Network science and sustainable performance of family businesses in tourism

Rodolfo Baggio
Master in Economics and Tourism, Bocconi University, Milan, Italy and
National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, Tomsk, Russia
rodolfo.baggio@unibocconi.it

Marco Valeri
NCI University London, UK and Niccolò Cusano University, Rome, Italy
marco.valeri@unicusano.it

==========

Journal of Family Business Management (2020), doi: 10.1108/JFBM-06-2020-0048

==========

Abstract

Purpose
There is a little appreciation for the role network science can play in sustainable tourism and it is not quite clear to what extent generic models from the tourism network analysis literature are applicable. In the international management literature, then, few significant studies exist that deal with the effects of network structures on the sustainable performance of tourism family businesses. This research analyzes these issues and discusses the state of the art of this area.

Design/methodology/approach
Based on a scrutiny of the literature conducted on research papers published in the last twenty years, this analysis focuses on the relation between network analysis methods and sustainable performance within the tourism family business domain. The paper uses a limited set of keywords, restricting the selection to tourism and hospitality works on sustainability. A qualitative content analysis is performed.

Findings
The results suggest a critical reflection on how the methods of network science can be profitably and advantageously used for supporting a sustainable performance of family businesses in tourism.

Originality
The paper contains a critical consideration on the potential drivers and drawbacks of the relationship between sustainability and networking in tourism and highlights some managerial implications. The analysis closes with some suggestions and indications for future research work.

Keywords: Network science, network analysis, quantitative methods, sustainable tourism performance, family business

1. Introduction

Within the family business research fields, there seems to be little appreciation for what a network analytic approach can do for sustainable tourism and it is not quite clear to what extent theories from generic publications on tourism networks are applicable (Stafford, et al., 1999; Lindow et al., 2010; Kallmuenzer et al., 2018; Elmo et al., 2020; Arcese et al., 2020). Network elements such as potential players, their requirements and fields of interest are yet to be fully addressed. Likewise, network roles, structures and dynamic effects, as well as strategies, players' practices and power relationships are still little investigated in this area.

Quite a few research works examining the cooperation linkages between players in tourism focus on networking for sustainable tourism (Morrison et al. 2004). Their conclusions, widely shared, assert that these networks can have a positive influence on community patronage and perception, reinforce the possibility of a well-organized usage of infrastructures and enhance communication, knowledge transfer and learning (Czernek, 2017; Cooper, 2018). A certain amount of these works can be found among the first studies on cooperation in tourism (Murphy, 1985; Jamal and Getz 1995). For example, by defining sustainable tourism as a cultural product, Dredge (2006) claims that inclusiveness, engagement and networking manage to considerably support the governance of tourism with increased sustainability. This statement underlines the necessity for an adequate development of networking in tourism governance in its broadest sense, an assertion that is even more relevant when sustainable tourism is concerned.

Actually, when collaboration, in its widest interpretation, is able to enhance the possibility to achieve good tourism outcomes with increased sustainability, a study of these networks emerges as fundamental for tourism academics. Although collaborative behavior was represented as a "condition for sustainable tourism planning and development" (Beritelli, 2011; Bramwell, 2011), not many expressly focus on networks for sustainable tourism. Even if not specifically a network study, Flagstad and Hope's (2001) research of sustainable benefit development in winter holiday destinations, can be considered among the first reports on the role of collaboration for sustainable destinations. Sims (2009) examines regional food and sustainable tourism experiences and recognizes networks as a tool used by locally based agents and manufacturers to jointly create a trademark to promote local market and upgrade tourists stay. Even though this is generally considered as a probable outcome of business networking, these findings cannot be seen as peculiar to sustainable tourism. Analyses examining networks for sustainable tourism from a destination perspective usually concentrate on distinct elements of destination management, commonly protected area management.

New perspectives of analysis

Researchers in the political studies framework (Marin and Mayntz, 1991) maintain that human interrelations can define a network better than the physical and inner characteristics of the players. The resulting requirements for (qualitative and quantitative) relational methods to analyze tourism networks are presently acknowledged and developed in a growing number of studies (Mariani and Baggio, 2019; Valeri and Baggio, 2020a; 2020c). In the international management literature on tourism, however, there are few significant studies of the effects of network structures on sustainable performance of tourism family businesses (Pratt, 2014; Seaman, 2015; Breton and Miller, 2016; Azila-Gbettor, 2018; Memili et al., 2018).

This is (probably) mainly due to the scarce attention the wide family business literature has given to the possibilities and the methods of network science. Just a few works mention the role played by a networked structure and do so by using quite elementary methods and

considerations. For example, Seaman at al. (2017) state that a multi-faceted approach can provide a better analysis of influences on family business development and behavior. They consider the interaction between family, business and friendship networks and provide an initial exploration of the topic. Distelberg and Blow (2011) use a combination of qualitative data, social network analysis, and multilevel modeling and study the boundary strength of family business systems (see also the review on family business research by Neubaum, 2018). However, despite the long recognized importance of a networked structure for the dynamic characteristics of many processes such as the transfer of knowledge (Barrat et al., 2008; Cowan and Jonard, 2004; Tsai, 2001; Zhang et al., 2016), even quite recent publications fail to mention or use network analytic methods and rely on more traditional techniques. This is, for example, the case of the analysis of knowledge and social capital transfer to the next generation in family businesses, and the different steps of the transmission process done by Bernhard et al. (2020).

In this regard, it is possible to hunt down some significant insights in the sociological literature. For this reason, this paper comments on the possible effects of network structure on sustainable tourism performance analyzing the papers published in the last twenty years, i.e. from 2000 to 2019 (and part of 2020). The paper is divided into three parts: the first part describes the materials collected, then we examine this literature on networking and sustainable tourism for setting the general framework, together with a brief description of the theoretical bases on complex systems and network science. The next section contains a critical discussion of the main points as derived from the papers recovered. The concluding section identifies limitations, possible practical implications and directions for future research.

2. Materials and methods

To map the progress of the academic literature on networking and the effects of network structure on sustainable performance of family business in tourism, it was decided to use a literature review methodology. Compared to other qualitative research methodologies, the literature review methodology is better suited to the needs of our research and is able to better highlight any gaps in the literature.

Here we focus on complexity and network structure and networks as intensity of relationships (Xiao and Ying, 2011) aiming at appraising research on the application of network analysis in tourism against the more generic literature on sustainability in tourism. As far as the number of studies is concerned, the research on networks in tourism basically overlaps, showing an increase of academic interest on the subject of sustainability and networks between 2015 and 2019.

We partly relied on the latest systematic reviews appeared on management journals in tourism. Leveraging on these works, the review included publications that would meet the following conditions: 1) the focal point of the research (either abstract or experimental) was the relation between sustainable tourism and networking, 2) the investigation was at company level rather than at population level (either individual or organized group), 3) the work appeared on academic books or journals. To trace the studies on this subject, the review followed a keyword search approach that allowed us to find relevant articles in three major databases of this area (Scopus, ProQuest and Web of Knowledge). Such databases have been previously used in other tourism researches (Song et al. 2012; Ying and Xiao, 2012). We explored the databases in quest of keywords, titles and abstracts. Our search was based on keywords including “networking and sustainable tourism performance”.

The period considered is 2000-2020 (the first months available). The papers recovered from our survey exceed 800 publications (with a total of 190 international journals). A further cleaning of this list, done by limiting our research to the topic of networks in the tourism managerial literature, and checking the compliance to this theme on titles and abstracts, identified 132 publications extracted from 20 international journals (*Annals of Tourism*

Research, Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, Current Issues in Tourism, International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, International Journal of Hospitality Management, International Journal of Tourism Research, Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research, Journal of Hospitality Leisure Sport and Tourism Education, Journal of Leisure Research, Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change, Journal of Travel Research, Leisure Sciences, Leisure Studies, Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, Tourism Economics, Tourism and Hospitality Management, Tourism Geographies and Tourism Management).

Although this could be seen as a limitation, we deem that having selected the most relevant publications in the domain the general picture that emerges is of good reliability.

For the purposes of this work we did not use any quantitative methods to analyze the literature uncovered, but rather proceeded to a thorough inspection and reading of the papers and derived the narrative that follows.

3. The framework

Complexity and network structure: concept and application perspectives in tourism

The notion of complexity has diverse meanings, commonly linked to the size and number of elements in a system and to the nature of the linkages between them. As yet, there is neither an officially shared definition, nor a commonly accepted philosophical formalization, of the concept of complexity. Nevertheless, this topic represents today a very active area of research (Baggio, 2008). The elements of a complex system work together in a non-linear way, they seldom have simple cause and effect relations, and minor stimuli may give rise either to considerable effects, or to absolutely no effect. The non-linearity of the relations among the system's elements creates a set of distinct properties characterizing its performance as complex.

A tourism system holds many of these features. Theoretical research in this area is still at a relatively early stage and few academics have fully considered the complex system analysis methods as a preferred context to comprehend the many and diverse phenomena that characterize the tourism domain (Baggio, 2008; Farrell and Twining-Ward 2004; McKercher, 1999; 2005). The theory of complexity bodes well for a deeper understanding, for instance, of the way critical situations, catastrophes or violent modifications may impact the sector, or the reason why, after major disasters (see e.g. the Twin Towers attack), the tourism industry manages to achieve a fast and relatively unexpected recovery (Hall et al., 2017).

Within the tourism framework, this approach is specifically adopted, for example, by the model discussed by McKercher. The model focal elements are (McKercher, 1999; 2005): 1) the traveler, representing the key player in tourism, since tourism would not exist in the absence of people travelling; 2) the communication vectors connecting the traveler to the destination, 3) the circumstances or elements influencing the impact of the communication vectors utilized, 4) the destination or internal tourism community made up of all organizations involved in tourism in a destination, 5) external tourism agencies (both public and private) striving to exert influence on tourism, 6) other tourism-related externalities, such as atypical tourism activities affecting a destination's aptitude to captivate travelers' interest, 7) non-tourism-related externalities, or macro-environmental factors such as changes in political, economic or social situations, conflicts, natural calamities, that have an effect on people's possibility to travel, 8) outcome from the system both desirable and undesirable, 9) mischief or chaos makers who can lead a system on the verge of disarray.

In other words, the model outlines the performance of complex tourism entities by listing the components that may affect tourism on the basis of different influence levels, i.e. nationwide, territorial, locally based or individual organization. Its assumptions are that the connections between the various components are similar, despite the number of key factors that

depend on the level. This allows the author to offer a scenario suitable to compare the failure of various well thought-out, carefully managed and sustainable tourism development strategies. Thanks to this method, the analysis is also able to better realize, even though only at a conceptual level, how the employment of modern technologies and their future developments may influence the system. Starting from this kind of frameworks, then, some scholars have proposed a number of methods capable to estimate quantitatively the main complex or chaotic features of a given tourism system (Baggio, 2008; Valeri and Baggio, 2020c).

Complex systems can be more easily understood when they are displayed in the shape of a graph (or network), in which the nodes are the components of the system (i.e. companies, associations, public bodies etc.) and the edges represent their relationships (i.e. business agreements, information exchanges etc.). They can be directed or undirected, depending on possible symmetries in the associations between nodes, and weighted when they can be assigned some sort of relationship intensity (costs, velocity, intensity or importance of contact etc.).

Network and intensity of relationship

A number of researches carried out analyses on the network characteristics of tourism destinations have highlighted that the examined samples have a low degree of connections and a high level of inhomogeneity, with some form of intermediate structures (Scott et al. 2008; Baggio et al. 2010; Baggio, 2017). The result are conjectured to be valid in general (Baggio, 2020) and are quite significant because, by means of policy and management mediations, it's possible identify the vulnerabilities in the efficiency of a destination. The interrelations inherent in a value-creation system enable us to identify differences in the measurement of the level of inter-organizational compactness in different contexts (Tran et al. 2016; Baggio, 2017; Éber et al. 2018; Girvan and Newman, 2002).

Moreover, network analytic methods have been implemented to identify the most relevant stakeholders of a tourism destination. These are those actors who can create a considerable added value for the progress of the business and for the destination development and governance.

It has been noted that the key members are usually positioned at the heart of the network, thus creating a sort of inner circle that plays a prominent role compared to that of the outer stakeholders (Baggio, 2017; Mariani and Baggio, 2019). This means that the overall control of a tourism destination is governed (implicitly or explicitly) by a restricted number of organisms, confirming once more the need for a cooperative inter-organizational arrangement able to lead to real integrated tourist practices. Not least, public stakeholders can be considered key factors in destination networks because they own fundamental resources, have a core position and are legally more powerful than other members.

Not all the formal structures are adequately explanatory to understand the flow of information in an organization and how tasks are achieved. Indeed, the dynamics of the organization mechanisms are influenced by the shared dependences in the community. Such correlations are not always easy to evaluate; therefore, the analysis should reconsider the strength of "informal structures".

Every organization theorist would agree that the best practice for an organization to achieve its defined targets is to examine in depth its internal and external framework, which is where the actions are allocated. However, considering the substantially qualitative nature of the organization dynamics, it is unvaryingly and exceptionally difficult to contextualize it with quantitative measures (Davies, 2003).

Social Network analysis: a systemic approach

Social Network Analysis (SNA) represents a valuable support to pursue a deeper understanding of both the qualitative and quantitative measures of organizational dynamics. In

particular, when referred to organizations, SNA assumes the connotation of Organizational Network Analysis (ONA) (Tichy et al. 1979). Organizational Network Analysis reveals the collaboration tendencies among employees in the working environment and helps to identify possible interventions to solve inefficiencies in the communication process (Burt, 2000; Inkpen and Tsang, 2005).

The tourism destination stands as a core element within the tourism management studies. Because of its characteristics and its evolutionary dynamics, a tourism destination has an essential function in outlining the management and development strategies and in understanding the economic, social and environmental effects created by tourism (Ritchie and Crouch, 2003). Obviously, this involves the need of a deep knowledge of the organization of the destination and of the links between its basic elements.

When examining these notions, one element appears to stand out with an exceptional emphasis: the relevance of the set of relationships among the different segments of the destination system. This evidence begs the question about how the latest developments of what is currently known as "network science" (Watts, 2004) can help increasing our knowledge, and in which way they are able to offer useful tools for an improved and more productive management of the system (Song and Li, 2008).

Many definitions have been proposed to describe a destination. As it often happens, there is no general agreement and the different expressions tend to highlight this or that aspect, depending on the aim of the author. In line with the objectives of the present paper, we can describe the tourism destination as a geographically delimited area, where a number of actors operate (businesses, associations, public administrations, etc.) for providing travelers and tourists with services and other products. Furthermore, this should ideally happen trying to promote a correct balance between the tourist use of a territory and the respect of its environmental, social and cultural features.

Touristic destination as complex system

Using a systemic approach, as said, the tourism destination can be considered as an example of dynamic and adaptive (to the external environment) complex system. In fact, it includes a number (generally not too small) of components that grows according to external and internal motivations; the relationships connecting the different elements can be characterized by nonlinear dynamical nature, often reported in the related literature (Farrell and Twining-Ward, 2004; Faulkner and Russell, 1997).

Events such as the opposition towards external shocks, the unplanned evolution of intermediate structures (self-organization), the reactivity to the alteration of the original conditions, the uncertainty of the effects of phenomena, even of low importance, the contrast between the behavior of the whole system and that of each basic elements, firmly confirm this interpretation (Hagberg et al. 2008; Baggio, 2008). In such a framework, as it is well known, the traditional reductionist techniques of analysis and forecast have shown big limits (Farrell and Twining-Ward, 2004; Russell, 2006; Russell and Faulkner, 2004).

Within the framework of complexity science, self-organization is perhaps the most remarkable feature, and that means that no single coordinator or manager can effectively manage the whole system behavior. Rather, the control is disseminated among different elements communicating and working together. In addition, the nonlinearity of these interactions implies that occasionally, in a very unexpected way, minor disruptions might be able to produce severe impacts while major shocks often seem to be overcome without much difficulty (Levin, 2003).

As mentioned before, one of the key elements of a tourist system is represented by its network organization. As a result, the processes and analysis practices of complex networks, created in recent years by a large group of scholars of several academic areas, offer stimulating

suggestions for a scientific approach to the study of a tourism destination (Baggio et al. 2010; Baggio, 2017).

4. Discussion

Tourism network research

Ongoing network researches in tourist sector are equally very dissimilar when it comes to scale. Networks can be analyzed at level of territory, destinations (Scott et al., 2008), community-destinations and clusters (Bodega et al., 2004). Despite the recent development of the field, still too few studies are conducted in the area, so new strategies toward qualitative and quantitative techniques are necessary. These may consist of - although not restricted to - multi-sited analysis, auto-ethnography and case studies. Discussions relative to qualitative research (Hesse-Biber and Levy, 2006) and case study research (Baggio and Mariani, 2016; Valeri, 2016; Valeri and Baggio, 2020a) should also be increased.

Additional branches and areas of knowledge have detected and examined a number of methods to outclass the quantitative-qualitative dichotomy in network analyses. Environmental researches, for instance, have utilized SNA to identify the "core networks", namely the net of key players in a system (Prell et al., 2008). These core networks can be analyzed by means of both quantitative and qualitative procedures to reach a more thorough comprehension of their features and schemes (Mariani and Baggio, 2020). The key players in a network for sustainable tourism, for example, can be selected and then studied focusing on their structural characteristics (clusters, groups, hierarchies) or more qualitative features such as motivation or past correlations with other players. Actually, academics in a political studies framework (Marin and Mayntz, 1991) imagine that human relationships can define a network in a clearer way than the players' personal characteristics. The resulting requirement for (qualitative) relational approaches to comprehend tourism networks is at present acknowledged and developed in an increasing quantity of studies (Valeri and Baggio, 2020b).

Critical reflection on network science and sustainable tourism performance

In the international management literature in tourism, there are few significant studies of the effects of network structural and dynamic characteristics on sustainable tourism performance. However, in this regard, it is possible to trace some significant insights in the sociological literature. According to Ingram and Roberts (2000), the greater the cohesiveness of organizations within a system, the better the performance of the organizations will be. The cohesiveness of network may lead to an improvement of the organization performance thanks to the processes of enhanced cooperation, reduced competition, and superior information exchange. Moreover, these advantages are best fulfilled when rival managers operate in a close-knit network, because cohesion facilitates the validation of information collected from the network, eliminates the structural gaps tackled by customers, and facilitates the normative control of competing players on sustainability. Same has been highlighted by Sainaghi and Baggio (2014) who assess the effects of a good "position" in the network on the performance of hotels in a destination.

A further nature of the cohesion question regards normative control. Starting from Simmel's (1950) work, Krachhardt (1994) claims that close-knit networks are excellent for implementing rules on sustainability. The groundwork of this statement is that relationships are the base for regulation observance. The motivation against norm breach is that people's relationships will decrease or be cancelled (Homans, 1950). The ability to adopt this relational type of rule implementation is considerably reinforced by cohesive ties. The suggestion is that groups of people having ties of friendship have a better "normative capacity" compared with single pairs. The applicability of normative control supports cohesion over non-redundancy in networks of competitors.

Lastly, getting back to the question of information exchange: the paper discussed earlier that the bonds of friendship may help the circulation of information, but in which way is this mechanism influenced by the degree of cohesion of such bonds? Granovetter's (1995) renowned assertion on strength-of-weak ties claims that the quantity of information that a subject collect is maximized by having weak network ties.

Considering that a subject can reasonably keep a limited number of contacts, the information received is maximized as long as these contacts are not linked among themselves. Nonredundant ties generate exclusive information, whilst cohesive ties generate redundant information. Nevertheless, the quantity of information must be compared with its accuracy. Inside networks, the chance to acquire deceitful information is a possible threat. Information coming from competitors must be checked with attention, for there might be a tactical interest from unfair competitors. By all means, if the competitor providing the information can be considered also as a friend, there is an additional component of trust. However, there is no assurance that friends are always trustworthy, especially when interests are high. When the reliability of the information is questioned, cohesive ties perform as a control on the information that is collected. To sum up, the closing of structural holes, the defense of normative control, and the trustworthy exchange of information all promote cohesive networks in our scenario.

On the other hand, some scholars assert the opposite, that strongly connected gatherings with redundant links have steadier relations and a more incisive sense of commitment that promotes a higher level of confidence and cohesiveness, thus easing the achievement of collective targets. Recent research, then, has shown that the two configurations may coexist in a network with strong communities loosely connected between themselves and that the two ways of measuring this particular characteristic can be unified (Latora et al., 2013).

Network benefits to sustainable performance

The enduring progress of the business relationship is largely subordinated to the aptitude of the participants to collaborate and work in harmony. Hence, a series of negotiation techniques must be developed to appoint and insert in the network a number of actors who are prepared to cooperate, even if they have no former experience of collaborative work (Sherer, 2003; Park and Zhou, 2005; Parkhe et al., 2006; Weaver, 2011; Yin et al., 2012).The network promoter (that may be a minor entrepreneur or a group of businessmen) leads the first steps of implementation in a proactive or reactive way trying to induce other entrepreneurs of small and medium sized companies to join the initiative.

In addition, the role of governance cannot be underestimated. Actually, as the network grows, governance becomes fundamental in promoting and supervising the coordination among network participants (Gulati et al., 2000; Sherer, 2003) and in devising strategies centered on relational income. In terms of property, governance can entail: 1) associates who share or exchange financial resources or associates who set up new businesses in which other network members may invest, 2) contract arrangements that do not entail the exchange of capital (for instance joint ventures, licensing, legal contracts, internal price techniques, etc.) (Ring and Van de Ven, 1994; Gulati and Singh, 1998; Kuittinen et al., 2008), 3) methods helping 'reduce the potential opportunism of the parties' (Hoetker and Mellewigt, 2009) such as the setting up of teams and task forces which can improve the confidence among network members.

Besides itemizing the most suitable governance techniques for any distinct condition, the selecting process of participants of a business network is based on: a) the degree of trust among the actors involved, b) the objective of the network, c) the balance of assets among partners (Kuittinen et al., 2008), d) the capital amount and knowledge based investments in the network (Hoethker and Mellewigt, 2009), e) the cost of coordination (Gulati and Singh, 1998).

The importance of a network perspective for a sustainable development has been well recognized (Albrecht, 2013), and operational proposals exist for a conceptual framework that, integrating different theoretical approaches such as stakeholder theory, social network analysis

(SNA), and actor-network theory (ANT), allow to further explore the nature, dynamics and operations of tourism networks for the achievement of the sustainable development goals as defined by UN (Nguyen et al., 2019).

5. Concluding remarks

The stated aim of the present paper is to reflect on the effects of network structures on sustainable tourism performance, and on the methods to conduct such analyses, and look for possible indications that might guide into well-grounded decision making processes. The axiom affirming that group cohesion promotes collective actions is one of the key concepts of social psychology and has been implemented to clarify prosocial behaviors (Stouffer, 1949; Homans, 1950; Sherif et al., 1961). A cohesive network architecture is more efficient when connecting the work of comparable actors, mainly when it is mediated by some form of weak links to other parts of the system. Along with showing the importance of horizontal networks for the description of organizational conduct and performance, our analysis shows the need of distinctive roles as well in order to have a clearer understanding of the relationships among network members.

Tourism and hospitality family businesses are quite diffused in many countries. They are typically of small size and as such suffer from certain shortages in strategic orientation, innovation and cooperation (Pikkemaat and Zehrer, 2016). Moreover, some scholar stated that they are often focused more on personal or family needs and preferences than on growth and profit maximization (Getz and Carlsen, 2005). If this are valid deductions, then the importance of an effective and efficient set of relationships between similar enterprises (i.e. a network) can be of paramount relevance for the survival and the very life of these companies. If networks manage to boost the performance of their organizations, our findings suggest that they should develop more bonds of "friendship", even with business rivals, encouraging them to become friends too. This suggestion implies the crucial warning that the useful advantages of friendships are inevitably connected to the affective side of those relationships. Single persons, who attempt to develop and keep friendships alive only to get a monetary advantage, will not be able to inspire trust and reciprocity from others to whom they get attached and will earn neither affective nor instrumental profits (Granovetter, 1995). Good sets of relationships, and the efficient knowledge transfers that can result, can also help overcoming a recognized need for education and training of the family tourism entrepreneurs to stay competitive in the marketplace (Ratten, 2020). Needless to say, the methods of network science, as discussed in this paper, can provide a fundamental basis for the fulfillment of these goals.

In conclusion, our analysis encourages to continue, improve and deepen research aimed at broadening and developing this context and gaining further actionable insights also looking for the presence of stronger and more clear relations between network characteristics and some of the measurable variables that support a socially and economically sustainable development.

As said above, a possible limitation of this contribution is in the choice of the literature to examine. However, as stated already, this can be overcome by considering the selection of the most relevant outlets for the tourism and hospitality research domain.

From a more "practical" point of view, we note here that a network model of a destination or of a group of businesses (whether family or not), once well-built based on a rigorous data collection (see e.g. Christopoulos and Aubke, 2014), naturally leads to the possibility of simulating different configurations in order to find the best possible solution for achieving the objectives set. Configurations that can then be obtained by designing and implementing suitable policies (Baggio and Baggio, 2020). Finally, the outcomes of a good network analysis and of the dynamic implications such structures have on the development of important processes such as the transfer of information and knowledge or the resilience of a specific destination system are of great relevance for all the actors involved and can be used as powerful means for

influencing attitudes and behaviors, driving them towards the chosen goals, whether economic, social or political, and ultimately affect the quality of the life of the system considered and, through this, that of the actors and the individuals living in the destination.

Acknowledgements:
R.B. acknowledges the financial support of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation in the framework of the Competitiveness Enhancement Program of the Tomsk Polytechnic University.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest

References

Albrecht, J. N. (2013), "Networking for sustainable tourism–towards a research agenda", *Journal of sustainable tourism*, *21*(5), pp. 639-657. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2012.721788

Arcese, G., Valeri, M., Poponi, S. and Elmo, G.C. (2020), "Innovative drivers for Family business models in tourism", *Journal of Family business Management*. DOI: 10.1108/JFBM-05-2020-0043.

Azila-Gbettor, E.M., Honyenuga, B.Q., Berent-Braun, M.M. and Kil, A. (2018), "Structural aspects of corporate governance and family firm performance: a systematic review", *Journal of Family Business Management*, 8(3), pp. 306-330. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFBM-12-2017-0045

Baggio, R. (2008), "Symptoms of complexity in a tourism system", *Tourism Analysis*, 13(1), pp. 1-20. https://doi.org/10.3727/108354208784548797

Baggio, R. (2017), "Network science and tourism – the state of the art", *Tourism Review, 72*(1), pp. 120-131. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-01-2017-0008

Baggio, R. (2020), "Tourism destinations: A universality conjecture based on network science", *Annals of Tourism Research*. DOI: 10.1016/j.annals.2020.102929.

Baggio, J. A. and Baggio, R. (2020), *Modelling and Simulations for Tourism and Hospitality*. Bristol, UK: Channel View.

Baggio, R., Scott, N. and Cooper, C. (2010), "Improving tourism destination governance: a complexity science approach", *Tourism Review,* 65(4), pp. 51-60. https://doi.org/10.1108/16605371011093863

Barrat, A., Barthélémy, M. and Vespignani, A. (2008), *Dynamical Processes on Complex Networks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Becken S. (2013), "A review of tourism and climate change as an evolving knowledge domain", *Tourism Management Perspectives,* 6, pp. 53-62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2012.11.006

Beritelli, P. (2011), "Cooperation among prominent actors in a tourist destination", *Annals of Tourism Research* 38(2), pp. 607–629. Doi:10.1016/j.annals.2010.11.015.

Bernhard, F., Hiepler, M. and Engel, F. X. (2020). Family Business Sustainability: The Intergenerational Transfer of Social Capital and Network Contacts. In *Sustainable Innovation* (pp. 101-132). Cham: Palgrave Pivot.

Bodega, D., Cioccarelli, G. and Denicolai, S. (2004), "New inter-organizational forms: Evolution of relationship structures in mountain tourism", *Tourism Review,* 59(3), pp. 13–19. DOI:10.1108/eb058437

Bramwell, B. (2011), "Governance, the state, and sustainable tourism: A political economy approach", *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 19(4–5), pp. 459–477. DOI:10.1080/09669582.2011.576765

Breton-Miller, I. Le and Miller, D. (2016), "Family firms and practices of sustainability: A contingency view", *Journal of Family Business Strategy*. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfbs.2015.09.001.

Burt R. S. (2000), *The network structure of social capital*. In R. I. Sutton and b. M. Staw (eds.) Research in Organizational Behavioral 22 (pp. 345-4239: Greenwich, CT: JAI Press

Casanueva, C., Gallego, A. and Garcia Sanchez, M.R. (2016), "Social Network Analysis (SNA) in Tourism", *Current Issues in Tourism,* 19(12), pp. 1190-1209. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2014.990422

Christopoulos, D. and Aubke, F. (2014), Data Collection for Social Network Analysis in Tourism Research. In M. McLeod & R. Vaughan (Eds.), *Knowledge networks and tourism* (pp. 126-142). New York: Routledge.

Cooper, C. (2018), "Managing tourism knowledge: a review", *Tourism Review*. DOI: 10.1108/TR-06-2017- 0104

Cowan, R. and Jonard, N. (2004), "Network structure and the diffusion of knowledge", *Journal of Economic Dynamics & Control, 28*, pp. 1557 – 1575. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jedc.2003.04.002

Czernek, K. (2017), "Tourism features as determinants of knowledge transfer in the process of tourist cooperation", *Current Issues in Tourism, 20*(2), pp. 204-220. DOI: 10.1080/13683500.2014.944107

Da Fontoura Costa, L., Rodrigues, A., Travieso, G. and Villas Boas, P. R. (2007), "Characterization of complex networks: A survey of measurements", *Advances in Physics, 56*(1), pp. 167-242.

Davies, B. (2003), "The Role of Quantitative and Qualitative Research in Industrial Studies of Tourism", *International Journal of Tourism Research, 5*, pp. 97-111. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.425

Distelberg, B. J. and Blow, A. (2011), "Variations in family system boundaries", *Family Business Review, 24*, 28-46. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486510393502

Dredge, D. (2006), "Networks, conflict and collaborative communities", *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 14(6), pp. 562–581. DOI:10.2167/jost567.0

Éber, F. Z., Baggio, R. and Fuchs, M. (2018), "Network analysis of a multi destination region – The case of Halland, South Sweden", *Information Technology and Tourism 20*(1-4), pp. 181–188. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40558-018-0108-9

Elmo, G.C. Arcese, G., Valeri, M., Poponi, S. and Pacchera, F. (2020), "Sustainability in Tourism as an Innovation Driver: An Analysis of Family Business Reality", *Sustainability, 12*(15), 6149. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12156149

Farrell, B. H. and Twining-Ward, L. (2004), "Reconceptualizing Tourism". *Annals of Tourism Research, 31*(2), pp. 274-295. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2003.12.002

Faulkner, B. and Russell, R. (1997), "Chaos and complexity in tourism: in search of a new perspective", *Pacific Tourism Review* 1, pp. 93-102.

Flagestad, A. and Hope, C.A. (2001), "Strategic Success in Winter Sports Destinations: A Sustainable Value Creation Perspective", *Tourism Management*, 22, pp.445-461. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(01)00010-3

Getz, D. and Carlsen, J. (2005), "Family business in tourism: State of the art", *Annals of tourism research, 32*(1), pp. 237-258. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2004.07.006

Girvan, M. and Newman, M. E. J. (2002), Community structure in social and biological networks. Proceedings of the National Academy of the Sciences of the USA, *99*, pp. 7821-7826.

Granovetter, M. (1995), *Getting a job*, 2d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Gulati, R. and Singh, H. (1998), "The Architecture of Cooperation: Managing Coordination Costs and Appropriation Concerns in Strategic. Alliances", *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43, pp. 781-814. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2393616

Gulati, R., Nohria, N. and Zaheer, A. (2000), "Strategic networks", *Strategic Management Journal,* 21, pp. 203-215. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(200003)21:3<203::AID-SMJ102>3.0.CO;2-K

Hagberg, A. A., Swart, P. J. and Schult, D. A. (2008), Exploring network structure, dynamics, and function using NetworkX. *Proceedings of the 7th Python in Science Conference (SciPy2008), Pasadena, CA (19-24 Aug)*, 11-15.

Hall, C. M., Prayag, G. and Amore, A. (2017), *Tourism and resilience: Individual, organisational and destination perspectives*. Bristol, UK: Channel View.

Hesse-Biber, S.N. and Levy, P. (2006), *The practice of qualitative research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hoetker, G. and Mellewigt, T. (2009), "Choice and performance of governance mechanisms: matching alliance governance to asset type", *Strategic Management Journal,* 30, pp. 1025-1044. DOI: 10.1002/smj.775

Homans, G. C. (1950), *The Human Group*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Ingram, P. and Roberts, P. W. (2000), "Friendships among competitors in the Sydney hotel industry", *American Journal of Sociology, 106(2)*, pp. 387–423.

Inkpen, A. C. and Tsang, E. W. K. (2005), "Social capital, networks, and knowledge transfer", *Academy of Management Review,* 30(1), pp. 146-165. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2005.15281445

Jamal, T. B. and Getz, D. (1995), "Collaboration theory and community tourism planning", *Annals of Tourism Research,* 22(1), pp. 186–204. DOI:10.1016/0160-7383(94)00067-3

Kallmuenzer, A., Nikolakis W., Peters, M. and Zanon, J. (2018), 'Trade-offs between dimensions of sustainability: exploratory evidence from family firms in rural tourism regions', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2017.1374962

Krackhardt, D. (1994), "Crisis in a Cluster: The Roles of Simmelian Ties in Organizations." Manuscript. Carnegie Mellon University, Heinz School of Public Policy.

Kuittinen, H., Kylaheiko, K., Sandstrom, J. and Jauntunen, A. (2008), "Cooperation governance mode: an extended transaction cost approach", *Journal of Management and Governance,* 4, pp. 303-323. DOI: 10.1007/s10997-008-9074-5.

Lee H. T. (2013), "Influence analysis of community resident support for sustainable tourism development", *Tourism Management,* 34, pp. 37-46. 10.1016/j.tourman.2012.03.007

Levin, S. A. (2003), "Complex adaptive systems: Exploring the known, the unknown and the unknowable", *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society,* 40(1), pp. 3-19.

Lindow, C. M., Stubner, S. and Wulf, T. (2010), 'Strategic fit within family firms: The role of family influence and the effect on performance', *Journal of Family Business Strategy*. DOI:

10.1016/j.jfbs.2010.08.004

Mariani, M. and Baggio, R. (2020), "The relevance of mixed methods for network analysis in tourism and hospitality research", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, DOI: 10.1108/IJCHM-04-2019-0378

Marin, B. and Mayntz, R. (1991), *Policy Networks. Empirical Evidence and Theoretical Considerations*, Frankfurt/New York.

McKercher, B. (1999), "A Chaos Approach to Tourism", *Tourism Management,* 20, pp. 425-434. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(99)00008-4

McKercher, B. (2005), "Destinations as Products? A Reflection on Butler's Life cycle", *Tourism Recreation Research,* 30(3), pp. 97-102. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2005.11081491

Memili, E. *et al.* (2018), 'Sustainability practices of family firms: the interplay between family ownership and long-term orientation', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2017.1308371.

Morrison, A., Lynch, P. and Johns, N. (2004), "International tourism networks", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16(3), pp. 197-202. https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110410531195

Murphy, P. E. (1985), *Tourism: A community approach*, London: Methuen.

Neubaum, D. O. (2018). Family business research: Roads travelled and the search for unworn paths. *Family Business Review, 31*(3), 259–270. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486518792948

Nguyen, T. Q. T., Young, T., Johnson, P., & Wearing, S. (2019). Conceptualising networks in sustainable tourism development. *Tourism Management Perspectives, 32*, art. 100575. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2019.100575

Park, S. H. and Zhou, D. (2005), "Firm heterogeneity and competitive dynamics in alliance formation", *Academy of Management Review,* 30(3), pp. 531- 554. DOI: 10.5465/AMR.2005.1729369

Parkhe, A., Wasserman, S. and Ralston, D.A. (2006), "New frontiers in network theory development", *Academy of Management Review,* 31(3), pp. 560- 568. doi:10.5465/AMR.2006.21318917

Pikkemaat, B. and Zehrer, A. (2016), "Innovation and service experiences in small tourism family firms", *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research,* 10(4), pp. 343-360. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCTHR-06-2016-0064

Pratt, C. (2014), "The Spare Heirs and Henriksen resort at Surprise lake", *Journal of Family Business Management*, 4(2), pp. 213-223. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFBM-02-2014-0002

Prell, C., Hubacek, K., Quinn, C. and Reed, M. (2008), "'Who's in the network?' When stakeholders influence data analysis", *Systemic Practice and Action Research,* 21, pp. 443–458. doi:10.1007/s11213-008-9105-9

Ratten, V. (2020), "Tourism entrepreneurship research: a perspective article", *Tourism Review, 75*(1), pp. 122-125.

Ring, P. S. and Van De Ven, A. H. (1994), "Developmental Processes of Cooperative Interorganizational Relationships", *Academy of Management Review*, 19(1). DOI: https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1994.9410122009

Ritchie, J. R. B. and Crouch, G. I. (2003), *The Competitive Destination: A Sustainable Tourism Perspective*. Oxon, UK: CABI Publishing.

Russell, R. (2006), Chaos theory and managerial approaches. In D. Buhalis & C. Costa (Eds.), Tourism Dynamics, Challenges and Tools: Present and Future Issues (pp. 108-115). Oxford Butterworth-Heinemann.

Russell, R. and Faulkner, B. (2004), "Entrepreneurship, Chaos and the Tourism Area Lifecycle", *Annals of Tourism Research,* 31(3), pp. 556-579. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2004.01.008

Sainaghi, R. and Baggio, R. (2014), "Structural social capital and hotel performance: is there a link? *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 37*, pp. 99-110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.11.004

Scott, N., Cooper, C. and Baggio, R. (2008), "Destination Networks - Theory and practice in four Australian cases", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(1), pp. 169-188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2007.07.004

Seaman, C. (2015), "Creating space for the business family: Networks, social capital & family businesses in rural development", *Journal of Family Business Management*, 5(2), pp. 182-191. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFBM-08-2015-0032

Seaman, C., McQuaid, R. and Pearson, M. (2017), "Social networking in family businesses in a local economy", *Local Economy*, *32*(5), pp. 451-466. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269094217722505

Sherer, S.A. (2003), "Critical Success Factors for Manufacturing Networks as Perceived by Network Coordinators", *Journal of Small Business Management,* 41(4), pp. 325-345. DOI: 10.1111/1540-627X.00086

Sherif, M., O. J. Harvey, B. Jack White, William R. Hood and Carolyn W. Sherif. (1961), *Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation: The Robbers Cave Experiment*. Norman, Okla.: Institute of Group Relations

Simmel, G. (1950), *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, edited by K. Wolff. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Sims, R. (2009), "Food, place and authenticity: Local food and the sustainable tourism experience", *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 17(3), pp. 321–336. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580802359293

Song, H. and Li, G. (2008), "Tourism Demand Modelling and Forecasting - A Review of Recent Research", *Tourism Management,* 29, pp. 203-220. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.07.016

Song, H., Dwyer, L., Li, G. and Cao, Z. (2012), "Tourism economics research: A review and assessment", *Annals of Tourism Research,* 39(3), pp. 1653–1682. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2012.05.023

Stafford, K., Duncan K. A. and Dane, S. (1999), "A research model of sustainable family businesses", *Family Business Review*. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-6248.1999.00197.x.

Stouffer, S. A. (1949), *The American Soldier*. New York: Wiley.

Tichy, N. M., Tushman, M. L. and Fombrum, C. (1979), "Social network analysis for organizations", *Academy of Management Review,* 4(4), pp. 507-519. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1979.4498309

Tran, M. T., Jeeva, A. S. and Pourabedin, Z. (2016), "Social network analysis in tourism services distribution channels", *Tourism Management Perspectives* 18, pp. 59-67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2016.01.003

Tsai, W. P. (2001). Knowledge transfer in intraorganizational networks: Effects of network position and absorptive capacity on business-unit innovation and performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*, pp. 996-1004. https://doi.org/10.5465/3069443

Valeri, M. (2016), "Networking and cooperation practices in the Italian tourism business", *Journal of Tourism, Heritage & Services Marketing,* 2(1), pp. 30–35. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.376333

Valeri M. and Baggio R. (2020a), "Social network analysis: organizational implications in tourism management", *International Journal of Organizational Analisys*. DOI: 10.1108/IJOA-12-2019-1971

Valeri M. and Baggio R. (2020b), "Italian tourism intermediaries: a social network analysis exploration", *Current Issues in Tourism*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2020.1777950

Valeri M. and Baggio R. (2020c), "A critical reflection on the adoption of blockchain in tourism", *Journal Information Technology and Tourism.* DOI: 10.1007/s40558-020-00183-1

Watts, D. J. (2004), "The "New" Science of Networks", *Annual Review of Sociology,* 30, pp. 243-270.

Weaver, D.B. (2011), "Organic, incremental and induced paths to sustainable mass tourism convergence", *Tourism Management,* 30(1), pp. 1-8. DOI: 10.1016/j.tourman.2011.08.011

Xiao, H. and Ying, T. (2011), "Knowledge linkage: a social network analysis of tourism dissertation subjects", *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research,* 36(4), pp. 450-477. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348011400745

Yin, X., Wu, J. and Tsai, W. (2012), "When Unconnected Others Connect: Does Degree of Brokerage Persist After the Formation of a Multipartner Alliance", *Organization Science*, 23(6), pp. 1682-1699. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1110.0711.

Ying, T. and Xiao, H. (2012), "Knowledge Linkage: A Social Network Analysis of Tourism Dissertation Subjects", *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 36(4), pp. 450-477. DOI: 10.1177/1096348011400745

Zhang, Z. K., Liu, C., Zhan, X. X., Lu, X., Zhang, C. X. and Zhang, Y. C. (2016), "Dynamics of information diffusion and its applications on complex networks", *Physics Reports, 651*, pp. 1-34.