



Theoretical Framework

Abstract This chapter establishes the theoretical foundation for understanding destination dynamics, particularly in the MICE sector. It thoroughly explores Stakeholder Theory (ST), defining stakeholders as any group or individual who can affect or is affected by an organization's objectives. The chapter examines ST's normative, descriptive and instrumental dimensions, highlighting its role in blending business and ethics by emphasizing value creation for all stakeholders. It delves into stakeholder analysis (identification, stakes, salience based on power, legitimacy and urgency) and stakeholder synthesis (strategic management balancing economic and ethical considerations). Furthermore, it discusses networking and systemic logic, defining a tourist destination as a complex product shaped by coordinated efforts. The "6 A's" model (Access, Attractions, Accommodation, Amenities, Ancillary services, Assemblage) is introduced as a framework for destination analysis. Different network configurations, shared governance, lead organization and network administrative forms are presented as crucial for effective territorial management.

Keywords Stakeholder theory · Destination dynamics · Network configurations

2.1 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: STAKEHOLDER THEORY

Understanding the complex dynamics of destinations, especially within the competitive global context where competition has shifted from individual tourism enterprises to destinations as systemic entities, requires a robust theoretical foundation.

This complexity makes the direct application of managerial tools designed for typical corporate contexts challenging due to differences in resource control, human factor relationships, governance structures and the systemic competitive landscape.

Competitive strategies of individual local actors are shaped by network, aggregation and interconnection schemes. Therefore, the destination competitiveness is derived from the capacity to articulate the potential of its offerings and enhance market visibility through communication and information processes, both at the individual and systemic levels (Ayikoru, 2015).

DMOs play a critical role, engaging in co-design processes to establish system standards and procedures and guiding the development and launch of new tourism products and initiatives (Sainaghi et al., 2019).

The growth of a territorial system is also fundamentally linked to the ability to implement strategies that integrate diverse components, such as economic, social and environmental, by identifying and involving various territorial actors, consolidating their disparate interests into a shared evolutionary plan (Torre, 2025).

Against this backdrop, Stakeholder Theory (ST) emerges as a pertinent theoretical lens. It offers a rationale for the inclusion of various stakeholders within an organization's processes and culture, positing that companies must consider the interests of these stakeholders in their activities (Im & Chung, 2023). Successful organizations are characterized by their emphasis on engagement with diverse stakeholders. Given the multi-faceted nature of destinations and the MICE sector, which involves a wide array of actors, ST provides a framework for understanding these complex relationships and their impact.

The latter is widely recognized as a solid theoretical framework within business ethics and organizational management (Mahajan et al., 2023). Although numerous studies based on ST, many have been confined to functional or niche areas, leaving a gap for a comprehensive understanding of the theory in its entirety.

Fundamentally, a stakeholder is typically defined as any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of an organization's objectives (Freeman, 2023a). This definition includes a broad range of groups and individuals, acknowledging that they may prevent the accomplishment of organizational purposes. Such a broad notion includes groups with vastly different values and agendas, potentially even those considered illegitimate from a traditional business standpoint, if they can substantially impact business operations (Dmytriiev & Freeman, 2023). While the concept may be applied practically by focusing on groups with significant impact at a given time, the theoretical definition remains inclusive.

The definition of the term stakeholder has itself been the subject of considerable debate (Sciarelli & Tani, 2013). Over time, different perspectives on stakeholder identification have emerged, broadly categorized as narrow and broad (Sciarelli & Tani, 2015).

The narrow perspective considers only those actors whose relationship is necessary for the organization's survival as legitimate stakeholders, focusing on those who can directly impact the enterprise's economic interests or essential resources. This normative approach directs managerial attention to a select group of significant actors.

In contrast, the broad perspective encompasses all actors who can influence or are influenced by the attainment of organizational goals. This necessitates a comprehensive analysis of the operating environment, mapping these actors and deeply understanding their expectations and motivations. From a managerial standpoint, an excessively rigid definition, limited only to actors directly influenced or those with a legal right, is considered inappropriate as it unduly constrains the theory's scope and hinders managers from considering the full network of relationships the firm is embedded within. This broad view may even extend to including actors who influence other stakeholders without having a direct relationship with the firm (Sciarelli & Tani, 2013).

ST is frequently discussed across three interconnected dimensions: normative, descriptive and instrumental (Friedman & Miles, 2002).

The normative dimension concerns the reason why organizations should take stakeholder interests into account, often rooted in ethical or philosophical principles (Freeman, 2020). It involves the acceptance that stakeholders are persons or groups with legitimate interests in corporate activity, whose interests are of intrinsic value, meaning they merit consideration for their own sake (Friedman & Miles, 2002).

The descriptive dimension focuses on whether stakeholder interests are taken into account, describing how organizations actually behave in relation to their stakeholders. The instrumental dimension assesses the effects of stakeholder management on the achievement of corporate performance goals, suggesting that companies practicing stakeholder management will, *ceteris paribus*, be relatively successful in conventional performance terms like profitability, stability and growth (Freeman, 2020).

While these dimensions are distinct, their muddling can lead to less rigorous analysis. The normative aspect is often considered central for justifying ST as an alternative to shareholder primacy (Freeman, 2023a). ST, in its essence, can be considered as a way to blend business and ethics, allowing for more detailed analyses and narratives about business (Freeman, 2023b).

A key principle of ST is the idea that an organization should be managed to create value for all its stakeholders, not merely a select few. This concept is built around a principle of fairness where various stakeholders participate in the processes of value creation and diffusion (Windsor, 2017). Their involvement is mediated by values and ethical principles.

The value creation process extends beyond purely economic value, recognizing the organization as an open system whose legitimacy to survive is tied to its role in society (Brickson, 2007; Wilson & Post, 2013). Its operations involve more than market transactions, connecting to the broader environment of its stakeholder set through diverse relationships. Value creation processes should involve stakeholders cooperatively, leading to continuous process re-engineering from a stakeholder-oriented perspective (Sciarelli & Tani, 2013).

Managing stakeholders involves two main phases, commonly identified as stakeholder analysis and stakeholder synthesis (Sciarelli & Tani, 2013, 2015).

Stakeholder analysis involves identifying and defining the organization's specific stakeholders, evaluating their stakes (what they care for) and mapping their network of relationships (Roloff, 2008). A key concept guiding stakeholder analysis is salience. It is a multidimensional construct based on the stakeholder's power to influence the organization, the legitimacy of their relationship or claims and the urgency of their claims against the organization (Mitchell et al., 1997; Neville et al., 2011). According to this framework, stakeholders possessing all three attributes (power, legitimacy and urgency) are considered highly relevant and their claims

warrant significant attention. Those with only two attributes are considered, but managers face less pressure to address their expectations, while stakeholders with only one attribute might not be considered relevant (Sciarelli & Tani, 2013).

However, relying solely on broad conceptual categories, such as power, legitimacy and urgency can pose challenges in practice. Applying these criteria to specific stakeholder subcategories often reveals that the degree of power, legitimacy and urgency is contingent on specific factors, including the particular issue at hand, the history of the relationship, the relevant politics and the operating environment (Dunham et al., 2006). This suggests the need for more detailed, particularizing work to gain deeper insights beyond broad theoretical categories.

Stakeholder synthesis, the subsequent phase, focuses on the strategic management of the identified relationships. This involves balancing economic considerations with ethical values, moving beyond purely economic rules to implement ethical principles such as justice, transparency and equity in business activities (Sciarelli & Tani, 2015). Adopting a systemic view is crucial, emphasizing the integration of complementary stakeholder interests rather than simply minimizing relationship risks.

Traditional approaches to ST have often focused on defining, identifying and managing individual, dyadic relationships. However, a growing stream of literature highlights the necessity of analyzing the whole structure of the relationships network in which the organization is embedded (Papaluca & Tani, 2020). This network perspective argues that managing relationships with individual stakeholders in isolation is insufficient; the interconnectedness within the network significantly influences dynamics. The network structure and its properties can help understand how relationships might evolve over time, enabling a more proactive strategic approach.

The network approach recognizes that the way an organization treats one stakeholder can significantly influence its relationships with other stakeholders. Consequently, the management of relationships generates a global effect that is greater than the sum of the direct effects on each relationship viewed separately (Byrd, 2007). This interdependence is linked to the concept of generalized exchange, where the flow of resources or benefits among multiple actors in a network is not always a direct one-to-one exchange and expectations are shaped by the perceived outcomes of

previous interactions within the network (Harrison et al., 2023; Luongo et al., 2023).

Stakeholder engagement (SE) is a critical practical application of ST, particularly in complex environments like destinations and events (Mitchell et al., 2022; Moggi et al., 2024). It is defined as the interaction between a firm and its stakeholders aimed at addressing knowledge problems to improve mutual understanding and, consequently, assist in resolving ethical challenges faced by managers (Mitchell et al., 2022). This aligns with definitions seeing engagement as learning activities involving the creation and diffusion of trust, knowledge and values to build social capital, or as practices undertaken to involve stakeholders positively. Engagement is believed to lead to more ethical practices, enable stakeholders to represent their interests, allow managers to treat stakeholder relationships as valuable assets, facilitate the garnering of contributions, aid in managing risks posed by influential stakeholders, foster collaborative value creation and help establish common ethical ground (Alshukri et al., 2024; Bacq & Aguilera, 2022; Iandolo et al., 2024).

Engaging stakeholders is a means to address knowledge problems, such as irreducible uncertainty, ambiguity, or complexity, that often plague relationships (Townsend et al., 2018). Relational contracts, crucial in managing complexity, require shared values and informal expectations based on mutual collaboration and obligation (Frydlinger et al., 2021). For organizations investing resources in potentially uncertain practices, addressing the conflicting needs of stakeholders, engagement can provide the assurance of continuity necessary for long-term value creation (Mason et al., 2024). Complexity can be managed through boundary-spanning activities and fostering continuous outside-in learning from multiple stakeholders (Mitchell et al., 2022).

Stakeholder engagement is particularly relevant in managing events, including mega-events and in destination management (Pham et al., 2025). Studies on sustainable mega-events highlight the need to understand community impact, accountability and the tools used for engagement (Moggi et al., 2024). An organization's commitment to stakeholder involvement through policy and practice indicates its responsibility; greater engagement correlates with increased accountability and responsibility (Alshukri et al., 2024). It is crucial to identify the proper engagement tool for each specific stakeholder. The degree of involvement in stakeholder engagement can vary, adapting to the different accountability

needs an organization faces. In the context of an event, engagement levels (e.g., recognition, support, dialogue) can differ across its development phases (pre-event, during-event, post-event), shaped by accountability needs and stakeholder claims (Moggi et al., 2024). For instance, pre-event engagement might focus on collecting opinions regarding content and legacy (Derom et al., 2025).

In destination management, stakeholder involvement is essential for sustainable development, especially concerning the creation and utilization of various types of evidence, including empirical research, expert knowledge, practical experience and notably, stakeholders' opinions (Nonet et al., 2022; Pham et al., 2025). While frameworks for sustainable tourism stakeholder involvement exist, they often lack detailed guidance on how involvement is executed, who the key players are, which tools are used and the factors influencing participation. This points to a need for more detailed frameworks and empirical studies on the processes of stakeholder involvement in destination planning and management (Pham et al., 2025).

The tourism industry, including MICE industry, is recognized as a substantial and rapidly expanding global economic force (Aria et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2024). However, its inherent nature involves a complex interplay of positive and negative impacts on destinations, affecting the economy, environment, culture, society and even politics (Byrd, 2007). This complexity necessitates a theoretical framework capable of encompassing the diverse actors involved and understanding their influence and interests.

In this scenario, ST has emerged as a crucial lens for analyzing and managing the multifaceted dynamics of tourism and MICE development (Khazaei et al., 2015; Muresherwa et al., 2022; Sciarelli & Tani, 2015).

Originating formally in strategic management with Freeman's work in 1984, ST posits that an organization's success is contingent upon effectively managing relationships with various groups and individuals who can affect or be affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives (Fares et al., 2021; Im & Chung, 2023; Papaluca & Tani, 2020).

In the context of tourism and MICE, this definition extends beyond traditional business concerns to include a wide array of actors within and external to the immediate industry, such as residents, tourists, businesses, government entities, non-profit organizations, educational institutions, environmental groups and future generations (Byrd, 2007; Pham et al., 2025; Yoon & Wang, 2023).

The theory provides a framework to understand how value is created and traded among these interconnected parties (Freeman, 2023c).

A central tenet consistently highlighted in the literature is the fundamental importance of involving and collaborating with stakeholders for the successful and sustainable development of tourism and MICE destinations (Yoon & Wang, 2023).

Sustainable tourism development, in particular, is widely considered unattainable if imposed without due regard for stakeholder interests (Byrd, 2007). Participation in planning and decision-making processes can lead to several beneficial outcomes, including a more informed and educated public, the identification and understanding of diverse interests and potentially the avoidance or mitigation of major conflicts between groups (Pham et al., 2025).

Drawing on Social Exchange Theory, researchers have explored how residents' perceptions of the costs and benefits of tourism influence their support or opposition to its development (Khazaei et al., 2015). Understanding these perceptions through direct engagement, such as surveys or interviews, is crucial for public administrations and DMOs to adopt effective strategies that leverage tourism's benefits while mitigating negative effects.

Insights from residents' opinions hold significant value in shaping policies and services (Aria et al., 2023). Similarly, in mega-events like World Exhibitions, stakeholder engagement is pivotal for enhancing value creation, particularly through the event's legacy (Moggi et al., 2024). Legacy, comprising tangible and intangible structures remaining after the event, creates long-term value for the host community.

Collaboration among stakeholders is also presented as essential, especially in the MICE industry, which consists of various entities that need to closely cooperate to hold successful events. Enhanced supply chain integration, representing strategic collaboration among MICE stakeholders, has been found to lead to higher corporate performance and destination competitiveness (Yoon & Wang, 2023). This collective function allows entities within a group to achieve higher performance when they collaborate.

Furthermore, stakeholder engagement can serve as a mechanism for addressing complex knowledge problems (such as risk, ambiguity, complexity, equivocality and uncertainty) and, by doing so, can aid managers in resolving ethical challenges that arise in these contexts (Mitchell et al., 2022). Engaging stakeholders fosters continuous learning

and improves shared understanding between managers and stakeholders. Building relational capital through relationships nurtured by trust, respect, reciprocity and personal connection is also a key aspect of successful collaboration (Della Corte et al., 2021).

The concept of a destination itself can be viewed through a systemic logic, representing a complex supply created through the joint and coordinated efforts of various entities involved in promoting the destination as a whole.

DMOs play a crucial role in managing both internal relationships among diverse actors and external relationships with other stakeholders to enhance the competitiveness of the destination. Implementing territorial strategies requires the identification and involvement of various local actors, converging their interests into a common plan.

Despite the consensus on the importance of stakeholder involvement, the process is acknowledged to be complex and difficult in practice (Mitchell et al., 2022).

A significant challenge lies in the heterogeneous nature of the host community and other stakeholder groups; not all subgroups have equal opportunity or capacity to participate in tourism planning or decision-making (Khazaei et al., 2015). This heterogeneity can manifest in diverse opinions, interests and priorities regarding tourism impacts (Aria et al., 2023).

The traditional top-down approach, where decisions are made by experts, is often perceived by local communities as not reflecting their interests and can lead to conflict (Erdmenger, 2023).

A participatory approach, in contrast, envisions the planner as an agent of social change, where all stakeholders engage in mutual learning (Cornelisse & van Klink, 2025).

Progressive approaches to ST suggest moving towards social transformation, empowering a broader range of stakeholders not only to participate but also to influence or even control the planning process.

Another critical issue is identifying the relevant stakeholders from the multitude of potential ones (Moggi et al., 2024; Sciarelli & Tani, 2013). While an inclusive definition views stakeholders as anyone who can affect or is affected by an organization's objectives (Papaluca & Tani, 2020), practical limitations often necessitate prioritizing engagement (Khazaei et al., 2015).

However, some approaches argue that focusing solely on stakeholders who can affect the organization risks overlooking those who are primarily

affected, potentially marginalizing important interests or even dangerous groups (Dunham et al., 2006).

Moreover, managing relationships often involves navigating conflicting interests (Byrd, 2007; Papaluca & Tani, 2020). ST challenges the notion that managers must simply choose between competing interests (trade-offs); instead, it suggests focusing on creating as much value as possible for stakeholders simultaneously, ideally without resorting to trade-offs (Freeman & Parmar, 2023). This requires a more nuanced understanding of stakeholder dynamics and the ability to integrate diverse value systems. The issue of precisely defining and understanding specific stakeholder groups, such as community, remains a challenge, necessitating a more granular, particularized view rather than a broad, potentially imprecise categorization.

In addition, ST has been widely applied and adapted in tourism research across various areas. Indeed, studies have investigated residents' perceptions of tourism impacts through the lens of ST. The theory has informed research on destination management and planning processes, emphasizing the need for multi-stakeholder involvement (Byrd, 2007; Mahajan et al., 2023; Pham et al., 2025).

Applications extend to specific event contexts, such as mega-events and sport tourism, where stakeholder engagement is analyzed for its role in planning, management, legacy and collaboration (Moggi et al., 2024; Mollah et al., 2021; Muresherwa et al., 2022; Yoon & Wang, 2023).

Research on the MICE industry specifically has examined stakeholder perspectives on competitiveness, facilities and transport systems, as well as complex issues like supply chain integration and disintermediation within distribution channels (Kim et al., 2024).

ST is often interpreted through descriptive/empirical, instrumental and normative lenses (Byrd, 2007; Friedman & Miles, 2002; Im & Chung, 2023; Mahajan et al., 2023).

As regards to tourism research, descriptive studies detail how stakeholders perceive impacts or how firms manage relationships (Im & Chung, 2023; Mahajan et al., 2023).

Instrumental studies examine the link between stakeholder management practices and outcomes like financial performance, destination competitiveness or sustainability (Yoon & Wang, 2023).

Normative perspectives argue how stakeholders should be treated, advocating for ethical principles, inclusivity and accountability in planning and management (Moggi et al., 2024).

Although these aspects are distinct, they are also intertwined, and a holistic understanding of ST suggests they are managerial aspects of creating value (Freeman & Velamuri, 2023).

In conclusion, ST provides a robust and essential framework for understanding and managing the complexities of the MICE sector. Its application helps to identify the diverse actors involved, understand their interests and influence and recognize the critical importance of their engagement and collaboration for sustainable development and overall success.

While challenges related to stakeholder identification, managing heterogeneity and navigating conflicting interests persist, ongoing research continues to refine theoretical approaches and develop practical methodologies for effective stakeholder management. By emphasizing value creation for all stakeholders and integrating ethical considerations into strategic decision-making, ST offers a pathway toward more responsible and sustainable practices within the sector.

2.2 NETWORKING AND SYSTEMIC LOGIC

The identification of tools and approaches for proper territorial management arises from the need to initiate a systemic development process of the destination.

Therefore, it is necessary to clarify the concept of a destination to understand the main activities aimed at the creation and marketing of integrated territorial offers.

According to Tamma (2000), a tourist destination, often referred to in international literature as a “destination”, represents a combination of actors and attractive factors located within a defined space (site, location, area), capable of offering an articulated and integrated tourism offer, i.e., it represents a system of specific and distinctive tourist hospitality that enhances local resources and culture.

From this definition, a unidirectional view of the concept of a destination emerges, as it is defined solely by the logic of the supply side.

A different perspective is offered by those who tend to distinguish between the concept of a coordinated supply on a systemic level and that of a supply on a geographical level, where there is not necessarily coordination for a shared purpose among the various actors.

In this view, a tourist destination does not necessarily coincide with the concept of a coordinated systemic supply, where the outputs of

various actors are strategically aligned towards specific market segments (Quattrociocchi et al., 2017). Specifically, a destination is essentially a geographically defined territorial space capable of offering one or more tourism products, thanks to the presence of natural or artificial attraction factors, without there necessarily being any connection or coordination among the actors operating within the territory; it is sufficient that tourist flows are directed towards a particular area (Errichiello & Micera, 2021). Essentially, according to this interpretation, tourist demand would autonomously qualify a location as a tourist destination, determining the actual value of the offer, even if this offer is uncoordinated or fragmented across a multitude of small activities.

However, it is necessary to adopt an analytical perspective of the destination, defined as “overlapping”, which considers both the logic of demand and supply. In this context, Della Corte (2000) argues that the destination is configured as a complex tourism product from the perspective of demand but is also a complex supply, created through the joint and coordinated efforts of the various entities involved in promoting the destination as a whole.

From this approach, the destination assumes a dual connotation: one concerning the existence of a territory characterized by natural, artistic and cultural resources and the other referring to the product as a complex of activities undertaken to express the offer.

In this perspective, the destination, being a place capable of independently attracting demand, can be defined according to the model of the “6 A’s” (Della Corte, 2020):

- Access, understood both as accessibility to the destination and internal mobility within the destination.
- Attractions, referring to local attraction factors, including natural and artificial resources.
- Accommodation, concerns the destination’s infrastructure (hotel and non-hotel accommodations).
- Amenities, all those services that contribute to creating integrated offer formulas (restaurants, shopping centers, etc.).
- Ancillary services, which may include tours, excursions and city visits, as well as the work of local public bodies.
- Assemblage, the activity focusing on all forms of cooperation and co-production among local tourism actors to create products and experiences for visitors.

Among these, the activity of assemblage proves to be strategic, as the actors in the value chain must combine all the elements contributing to the formation of the “destination” product by developing concrete commercial proposals and creating a dynamic hospitality system on the territory for sustainable tourism development.

From this point of view, the concept of a destination implies a systemic logic in territorial management, considering the complementarity of tourism services and the necessary cooperation between public and private entities in the process of enhancing and promoting local areas (Luongo et al., 2023).

More precisely, the fact that the tourism offer is closely connected to the territory and its resources implies that the entities offering services and those managing and protecting resources (often of a public nature) must be linked through cooperative relationships. According to Pike (2015), the role of local government institutions is fundamental in terms of infrastructure funding needs, cultural heritage protection, setting rules and regulations and addressing social needs.

The collaborative processes established between service providers and public entities represent a potential strategic solution capable of generating sustainable competitive advantages (Della Corte & Aria, 2016).

In particular, the establishment of a collaborative logic among businesses allows them to network complementary resources and competencies, thereby gaining strategic flexibility.

The dynamics of aggregation can follow different logics:

- Territorial logic, identifies realities located in a specific territory.
- Sectoral logic, observes the relationships among businesses.
- Value chain logic, refers to the analysis of all components that, complementarily, characterize a specific type of offer, including relationships among businesses from different sectors but with product or demand affinities.

Regarding collaboration and cooperation processes, these three logics are often complementary or overlapping, as there is a territorial component, as well as a sectoral and value chain component, which involves interrelationships not only between tourism businesses but also with other sectors that contribute to enhancing the local offer.

The close connection with the territory recalls the concept of the industrial district, defined as a socio-territorial entity characterized by the active coexistence, in a defined territorial area, of a community of people and a population of industrial businesses (Rocha & Audretsch, 2022).

The district logic has, over time, been extended from the production sector to other sectors, particularly tourism. In fact, the notion of a district fits well with the dynamics of the tourism sector for two main reasons: the first is that one of the primary objectives of the tourism sector is the enhancement and promotion of the territory, while the second refers to the marked specialization and inter-sectoral complementarity of local businesses (Gazoni & Silva, 2022).

Based on the concept of the tourist district, Pencarelli (2003) distinguishes destinations into two types (the causal district and the district in the strict sense) based on variables such as the level of trust among actors in the system's organization, the willingness to collaborate, both privately and publicly and the presence or absence of a "pivot" entity capable of fulfilling the governance function of the system.

In the causal district, spontaneous forms of supply emerge, with a modest level of trust among operators in the system, an inability to express conscious forms of collaboration and a lack of unified governance of the supply.

In the district in the strict sense, there is a high level of trust in the system, awareness of organized action and collaboration among all actors, who voluntarily appoint a pivot entity capable of effectively managing interdependencies and strategically designing the offer in response to market variability and the competitive landscape.

In the literature on tourist districts, other authors propose a distinction between "network districts" and "constellation districts" based on different relational structures (Li et al., 2022; Luongo et al., 2023).

In the first type, the actors are aware of creating a unified product whose competitiveness depends on the ability of the district participants to act collectively, guided by common and shared objectives. In this framework, the connection between operators in the supply system is no longer spontaneous or causal but is consciously organized into a strategically oriented unified offer, without the presence of an institutional leader figure. Instead, this role is implicitly assumed by one of the local supply actors based on a collaborative scheme in which the principles of participant equality and shared goals prevail.

In the constellation district, nearly all the elements of the network are present (collaborative forms, mutual trust, awareness of organized action), but there is hierarchical asymmetry among the district's actors, as one entity assumes the pivot role and performs the strategic governance function of the offer. In this configuration, governance decisions depend on the entity that designed and implemented the district using a top-down approach.

In any case, for such a system to function, a form of governance is required.

REFERENCES

- Alshukri, T., Seun Ojekemi, O., Öz, T., & Alzubi, A. (2024). The interplay of corporate social responsibility, innovation capability, organizational learning and sustainable value creation: Does stakeholder engagement matter? *Sustainability*, 16(13), 5511.
- Aria, M., D'Aniello, L., Della Corte, V., & Pagliara, F. (2023). Balancing tourism and conservation: analysing the sustainability of tourism in the city of Naples through citizen perspectives. *Quality & Quantity*, 1–21.
- Ayikoru, M. (2015). Destination competitiveness challenges: A Ugandan perspective. *Tourism Management*, 50, 142–158.
- Bacq, S., & Aguilera, R. V. (2022). Stakeholder governance for responsible innovation: A theory of value creation, appropriation and distribution. *Journal of Management Studies*, 59(1), 29–60.
- Brickson, S. L. (2007). Organizational identity orientation: The genesis of the role of the firm and distinct forms of social value. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 864–888.
- Byrd, E. T. (2007). Stakeholders in sustainable tourism development and their roles: Applying stakeholder theory to sustainable tourism development. *Tourism review*, 62(2), 6–13.
- Cornelisse, M., & van Klink, A. (2025). Exploring participatory scenario planning for sustainable urban tourism development. *Research in Hospitality Management*, 15(1), 23–25.
- Della Corte, V. (2000). La gestione dei sistemi locali di offerta turistica, Cedam, Padova.
- Della Corte, V. (2020). Imprese e sistemi turistici. Terza edizione, Egea.
- Della Corte, V., & Aria, M. (2016). Coopetition and sustainable competitive advantage. The case of tourist destinations. *Tourism Management*, 54, 524–540.
- Della Corte, V., Aria, M., Del Gaudio, G., Barney, J. B., Cobanoglu, C., & Sepe, F. (2021). The relevance of relational capabilities in collaborative

- decisions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33(12), 4391–4417.
- Derom, I., Taks, M., Potwarka, L. R., Snelgrove, R., Wood, L., & Teare, G. (2025). How pre-event engagement and event type are associated with spectators' cognitive processing at two swimming events. *Journal of Global Sport Management*, 10(1), 84–108.
- Dmytriiev, S. D., & Freeman, R. E. (Eds.). (2023). *R. Edward Freeman's selected works on stakeholder theory and business ethics* (Vol. 53). Springer nature.
- Dunham, L., Freeman, R. E., & Liedtka, J. (2006). Enhancing stakeholder practice: A particularized exploration of community. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 16(1), 23–42.
- Erdmenger, E. C. (2023). The end of participatory destination governance as we thought to know it. *Tourism Geographies*, 25(4), 1104–1126.
- Errichiello, L., & Micera, R. (2021). A process-based perspective of smart tourism destination governance. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 29, 2909–2909.
- Fares, J., Chung, K. S. K., & Abbasi, A. (2021). Stakeholder theory and management: Understanding longitudinal collaboration networks. *Plos one*, 16(10), e0255658.
- Freeman, R. E. (2000). Business ethics at the millennium. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 10(1), 169–180.
- Freeman, R. E. (2020). The stakeholder approach revisited. In *Wirtschafts- und unternehmensethik* (pp. 657–671). Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.
- Freeman, R. E. (2023a). Stakeholder management: Framework and philosophy. In *R. Edward Freeman's selected works on stakeholder theory and business ethics* (pp. 61–88). Springer International Publishing.
- Freeman, R. E. (2023b). The politics of stakeholder theory: Some future directions. In *R. Edward Freeman's selected works on stakeholder theory and business ethics* (pp. 119–132). Springer International Publishing.
- Freeman, R. E. (2023c). Business ethics at the Millennium. In *R. Edward Freeman's selected works on stakeholder theory and business ethics* (pp. 741–752). Springer International Publishing.
- Freeman, R. E., & Parmar, B. L. (2023). Managing for stakeholders and the purpose of business. In *R. Edward Freeman's Selected Works on Stakeholder Theory and Business Ethics* (pp. 281–294). Springer International Publishing.
- Freeman, R. E., & Velamuri, S. R. (2023). A new approach to CSR: Company stakeholder responsibility. In *R. Edward Freeman's Selected Works on Stakeholder Theory and Business Ethics* (pp. 251–264). Springer International Publishing.

- Frydinger, D., Vitasek, K., Bergman, J., & Cummins, T. (2021). *Contracting in the new economy: using relational contracts to boost trust and collaboration in strategic business relationships*. Springer Nature.
- Gazoni, J. L., & Silva, E. A. M. D. (2022). System Dynamics framework for tourism development management. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 25(15), 2457–2478.
- Harrison, J. S., Ho, V. T., Bosse, D. A., & Crilly, D. (2023). A configurational theory of generalized exchange in stakeholder-oriented firms. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 37(1), 16–36.
- Im, J., & Chung, Y. K. (2023). Exploring diversity, equity, and inclusion in hospitality and tourism firms through the organizational justice and stakeholder theories. *Tourism Management*, 95, 104662.
- Khazaei, A., Elliot, S., & Joppe, M. (2015). An application of stakeholder theory to advance community participation in tourism planning: The case for engaging immigrants as fringe stakeholders. *Journal of sustainable tourism*, 23(7), 1049–1062.
- Kim, S., Williady, A., Wang, J., & Kim, H. S. (2024). A mixed-method approach to grounded theory regarding the MICE industry at Busan Exhibition & Convention Center. *Tourism and Hospitality*, 5(4), 1012–1027.
- Iandolo, F., La Sala, A., Turriziani, L., & Caputo, F. (2024). Stakeholder engagement in managing systemic risk management. *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility*.
- Li, Y., Gong, G., Zhang, F., Gao, L., Xiao, Y., Yang, X., & Yu, P. (2022). Network structure features and influencing factors of tourism flow in rural areas: Evidence from China. *Sustainability*, 14(15), 9623.
- Luongo, S., Sepe, F., & Del Gaudio, G. (2023). Regional innovation systems in tourism: The role of collaboration and competition. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 9(4), Article 100148.
- Mahajan, R., Lim, W. M., Sareen, M., Kumar, S., & Panwar, R. (2023). Stakeholder theory. *Journal of Business Research*, 166, 114104.
- Mason, M. C., Iacuzzi, S., Zamparo, G., & Garlatti, A. (2024). How do stakeholders co-create value in a service ecosystem? Insight from Mega-Events. *Management Decision*, 62(13), 398–425.
- Mitchell, J. R., Mitchell, R. K., Hunt, R. A., Townsend, D. M., & Lee, J. H. (2022). Stakeholder engagement, knowledge problems and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 175, 75–94.
- Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4), 853–886.
- Moggi, S., Giacomo, F., & Elisa, I. (2025). Enhancing value creation through stakeholder engagement in sustainable mega-events: the case of expo 2020

- Dubai legacy. *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility*, 34(4), 1928–1941.
- Mollah, M. R. A., Cuskelly, G., & Hill, B. (2021). Sport tourism collaboration: A systematic quantitative literature review. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 25(1), 3–25.
- Muresherwa, G., Tichaawa, T. M., & Swart, K. (2022). Developing event tourism in Zimbabwe: Opportunities and challenges amid the Covid-19 pandemic. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 11(3), 1259–1272.
- Neville, B. A., Bell, S. J., & Whitwell, G. J. (2011). Stakeholder salience revisited: Refining, redefining, and refueling an underdeveloped conceptual tool. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102, 357–378.
- Nonet, G. A. H., Gössling, T., Van Tulder, R., & Bryson, J. M. (2022). Multi-stakeholder engagement for the sustainable development goals: Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 180(4), 945–957.
- Papaluca, O., & Tani, M. (2020). Network Centrality and Homophily in Stakeholder Relationship Management: The Effects on a Social Enterprise's Decision-Making Process. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 15, (10.5539).
- Pencarelli T. (2003), *Lecture di economia e management delle organizzazioni turistiche*, Edizioni Goliardiche, Trieste.
- Pham, K., Andereck, K. L., & Vogt, C. A. (2025). Stakeholders' involvement in an evidence-based sustainable tourism plan. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 33(4), 673–696.
- Pike, S. (2015). *Destination marketing: Essentials*. Routledge.
- Quattrociocchi, B., Mercuri, F., Calabrese, M., & Perano, M. (2017). Tourism supply chain & strategic partnerships for managing the complexity in tourism industry. *Enlightening Tourism*, 7(1), 62–93.
- Rocha, H., & Audretsch, D. B. (2022). Entrepreneurial ecosystems, regional clusters, and industrial districts: Historical transformations or rhetorical devices? *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 1–24.
- Roloff, J. (2008). Learning from multi-stakeholder networks: Issue-focused stakeholder management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82, 233–250.
- Sainaghi, R., De Carlo, M., & d'Angella, F. (2019). Development of a tourism destination: Exploring the role of destination capabilities. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 43(4), 517–543.
- Sciarelli, M., & Tani, M. (2013). Network approach and stakeholder management. *Business Systems Review (ISSN 2280-3866) Volume, 2*, 175–190.
- Sciarelli, M., & Tani, M. (2015). Sustainability and stakeholder approach in Olivetti from 1943 to 1960: a lesson from the past. *Sinergie Italian Journal of Management*, 33, (Jan–Apr), 19–36.

- Tamma, M. (2000). Aspetti strategici del destination management. In H. Pechlaner, & K. Weiermair (Eds.), *Destination management*. Touring Editore.
- Torre, A. (2025). Contribution to the theory of territorial development: A territorial innovations approach. *Regional Studies*, 59(1), 2193218.
- Townsend, D. M., Hunt, R. A., McMullen, J. S., & Sarasvathy, S. D. (2018). Uncertainty, knowledge problems, and entrepreneurial action. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(2), 659–687.
- Wilson, F., & Post, J. E. (2013). Business models for people, planet (& profits): Exploring the phenomena of social business, a market-based approach to social value creation. *Small Business Economics*, 40, 715–737.
- Windsor, D. (2017). Value creation theory: Literature review and theory assessment. *Stakeholder Management*, 75–100.
- Yoon, T. H., & Wang, S. (2023). How important is stakeholder collaboration in the mice industry: Antecedents and outcomes of supply chain integration. *Sustainability*, 15(20), 14966.