Wyss R, Schuckert M (2012) Network governance and regional resilience to climate change: empirical evidence from mountain tourism communities in the Swiss Gotthard region. Reg Environ Change 12(4):839–854
MacCannell D (1976) The tourist: a new theory of the leisure class. University of California Press, Berkeley
Mayer RC, Davis JH, Schoorman FD (1995) An integrative model of organizational trust. Acad Manag Rev 20(3):709–734
McCabe S, Sharples M, Foster C (2012) Stakeholder engagement in the design of scenarios of technology-enhanced tourism services. Tour Manag Perspect 4:36–44
McKercher B, Koh E (2017) Do attractions "attract" tourists? The case of Singapore. Int J Tour Res 19(6):661–671
Michael EJ (2003) Tourism micro-clusters. Tour Econ 9(2):133–145
Ontit-Osservatorio Nazionale del Turismo: I mega eventi del 21esimo secolo in Italia: l'impatto nel turismo. https ://www.ontit .it/openc ms/openc ms/ont/it/stamp a/in_evide nza/I_mega_event i_del_21esi mo_secol o_in_Itali a_l_impat to_nel_turis mo (2016)
Nordin S (2003) Tourism clustering and innovation: paths to economic growth and development. In: Etour
Novani S, Putro US, Hermawan P (2015) Value orchestration platform: promoting tourism in batik industrial cluster solo. Proc Soc Behav Sci 169(1):207–216
Novelli M, Schmitz B, Spencer T (2006) Networks, clusters and innovation in tourism: a UK experience. Tour Manag 27(6):1141–1152
Peters M, Siller L, Matzler K (2011) The resource-based and the market-based approaches to cultural tourism in alpine destinations. J Sustain Tour 19(7):877–893
Petrevska B (2017) Predicting tourism demand by ARIMA models. Econ Res 30(1):939–950
Presenza A, Cipollina M (2010) Analysing tourism stakeholders networks. Tour Rev 65(4):17–30
Rodríguez-Díaz M, Espino-Rodríguez TF (2008) A model of strategic evaluation of a tourism destination based on internal and relational capabilities. J Travel Res 46(4):368–380
Roussel CS, Deltour F (2012) Beyond cross-functional teams: knowledge integration during organizational projects and the role of social capital. Knowl Manag Res Pract 10(2):128–140
Richter C, Kraus S, Syrjä P (2015) The shareconomy as a precursor for digital entrepreneurship business models. Int J Entrep Small Bus 25(1):18–35
Ridder HG, Hoon C, McCandless Baluch A (2014) Entering a dialogue: positioning case study findings towards theory. Br J Manag 25(2):373–387
Ritala P, Olander H, Michailova S, Husted K (2015) Knowledge sharing, knowledge leaking and relative innovation performance: an empirical study. Technovation 35:22–31
Schildt H, Keil T, Maula M (2012) The temporal effects of relative and firm-level absorptive capacity on interorganizational learning. Strat Manag J 33(10):1154–1173
Schmidt R, Möhring M, Keller B, Zimmermann A, Toni M, Di Pietro L (2017) Digital enterprise architecture management in tourism–state of the art and future directions. In: International conference on intelligent decision technologies. Springer, Cham, pp 93–102
Serna A, Gerrikagoitia JK,Bernabé U (2016) Discovery and classification of the underlying emotions in the user generated content (UGC). In: Information and communication technologies in tourism 2016. Springer, Cham, pp 225–237
Song H, Liu H (2017) Predicting tourist demand using big data. In: Analytics in smart tourism design. Springer, Berlin, pp 13–29
Souto JE (2015) Business model innovation and business concept innovation as the context of incremental innovation and radical innovation. Tour Manag 51(1):142–155
Stake RE (2013) Multiple case study analysis. Guilford Press, New York City
Szopiński T (2017) The influence of the assessment of internet websites offering tourist services on the manner of purchase of holiday packages. Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja 30(1):1655-1668

UNWTO (2017), 2017 International year of sustainable tourism for development. https ://www.tourism4de velop ment2 017.org/about /
van der Zee E, Vanneste D (2015) Tourism networks unravelled; a review of the literature on networks in tourism management studies. Tour Manag Perspect 15(1):46–56
van der Zee E, van der Borg J, Vanneste D (2017) THE DESTINATION TRIANGLE: towards relational management
Wang Y, Fesenmaier DR (2007) Collaborative destination marketing: a case study of Elkhart county. Tour Manag 28(3):863–875
Wooten M, Hoffman AJ (2008) Organizational fields: past, present and future. In: SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism, pp 130–147 (2008)
WTTC—World Travel and Tourism Council Travel and tourism global economic impact and issues 2017. London. https ://www.wttc.org/-/media /files /repor ts/econo mic-impac t-resea rch/2017-documents/globa l-econo mic-impac t-and-issue s-2017.pdf (2017)
Yamao S, Cieri HD, Hutchings K (2009) Transferring subsidiary knowledge to global headquarters: subsidiary senior executives' perceptions of the role of HR configurations in the development of knowledge stocks. Hum Resour Manag 48(4):531–554
Yin RK (2013) Validity and generalization in future case study evaluations. Evaluation 19(3):321–332
Yoon S, Lee J, Kim H (2016) Research into a visualization analysis of big data for the decision making of a tourism policy
Youndt MA, Snell SA (2004) Human resource configurations, intellectual capital, and organizational performance. J Manag Issues 337–360
Zach F, Racherla P (2011) Assessing the value of collaborations in tourism networks: a case study of Elkhart County. J Travel Tour Market 28(1):97–110
Zhang X, Song H (2017) An integrative framework for collaborative forecasting in tourism supply chains. Int J Tour Res. 20:1–14