

INDICATORS FOR EVALUATING GOVERNANCE IN TOURIST DESTINATIONS – an analysis of the applicability of proposed models

Doris Van de Meene Ruschmann

PhD in Communication Sciences – Tourism
Universidade do Vale do Itajaí
doris@ruschmannconsultores.com.br

Francisco Antonio dos Anjos

PhD in Production Engineering / Environmental Management
Universidade do Vale do Itajaí
anjos@univali.br

Marcos Arnhold Junior

M.Sc. in Tourism and Hospitality
Universidade do Vale do Itajaí
marcosjunior@univali.br

RECEIVED: June 17th, 2016

APPROVED: November 17th, 2016

ABSTRACT

This study aims to identify concepts related to tourism governance, and based on this, to report different models of proposed indicators and typologies applied to governance that test the construction of an evaluation tool for measuring tourism governance. This survey used bibliographic research to identify evaluation indicators in the literature on governance. As a result, we identified four studies: two related to tourism governance, one to public governance, and one related to types of tourism governance. This analysis also perceived the need for real application of an instrument that can evaluate tourism governance in different destinations.

Keywords: Tourism. Governance. Evaluation Indicators.

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the public management model has been open to new ways of governing. The construction of public policies that ensure benefits for most of society is a constant search, whether by the State, or by business leaders and organized civil society.

Public policies should be understood as those actions that a particular government chooses to implement in order to meet a public demand or solve a problem, remembering that this choice suffers strong political influence in the interests of the various sectors that can be benefited by it. (Oliveira & Pisa, 2015, p. 1264-65)

When these policies affect the participation of other actors in society (stakeholders) there is a search for consensus on the definition of objectives to achieve beneficial results for all the participants. The incentive for organized civil society to participate in the public management process allows the search for development that respects the will of the people (Hall, 2011).

129

Within the environment of this participation for the choice of political forms is the concept of governance, which is gaining a significant degree of importance, both in academic studies and in institutional practices. Governance is the result of a public policy that was rethought in order to enable the convergence of actions and objectives. In Brazil, this thought comes with the promulgation of the 1988 Constitution, which opened the way for the creation of a democratic state of law, allowing citizens to exercise control in public administration and choose the policies to be implemented, and demanding ethics, integrity, transparency and accountability (Oliveira & Pisa, 2015).

This management model has a higher degree of complexity due to its participatory nature, with the singularity of the state acting as the driver of the process. Governance is not restricted to the managerial and administrative aspects of the state, nor to the effective functioning of the state apparatus, but involves the forms of articulation and cooperation between social and political actors and institutional arrangements that coordinate and regulate transactions within and across the borders of the economic system (Santos, 1997),

including not only the traditional mechanisms of aggregation and articulation of interests, such as political parties and pressure groups, but also the informal social networks.

Governance would be a distinct form of government, with different causes, manifestations and outcomes that lead to activities with high variation in format, content, and reach, and may take the form of a phenomenon or even be organized for an analytical framework. Thus, governance ends up having a very broad concept today, but it can also be an obsolete concept when used indiscriminately (Durán, 2013).

When applying the concept of governance in tourism, the results also appear to be different in various destinations. Understanding that tourism governance is the management of the tourism process, leading destinations to be more, or less organized and therefore more, or less attractive to tourists and visitors, there is a need for greater understanding of this complexity. Governance has become a focus of current debate in politics and tourism, as a new government focus that responds to the growing complexity of managing tourist destinations (Queiroz & Rastrollo-Horillo, 2015).

The form and processes of governance in tourist destinations will be critical to achieving the desired results. Thus, governance finds its space in the participation of all the parties interested in the pursuit of these common objectives, making it a useful model of governance to effectively implement the search for sustainability in destinations (Queiroz & Rastrollo-Horillo, 2015).

However, there is an understanding that the governance process can be directed not only at actions, but also at the understanding of the results achieved by the destinations, since they will be different in each situation, due to the complexity and particularities of each situation. It is important to view governance in its broader sense, focusing on its forms and means, but at the same time, on the results (Dias & Pisa, 2013).

One of the difficulties still related to governance is the instruments designed to evaluate its processes and results. In fact, there are still a lack of evaluative instruments to demonstrate the effectiveness of government actions in a systematic and timely way, and that are based on the principles of public governance applied to the materialization of public policies, whether of the State or the government (Dias & Pisa, 2015). Some authors have suggested indicators for evaluating tourism governance (Duran, 2013; Queiroz & Rastrollo-Horillo, 2015), and for evaluating public governance (Dias & Pisa, 2015), while others have dealt with tourism governance typologies with different characteristics (Hall, 2011), but there is still no effective proposal for a tool to assess or measure governance in tourist destinations.

Understanding the need for conceptual and practical development of the hypothesis presented above, this work aims to identify the tourist literature on governance indicators and typologies that can form the basis for the creation of a tool for evaluating tourism governance. As a general objective of this research, we seek to analyze evaluation indicators of tourism governance. To achieve the overall objective, the following specific objectives were listed: to identify the relationship between governance and public tourism policies; to present the indicators suggested by authors in the area and related areas; to create a table summarizing the various evaluation indicators of tourism governance; and to analyze the governance assessment indicators found in the literature and related areas for the composition of a conceptual framework.

GOVERNANCE AND PUBLIC TOURISM POLICIES

The policy management process has undergone changes in recent decades. The participation of communities is becoming more common in the continuous search for common goals. This new process of governing is recognized by the concept of governance. Understanding governance as the act of governing, the power of government is increasingly accessible to the population, since this process is accepted by the whole of society, and especially by the government (Hall, 2011). Historically,

The concept of governance has gained importance and was initially conceived as a theoretical and analytical approach to understand the new forms and practices of political and administrative coordination that have arisen, related on one hand to the growing political influence in the European Union and on the other, to the process of metropolization (Frey, 2012).

Regarding the implications, we can say that governance has served as an object of study in various areas, and the term governance is widely used in a variety of academic and practical circles. It involves systems of government, and the ways in which societies are governed, regulated or stimulated. The term also suggests collective action and coordination (Bramwell, 2011).

The growth of cities, and the need for greater integration with the emergence of the European Union, began to intrigue researchers, who sought to understand these new practices (Frey, 2012). It is extremely important to emphasize the role of governance in this new context, understanding that it is influenced by numerous internal and external factors. Governance cannot be understood in isolation from its relations with society, including the social groups that seek to influence the governance process (Bramwell & Lane, 2011). The authors call attention to the fact that the wills of the groups involved will directly influence the management process, therefore, we must take all aspects into consideration when studying the governance of a particular locality. It is notable that many actors may be involved, representing communities, businesses or the third sector (Bramwell & Lane, 2011).

This new division of responsibilities empowers participants that were previously passive to become agents of governance. In general terms, governance is a change in the formal roles of government agencies and contemporary structures. There is also a change in the distribution of responsibilities between public groups, the third sector, and private initiative (Uzum, 2010). This new model enables the popularization of government decisions, and consequently, of the results to be achieved, often seeking common goals for the majority of those involved. This new concept can bring many uncertainties, not only theoretical but also in practice, as

The concept of governance has become one of the most important, but also more dubious concepts in urban policies. The bright prospects for cooperation, participation and collective construction are accompanied by dark fears of public resignation, oligarchic regimes and reduction of local democracy (Seixas & Mas, 2010).

We can emphasize, however, that the main intention of this new management process is to ensure that decisions are for the benefit of the majority, seeking in itself to regulate processes and mobilize social actions to produce a social order involving matters of collective concern (Bramwell & Lane, 2011). Another aspect to be taken into account when we talk about governance is the need for a broader observation, seeking an understanding of the resources and processes, but at the same time, seeking results (Dias, 2013). We cannot say that the government or the state no longer has an influence in the management process or governance, because it still has influence in the development of public policies for development (Bramwell & Lane, 2011).

Regarding the primary involvement of the government in the process of governance, we must also take into account that in any form of management, there must be a harmonious search in regulatory forms between the actors involved, seeking to understand that both the public and private sectors need a consensus, seeking common goals for society as a whole, represented by the government, the community, and the private sector (Silva et al, 2012).

Tourism has offered an alternative for various locations around the world, in search of economic development, but at the same time, seeking environmental, social and cultural sustainability. The management process of a tourist area varies according to the regional peculiarities, and the participation of its actors at various levels (Zahra, 2011), among other relevant aspects. In this sense, the concept of governance is also gaining attention in the tourism management process. The study of governance has already been used as a concept in tourism research since 1993 (Wang & Li, 2013). Governance is a key concept in politics and public policy, and has been used more frequently in tourism (Hall, 2011).

Due to the needs of a tourist destination to be able to compete in a global and increasingly competitive market, the governance process of this activity seeks the competitiveness of the destination, in order to maximize the changes needed to meet this goal.

Many of the new types of governance have the intention and need to accelerate the competitiveness in terms of structural change and urban economic growth, where the city is considered a collective agent that should look for resources that are scarce (such as economic investments, image, tourists, spectacular architecture) to ensure an advantageous place in the urban market (Seixas & Mas, 2010).

Since tourism is an activity that directly affects not only the economy of a place, but also the way of life of its population, the governance process must ensure the inclusion of various stakeholders, such as communities, governments and the tourism industry, as this will enable greater cohesion in the management and possibly greater marketing relevance for the destination (Zahra, 2011).

Given that sustainability is one of the main objectives of tourism management, the participants of tourism governance should also be focused on actions that seek sustainability, regardless of the geographical context in which they are inserted. Sustainability often requires collective action to make it happen, and governance is the heart of these collective actions (Bramwell, 2011). The responsibility for the pursuit of sustainability must be a commitment of all levels of government.

In each country, the responsibility for the development of sustainable tourism is divided by different types of actors. Public authorities at all levels, domestic and foreign sales agents, tourists and local community - are actors in the tourism governance structure and impact on the sustainable performance of the industry (Dinica, 2009).

A governance directed towards sustainability is the key to the implementation of the governance process and may facilitate democratic processes, direct and provide means for

the goals to be achieved. Governance can be changed from time to time, mainly due to political changes and even because of the lessons learned from previous results (Bramwell et al, 2011). The role of residents is extremely important in this context, since they will be directly affected by the results of the planning and execution of actions.

Also embedded in these social representations of tourism planning taken by those in the tourism development sphere are beliefs about how tourist destinations should be managed and about the role that the residents should take in the tourism governance (Moscardo, 2011).

In addition to the resident paper, we highlight the role of the Destination Management Organizations (DMOs) that plays an important role in network management and facilitating the cooperation between actors. These are central characters in the governance of tourist destinations, but they greater credibility based also on the efficiency and effectiveness of their own results, since they are organizations (Pechlaner & Volgger & Herntrei, 2012).

135

Another important player in governance is the instances of governance (IG), which serve to institutionalize the organization of common interest groups, in this case tourism. These groups may be private, public or political-private partnerships formed between companies, associations, local and regional development agencies, technology centers, and universities, among others (Sahaidak, 2013; Mtur, 2008). The common objectives will be decisive for the formation of this participation, which must be equal in the sense of shared responsibility and representativeness.

The identification of the actors will determine the interested players in the future of destination to ensure the search for shared goals. The challenge is to characterize the features of these actors to find the balance between the parties, and to ensure the effective participation of a variety of actors and giving them legitimacy and representativeness (Queiros & Rastrollo-Horillo, 2015).

Despite the possibility of success in the participation of all the stakeholders, sustainable tourism is a goal that is often quite difficult to achieve, since its needs cut across many sectors and many different aspects, such as planning, transportation, climate change, employment rate and efficiency of regional development (Bramwell, 2011). Although tourism is a factor of environmental change and a means of economic growth, the development of sustainable tourism is also an important aspect of the process of creation of policies focused on sustainability, and an important aspect for the administrations of tourist destinations (Hall, 2011).

Public policies are plans, guidelines, regulations, standards and, in particular, decisions that express the government's intention to intervene in a particular demand. Public policies are the solidification of the state's intentions to achieve collective goals, through government programs and projects, such as the fight against poverty, the creation of new taxes, pollution control, among others (Lowi, 1994).

For the field of tourism, public policies can be understood as the direction given by the federal, state, municipal or regional government for the development of tourism, after consulting the representatives of the tourism sector and society (Lohmann & Panosso NETO, 2008).

The role of public policies in tourism should be to promote the harmonious development of this activity. Therefore, it is the state's responsibility to organize a legal-administrative superstructure (secretariats and the like) whose role is to plan and control investments made by the State that will allow the advancement of the private sector, through the construction of equipment and provision of services, as well as the government's role to create mechanisms that ensure a return in the form of benefits for the population (Barreto, 2003).

There is no doubt that the creation of administrative structures is important for the development of tourism, because it directly involves governance action, an essential means

of balancing decision making, aimed at encouraging and controlling, in order to reduce losses arising from conflicts of interest, inherent to the process of formulating and implementing public policies. We therefore emphasize the importance of the role of governance, understood here as all the different ways to manage problems in an integrated way between state and private sectors in order to maximize tourism. Governance is a broader phenomenon than government; It covers governmental institutions, but also involves informal mechanisms, non-governmental entities, that make people and organizations adopt a particular conduct, to meet their and respond to their demands (Rosenau, 2000).

METHODOLOGY

The methods used for the pursuit of scientific knowledge will determine whether a certain study achieves credibility or not. The methodology is a process of planning actions for the correct implementation of all the steps of scientific research. Regarding the nature of this work, it is defined applied research, as it seeks to generate knowledge that can solve specific problems in practice and may involve truths and local interests related to this work. This research is also exploratory, because it builds hypotheses and seeks to understand practical experience through analysis (Matias-Pereira, 2013).

It is also a qualitative research because of the perceptions obtained through qualitative instruments. Regarding the qualitative approach, which will allow the validation of quantitative data,

In the qualitative method the research is descriptive, the information obtained cannot be quantified. The data obtained are analyzed inductively. In this sense, the interpretation of phenomena and assigning meanings are basic in the qualitative research process (Matias Pereira, 2013).

To obtain the results, we analyzed four studies related to governance typologies (Hall, 2011), public governance indicators (Dias & Pisa, 2015) and governance in tourism (Duran, 2013; Queiroz & Rastrollo-Horillo, 2015).

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS GOVERNANCE MODELS FOR TOURIST DESTINATIONS

WTO / Duran Indicators (2013)

In 2013, the World Tourism Organization, through its official publications, released a text entitled "Governance for the tourism sector and its measurement." The text, written by C. Duran, was released in October 2013, seeking to demonstrate the importance of measurement and analysis in tourism, which aims to disseminate the correct tools for this to happen, and to serve as a platform for the development of this field of work (Duran, 2013).

Throughout the text, the author presents different perspectives related to governance, followed by a conceptual approach to governance in the tourism sector, and continuing with the general guidelines for measuring governance in tourism. According to the author, the difficulty of assessing governance is also due to the multiple interpretations of the term.

Someone can easily describe governance, but as a concept that is more often quoted than understood. The best one can say is that in mentioning the concept, different actors mean different things. The concept remains nebulous, and is used indiscriminately - and often incorrectly - often serving as a generic term. This not only deprives the term of analytical usefulness, but also makes it difficult to understand and evaluate its importance and implications for development (Duran, 2013).

Addressing governance in the tourism sector, the author states that the term is increasingly being used, and is a relevant and current topic that is being discussed in forums at various levels, whether by researchers or government programs, but it is still an obscure term that is not well defined, and is surrounded by confusion about its definition and its implications in the activity (Duran, 2013).

Based on these recommendations, the author suggests a general guide for measuring governance in the tourism sector, with two approaches. The first is related to the space occupied by the governance in the tourism sector, evaluating the size of its political capacity, with the management being related to governance. The second, evaluating the effectiveness of the policies, is related to the results obtained with governance. In relation to measurement, the facts that can be observed are:

- Regulatory or legal means for the exercise of public coordination, collaboration and cooperation in sectoral and structural levels of government.
- Regulatory or legal means for training and development of public-private partnerships and cooperative relations.
- Legal and regulatory means to ensure responsibility, transparency and accountability in public-private relationships.
- Coordination exercise, collaboration and public cooperation.
- Collaboration exercise and public-private cooperation (Duran, 2013).

Concerning for the space occupied by the governance in tourism, it would be defined by the ability and effectiveness directive, which require their own resources and have degrees of importance in individual destinations. In assessing the political capacity, the fields of observation would be normative and legal means for the exercise of public coordination, cooperation and collaboration in the sector and in the government structures, with the observable facts being the powers and functions assigned to the tourism administration in the area of coordination, collaboration and cooperation at inter- and intra-governmental levels; Public sector departments with functions that impact on public tourism policies, according to the level of government; The areas in which these functions are shared or concurrent (Duran, 2013).

Evaluating the legal and regulatory means for collaborative establishing and developing public-private and cooperative relations, the following facts can be observed: regulatory structure according to the level of government and those responsible for structuring and

operating partnerships, regarding the areas of application or intervention by the State or by types of public tourism services already covered or planned and; other forms of collaboration and cooperation (networks for the exchange of experiences, observatories, etc.).

In the assessment of regulatory and legal means to guarantee responsibility, transparency and accountability in public-private relationships, the observable facts are structures of collaboration and public-private cooperation with shared responsibilities; Mechanisms and instruments for the provision of accounts based on objectives and results; Mechanisms and instruments for evaluation of results; and Instruments to promote responsible business.

Concerning the policy of effectiveness, the author suggests that government practices should be observed related to the exercise coordination, collaboration and public cooperation, observing the existing coordination mechanisms and instruments of public cooperation used to search for priority objectives of the basic tourism policy, based on the identification of types of (legislative, executive); the degree of coordination (levels); fields of intervention (sectoral, inter-governmental); scope (national, regional, local and international) and; procedures for accountability based on objectives and results, and the evaluation of the results.

The author concludes by stating that indicators are just examples, and can be a start for the development of a system of indicators that can enrich the information system on tourism governance and other common areas of study (Duran, 2013).

Public Governance Indicators / IgovP

The evaluation index of public governance - IgovP was presented by the authors Oliveira and Pisa (2015), as a tool to be used for the measurement of public governance aiming at state planning and the possibility of social control by the citizen.

The use of analysis models and detailed measurement of indicators that have as substrate the principles of public governance is an innovation in order to be an effective mechanism for knowledge of the degree of governance practiced by the Union, Federal District and states, allowing the monitoring of its evolution (Oliveira & Pisa, 2015).

The authors suggest indicators for assessing the effectiveness, transparency and accountability, participation, equity and legality, ethics and integrity. They finalize the work by applying the IGovP in different Brazilian states, confirming its efficacy as an evaluation tool for public governance.

Tourism Governance Typologies

In 2011, Hall published an article proposing the definition of tourism governance types, targeting the framework of governance models of tourist destinations in four categories proposed by the author. After discussing the new governance, he proposes an analysis that points to governance typologies, which were characteristic; policy/governance themes; policy standpoint; democratic model; main focus; profile of non-central actors; distinction between policy formulation and implementation; success criteria; implementation difficulties; reasons for the implementation difficulties; solutions to the difficulties of implementation; and policy instruments (Hall, 2011). The author then proposes four types of governance, hierarchical, networks, community and market governances.

141

Hierarchical governance has been little discussed in the literature, particularly in tourism, because the discussions are more general, about the role of government in tourism, and the nature of state intervention in the activity (Hall, 2011).

Market governance, despite the state's decision to allow market action in governance, does not mean that it ceases to influence the market. Instead of using tax regulatory mechanisms, the government has the option to pursue other form of interfering, either through financial

incentives, education actors and even possible future interventions to encourage the following market to follow certain directions, usually seeking self-regulation.

Network governance is considered a step between hierarchical governance and market governance. Networks have been proposed as means of integrating different views and political perspectives, although the integration capacity may depend on the degree of participation in the planning process and the influence on the perception of gains by this participation. The author writes about the degree to which these networks can act to achieve the results aimed at their own interests instead of common interests, becoming a challenge in its use as a political instrument, often seeking more economic results than sustainability (Hall, 2011).

Finally, community governance (decentralized) is influenced by communitarianism, proposing that large-scale government be replaced by spatial units on a smaller scale, with the nearest government of the community, as well as greater public participation in the creation of public policies.

Dimensions of Governance

In 2015, the authors Queiroz and Rastrillo-Horillo, in a study related to the state of the art of governance, and after evaluating all the material researched by them, identified three dimensions for assessing governance in tourist destinations: who, what and how.

In the dimension “who”, which is related to the actors involved in governance, the authors propose the evaluation of legitimacy and representativeness; ability to motivate the participation of the variety of actors; collective goals. In the dimension “what”, related to the process and results, the assessment would refer to training; commitment; financial resources; participation time; technological resources. Finally, in the dimension “how”, also related to processes, the authors suggest assessing the ability to make the rules respected; control mechanisms and sanctions; ability to accountability; instruments: networks and

multilevel coordination (national, regional, local), DMO's; Web sites, forums, councils, planning; regulatory aspects, incentives; control agencies; vote, popular consultations; annual calendar of activities (Queiroz & Rastrollo-Horillo, 2015).

These suggestions still lack an enforcement tool to determine the effectiveness of the proposals made by the authors.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

After the presentation of these four previous studies, the construction of a table was needed to summarize the information, seeking to compare the different tools and indicators for future verification of common aspects and/or to complement aspects that were excluded in these studies (chart 1).

Chart 1 - Comparative Table adapted from Queiroz, 2015; WTO, 2013; Hall, 2011; Oliveira, Pisa, 2015.

Autor	Hall, 2011	Duran, 2013	Queiroz & Rastrollo - Horillo, 2015	Oliveira & Pisa, 2015
Object of Study	Governance Typologies	Governance Indicators	Governance Dimensions	Public Governance Indicators
Divisions	Hierarchical governance Governance of Communities Governance of Networks Governance of Markets	Directive Capacity Directive effectivity	Dimension Who Dimension What Dimension How	Effectiveness Transparency and Accountability Participation Equity Legality, ethics and integrity
Analysis Factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Types of Classification and Features. Political/governance themes. Perspective Policy. Used model of democracy. Main focus. Actors. Distinction between formulation and implementation of policies. Success criteria. Implementation gaps/deficits. Reasons for implementation gaps / deficits. Solution for implementation gaps / deficits. Primary policy instruments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional capacity of public tourism agencies for coordination, collaboration and public cooperation Institutional capacity of PTAs for public-private collaboration institutional capacity of PTAs for transparency Level of responsibility in tourism management Degree of transparency and accountability in public-private collaborations Degree of non-governmental participation in decisions on tourism effectiveness of policy Index of PTAs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who - legitimacy and representativeness; ability to motivate the participation of the variety of actors; collective goals. What - Training; commitment; financial resources; time to participate; technological resources. How - Ability to make the rules respected; Control mechanisms and sanctions; Ability to accountability; Instruments: networks and multilevel coordination (national, regional, local), DMO's; Web sites, forums, Councils, Boards, Planning; regulatory, incentives; control agencies; Vote, popular consultations; annual calendar of activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectiveness - average household income per capita percentage; Municipal Human Development Index (HDI - M). Transparency and Accountability - Transparency Index. Participation - Percentage of Valid Electorate Votes versus Electors able percentage 1. Shift; Rate of participation in National and State Councils. Equity - Gini Index of distribution of monthly income of persons 10 years old or older, employed in the reference week, with labor income; Illiteracy rate Population of 15 or more by state; Unemployment rate: Percentage of the population of 16 years and more economically active unemployed. Legality, ethics, integrity: Pass rate of accounts by the ECA/TCU, in compliance with the Fiscal Responsibility Law; Human rights Child labor rate by region/state of the Federation.

Source: Authors, 2016.

Ruschmann, D. V. M.; Anjos, F. A. & Arnhold, M. Jr. (2017). INDICATORS FOR EVALUATING GOVERNANCE IN TOURIST DESTINATIONS – an analysis of the applicability of proposed models. *Applied Tourism*, 2(1), 128-148.

Based on the summary of the different indicators, it is clear that there is still a shortage related to the application of these indicators in real assessment tools. The indicators proposed by Queiroz & Rastrollo-Horillo (2015) are more simplistic, assessing only three dimensions. As for the indicators proposed by Duran (2013), these has a greater depth, but the difficulty is how to measure the proposed indicators. Evaluating the typologies of Hall (2011), these serve to typify, giving specific characteristics, but without the intention of measuring results. Finally, the index for evaluating Public Governance, proposed and tested by Oliveira and Pisa (2015) does not have specific indicators for measuring tourism governance, and may require adjustments for this purpose.

Following the analysis, we believe it would be extremely important to measure the tourism governance of a destination, assessing the degree of participation of public and private actors, processes and procedures thereof, with an instrument that would allow the monitoring of the management of destinations, aimed at correcting any deviations (measured by the instrument), seeking to develop a lasting and sustainable activity. Thus, the construction of an evaluation model of tourism governance appears as an important goal for further research in the area of study related to tourism management.

REFERENCES

- Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2011) Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 19, may-june, 411-421.
- Bramwell, B. (2011). Governance, the state and sustainable Tourism: a political economy approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 19, n.4-5, may-june, 459-477.
- Brasil, Ministério do Turismo. (2013) *Programa de Regionalização do Turismo*. Diretrizes. Brasília: MTUR.
- Brasil. Ministério do Turismo. (2009) *Programa de qualificação à distância para o desenvolvimento do turismo: formação de gestores das políticas públicas do turismo*. Florianópolis: SEAD/FAPEU/UFSC.
- Brasil. Secretaria de Planejamento e Investimentos Estratégicos. (2010). *Indicadores de programas: guia metodológico*. Brasília: Ministério do Planejamento, Orçamento e Gestão (MPOG).

- Dias, P. P. (2013) *O desenvolvimento do ecoturismo em Pernambuco: Uma análise sob a ótica da governança*. Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco. Recife.
- Dinica, V. (2009) Governance for sustainable tourism: a comparison of international and dutch visions. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol 17, n.5. Sep., 45-56.
- Duran, C. (2013). *Governance for the Tourism Sector and its measurement*. UNWTO Statistics and TSA Issue Paper Series.
- Frey, K. (2012) Abordagens de governança em áreas metropolitanas da América Latina: avanços e entraves. URBE. *Revista Brasileira de Gestão Urbana*. Vol 4, n.1. Curitiba, jan/jun, 87-102.
- Hall, C. M. (2011) Policy Learning and policy failure in sustainable tourism governance: from first and second order to third order change? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol 19. May-June, 649-671.
- Hall, C. M. (2011) A typology of governance and its implications for tourism policy analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol 19, may/june, 437-457.
- Lohmann, G.; Panosso Neto, A. (2008) *Teoria do turismo: conceitos, modelos e sistemas*. São Paulo: Aleph.
- Matias-Pereira, J. (2012) *Manual de Metodologia da pesquisa científica*. São Paulo: Atlas.
- Moscardo, G. (2011) Exploring Social representations of tourism planning: issues for governance. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 19. May-June, 423-436.
- Oliveira, A. G., & Pisa, B. J. (2015) IGovP: índice de avaliação da governança pública – instrumento de planejamento do Estado e de controle social pelo cidadão. *Revista de Administração Pública* – Rio de Janeiro 49 (5): 1263-1290, set/out.
- Pechlaner, H., Volgger, M., & Herntrei, M. (2012). Destination management organizations as interface between destination governance and corporate governance. *Anatolia – An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*. Vol. 13, n.2. August, 151-168.
- Queiroz, F., & Rastrollo-Horillo, M. (2015) El estado del arte en gobernanza de destinos turísticos. *Tourism and Management Studies*, 11, vol 2, 47-55.
- Rosenau, J. N. Governança, ordem e transformação na política mundial. In: J. N. Rosenau, & E. Czempiel. (2000) *Governança sem governo: ordem e transformação na política mundial*. Brasília: Ed. Unb e São Paulo: Imprensa Oficial do Estado, 2000. p. 11-46.
- Sahaidak, A. (2013) *A implantação do projeto turístico Rota dos Tropeiros (PR): Políticas Públicas e Governança*. Universidade Estadual de Ponta Grossa. Mestrado em Gestão do Território. Ponta Grossa.
- Santos, M. H.C. (1997). Governabilidade, governança e democracia: criação da capacidade governativa e relações executivo-legislativo no Brasil pós-constituente. In: *DADOS - Revista de Ciências Sociais*. Rio de Janeiro, v. 40, n. 3. p. 335-376.

- Seixas, J., & Mas, A. A. I. (2010) Urban Governance in the South of Europe: cultural identities and global dilemmas. *Análise Social*. N.197. Lisboa, 771-787.
- Silva, L. F., Mantovaneli Jr, O., & Sampaio, C. A. C. (2012). Gobernanza y Territorialidad em el desarrollo turístico regional: el caso del Oktoberfest en Blumenau – Brasil. *Estudios Y Perspectivas en Turismo*. Vol. 21, n.6. Buenos Aires, 1369-1388.
- Wang, J., & Li, T. (2013) Review on Tourist Destination Governance in Foreign Countries. *Tourism Tribune*. Vol 28, n6, 15-25.
- Zahra, A. L. (2011) Rethinking regional Tourism governance: the principle of subsidiarity. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 19. N. 4-5, May, 535-552.