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Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to develop a conceptual framework for a wider Tourism Value Ecology (TVE) consisting of intermediaries, industry partners, and also various stakeholders to extend and/or modify the critical factors in a TVE.

Design/methodology/approach – This is a conceptual paper using a thorough literature review approach, culminating in an overview of the managerial issues involved in a tourism value ecology.

Findings – The first contribution of our research is a comprehensive study of the role of a TSC/TVC within a destination as embedded in a TVE. A second contribution is the development of a future cross-disciplinary research framework for TVE by synthesising and highlighting the critical issues at play when conceptualising a broad value ecology. Finally, the critical issues identified in this work may help contribute to the development of TVE theory by refining and extending these issues into future theoretical models that can be validated.

Originality/value – This study advances our understanding of how tourism supply chains are evolving into tourism value ecologies or business ecosystems.
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Introduction

A visitor evaluates the tourism experience at a holistic level, across a multiplicity of service encounters (Otto and Ritchie, 1996). The assessment determines if the tourism experience has generated net gains, or perceived value, from visiting a destination (Oh et al., 2007). A tourism supply chain (TSC) is defined as a web of tourism-related organisations engaged in different activities cumulating in the end services offered to a visitor for consumption (Zhang et al., 2009). In tourism, scholars have investigated the measurement of overall TSC with particular destinations (Kozak, 2001; Alegre and Cladera, 2006; Yu and Goulden, 2006) and TSC with specific service sectors, such as accommodation (Saleh and Ryan, 1992), restaurants (Chadee and Mattsson, 1996), attractions (Dorfman, 1979), travel agencies (Leblanc, 1992), package tours (Pizam and Milman, 1993), and retail shops (Reisinger and Turner, 2002).

The extant literature on TSCs has concentrated largely on tourism distribution channels, and especially, on the roles of intermediaries (Buhalis, 2001; Ujma, 2001; Pearce and Schott, 2005) rather than overall TSC. Zhang et al. (2009) stated that further examination of the issues that are critical to TSCs is necessary because changes to any facet of the TSC will have likely impacts on all stakeholders, and vice versa. This research aims to address this gap by developing a TVE framework, which extends the TSC to include the wider environment of governments, visitors, and the natural environment. In order to derive the TVE, we first examine the scope of relevant concepts.

Tourism supply chains

In earlier studies on tourism supply chains (TSCs), Sinclair and Stabler (1997) emphasise the importance of the supply side of the tourism industry. Other descriptive studies of TSCs likewise illustrated the building blocks of the TSC to include functions such as logistics and marketing, while assessing it for efficiency and effectiveness (Alford, 2005; Yilmaz and Bititci, 2006). In her investigation of the role of tour operators within Europe, Sigala (2008) showed how they act as intermediaries between the destination and potential visitors.

Perceived value is often the measure of tourism experiences (Sanchez et al., 2006). For this reason, Yilmaz and Bititci (2006) focused on value creation within a TSC to influence consumption patterns. Table 1 illustrates how relevant studies have positioned TSC across culinary tourism, hotels and travel agencies; and varying destination contexts.

Table 1 shows that prior to 2006, studies on TSC were largely concerned with locating the roles of different agents within the network. Since 2006, attention has shifted towards the value proposition offered by TSCs, within a sustainability context. Schwarz et al. (2008) postulated that sustainability was a key consideration within any TSC because of the intrinsic link of tourism to the ebbs and flows of the global economy.
Table 1: Relevant studies on TSCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kothari <em>et al.</em></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Philadelphia, USA</td>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>e-Procurement as business process re-engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Font <em>et al.</em></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novelli <em>et al.</em></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>East Sussex, England</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>SMEs in a sustainable supply chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodriguez-Diaz and Espino-Rodriguez</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Conceptual paper</td>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>Value creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yilmaz and Bititci</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Conceptual paper</td>
<td>Tourism industry</td>
<td>Tourism value chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deale <em>et al.</em></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>South Carolina, USA</td>
<td>Shrimp</td>
<td>Tourism satisfaction – value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodriguez-Diaz and Espino-Rodriguez</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Gran Canaria, Spain</td>
<td>Tourism industry</td>
<td>Destination competitiveness through relational capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz <em>et al.</em></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Tour operations</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith and Xiao</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>Culinary supply chain</td>
<td>Considers the flow of services from paddock to plate – some associations with value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budeanu</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Travel agencies</td>
<td>Environmental sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Chinese visitors to Australia</td>
<td>Tour operators</td>
<td>Role of ethics to deliver tourism experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy and Smith</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Restaurant chain</td>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>Culinary supply chains as a driver of premium value in upscale menus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusko <em>et al.</em></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Ski resort</td>
<td>Strategic thinking and planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang <em>et al.</em></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Conceptual paper</td>
<td>Tourism industry using supply side perspective</td>
<td>Evidence of tourism value chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang and Murphy</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Goldfields, Victoria, Australia</td>
<td>Travel agencies</td>
<td>Economic value of travel agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost interchangeably, TSCs are associated with tourism value chains (TVCs), tourism industry chains, or global tourism value chains (GTVCs). Kaukal et al. (2000) and Weiermair (2006) noted that a typical TVC comprised four components - the tourism supplier, tour operator, travel agent, and customer, all of which are in a single linked chain. In addition, Alford (2005) depicted a TSC to identify pressure points to reduce costs. Yilmaz and Bititci (2006) developed a TVC model to manage the tourism product as an end-to-end seamless entity. Guzman et al. (2009) analysed the configuration of a global tourism value chain (GTVC) in Andalusian SMEs.

Building on the highly fragmented nature of extant studies, Zhang et al. (2009) produced a framework to represent a typical TSC within a destination, and asserted that tourism is a coordination-intensive industry in which different products/services, such as transportation, accommodation are bundled together to form a final tourism product. As no pre-testing occurs prior to tourism purchases, the sale of tourism products very much
depends upon the presentation and interpretation of the products, making the TSC very information-intensive (Ujma, 2001).

The destination thereby acts as a stage where the TSC and its actors operate. This in turn gave rise to recent research on the use of the multiplier effect to provide a different angle to understand and conceptualise TSCs. Tourism multipliers focus on where visitor consumption can derive economic value from the TSC (Zhang et al., 2009). When tourism expenditure diffuses into the local economy, the industry can create jobs and other ancillary services, such as public roads (Deale et al., 2008; Rusko et al., 2009). Yet, the value creation potential of a TSC within a tourism destination extends beyond just economic sustainability. Budeanu (2009) emphasised that large tour operators are equipped to facilitate environmental sustainability through their business processes, where the outcomes have led to strong brand positioning and customer loyalty. Likewise, Smith and Xiao (2008) argued that socio-cultural sustainability could result from TSCs in a culinary tourism context by cultivating a sense of belonging within stakeholders. Recently, van der Borgh et al. (2012) concurred that organisations are shifting their strategy, focus, and capabilities from firm centricity to ecosystems in order to exploit open innovation opportunities.

Despite the apparent benefits associated with TSCs, existing studies are still unclear about how to define and measure the value created by the TVC (Song et al., 2013). This is because of the parsimonious stance towards value appropriation, which has resulted in a highly fragmented field of research (Zhang et al., 2009). Therefore, a strong argument emerges to extend our understanding of a TSC within a destination, to a more holistic view of a TVE, to create value for all stakeholders, and generate preferred visitor outcomes.

Value Ecology

Hearn and Pace (2006) first introduced the term value ecology to represent the intricate relations occurring in a business environment. In a subsequent paper, Hearn et al. (2007) further espoused on the value ecology through the metaphor of an ecosystem involving supply, value chains and networks, coined by Moore (1998) as a “business ecosystem”. Kandiah and Gossain (1998) extended the business ecosystem concept further to prioritise value creation across technologically mediated product or service delivery. This thinking has extended with the paradigm of the “circular economy” in ecological tourism, tourism circular economy, and sustainable development of tourism (Zhang and Tian, 2014). In this context, the tourism industry is evolving towards a value ecology, and is discussed next.

Tourism value ecology

Drawing on earlier studies, a TVE is adapted from prior literature in order to conceptualise the various elements and is presented in diagrammatic form displayed in Figure 1.
Figure 1: 
A TVE model

Superimposing the larger competitive framework of the tourism destination (Rodriguez-Diaz and Espino-Rodriguez, 2008) on top of the tourism supply chain within a destination (Zhang et al., 2009) creates a holistic TVE. Such framework closely mimics that of a business ecosystem (Letaifa, 2014). In this context, value ecologies and business ecosystems are interchangeably used. Table 2 highlights the propositions of a TVE.

Table 2: 
Propositions of a TVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of a TVE</th>
<th>Paradigm shift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasises the idea of networks or webs of relationships</td>
<td>From thinking about consumers to co-creators of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggests a dynamic rather than a static view</td>
<td>From thinking about value chains to value networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggests that the generation of value does not just reside in the product itself</td>
<td>From thinking about product value to network value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argues that both competitive and cooperative processes interact with one another</td>
<td>From thinking about simple co-operation or competition to complex co-opetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encompasses the notion that an environment creates value in itself without necessarily being part of the first order productivity</td>
<td>From thinking about individual firm strategy to strategy in relation to the value ecology as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explores the use of metaphors to analyse organisational change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Derived from Rodriguez-Diaz and Espino-Rodriguez (2008)
The subsequent sections expound on the elements within the postulated TVE are as follows.

**The shift from thinking about consumers to co-creators of value**

In today’s knowledge-based economy, the customer becomes primarily a co-producer or co-creator, rather than a target, and can be involved in the entire value chain (Vargo and Lusch, 2004). In tourism, value as a construct resides within an evaluation framework of many experiences in terms of time, space, and costs (van Raaij and Crotts, 1995). Sheth et al. (1991) suggest that consumers buy or use a certain product, service or experience rather than another, by integrating their sense of cost and benefits in their value concept. In a tourism sense, Williams and Soutar (2009) found similar outcomes in that visitors assess the notion of value for money, as a cost, into a functional value component. Woodruff (1997) claimed that value perception is an evaluation of product attributes and their abilities to meet consumer needs.

Value in the TSC is grounded in the Service-Dominant logic (S-D logic). S-D logic posits that co-creation is a convergence of value by both a company and its customers (Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2004). S-D logic posits that value creation stems from the perception as to the utility levels related to a transaction (Lusch and Vargo, 2006). Value-in-use is only the first component of value co-creation. The second component of co-creation is co-production (Vargo and Lush, 2006, p. 28). Co-production occurs through the integration of resources contributed by the service providers (e.g., the firm) and by the service beneficiaries (e.g., customers). Therefore, S-D logic suggests that customers are equivocally important to the company in the value creation process (Payne et al., 2008).

Value co-creation within a TVE framework is illustrated in the recent research contribution of Cabiddu et al. (2013). Using the example of Portale Sardegna in Sardinia, the authors described how an Open Voucher mechanism formulated the co-creation of value. Figure 2 is a pictorial representation of how Open Voucher operates.

**Figure 2:**
*Portale Sardegna and the Open Voucher*

---

**The shift from thinking about value chains to value networks**

For co-creation to come to fruition, the Open Voucher example required all tour operators to be as transparent about their operations as possible. Collaboration did not come easy, as the tourism industry often views other parties with suspicion due to the highly competitive business (Briedenhann and Wickens, 2004). However, partners within the
Open Voucher platform realised what the potential of co-creation could achieve and made the effort to accomplish the unthinkable (Cabiddu et al., 2013).

**The shift from thinking about product value to network value**

Service becomes a perspective on value creation, with the focus through the lens of the customer (Edvardsson et al., 2005). Value creation, in a service cluster such as tourism, is achieved through capitalising on the service value creation attributes, and harnessing the potential of dynamic network relationships to provide integrated solutions and unique experiences for customers (Hsieh et al., 2012). For the Open Voucher example, visitors were the clear beneficiaries (Lusch and Vargo, 2006). Furthermore, the internet has the potential to compress time and effort for travel planning (Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2004). This is further exacerbated with the "groundswell effect", created by people, technology, and online economics (Li and Bernoff, 2008).

Clearly, collaboration is central to the S-D Logic framework (Lusch et al., 2008). Recent research in the application of S-D Logic in tourism suggests that hotel companies ignore the potential for competitive advantage due to business myopia (FitzPatrick et al., 2013). This emphasises the need for hotel companies, and other organisations to invest in a network to exploit the value of the TVE.

**The shift from thinking about simple co-operation or competition to complex co-opetition**

Hsieh et al. (2012) examined how value creation and capture enhanced regional development and global competitiveness. In comparison, Porter (1998) defines clusters as geographic concentrations of interconnected agencies in particular fields that compete but also cooperate (co-opetition). While not as encompassing as a value ecology, clusters include attributes of a supply chain embedded in a particular destination, and are a fertile ground to show how co-opetition may operate in a TVE.

Hsieh et al. (2012) defined a Type II service cluster as a consumption-oriented and destination-based service cluster. In such a cluster, service firms engage in strategic networking and share resources to co-create value for customers. Here, “cooperation” initiatives of the network, such as joint marketing, all play a very significant role to drive synergistic outcomes.

**The shift from thinking about individual firm strategy to strategy in relation to value ecologies**

In a TVE, the notion of strategic alignment is a key factor to achieve strategic fit. As more firms get involved, it becomes more difficult to achieve strategic fit (Palmer and Bejou, 1995; de Araujo and Bramwell, 2002). Cabiddu et al. (2013) stated the need for strategic alignment across the TSC so that all partners share an overall strategic goal. Synergy is an outcome of cooperation, where two firms pool resources together to achieve more than the sum of their parts (Davis and Thomas, 1993; Goold and Campbell, 1998; Tanriverdi and Venkatraman, 2005). Camacho and Rodriguez (2005) cautioned that service innovations are difficult to patent. To mitigate the likelihood of compromising service innovation, appropriation mechanisms are required to prevent free-rider problems (Teece, 1986; Pisano, 1990; Sakakibara, 2002). Lee et al. (2010) developed a framework to assist managers in creating and appropriating the value from service innovations.
**Dimensional differences of the TVE in comparison with the traditions of TSC/TVC**

Table 3 displays dimensional differences of a TVE in comparison with traditional conceptualisations of a TSC/TVC and Tourism Service Cluster.

**Table 3: Dimensional differences among TSC, Tourism Service Cluster, and a TVE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Elements</th>
<th>TSC / TVC</th>
<th>Tourism Service Cluster</th>
<th>TVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customers</strong></td>
<td>Consumers</td>
<td>Consumers</td>
<td>Consumers, suppliers, competitors, government, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value Creation</strong></td>
<td>Emphasises value creation at every node of the TSC/TVC</td>
<td>Emphasises cluster/network value creation in co-creation with consumer</td>
<td>Emphasises holistic approach to value creation throughout the eco-system in co-creation with consumer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profit Focus</strong></td>
<td>Increase own profits</td>
<td>Increase own profits</td>
<td>Increase eco-system profits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Hearn and Pace (2006)

**Management issues in a Tourism Value Ecology**

**Strategic evaluation of the tourism destination and strategic alignment**

Rodriguez-Diaz and Espino-Rodriguez (2008) provided a framework to analyse a destination strategy in terms of strategic alignment. Cabiddu et al. (2013) reiterated the importance of appropriate strategic alignment recently, with strategic fit and synergy enabling a TSC to co-create value with its customers. Alignment in the tourism industry has been studied from different perspectives, including organisational-, technology-, service-, and strategic alignment (Sautter and Leisen, 1999; Michael, 2003; Morrison et al., 2004; Crotts et al., 2009). Furthermore, alignment with a country image is a recent research development (Singh and Hu, 2008; King et al., 2011).

In terms of organisational alignment, Wehmeyer et al. (2009) used empirical evidence from EuropTravel to highlight differences between on- and offline value propositions. In comparison, technology alignment in tourism is relevant because the tourism product is a purchase decision solely based on information that is available (Werthner and Ricci, 2004). For instance, Alipour (1996) found that informed decision-making was derived out of a well-devised network of tourism planning mechanisms, involving people and technology. In tourism literature, such considerations occur in an environment of rapid change and evolution, which further complicate alignment outcomes (Butler, 2009).

Service alignment in tourism occurs across sectors. For instance, hotels are increasingly expecting that its contractors, such as tour operators, deliver at least equal service standards to its guests (Ku et al., 2011). Strategic alignment assists a firm in three ways: by maximising return on the investment, achieving competitive advantage, and providing direction and flexibility for new opportunities (Testa and Sipe, 2012). Similarly, alignment amongst players in a tourism network may provide opportunities to increase
overall network value (Jimenez-Zarco et al., 2011). These considerations lend further clarity to required alignment efforts as to how a TVE can have desired outcomes.

**Value ecology governance and value appropriation**

Ecosystems represent coopetition and interdependence (Adner and Kapoor, 2010). Ecosystemic value is multi-actor (individuals, firms, customers) and multidimensional (social, cultural, and economic) (Letaifa, 2014). This view is congruent with our extension of the TSC/TVC into a TVE as it relates to a destination.

Value creation and value capture should reflect a more balanced perspective that includes both firms and customers, and tackles co-creation in networks (Pitelis and Teece, 2009). Socioeconomic actors create value for themselves and for the ecosystem through reciprocal resource integration (Wieland et al., 2012). Ecosystems are based on social relationships that generate value through knowledge sharing and social experiences (Mele and Polese, 2011). Community bonds, economic development, and innovation are organisational outputs that foster more robust ecosystems (Letaifa, 2014). As such, this multidimensional value includes social, economic, cultural, and other “values in use” or value determined by different users. Some innovations may have small value capture at firm level, but fascinating value in use for the entire ecosystem. An example in tourism is the earlier disruptive innovation of the Quick Response Code created by Denso-Wave in the 1990s that is still generating value. Firms can have a long-term impact within society as a driver of values (Lepak et al., 2007). This discussion of value, value creation, and value appropriation/capture in a business ecosystem form appropriate guidelines to operationalise a TVE for any destination.

**Value ecology relationship management, collaboration, and co-opetition**

An ecosystem relies on the application of competencies and the proactivenss of every participant to co-create value (Velu et al., 2013; Wieland et al., 2012). Today in tourism, new technologies are transforming the product space into an integrated experience space in which value is co-created and co-captured with customers and competitors (Cabiddu et al., 2013). The shift from supply-chain logic to ecosystem can be complex. Letaifa (2014) pointed to competition legacy as a true potential impediment to the establishment of new cooperative relationships. Even though firms may be able to envision the benefits of future cooperation, they may continue to use the ecosystem network to compete.

Different forms of collaboration exist, such as open-source collaborative community and social networks. The main characteristic of collaboration for co-creation is a shared purpose, or for pleasure (Lee et al., 2012). Carayannis et al. (2015) argued that firms do not operate in isolation, and the process of value creation should be viewed from a network perspective. The benefits of division of labour and specialisation cannot be realised without building relationships and networks over time (March and Wilkinson, 2009). However, in Australia, policy initiatives focused on economic wealth generation through the creation of industry networks has been largely ignored within the tourism industry (Dredge, 2006). The process of building long-term relationships between individuals, units and institutions can also be regarded as a social and economic process (Webster Jr, 1992). This requires a change of focus from mere profit maximisation. Instead, Zineldin (1998) called for greater commitment and trust to seek mutually beneficial outcomes of collaboration.

In this context, Morris et al. (2007) emphasised the need for coopetition to foster robust firm performance. Additionally, mutual benefit, trust and commitment
underpin the value creating ecology (Carayannis et al., 2015). According to Golnam et al. (2014), the creation of value is interwoven among coopetition motives and the relational capabilities. The above discussion points to the need to balance the intricate web of cooperative and competitive forces at work within a TVE, an issue iterated earlier by (Wang and Krakover, 2008).

Value ecology sustainability and risk management

In recent times, businesses have expanded their *modus operandi* from profit maximisation to a greater emphasis on sustainability (Parsa et al., 2014). Driven by stakeholder expectations and regulatory pressure, the onus is on an organisation to have a value ecology that caters to the triple bottom line of people, place and profits (Budeanu, 2009). In earlier studies on environmental supply chain management (ESCM) in tourism, Kogg (2003) found interestingly that regulatory pressure and cost savings had little relevance for tour operators. However, the ability to remain resilient is dependent on buyer-supplier relationships responding to unexpected events, such as terrorism and natural disasters (Schwartz et al., 2008). Hence, it is clear that ESCM is a mantra for organisations in the future (Budeanu, 2009). Moreover, recent tourism studies found that organisational habit and perceptions were barriers to effective environmental sustainability (Baddeley and Font, 2011; da Costa and Carvalho, 2011). These studies point to the relevance and urgency of adopting a futures perspective to drive a TVE framework in achieving sustainability.

Tourism innovation and co-innovation

Innovation has progressed from its origins of closed innovation to co-innovation as amplified within a value ecology framework (Tapscott and Williams, 2006). The premise of open-innovation is to create value by whom and for various purposes (Lee et al., 2012). For instance, a number of brokerage firms have leveraged on open-innovation such as NineSigma (Lichtenthaler, 2011). While these exemplars are external to tourism, there is nothing to suggest that a TVE cannot realise such potentials.

In our TVE, the most recent version of innovation, co-innovation, is called for. In the co-innovation platform an organisation can create value with just about anyone (Binkhorst and Dekker, 2009). An example of co-innovation for service value creation would be medical tourism practices at Bangkok International Hospital Group, where the entire hospital operations are enshrined in a culture of relational collaboration (Lee et al., 2012).

Value ecology consumers

Anyone may form a consumer base within a TVE. The unique feature of a TVE consumer is that value co-production may not be occurring face to face, but take place often across technological spheres, such as Second Life (Penfold, 2009). As Mokhtarian (2002) has posited, the internet has compressed the temporal and spatial components of the visitor experience that evolve how tourism is to be understood and managed. This has implications for practitioners within a TVE to translate the ebbs and flows occurring across cyberspace in order to devise timely and desired visitor experiences.

Within the TVE, there is also a need for best-suited consumers to be positioned at the right place at the right time. This is built on the principles laid out across several studies to ensure that there is a sound base to allocate resources (Ehrenfeld and Gertler, 1997; Korhonen, 2004; Roberts, 2004; Seuring, 2004). Nowadays, highly educated and
informed visitors will dictate the distribution of value within the ecology (Andrews, 2000; Hart and Milstein, 2003). Collectively, consumers within must perform a delicate balance of responsibility, knowledge sharing and reflexivity to ensure the overall success of any ecology (Huber, 2000).

**Conceptual framework of a Tourism Value Ecology**

From our previous discussion of varying management issues pertaining to operating in a value ecology, five main dimensions emerge:

- Strategic evaluation and alignment
- Collaboration and co-opetition
- Governance and value appropriation
- Sustainability, risk and security, and
- Innovation and co-creation.

While Tourism Supply Chains/Value Chains have addressed value creation across the above stated dimensions to some extent, the main perspective remains commercial (business-like) in nature. Nowadays, tourism, in particular tourism destinations, operate on a wider value ecology level that more holistically addresses, and incorporates, the wider community and natural environment, government agencies and/or NGO’s, and regulatory framework (for example, new free trade agreements across services).

Progression from a Tourism Supply Chain/Value Chain to a Tourism Value Ecology requires the five main dimensions to be addressed and executed not only in a commercial sense with business like KPI’s and outcomes, but also across social and cultural dimensions; which requires a broadened paradigm that may include social networks, co-innovation through crowd-sourcing, and operating on an ecology wide- platform with multiple, sometimes conflicting goals; just to name a few. The wider Tourism Value Ecology framework is shown in Figure 3.
Figure 3:  
**Progression from a TSC into a TVE**

**Conclusion, limitations and future research**

This research provides a theoretical framework for the definition of a TVE operating in a destination, and synthesises the critical success factors of a value ecology by building on associated studies of Rodriguez-Diaz and Espino-Rodriguez (2008) and Zhang et al. (2009).

The first contribution of our research is a comprehensive study of the role of a TSC/TVC within a destination as embedded in a TVE. Such TVE integrates value creation, strategy formulation and alignment, governance, coordination issues, and the like to desired outcomes. A second contribution is the development of a future cross-disciplinary research framework for TVE by synthesising and highlighting the critical issues at play when conceptualising a broad value ecology. Finally, the critical issues identified in this work may help contribute to the development of TVE theory by refining and extending these issues into future theoretical models that can be validated.

As with any research, some limitations may be identified. The research postulates a framework that offers opportunity for further refinement and empirical validation. In addition, a wider value ecology perspective in tourism may yield additional
factors and interrelationships at play when future empirical insights become available from such TVEs in action. Despite these limitations, the research makes a strong case to argue for the conceptualisation towards a TVE.
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