

Aliu, Armando; Parlak, Bekir; Aliu, Dorian
HYBRID STRUCTURES IN TOURISM INDUSTRY Innovative Models, Sociological Insights and Multilevel
Approaches
Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo, vol. 23, núm. 4, octubre-, 2014, pp. 834-851
Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Turísticos
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Available in: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=180732145011>



Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo,
ISSN (Printed Version): 0327-5841
cietr@uolsinectis.com.ar
Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Turísticos
Argentina

HYBRID STRUCTURES IN TOURISM INDUSTRY

Innovative Models, Sociological Insights and Multilevel Approaches

Armando Aliu^{*}

University of Heidelberg - Germany

Bekir Parlak^{**}

Uludag University - Turkey

Dorian Aliu^{***}

Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University -Turkey

Abstract: *The aim of this study is to examine the new trends in the hybridity research area and clarify the convergence of interests of state actors, private actors and civil society actors. Hybridity is perceived as a 'multidimensional phenomenon' and 'new paradigm' in tourism industry. The effective collaboration amongst public sector – private sector – civil society can be attained likelihood with taking into account regional governance and multilevel governance. Hybridity at global governance level covers 'decentration' (supra: centralisation and infra: decentralisation) which includes the nexus of 'voice' (democratic participation) and 'entitlement' (legal-social rights and duties). In this framework, this study explores state and non-state interactions at multiple levels and attempts to clarify how hybridisation provides triple win solution for state actors, private actors and civil society actors related issues in realm of theory/praxis dichotomy. Through enhancing legitimacy and effectiveness of the activities and efforts of non-state actors in the framework of (quasi)indirect centralisation process, states ensure reciprocal understanding. In this study, constructivism was followed as paradigmatic research method.*

KEYWORDS: *hybridity, destination governance, regional tourism development, stakeholders, public sphere*

Resumen: *El objetivo de este estudio es examinar las nuevas tendencias en el área de investigación de hibridación y clarificar la convergencia de los intereses de los actores estatales, actores privados y los sectores de la sociedad civil. La hibridación es percibida como un "fenómeno multidimensional" y "nuevo paradigma" en la industria del turismo. La colaboración efectiva entre el sector público, el sector privado y la sociedad civil puede ser probablemente lograda tomando en cuenta la gobernanza regional y la gobernanza en múltiples niveles. La hibridación a nivel de la gobernanza global cubre 'descentración' (supra- centralización e Infra-descentralización) que incluye los nexos de la 'voz' (participación democrática) y la 'calificación' (legal-social derechos y deberes). En este marco, este estudio explora el estado y las interacciones no-estatales en múltiples niveles y los intentos para aclarar cómo la hibridación ofrece ganancias triples para actores estatales, actores privados y para los actores de la sociedad civil en aspectos relacionados con la dicotomía teoría/práctica. Aumentando la legitimidad y la eficacia de las actividades y esfuerzos de los actores*

^{*} Postgraduate Scholar at Heidelberg University (Germany). He holds an M.A. degree in European Studies from Hamburg University. He is the Co-Principal Investigator (CPI) of the Hybridity Project. E-mail: aliu@stud.uni-heidelberg.de

^{**} Presently working in the Department of Public Administration at Uludag University (Turkey). He is Professor and Chair of the Department of Administrative Sciences. He holds a B.A. and an M.A. degree from Uludag University and a PhD degree from Cumhuriyet University. He is the Principal Investigator (PI) and Advisor of the Hybridity Project. E-mail: bepar@uludag.edu.tr

^{***} Holds a B.A. degree from Uludag University and an M.B.A. degree from Akdeniz University. He is a PhD student in Business Administration at Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University (Turkey). He is the Project Coordinator of the Hybridity Project. E-mail: dorianaliu@gmail.com

no estatales en el marco del proceso de centralización (casi) indirecto, los Estados aseguran la comprensión recíproca. En este estudio, el constructivismo fue utilizando como método de investigación paradigmático.

PALABRAS CLAVE: hibridez, destino gobernanza, desarrollo turístico regional, asociados, esfera pública

INTRODUCTION

Hybrid structures stand out as a new governance model of 21st century. In fact, these structures which are established amongst government, market and civil society will enhance democratic participation and interaction in quasi-indirect centralisation process (at supra level) and quasi-decentralisation process (at infra level).

In some key researches, the development of multiscalar policies impacts on power relations has been argued for enrichment of the 'tourism destination governance' notion (Church 2004; Hall and Jenkins 2004; Beritelli, Bieger and Laesser 2007; Baggio, Scott and Cooper 2010; Callaghan 2010; d'Angella, de Carlo and Sainaghi 2010; Haugland et al. 2011; Zahra 2011; Pechlaner, Volgger and Herntrei 2012; Pechlaner et al. 2012; Dredge and Jamal 2013). At the planning process of multilevel destination governance, in a quite high amount of studies has been attached considerable attention to the nexus amongst collaboration theory and community involvement through selection of key stakeholders (Bramwell and Sharman 1999; Trousdale 1999; Göymen 2000; Araujo and Bramwell 2002; Jackson and Murphy 2006; Cooper, Scott and Baggio 2009, d'Angella and Go 2009; Presenza and Cipollina 2010; Hultman and Hall 2012).

At the heart of the collaboration theory, there has been a shift from 'state-private partnership' (Jamal and Getz 1995; Jackson and Murphy 2006; Page 2007; Bills 2010; Aliu 2011) to 'state-private-civil society collaboration' which is also accepted as 'hybridity'. Recently, many respected scholars all around the world have pointed out the importance of hybridity notion (i.e. the collaboration of state and non-state actors) and published many scientific works regarding hybrid model. In this context, this research mainly analyses the reasons behind the purpose of such an increasing demand and illustrates why the usages and quotations of these notions (e.g. hybridity, hybrid model, and hybrid organisations) are keeping up (Anheier and Siebel 1990; Anheier and Toepler 1999; Evers 2005; Mückenberger 2008; Bills 2010; Aliu 2011; Herrmann 2011; Aliu 2012a; Aliu 2013; Dreher and Baechtold 2013).

Hybridity has been emerged on the base of critical tourism approach. Thus, the involvement of civil society to the state and private partnerships has become very crucial and even vital/moral for the enhancement of the third sector in tourism industry (Young 2004; Tribe 2008; Bramwell and Lane 2011; Bramwell 2011; Hung, Sirakaya-Turk and Ingram 2011; Tribe 2011; Aliu 2012a; Aliu 2012b; Caton 2012; Nodar 2012; Aliu 2013; Hall 2013; Platenkamp and Botterill 2013).

The involvement of non-state actors to central governmental works at national level and municipality works at local level in theory provides a quasi-decentralisation process, however with effective hybridity it turns out to a quasi-indirect centralisation process which enhances the image and development of states' authorities. Moreover, the institutions of the European Union have attained joint actions with non-state actors at various levels, provided that state and non-state collaborations have been ranged in between multilevel governance perspectives and regional governance.

The research questions of this study are generated and listed as follows: Rq₁: Has “Public Sector – Private Sector – Civil Society” triangle (hybridity) a significant effect on (quasi)indirect centralisation and enhancement of the authority/position of political actors (Elites) in tourism industry? Rq₂: Can hybridity balance the public and private sphere dichotomy effectively? Rq₃: Has hybridity a significant influence on political atmosphere, political economy of interest mediation and organisational sociology? Rq₄: Has hybridity a positive impact on the strategic operations of voluntary sector and nonprofit organisations?

Rq₅: Can hybridity affect the heterogeneity and pluralism level of state and non-state actors and provide that states are embedded with non-state actors in actor constellations in equal order, and at least of the plurality of opinion development processes? Rq₆: Can hybridity preserve stability of states and ensures incremental improvements at institution-based platforms? Rq₇: Has hybridity a significant effect on the consciousness level of foundationalism, cooperationalism, institutionalism, social responsibility and philanthropic actions/global philanthropy? Rq₈: Can ‘voice – entitlement’ nexus on the one hand, and ‘legitimacy – effectiveness’ on the other, be clarified in the context of regional governance and multilevel governance as are applied in tourism industry? (Hirschman 1993; Mückenberger 2012).

METHODOLOGY

In this study, constructivism was followed as paradigmatic research method. Constructivism, broadly conceived, is the thesis that knowledge cannot be a passive reflection of reality, but has to be more of an active construction by an agent. Although this view has its roots in the ideas of Kant, the term was first coined by Piaget to denote the process whereby an individual constructs its view of the world (Healy and Perry 2000; Zahra and Ryan 2005; Moutinho 2012).

A contemporary dispute within constructivist social science is evidenced in the systems theory concept of autopoiesis. Systems theory researchers, while acknowledging the constructivist activity of the mind, argue that science can offer something other than just scientific constructions. There is something more to science than science. What emerges from the empirical process in systems theory is access to a set of self-regulating structures that are uninfluenced by human agency – a concept similar to the idea of the selforganising and operationally closed systems of natural science (Botterill 2001).

As a consequence, from ontological viewpoint, constructivism covers relativistic approach which acknowledges the fact that knowledge is socially constructed, local, and specific (Riley and Love 2000). From epistemological viewpoint, constructivism is subjectivistic (i.e. knowledge created and coproduced by researcher and subject). From methodological viewpoint, constructivism contains a process of reconstructing multiple realities through informed consensus. Thus our research has a mainstream methodology understanding (theoretical-constructivistic) and the reason of this is twofold.

Initially, the author of this research paper is conducting a large-scale research project which is currently implementing in Turkey and will be applied to the Eastern European Countries (EEC) soon. Concerning with the methodology, the project team is planning to produce statistical datasets in SPSS, STATA and MATLAB in order to ensure an opportunity that allows scientists who are interested in our research areas to work on positivistic/empirical works. The lack of statistical datasets in this area is a huge issue that we will tackle on through creating “Hybridity Codebook” within the three year duration of the project (2013-2016). Therefore, making theoretical elaborations and comparing interpretative approaches those ground on the theoretical perspectives are research tools of this research and thus an attempt is to attach considerable attention to the interpretations of the world’s leading Scholars in this area. Hypothetically, the research questions of this research were compared with the arguments and assertions of these Scholars.

Secondly, the EU member states within the EU supranational/multilevel structure and the EU candidate states that are likely to join these structures in the future, have been analysed and compared for better contextualisation of the hybridity notion.

HYBRID STRUCTURES

Sociologists argued hybridity as an indispensable collaboration and voluntary or strategic efforts of state actors, private actors and non-profit organisations. In this respect, the third sector which essentially has characteristics of heterogeneity and pluralism rather than homogeneity and isomorphism was argued for engagement in between public and private dichotomy (Anheier and Seibel 1990; Anheier and Toepler 1999).

From hybridity perspective, this kind of innovative governance implies that non-state actors are involved in decision-making in order to provide common goods and that non-hierarchical means of guidance are employed. Where there is innovative governance, non-state actors may independently engage in self-regulation, or a regulatory task may have been delegated to them by a public authority, or they may be regulating jointly with a public actor. This interaction may occur across levels – ‘vertically’ or across arenas – ‘horizontally’ (Héritier 2002; Mückenberger 2012). Three advantages for non-state actors involvement in multilevel governance are as follows: i) know-how provided by experts from associations and enterprises; ii) interest aggregation by associations, on a functional as well as territorial level, allowing for negotiations, reliability of achieved agreements and homogenisation of interests across levels; and iii) compensation for the loss of democratic legitimacy by governments.

With these facts in mind, multilevel governance emphasise on the growing importance of both horizontal and vertical interdependence in the context of European integration, i.e. between actors located at different territorial levels and from public, private, and voluntary sectors (Bache and Chapman 2008). This is exactly the point where state and non-state actors interact and the base of hybridity emerges.

Functionally, the hybrid model covers state actors (government, municipality and so on) and non-state actors (private actors, civil society organisations, NGOs, Lobby Groups and so on) that are equally participating in various industries. The cooperation of public – private – civil society parts has an effective role at creating strategies, determining plans and forecasting models (Aliu 2011: 1331).

Hybrid structures emerge on a blurring base of pluralism, corporatism and network approaches. Statism ought to be distinguished from others because state authority, command and control mechanisms are very crucial elements for state actors and particularly for the political actors (elites) who are leading states and holding power relations with non-state actors (Mückenberger 2012). Thus the driving force of hybridity is the role and purpose of states' political elites.

Hybrid Structures and the Third Way Approach

Hybridity lies behind the understanding of third way approach (Giddens 1998; Blair 1998; Giddens 2000; Etzioni 2000; and Jordan 2010). The third way has the potential for sustainable growth at national, regional, and local levels, civic transformations, human development, local-global partnerships/networks, consumption patterns and the effect on culture (Burns 2004). On the other side, Jordan raised his critics of the third way through looking to international financial crisis and Eurozone sovereign debt crisis, and he considered the third way as failure because of being unsuccessful at regulating morality in economic and social relations (Jordan 2010). Ideally, hybridity looks into various communities, associations, unions and organisations to form an engaged and networked society. Indeed, it tries to shape a hybrid society.

The distinction between the hybrid model and the third way idea is that the hybrid model seeks for approaching governance equilibrium in terms of the interest of state, economy and civil society from a broader perspective. Whereas, the third way idea looks more into political doctrines to create better political rhetoric for political actors of centre left. Thus, the third way approach has disequilibrium between theory and practice. It explains how the ideal policies ought to be; however, in practice it is vague that to which issues it provides solutions in real terms.

With these facts in mind, if we consider hybridity in the EU structures, we may acknowledge that there are many institutions of the EU which continue working on structuring partnership platforms. For instance, the Committee of the Regions has published a White Paper on multilevel governance that covers perspectives for a partnership-based European Union amongst 2020-2030 (Bekemans 2012).

Consequently, Habermas argued that developing the idea of theory of society conceived with a practical intention. He stated that political theory cannot aim at instructing the state what it should be like, but rather instead how the state – the moral universal – should be known (Habermas, 1988). Therefore, a convergence of the two systems on the middle ground of a controlled mass democracy within the welfare state is not to be excluded (Ibid). Likewise, Esping-Andersen argues that the state, the market economy and the family – a community archetype – are the three basic welfare pillars of society (Evers 2005). As a consequence, hybrid structures lay behind Esping-Andersen's understanding and arguments which have implications of the impact of what is labelled as state, community and societal or market-principles (Esping-Andersen 1990; Esping-Andersen 1999).

Hybridity and Quasi-Indirect Centralisation: Governance by Governments for Decentring the Multifold Hybrid Structure

Quasi-indirect centralisation has the potential to shape the collaboration level with the leadership and central authority of state. Certainly, the 'fundamental rights' enforce the participation with equal opportunity in 'social rewards' (Habermas 1988) and political institutions ought to be attained through quasi-indirect centralisation. Habermas sought to formulate a quasi-indirect centralisation process in between state-private relationships and full-centralisation in between state and civil society actors (excluding private sector). This can be accepted as a strong counter-argument towards Anheier's research outcomes. Indeed, perhaps researchers are tending to unnotice the emerging debate amongst these two different perspectives – i.e. the debate of public sphere (Habermasian) versus private sphere (Arendtian).

A similar Habermasian approach has been put forward by Moutinho (2000) who suggested a state-non-state collaboration in the context of quasi-indirect centralisation. According to Moutinho, the tourism industry is dominated by private firms and small businesses across a broad spectrum of sectors, including transport, accommodation and attractions. Thus, the public sector has a key role to play in the successful development of tourism in a particular locality. Public sector intervention is necessary to ensure that the associated benefits of tourism are maximised and any potential problems are minimised for the benefit of the state sector, private sector and civil society (p.3).

In the light of these considerations, hybridity is likely to shape the world's multi-dimensional transformation process. With respect to this great transformation (using the terminology of Polanyi), multilateralism, regionalisation and multipolarity caused emerging of new regional powers in the world. Monopoly powers are oligopolised and this situation has balanced global powers because of the rising competitiveness level at both international and transnational level, and therefore the hybrids in various countries have been proliferating abruptly.

Moreover, the economic power shift from the western countries to the BRICs (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) and East Asia and Pacific countries has prepared a base for the rise of hybrid

model. The rise of middle classes and Small-Medium-size Enterprises (SMEs) in these countries is a good evidence for effective hybridisation via national private actors in modern nation states (Aliu 2012c).

There are several crises as turning points towards the transformation and emergence of a new order. If one succeeds to reinterpret both categories - networks and norms - within the context of decentration they lose their limitations in terms of national states or any geographic border and become suitable tools for analysing and investigating world societal change (Mückenberger 2012).

Decentration, to be differentiated from decentralisation as well as deconcentration, stands for the simultaneity of the globalisation as well as the localisation of important economic and political decision-making processes. So far, society has shown itself to have 'gravitation centres' with a layered and defined legitimate decision-making authority – i.e. centres with regard to which subjects could draw on 'voice' and have 'entitlements.' Decentration has caused the reciprocity of voice (representation) and entitlement (clearly defined right/duty constellation regarding the access to services and protection, etc.) to lose its former material basis, either in part or entirely (Hirschman 1993; Mückenberger 2008).

In hybrid model, the embeddedness of states with non-state actors in actor constellations in which they do not act on the basis of sovereignty, but of equal circumstances, reflects the reason why many cases of hybrid development situated between of which is categorised as sovereign within the state and that which is categorised as pertaining to private law (Mückenberger 2008). Therefore, distinguishing these cases is very complicated because these can become an amalgam which is not only a part of private law but also it is a part of public law.

To be more precise, this is a challenge that non-state actors or sovereignty-free actors influence deeply the inter-state system's monopoly of authority. There is a power shift from state to non-state actors, as sovereignty-free actors link up and operate across state borders as part of transnational networks (Aliu 2012a). The current transformation of governance for political concepts such as central authority, sovereignty, decentralisation and democratic legitimacy is to balance the tendency towards theoretical complexity with the need for simplicity to avoid replicating the multidimensional/multicausal nature of world politics (Dingwerth and Pattberg 2006).

From this perspective, there is an examination of the transfer of authority, the distribution of power, the efficiency of participatory and representative democracy, coherence/openness (Herrmann 2011) enhancement of legitimacy, sovereignty and accountability. The centralisation at national level and decentralisation at local level provides a new approach such as 'centralised decentralisation' (Yüksel, Bramwell and Yüksel 2005; Kimbu and Ngoasong 2013) and/or quasi-indirect centralisation.

Quasi-indirect centralisation ought to include an amalgamation of communicative action – i.e. oriented to reaching understanding and strategic action – i.e. oriented to the actor's success

(Habermas 1990). With this mainstream approach, participants implicitly raise and reciprocally recognise possible consensus that carries action in common. Strategic action remains indifferent with respect to its motivational conditions, whereas the consensual presuppositions of communicative action can secure motivations. Thus, strategic actions must be institutionalised, that is embedding in intersubjectively binding norms that guarantee the fulfilment of the motivational conditions (Habermas 1979). According to the implications of the communicative action, based on the system theory of society of Niklas Luhmann, Garcia (2007) proposes to conceive tourism as a communicative social action which sounds like a Habermasian approach. This allows distinguishing the interaction, the organisations and the functional systems of the ample complexity of tourism by its diversity of sense.

From ontological point of view, Giddens supported Habermas' communicative action theory (Giddens 1991). To achieve a better theory-practice nexus, Giddens created the theory of structuration which is an interaction of objectivism (Marx) and subjectivism (Weber). Broadwise, structuration theory can be a guide for the hybrid model.

Hybridity and Public Sphere

The public sphere means a realm of our social life in which public opinion can be formed. Access is guaranteed to all citizens. The state authority is usually considered 'public' authority, but it derives its task of caring for the well-being of all citizens primarily from this aspect of the public sphere. The public sphere itself appears as a specific domain – i.e. the public domain versus the private (Habermas 1974; Habermas 1996; Durham and Kellner 2006). The public sphere is the space of communication of ideas and projects that emerge from society and are addressed to the decision makers in the institutions of society. The relationships between government and civil society and their interaction via the public sphere define the polity of society (Castells 2008). Public diplomacy seeks to build a public sphere in which diverse voices can be heard and entitlement can be distributed.

The public sphere is structured by representative individuals who are analogous to representative democracy found in electoral institutions. These representatives make public values present in their constituencies. The consequences of a representative public sphere include the development of a sense of deliberative justice on the part of the citizenry and the reduction of the possibility of domination and oppression by ideologically oriented elites (Rautenfeld 2005). In the light of these clarifications, the concept of representation has been preserved down to the most recent constitutional doctrine, and thus representation can occur only in public because there is no representation that would be a private matter ideologically oriented by elites. Therefore, civil society came into existence as the corollary of a depersonalised state authority. Activities and dependencies hitherto relegated to the framework of the household economy emerged from this confinement into the public sphere (Habermas 1989).

Anheier (1991) examined quasi-nongovernmental hybrid forms and the relation between the public sphere and the voluntary sector in Germany. He found out that the public sphere is institutionally embedded between state and society and located amongst the decentralised public sector and the centralising tendencies in civic society. Likewise, there are many Scholars who framed a liberal democratic image of a public sphere and stressed that the emergence of values, conflicts and new subjects of public discourse do not take place in the official public sphere – 'Öffentlichkeit' but in the counter-public spheres or alternative spheres 'Gegen-öffentlichkeiten' that cover alternative media, public space, green public sphere, internet, new public sphere and so forth (Anheier and Seibel 1990; Calhoun 1993; Anheier and Toepler 1999; Calhoun 1999; Garber 2001; Downey and Fenton 2003; Yang and Calhoun 2007; Dredge and Whitford 2011).

HYBRIDITY, COLLABORATIVE APPROACH AND MULTILEVEL GOVERNANCE

The term multilevel governance describes the dispersion of power away from national governments, both upwards to the supranational level and downwards to the subnational level of provincial, state and municipal governments (Callaghan 2010). If the extend of multilevel governance become larger, the collaboration level, the community involvement, stakeholder participation, and indeed, hybridity scope will be more expanded. This will be a shift from a more general and real picture of hybridity to a more specific and idealised hybrid model.

The characteristics of governance are changing the nature of the nation-state with state roles being reorganised functionally and territorially amongst sub-national, supranational and even transterritorial lines. Moreover, tourism industry has become subject to multilevel governance, coordination in networks and negotiated agreements, incremental evolution of structures, innovation of policies and/or institutional reform (Benz 2012). This perspective has been challenged by economic theories of federalism and intergovernmental collaborations and relations in federal systems, international politics and regional powers. Eising (2004) argued that the multilevel governance approach to European integration captures the realities of EU interest intermediation better than neofunctionalism and intergovernmentalism. Within the European Union there are substantial policy stresses and strains which play out in the interplay between local, regional, national, and supranational levels of governance and which have substantial implications for economic development and political citizenships, including the level of participation in the development of policy.

The global–local dialectic (or glocalisation) is a useful perspective from which understandings of regional instabilities can be developed. International cooperation and national governments who desire to participate in supranational alliances may want to consider encouraging more local-level cross-border cooperation as an antecedent to broader collaborative ventures (Dredge and Jenkins 2003; Timothy and Teye 2004). In this context, politics and public policy are significant aspects of tourism matters because of their role in regulating the tourism industry, tourism geography, power

structures, development of destination governance and multiscalar policies impacts on power relations.

In addition to destination governance, collaboration may provide an effective mechanism for local community involvement through selection of key stakeholders to represent the various public-private-civil society interests at national, regional, and local geographical scales. Within such a collaboration, a competitive market framework with the presence of appropriate levels of 'social capital in social economy' (Weber 1922; Zhao, Ritchie and Echtner 2011) enables competition to be based on cooperation, differentiation, and innovation.

Hybridity can offer space for innovation; however, this depends on commitment to a clear vision for the organisation and a clear overall structure. Many localities promote tourism business developments. Through using local networks, these developments have attracted a great of attention from public and private-sector organisations seeking to promote local collaboration where collaborations can also become the basis for inclusion of civil society organisations and local community (Jamal and Getz 1995; Jackson and Murphy 2006; Page 2007; Bills 2010).

One of the main factors indicating the success of using tourism for regional development purposes is the extent that the benefits of tourism are spread throughout the surrounding region. Likewise, these benefits must be allowed to accrue to local populations. However, there is an interest divergence of local elites concerning with the regional/local tourism development. Thus, there is a differentiation between 'explicit governance' – i.e. legal framework, institutional roles, stakeholder interests, and so on; and 'implicit governance' – i.e. multiple relationships funded on interdependencies, communication, trust, consensus and so forth (Telfer 2002; Timothy 2002; Beaumont and Dredge 2010; Beritelli 2011; Chaperon and Bramwell 2013).

Governments and community leaders should provide opportunities for residents to benefit financially from tourism by allowing and encouraging social-entrepreneurial activities. With an increase in political, social, economic, and psychological empowerment amongst these lines between residents and other stakeholders, tourism will have the potential to help meet local needs for development, increase employment, bringing to fruition many of the goals of sustainability, including harmony, equity, balance, cultural integrity, and ecological conservation. In this framework, 'embeddedness' concept ought to be announced. Essentially, this has a linkage with external capital and local firms' relationships (Polanyi 2001; Hall and Page 2006).

In most developing countries, the need to balance rapid conjunctural changes, market demands, and overcoming isolation and fragmentation, particularly in collaborative destination governance, marketing and promotion, suggests a combination of the role of central government at a strategic level with local and regionally based partnership schemes as can be found in the applications of

decentration/quasi-indirect centralisation (Hall 2004; Boniface and Cooper 2005; Wang and Xiang 2007; Wang 2008).

The specific approaches to partnerships and consultation in particular circumstances at regional and multilevel governance affect the power relations between actors, issues of participatory/representative democracy and accountability, coherence/openness, and the final distribution of the benefits and costs of industrial growth (Bramwell 2004; Bramwell 2006; Benz 2007a; Benz 2007b; Herrmann 2011).

Multilevel approach of policy analysis has tended to be traditionally focused on decision-making process in federal systems. Nevertheless, policy analysis is increasingly becoming related to broader government strategies with respect to trade and promotion at both national and regional levels. This situation also highlights the interplay between 'civil society-based policy development' (Krutwyscho and Bramwell 2010) and regional/multilevel governance and processes of economic globalisation.

CONCLUSION

We are living in a world where continuing rapid population growth is going up and scarce resources are more and more consumed. Thereof, this fact encourages state and non-state actors to create possible alternative solutions for dealing with national, international, transnational issues and ensure innovative values for the benefits and goodness of societies.

A list of 15 impact factors/dimensions of (multilevel) governance and hybridity are listed as follows (Ruhanen et al. 2010): accountability, transparency, involvement, structure, effectiveness, power, efficiency, (de)centralisation, shareholder rights, knowledge management, legitimacy, leadership, authority, communication, performance. However, Hall (2011) has fixed the characteristics of new modes of governance to 6 elements that are as such: i) participation and power-sharing, ii) multi-level integration, iii) diversity and decentralisation, iv) deliberation, v) flexibility and revisability and vi) experimentation and knowledge creation.

Mainly, constructing hybridity with taking into consideration the foregoing debates will shape hybrid model as a new paradigm. Neutrally, the proposal of this research is to use hybrid model as a paradigm because there is a need to use common scientific glasses for reasoning the fundamental issues concerning with hybridity such as coordination, networking, linking interrelationships between state and non-state actors at local, regional, national, international and transnational level.

Hybridity covers the intermediary zone that is ranged in between the state and the market which consists of an ambivalent political atmosphere, a political economy of interest mediation and organisational sociology. Thus, hybridity as appeared in sociological research area, paradoxically, relied on confrontations with difficulties that occur amongst Government Organisations (GOs), Nonprofit Private Organisations (NPOs) and Private Market Organisations (PMOs).

In this great transformation era, equal participation of state actors and non-state actors will create hybrid structures which come together to deal with common issues and gain common objectives. Hybrid model is typically related to governance with governments because public actors, private actors and civil society actors share common interests and these interests are quite important in terms of reciprocal understanding. For state actors hybrid model means centralised authority of state that has an influence on private sector and civil society. For private actors hybrid model means creation of new markets and capacity building. For civil society hybrid model means having a mainstream role among state and private and transform interests in favour of the goodness of society.

In general, after arguing relevant research papers, we may conclude that public sector – private sector – civil society triangle (hybridity) significantly affects the quasi-indirect centralisation and enhancement of the authority/position of political actors (elites); balances the public and private/counterpublic sphere dichotomy effectively. Hybridity has a significant influence on political atmosphere, political economy of interest mediation and organisational sociology, and a positive impact on the strategic operations of voluntary sector and non-profit organisations; affects the heterogeneity and pluralism level of state and non-state actors and provides that states are embedded with non-state actors in actor constellations in equal order, and at least of the plurality of opinion development processes, and the consciousness level of foundationalism, cooperationalism, institutionalism, social responsibility and philanthropic actions; preserves stability of states and ensures incremental improvements at institution-based platforms.

Tourism industry might be a good example for better conceptualising and examining the content of hybridity approach. Hybridity in tourism industry can be clarified with the tourism system approach that is through the travel paths taken by individual consumers. This approach is usually termed a geographical system of tourism (Cooper and Hall 2008) and consists of four basic elements that are listed as follows: i) a generating or source region which is the permanent residence of the tourist and the place where the journey begins and ends; ii) a transit route which is the path through the region across which the tourist must travel to reach his or her destination; iii) a destination region, the region which the tourist chooses to visit and which is a core element of tourism; iv) the environment that surrounds the other three regions.

Mentally, there are interrelationships and dialectics amongst triple win model (source region – destination region – tourists) and hybrid model, i.e. state – source region nexus, private – destination region nexus and tourists – civil society/local community nexus. From triple win point of view, social scientists should strongly criticise and contest the researches which are focusing only on destination regions' self-interest maximisations without embedding hybridity. Ethically, a strategic source region and destination region partnership which does not take into account local communities' interests should be contested as well. This study goes one step further and attempts to enhance the triple win solutions for three parts of hybrid model.

Indisputably, hybrid model has a catalyst role in terms of balancing social problems and civil society needs. Paradigmatically, it is better to perceive the hybrid model as a combination of communicative and strategic action that means the reciprocal recognition within the model is precondition for significant functionality. This will shape social relations with moral meanings of communication. In the ambiguity of hybrid model, communicative action and strategic action require more attention.

This article was written in the framework of the project that is entitled "The National Hybridity Project: Innovative Governance, Judicial and Sociological Approaches in Turkey (Project Grant No: KUAP(I) – 2013/94). The project is endorsed by Uludag University in Bursa, Turkey.

REFERENCES

- Aliu, A.** (2011) "Proyección y Planificación Estratégica en la Industria Turística: Enfoque comparativo y Modelo Híbrido" *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo* 20(6): 1324-1344
- Aliu, A.** (2012a) "International Migration and the European Union Relations in the Context of a Comparison of Western Balkans and North African Countries: Controlling Migration and Hybrid Model" Ludwig Maximilians Universität München MPRA Paper No. 41102, Retrieved from: <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/41102/> date accessed: 21 October 2013
- Aliu, A.** (2012b) "European Industrial Relations: Transnational Relations and Global Challenges" Ludwig Maximilians Universität München MPRA Paper No. 38897, Retrieved from: <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/38897/> date accessed: 21 October 2013
- Aliu, A.** (2012c) "The BRICs Hegemony in a Post-American World" Retrieved from: <http://brics-ped.com.br/the-brics-hegemony-in-a-post-american-world-era-analysis/> date accessed: 21 October 2013
- Aliu, A.** (2013) "The Theory of Interhybridity: Socio-political Dimensions and Migration Experiences of Post-communist Western Balkan States" *Journal of Advanced Research in Organizational Psychology* 2(2): 5-54
- Anheier, H. K. & Seibel, W. (Eds.)** (1990) "The Third Sector: Comparative Studies of Nonprofit Organisations" Walter de Gruyter. Berlin
- Anheier, H. K.** "West Germany: The Ambiguities of Peak Associations" In Wuthnow, R. (Eds.) (1991) "Between States and Markets: The Voluntary Sector in Comparative Perspective" Princeton University Press. New Jersey
- Anheier, H. K. & Toepler, S. (Eds.)** (1999) "Private Funds, Public Purpose: Philanthropic Foundations in International Perspective" Kluwer. New York
- Araujo, L. M. & Bramwell, B.** (2002) "Partnership and Regional Tourism in Brazil" *Annals of Tourism Research* 29(4): 1138-1164
- Bache, I. & Chapman, R.** (2008) "Democracy through Multilevel Governance: The Implementation of the Structural Funds in South Yorkshire" *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions* 21(3): 397-418

- Baggio, R., Scott, N. & Cooper, C.** (2010) "Improving Tourism Destination Governance: A Complexity Science Approach" *Tourism Review* 65(4): 51-60
- Beaumont, N. & Dredge, D.** (2010) "Local Tourism Governance: A Comparison of Three Network Approaches" *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 18(1): 7-28
- Bekemans, L. (Ed.)** (2012) "Intercultural Dialogue and Multilevel Governance in Europe: A Human Rights Based Approach" Peter Lang. Brussels
- Benz, A.** (2007a) "Accountable Multilevel Governance by the Open Method of Coordination" *European Law Journal* 13(4): 505-522
- Benz, A.** (2007b) "Inter-regional Competition in Co-operative Federalism: New Modes of Multilevel Governance in Germany" *Regional and Federal Studies* 17(4): 421-436
- Benz, A.** (2012) "Yardstick Competition and Policy Learning in Multilevel Systems" *Regional and Federal Studies* 22(3): 251-267
- Beritelli, P., Bieger, T. & Laesser, C.** (2007) "Destination Governance: Using Corporate Governance Theories as a Foundation for Effective Destination Management" *Journal of Travel Research* 46: 96-107
- Beritelli, P.** (2011) "Tourist Destination Governance Through Local Elites: Looking Beyond the Stakeholder Level" *Kumulative Habilitationsschrift, University of St. Gallen – Institute for Systemic Management and Public Governance. St. Gallen*
- Bills, D. (Ed.)** (2010) "Hybrid Organisations and the Third Sector: Challenges for Practice, Theory and Policy" Palgrave Macmillan. New York
- Blair, T.** (1998) "The Third Way" Fabian Society. London
- Boniface, B. & Cooper, C.** (2005) "Worldwide Destinations: The Geography of Travel and Tourism" (4th ed.) Elsevier. Oxford
- Botterill, D.** (2001) "The Epistemology of a Set of Tourism Studies" *Leisure Studies* 20: 199-214
- Bramwell, B. & Sharman, A.** (1999) "Collaboration in Local Tourism Policymaking" *Annals of Tourism Research* 26(2): 392-415
- Bramwell, B.** (2004) "Partnerships, Participation, and Social Science Research in Tourism Planning" In **Lew, A. A., Hall, C. M. & Williams, A. M. (Eds.)** (2004) "A Companion to Tourism" Blackwell Publishing. Oxford
- Bramwell, B.** (2006) "Actors, Power, and Discourses of Growth Limits" *Annals of Tourism Research* 33(4): 957-978
- Bramwell, B.** (2011) "Governance, the State and Sustainable Tourism: A Political Economy Approach" *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 19(4-5): 459-477
- Bramwell, B. & Lane, B.** (2011) "Critical Research on the Governance of Tourism and Sustainability" *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 19(4-5): 411-421
- Burns, P. M.** (2004) "Tourism Planning: A Third Way?" *Annals of Tourism Research* 31(1): 24-43
- Callaghan, H.** (2010) "Beyond Methodological Nationalism: How Multilevel Governance Affects the Clash of Capitalisms" *Journal of European Public Policy* 17(4): 564-580
- Calhoun, C. J.** (1993) "Civil Society and the Public Sphere" *Public Culture* 5: 267-280

- Calhoun, C. J.** (1999) "Community without Propinquity Revisited: Communications Technology and the Transformation of the Urban Public Sphere" *Sociological Inquiry* 68(3): 373-397
- Castells, M.** (2008) "The New Public Sphere: Global Civil Society, Communication Networks, and Global Governance" *ANNALS, AAPSS* 616: 78-93
- Caton, K.** (2012) "Taking the Moral Turn in Tourism Industry" *Annals of Tourism Research* 39(4): 1906-1928
- Chaperon, S. and Bramwell, B.** (2013) "Dependency and Agency in Peripheral Tourism Development" *Annals of Tourism Research* 40: 132-156
- Church, A.** (2004) "Local and Regional Tourism Policy and Power" In Lew, A. A., Hall, C. M. & Williams, A. M. (Eds.) (2004) "A Companion to Tourism" Blackwell Publishing. Oxford
- Cooper, C. & Hall, C. M.** (2008) "Contemporary Tourism: An International Approach" Elsevier. Oxford
- Cooper, C., Scott, N. & Baggio, R.** (2009) "Network Position and Perceptions of Destination Stakeholder Importance" *Anatolia* 20(1): 33-45
- d'Angella, F. & Go, F. M.** (2009) "Tale of Two Cities' Collaborative Tourism Marketing: Towards a Theory of Destination Stakeholder Assessment" *Tourism Management* 30: 429-440
- d'Angella, F., de Carlo, M. & Sainaghi, R.** (2010) "Archetypes of Destination Governance: A Comparison of International Destinations" *Tourism Review* 65(4): 61-73
- Dredge, D. & Jenkins, J.** (2003) "Destination Place Identity and Regional Tourism Policy" *Tourism Geographies* 5(4): 383-407
- Dredge, D. & Whitford, M.** (2011) "Event Tourism Governance and the Public Sphere" *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 19(4-5): 479-499
- Dredge, D. & Jamal, T.** (2013) "Mobilities on the Gold Coast, Australia: Implications for Destination Governance and Sustainable Tourism" *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 21(4): 557-579
- Dreher, M. T. & Baechtold E.** (2013) "Práticas e Intenciones de las Organizaciones no Gubernamentales (Ong's) en el Desarrollo del Turismo en Blumenau (Sc) – Brasil" *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo* 22(3): 378-390
- Dingwerth, K. & Pattberg, P.** (2006) "Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics" *Global Governance* 12: 185-203
- Downey, J. & Fenton, N.** (2003) "New Media, Counter Publicity and the Public Sphere" *New Media and Society* 5(2): 185-202
- Durham, M. G. & Kellner, D. M.** (2006) "Media and Cultural Studies: KeyWorks" (2nd Ed.) Blackwell Publishing. Oxford
- Eising, R.** (2004) "Multilevel Governance and Business Interests in the European Union" *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions* 17(2): 211-245
- Esping-Andersen, G.** (1990) "The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism" Polity Press. Cambridge
- Esping-Andersen, G.** (1999) "Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economics" Oxford University Press. Oxford
- Etzioni, A.** (2000) "The third Way to a Good Society" Demos. London
- Evers, A.** (2005) "Mixed Welfare Systems and Hybrid Organisations: Changes in the Governance and Provision of Social Services" *International Journal of Public Administration* 28(9/10): 737-748

- Garcia, M. O.** (2007) "El Carácter Social del Turismo: Un Análisis Sistémico Sobre su Complejidad" *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo* 16(4): 464-492
- Garber, J. A.** (2001) "The Public Sphere and Antiglobalisation Protests" *The Good Society* 10(2): 16-20
- Giddens, A.** (1991) "Structuration Theory: Past, Present and Future" In Bryant, C.G.A. & Jary, D. (Eds) (1991) "Giddens' Theory of Structuration: A Critical Appreciation" Routledge. London
- Giddens, A.** (1998) "The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy" Polity Press. Cambridge
- Giddens, A.** (2000) "The Third Way and its Critics" Polity Press. Cambridge
- Göymen, K.** (2000) "Tourism and Governance in Turkey" *Annals of Tourism Research* 27(4): 1025-1048
- Habermas, J.** (1974) "The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article" In Durham, M. G. & Kellner, D. M. (2006) "Media and Cultural Studies" (Revised ed.) Blackwell Publishing. Oxford
- Habermas, J.** (1979) "Communication and the Evolution of Society" Heinemann. London
- Habermas, J.** (1988) "Theory and Practice" Polity Press. Cambridge
- Habermas, J.** (1989) "The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Burgeois Society" MA: MIT Press. Cambridge
- Habermas, J.** (1990) "Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action" Polity Press. Cambridge
- Habermas, J.** (1996) "Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy" MA: MIT Press. Cambridge
- Hall, D.** (2004) "Rural Tourism Development in Southeastern Europe: Transition and the Search for Sustainability" *Int. J. Tourism Res.* 6: 165-176
- Hall, C. M. & Jenkins, J.** (2004) "Tourism and Public Policy" In Lew, A. A., Hall, C. M. & Williams, A. M. (Eds.) (2004) "A Companion to Tourism" Blackwell Publishing. Oxford
- Hall, C. M. & Page, S. J.** (2006) "The Geography of Tourism and Recreation: Environment, Place and Space" (3rd ed.) Routledge. New York
- Hall, C. M.** (2011) "A Typology of Governance and Its Implications for Tourism Policy Analysis" *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 19(4-5): 437-457
- Hall, C. M.** (2013) "Book Review: Understanding Tourism – A Critical Introduction" *Annals of Tourism Research* 41: 244-246
- Haugland, S. A., Ness, H., Grønseth, B. & Aarstad, J.** (2011) "Development of Tourism Destinations: An Integrated Multilevel Perspective" *Annals of Tourism Research* 38(1): 268-290
- Healy, M., & Perry, C.** (2000) "Comprehensive Criteria to Judge Validity and Reliability of Qualitative Research within the Realism Paradigm" *Qualitative Market Research* 3(3): 118-126
- Héritier, A. (Ed.)** (2002) "Common Goods: Reinventing European and International Governance" Rowman and Littlefield. Lanham
- Herrmann, P.** (2011) "Multilevel Governance: Participatory Democracy and Civil Society's Role in Governance in the Perspective of the Lisbon Treaty" *Current Politics and Economics of Europe* 22(1): 27-42
- Hirschman, A. O.** (1993) "Exit, Voice, and the Fate of the German Democratic Republic: An Essay in Conceptual History" *World Politics* 45(2): 173-202

- Hultman, J. & Hall, C. M.** (2012) "Tourism Place-Making: Governance of Locality in Sweden" *Annals of Tourism Research* 39(2): 547-570
- Hung, K., Sirakaya-Turk, E. & Ingram, L. J.** (2011) "Testing the Efficacy of an Integrative Model for Community Participation" *Journal of Travel Research* 50(3): 276-288
- Jackson, J. & Murphy, P.** (2006) "Clusters in Regional Tourism: An Australian Case" *Annals of Tourism Research* 33(4): 1018-1035
- Jamal, T. B. & Getz, D.** (1995) "Collaboration Theory and Community Tourism Planning" *Annals of Tourism Research* 22(1): 186-204
- Jordan, B.** (2010) "Why the Third Way Failed: Economics, Morality and the Origin of the Big Society" The Policy Press. Bristol
- Kimbu, A. N. & Ngoasong, M. Z.** (2013) "Centralised Decentralisation of Tourism Development: A Network Perspective" *Annals of Tourism Research* 40: 235-259
- Krutwyscho, O. & Bramwell, B.** (2010) "Tourism Policy Implementation and Society" *Annals of Tourism Research* 37(3): 670-691
- Moutinho, L.** (2000) "Strategic Management in Tourism" CABI Publishing. New York
- Moutinho, L.** (2012) "Methodology and Methods, Phenomenological or Ideographic Research: A Multiplicity of Methods Applied to Scholarly Research in Management" Seminar Materials, University of Glasgow. Scotland
- Mückenberger, U.** (2008) "Civilising Globalism: Transnational Norm-Building Networks - A Research Programme" GIGA Working Paper Nr.90, Retrieved from: http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/wp90_mueckenberger.pdf date accessed: 21 October 2013
- Mückenberger, U.** (2012) "Globalisation and European Governance" Euromaster Programme – Lecture Materials, Hamburg University. Hamburg
- Nodar, J. M. F.** (2012) "La Moralinización del Turismo: Reflexiones Críticas y Visiones Alternativas" *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo* 21(4): 838-855
- Page, S. J.** (2007) "Tourism Management: Managing for Change" (2nd ed.) Elsevier. Oxford
- Pechlaner, H., Volgger, M. & Herntrei, M.** (2012) "Destination Management Organisations as Interface Between Destination Governance and Corporate Governance" *Anatolia – An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research* 23(2): 151-168
- Pechlaner, H., Herntrei, M., Pichler, S. & Volgger, M.** (2012) "From Destination Management Towards Governance of Regional Innovation Systems – The Case of South Tyrol, Italy" *Tourism Review* 67(2): 22-33
- Platenkamp, V. & Botterill, D.** (2013) "Critical Realism, Rationality and Tourism Knowledge" *Annals of Tourism Research* 41: 110-129
- Polanyi, K.** (2001) "The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Times" (2nd ed.) Beacon Press. Boston
- Presenza, A. & Cipollina, M.** (2010) "Analysing Tourism Stakeholders Networks" *Tourism Review* 65(4): 17-30

- Rautenfeld, H.** (2005) "Thinking for Thousands: Emerson's Theory of Political Representation in the Public Sphere" *American Journal of Political Science* 49(1): 184-197
- Riley, R. W. & Love, L. L.** (2000) "The State of Qualitative Tourism Research" *Annals of Tourism Research* 27(1): 164-187
- Ruhanen, L., Scott, N. Ritchie, B. & Tkaczynski A.** (2010) "Governance: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature" *Tourism Review* 65(4): 4-16
- Telfer, D. J.** (2002) "Tourism and Regional Development Issues" In Sharpley, R. & Telfer, D. J. (Eds.) (2002) "Tourism and Development: Concepts and Issues" Channel View Publications. Clevedon
- Timothy, D. J.** (2002) "Tourism and Community Development Issues" In Sharpley, R. & Telfer, D. J. (Eds.) (2002) "Tourism and Development: Concepts and Issues" Channel View Publications. Clevedon
- Timothy, D. J. & Teye, V. B.** (2004) "Political Boundaries and Regional Cooperation in Tourism" In Lew, A. A., Hall, C. M. & Williams, A. M. (Eds.) (2004) "A Companion to Tourism" Blackwell Publishing. Oxford
- Tribe, J.** (2008) "Tourism: A Critical Business" *Journal of Travel Research* 46: 245-255
- Tribe, J.** (2011) "The Economics of Recreation, Leisure and Tourism" (4th ed.) Elsevier. Oxford
- Trousdale, W. J.** (1999) "Governance in Context: Boracay Island, Philippines" *Annals of Tourism Research* 26(4): 840-867
- Wang, Y. & Xiang, Z.** (2007) "Toward a Theoretical Framework of Collaborative Destination Marketing" *Journal of Travel Research* 46: 75-85
- Wang, Y.** (2008) "Collaborative Destination Marketing: Understanding the Dynamic Process" *Journal of Travel Research* 47(2): 151-166
- Weber, M.** (1922) "Grundriss der Sozialökonomik: III. Abteilung – Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft" J.C.B. Mohr. Tübingen
- Yang, G. & Calhoun, C. J.** (2007) "Media, Civil Society, and the Rise of a Green Public Sphere in China" *China Information* 21(2): 211-236
- Young, B. C.** (2004) "Book Review: The Moralisation of Tourism: Sun, Sand and Saving the World?" *Annals of Tourism Research* 31(3): 727-729
- Yüksel, F., Bramwell, B. & Yüksel, A.** (2005) "Centralised and Decentralised Tourism Governance in Turkey" *Annals of Tourism Research* 32(4): 859-886
- Zahra, A. L. & Ryan, C.** (2005) "Reflections on the Research Process: The Researcher as Actor and Audience in the World of Regional Tourism Organisations" *Current Issues in Tourism* 8(1): 1-21
- Zahra, A. L.** (2011) "Rethinking Regional Tourism Governance: The Principle of Subsidiarity" *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 19(4-5): 535-552
- Zhao, W., Ritchie, J. R. B. & Echtner, C. M.** (2011) "Social Capital and Tourism Entrepreneurship" *Annals of Tourism Research* 38(4): 1570-1593

Submitted: November 13, 2013

Resubmitted: January 16, 2014

Accepted: January 30, 2014

Refereed anonymously