

Papers

Governability of tourist policies: the role of the participation spaces in the perspective of the network analysis and the institutional theory

A governança das políticas de turismo: o papel dos espaços de participação na perspectiva da análise de redes e da teoria institucional

La gobernanza de las políticas de turismo: el papel de los espacios de participación visto desde la perspectiva del análisis de redes y de la teoría institucional (el caso del Estado de Paraíba, Brasil)

Ana Valéria Endres¹; Elbio Troccoli Pakman¹

¹ Federal University of Paraíba (UFPB), João Pessoa, PB

Abstract

Keywords:

New institutionalism.
Governability.
Social Network Analysis – SNA.
Public tourist policies.
Paraíba/Brazil.

The discussions presented in this article propose an original reading on the participation in the processes of the tourist implementation policies subject to institutionalized spaces searching for more legitimacy than efficiency. The study is supported by a theoretical outline that sees the reflex of isomorphic processes in the institutional in-force changes. Objective: to study out the specific spaces between the state and non-state actors – projected by the tourist policies – strengthen the new governability. Methodology/Approach: the study of these processes is circumscribed to the imaginary limits of the organizational field defined by the tourist public policies network in Paraíba/Brazil. Both the field and the network were sketched as from the directed interviews, documents and bibliographic analysis and represented by sociograms, formulated via mathematical resources through the Social Network Analysis – SNA. The studied spaces of participation have their headquarters in Joao Pessoa, capital of Paraíba State. Results: the reading of the obtained results suggests that the institutionalized spaces of participation by the new governability have a transforming potential of the tourist reality in Paraíba, as they influence on the actions and strategies of the local actors. Yet, it is still early to assess if the spaces really produce significant institutional changes to deepen really legitimated and more efficient participative processes as well. Their virtuous

circle may promote values and practices to strengthen the new governability.

Resumo

Propósito: as discussões apresentadas neste artigo propõem uma leitura original sobre a participação no processo de implementação de políticas de turismo sujeita a espaços institucionalizados que visam buscar mais legitimidade do que eficiência. O estudo é sustentado por um recorte teórico que vê nas mudanças institucionais vigentes o reflexo de processos isomórficos. **Objetivo:** analisar como os espaços específicos de deliberação entre os atores estatais e não-estatais, projetados pelas políticas de turismo, fortalecem a nova governança. **Metodologia/Abordagem:** o estudo destes processos está circunscrito aos limites imaginários do campo organizacional definidos pela rede de políticas públicas de turismo na Paraíba/Brasil. Tanto o campo quanto a rede foram delineados a partir de entrevistas direcionadas, análise documental e bibliográfica e representados por sociogramas, formulados via recursos matemáticos através da Análise de Redes Sociais – ARS. Os espaços de participação analisados têm sede na capital da Paraíba, João Pessoa. **Resultados:** a leitura dos resultados obtidos sugere que os espaços de participação institucionalizados pela nova governança têm potencial transformador da realidade turística da Paraíba, pois influem nas ações e estratégias dos atores locais. Contudo, ainda é cedo para se avaliar se estes espaços realmente produzem mudanças institucionais significativas que aprofundem processos verdadeiramente participativos, legítimos, e também mais eficazes. Seu círculo virtuoso pode vir a instituir valores e práticas que fortaleçam a nova governança.

Resumen

Las discusiones presentadas en este artículo proponen una lectura original de la participación en el proceso de implementación de políticas de turismo sujetas a espacios institucionalizados que buscan más legitimidad de que eficiencia. El estudio tiene por base una visión teórica que ve los cambios institucionales en vigor como un reflejo de procesos isomórficos. **Objetivo:** analizar como los espacios específicos de deliberación entre los actores estatales y no estatales, proyectados por las políticas de turismo, fortalecen la nueva gobernanza. **Metodología/Abordaje:** el estudio de estos procesos se circunscribe a los límites del campo organizacional definidos por la red de políticas públicas de turismo en el estado de Paraíba (Nordeste del Brasil). Tanto el campo cuanto la red fueron delineados a partir de entrevistas dirigidas y análisis documental y bibliográfico, y están representados por sociogramas elaborados con los recursos matemáticos propios del análisis de redes sociales – ARS. **Resultados:** la lectura de los resultados así obtenidos sugiere que los espacios de participación institucionalizados por la nueva gobernanza disponen de potencial para transformar la realidad turística de la Paraíba, puesto que influyen en las acciones y estrategias de los actores locales. Sin embargo, aún es temprano para evaluar si estos espacios realmente producen cambios institucionales significativos que ahonden procesos verdaderamente participativos, legítimos y también más eficaces. Su círculo virtuoso podría llegar a establecer valores y prácticas que fortalezcan la nueva gobernanza.

How to cite: Endres, A. V. ; Pakman, E. T. (2019). Governability of tourist policies: the role of the participation spaces in the perspective of the network analysis and the institutional theory. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo, São Paulo*, 13 (1), p. 1-18, jan./abr. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7784/rbtur.v13i1.1431>

Palavras-chave:

Neoinstitucionalismo.
Governança.
Análise de Redes Sociais – ARS.
Políticas públicas de turismo.
Paraíba/Brasil.

Palabras clave:

Neoinstitucionalismo.
Gobernanza.
Análisis de Redes Sociales – ARS.
Políticas públicas de turismo.
Paraíba/Brasil.

Reviewed by pairs.

Received in: 03/03/2018.

Accepted in: 13/08/2018.



1 INTRODUCTION

The redemocratization processes throughout the world evinced since the 1980s, the orientation toward

institutional changes that allow a wider social participation in the implementation of public policies has undergone some pressure and has become the basis of discussions to offer the state a higher action capacity to improve its performance and provide the tourism activity with the expected results.

The proposed institutional changes refer to the rules and values that are outlined by actions and behaviors supported by cooperation and participation of the various social actors within the relationships between state and society. This is a trajectory that tends to go from an inefficient bureaucratic administration to a new public service interested in improving the governance that mediates these relationships (Gomes & Secchi, 2015; Draibe, 2014; Secchi, 2009; Frey, 2004, 2000; Rhodes, 1996), centralized actions toward more decentralized and participative structures and mechanisms (Kimbo & Ngoasong, 2013; Endres, 2014; Secchi, 2010), a situation that emphasizes the great capital toward another allowing the widening of local and endogenous values (Secchi, 2016; Arrais, 2012).

To make the new governance resulting from these changes effective, increasing evidence is required to strengthen the management capacity of the actors who participate in the changes and in the institutional relationships established between them to make the proposed actions more efficient. In this regard, it is important to observe how the state and the remaining actors play their roles that are now imposed on them by a management style based on sharing and participating in the partnerships and cooperation. Studies conducted by Nunkoo (2017), Lin and Simmons (2017), Blasco (2014), and Pastras and Bramwell (2013) incessantly argued for the need of a coordination structure to gather all institutional levels and policies to reach the desired social target, i.e., the community.

As part of this reality, we observe that discourses of tourism policy refer to the possibility of change arising from new network arrangements, so easing the process of decentralization and participation as ingredients for enhancing tourism governance (Der Zee, 2017; Jesus & Franco, 2016; Trentin, 2016; González, 2014; Endres, 2014; Knupp, 2014; Hall, 2011). Yet, we cannot ignore the fact that these arrangements are typical of an institutional monoculture (Evans, 2004; Frey, 2000) conceived by a dominating structure, composed by supranational and international spheres, to point out – or even direct – the way developing countries ought to follow to achieve public policy effectiveness.

In Brazil, the still-open results of these strategies for the effectiveness of new governance is guided as per the ways through which the state relates with civil society, be it as from FHC's (1994-2002) administration managerialism presuppositions (Paula, 2005) experienced in the *Programa Nacional de Municipalização do Turismo - PNMT* (National Program of Tourism Municipalization - NPTM) (1994-2002) (Brasil, 1994), as well as other subsequent management models, which adopted several mechanisms of governance for this purpose (Avritzer, 2009). During Lula's (2003-2011) and Dilma's (2011-2016) administrations these mechanism were reflected in the 2003/2007 and 2007/2010 *Planos Nacionais de Turismo* (National Tourism Plans) (Brasil, 2003; 2006) and in the *Programa de Regionalização do Turismo - PRT* (Tourism Regionalization Program) (2003 -) (Brasil, 2004; 2013). Regardless of the federal administrations to which these policies are linked, all of them bring – in their structure – a variety of participation spaces such as forums, councils, and committees. Statutory conditions are not the focus in this context, but rather understanding that these participation experiences, formally institutionalized and tied up to the state bureaucratic structure, are indispensable for their implementation.

We also observe that these mechanisms, despite official discourse, are not necessarily guided by an efficient and effective rationality of public policies (Vale & Lobo, 2007), but by a rationality that tries to manage the demands. And this does not refer much to the desired objectives and more efficient rational-intentional courses of action to reach them, but to the basic rules for structural arrangements and institutional schemes constituting the means through which the processes inherent to public policies get developed. Therefore, this research fits in the so called new institutional studies (Peters, 2000; Hall & Taylor, 1996; Evans, 1995; DiMaggio & Powell, 1991; North, 1990; Ostron, 1986; March & Olsen, 1984; Granovetter, 1985; Skocpol, 1985), which emphasize the fact that institutions matter and try to understand how they manage to constrain behaviors to make them adjust to the legitimacy of their actions and the intended participation.

In this context, the observed issues are revealed by the tenuous relationship between effectiveness and legitimate participation in tourism public policy and the discourse of the state/non-state actors' combination to its implementation. Under this perspective, this study main objective is to understand how the specific spaces of deliberation (such as Councils, Forums, and other mechanisms proposed by tourism policies) strengthen new governance. The specific objectives are i) construction of the Paraíba tourism policies network, by the identification of the institutional links established between actors from the four analyzed participation spaces; ii) the identification of the most central actors in the network to delimit the organizational field of the sector, through which the organizations are constrained to reinforce or discourage the institutionalization of rules, norms, and values based on isomorphic processes.

As said before, the theoretic-methodological framework is based on institutional theory and social network analysis (SNA). Institutional studies present a variety of approaches, such as historical/empirical, rational choice or economic, sociological, and normative institutionalism (Peters, 2003). Among such views, this study makes use of the concepts proposed by Meyers and Rowan (1977), DiMaggio and Powell (1983) and Scott (1999), which integrate the classic analyses of the sociological new institutionalism. The chosen actors present complementary perspectives that help to understand the behavior of organizations that are part of the political process. These theoretical perspectives were chosen because they are all guided by the basic principle that says behavior is endogenous to the decision process, built up from the relationship established by the organizational field, within which the political actors are circumscribed.

This theoretical framework has influenced the choice of the method, the SNA, which is focused on showing the relationships between actors, but not on their attributes (Sañudo, 2015; Hannemann, 2001; Wellman, 2000; Scott, 2005). Thus, in essence, the bigger the number of relationships presented by the organizations (actors), the higher the centrality in the network and, presumably, the more significant the power of intermediation and influence on the decision (Marques, Bichir, Moya, 2014; Ferreira & Vitorino Filho, 2010; Lopes & Baldi, 2009; Lavalle, Castello & Bichir, 2007; Marques, 2000).

The study object of these analyses is the participation spaces projected by the tourism policies designed as of 1994. The PNMT incessantly encouraged the creation of municipal tourism councils in almost all the Brazilian cities involved in the program, while the 2007-2010 National Tourism Plan (PNT) reinforced the need for their strengthening. Following the guidance of the 2003-2007 PNT and that of PRT, in 2003, the state of Paraíba begins the mobilization among local, state, and non-state organizations, at state and municipal levels, to make Northeast Brazil a strong tourism destination. The targeted spaces of participation in this study are: the *Conselho Municipal de Turismo de João Pessoa* – CONDETUR (Paraíba State Council for Tourism Development), the *Conselho Municipal de Turismo de João Pessoa* – COMTUR/JP (João Pessoa Municipal Tourism Council), the *Grupo Gestor dos 65 Destinos Indutores do Turismo Regional* – GG65 (Managing Group of the 65-Regional Tourism-inducing Destinations), and the *Fórum de Turismo da Região Turística do Litoral da Paraíba* (Coastal Tourism Forum of Paraíba Tourism Region).

The documentary research investigated, for the first time, the minutes, and statutes of all the spaces, formally institutionalized and based in the municipality of João Pessoa, capital of Paraíba State. Based on the collected data, we were able to identify the network actors and to outline the local tourism organizational field. The minutes are from the meetings carried out between 2009 and 2011, the period of major effervescence for the establishment and maintenance of the spaces.

With the definition of the network central actors, we proceeded with the interviews of nine representatives of the private sector, two of the public power, and another of the third sector. The meetings took place in two moments: the first one in 2012, during the identification of the actors, and the other in 2017 in face of the new PRT guidelines and the CONDETUR performance. The analysis of data obtained in the literature and documentary survey, and the interviews sought to monitor the progress and dynamics of the participation spaces, covering a period of 13 years, from 2003 through 2016.

Thus, in brief, we present firstly an overview of the Brazilian tourism policies since the 1990s when a promise of a new governance pact based upon the precepts of a participative democracy was put forward. After, we discuss the concept of institution and the complementary perspectives of institutional and network analysis. To continue with the analysis, there is also a brief panorama of the institutional context within which the

network of public policies for tourism in the territory of Paraíba is inserted. This allows delimiting and analyzing the local tourism organizational field, as well as contributions to the intended institutional changes: a new governance.

2 BRAZILIAN TOURISM POLICIES AND THE POSSIBILITY OF A NEW GOVERNANCE

To integrate the country into the international tourism market – concomitantly with the strong tourism discourse as a local and sustainable development factor – is a direction present in the federal government's actions to stimulate this activity. These actions deal in giving more quality to the local and regional tourism product, in diversifying the offer and structuring the tourism destinations, in widening and training the workforce, in increasing the competitive insertion of the tourism product into the international market and the consumption of the tourism product in the domestic market and, finally, in increasing the length of stay and tourist expenditure in the destinations.

To attain such targets, as from 1990, several programs of action [such as the National Program for Tourism Municipalization – PNMT (1994-2002), the Northeast Tourism Development Program – PRODETUR/NE (1992-2013), the NATIONAL PRODETUR (2008-), and the Program for Tourism Regionalization – Brazilian Routes – PRT (2003/2013-), the last two ones still in force] have been elaborated. In all these policies, in addition to the praise of tourism, there are formulas to try to encourage political and management capacity, networking, and ways of valuing the human capital. These are topics aimed at strengthening the political and social acceptance, consubstantiated as new governance expressed in the decentralizing character of the implementation structures, in which these new institutional arrangements are established with the participation of several segments of society.

The arrangements must be essentially participative and structured to allow a better performance of the network of organizations, either public and private ones, in the conduct of the national and sub-national policies (Sipioni, Zorzal & Silva, 2013). Several participation spaces appeared after such guidelines: i) the Regional Governance Instances, also called Regional Forums, which are regional arenas that congregate representatives of various municipalities; ii) the Management Group of the 65-Regional Tourism-inducing Destinations, mainly composed by representatives of the private sector that act in the capitals; iii) the State Tourism Councils, and iv) the Municipal Tourism Councils that gather together representatives of the tourism sector – acting respectively at state and municipality levels – and result from PNT guidelines since 2003. The two first mentioned spaces were created under PRT guidance.

This very conception is also reproduced by the norms of governmental bodies in the three levels of power – federal, state, and municipal. Despite having no political-administrative hierarchy among them (Avelar & Cintra, 2007), the national tourism policies presented by the Ministry of Tourism – MTUR attribute the responsibility of their implementation to state and municipal bodies, and to part of society, that adjust them to local needs or peculiarities.

In face of this governance structure, we observe that the decision to go ahead with federal programs, such as PRT, does not fit in the space they were elaborated to, but to that one of the public and private organizations, which are inserted in states and municipalities and have specific political and social dynamics. The effectiveness of the policy depends on the prominence of these actors and on their capacity for action: a capacity that is subject to the positioning of these actors in the web of relationships established by the governance structure adopted for the PRT development in each place.

This web, woven by the new arrangements projected by the national programs, is the environment within which these institutional changes take place. In this sense, we also understand that these spaces – expressed by the Committees, Forums, Councils, and Managing Groups – can establish, from this decentralizing structure and shared practices, a possibility of making the relationships between state, market, and civil society more effective and helpful toward tourism growth in Brazil. However, changes are slow and tied up to constraints that are not always considered, hence the need of our appealing to the new institutional analysis, to try to understand the behavior and political decisions inserted in the structures of these new arrangements and brought in by tourism policies.

3 THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF NEW INSTITUTIONALISM TO UNDERSTAND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

To understand how institutions change we need to inquire: what are institutions? What do they exist for? How do they get formed and change? What impact do they have, or not, on the behavior of actors in the conduction of the political process? The fact is that – in the literature – it is recurrent to state that institutions matter (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991; Peters, 2003; Peres, 2008; Hall & Taylor, 1996; Marques, 2000) and “must be considered as the focus of the analysis of political and social processes” (Marques, 1997, p. 75).

Seen as mediators between social structures and individuals' behaviors, institutions are a useful field of analysis, in the attempt to search for explanation on how individuals place and organize themselves in society to produce political decisions (Draibe, 2014; Carvalho, Vieira & Silva, 2012; Théret, 2013). In this context, we can state that the studies on the institutional phenomena go necessarily through what is known as new institutionalism. Despite current research on the political phenomenon – by political scientists – converge on this new model, the new institutionalism shows some features or versions not always convergent (Peres, 2008). And, in face of the myriad of studies that call themselves so, it is timely to ask: what is it that makes a given feature of the social and political activity to be institutional?

The answer assumes that – despite differences of focus – there are some basic elements common to all approaches. According to Peters (2003), an important element to consider is that – in a way – an institution is a structural feature of society and/or a form of government, either formal or informal. The other three basic elements are: stability in time; it affects the individual behavior by restricting the behavior of its members; and, there must be certain shared values among members of an institution.

Although there are similarities and divergences in how each focus and author define institution, how they perceive its formation, change, and institutional design, as well as the interactions between institutions and individuals in the political process, many of the authors hereby cited only make the distinction between rational choice neo-institutionalism and the remaining approaches by their analytical convergences, among these the sociological new institutionalism.

The main distinction of the first in relation to the remaining ones is that the basic characteristic of the neo-institutional focus consists in considering that individuals behave in an entirely utilitarian mode so as to maximize personal benefits, which can be effectively achieved through institutions, even if these push them into following behaviors. Under this viewpoint, the individuals rationally choose to be constrained (up to a certain level) by their affiliation to institutions, may this be voluntarily or not.

For rational new institutionalism, the individuals' preferences are exogenous as regards the process of decision; because it considers that preferences are already given and guided toward maximizing personal benefits. Assuming the behavioral presupposition, to understand the roots of such preferences is of little or no interest in this approach: the emphasis is on incentives and rules that define the field of possibilities where individuals seek to maximize their preferences (Czernek, 2013; Granovetter, 1985; Peters, 2003; Hall & Taylor, 1996; Théret, 2003).

Therefore, in the rational choice approach, institutions are specifically defined by a set of rules that shapes individuals' behaviors, however, individuals react rationally to incentives and restrictions established by these rules. According to Peres (2008), neither socialization nor the formation of the preferences appear to be relevant.

What separates this study from the analytical approach is the divergence between structural sociology (to which the analysis of social networks is aggregated) and the theory of rational choice as regards the determinants of behavior. The first one “does not involve the inherent premises as to the rationality of human agents. (...) That is, the formation of preferences is seen as something to be explained” (Mizruchi, 2006, p. 79), considering the effects of the social relations on individual or group behavior. Thus, by setting the endogenous behavioral presupposition aside, the rational choice perspective would be of little value to the objectives of this article, since the characteristics of these behaviors are fundamental to the process of decision inherent to the proposed and encouraged institutional arrangements by the official policies of tourism in Brazil.

4 SOCIOLOGICAL INSTITUTIONALISM, THE ORGANIZATIONAL FIELD AND ISOMORPHISM

Unlike rational choice institutionalism, sociological institutionalism stands out for the broad understanding of institutions, which “include not just formal rules, procedures or norms, but the symbol systems, the cognitive scripts, and moral templates that provide the ‘frames of meaning’ guiding human action” (Hall & Taylor, 1996, p. 209). In these terms, sociological institutionalism “emphasize the way in which institutions influence behavior by providing the cognitive scripts, categories, and models that are indispensable for action” (id., p. 210), and on the way individuals most often make use of and/or accept to interpret the norms, and values of their organizations. In both empirical and theoretical terms, we hereby understand that it is the process of socialization that conditions individuals’ behavior in the institutional environment. Thus, the preferences are endogenous – a product of this process.

Within the perspectives introduced by sociological institutionalism, the contributions of Meyer and Rowan (1977) and DiMaggio and Powell (1983) appear to be more suitable to the objectives of this article, since the concept of institution emphasizes “the realities of symbolic nature that legitimate and enable the arrangements and rules of organizational behavior, providing a sense of order to members’ daily activities” (Prates, 2000, p. 139).

Thus, instead of looking for efficiency within its technical environment, guided by a bureaucratic rationality to supply solutions to well-defined problems, organizations also look for legitimacy from external or institutional environment. That is, modern organizations look like one another, not because they are necessarily more efficient, but because the need of legitimacy also demands this from them.

Survival of organizations relates to the assessment that society makes of them, even if their structures do not actually work. Because, we consider not only the performance, but also conformity with institutional requirements (values) supported by public opinion, opinion-makers, social prestige, laws, among other elements of the social reality. These are manifestations of strong institutional rules, which work like myths that are rationalized by organizations and are determinant for survival.

According to Meyer and Rowan (1977), we can observe three specific processes of organizational structure that generate rationalized myths: i) elaboration of relational networks – the more dense and interconnected, the more rationalized myths arise; ii) the degree of collective organization of the environment – the stronger the legal order, the greater the extent to which rules and rationalized procedures become institutional requirements; and iii) leadership efforts of local organizations – which are frequently adjusted to their organizational contexts, but also play an active role in the conformation of this context through which – when powerful – attempt to force their immediate relationship networks to adjust to their patterns of relationships. In this way, organizations adopt specific structural arrangements that have acquired social meaning, though, many a time, they do not fulfill the technical requirements of the organizational environment.

Thus, the search for legitimacy leads to similar organizational practices, defined as isomorphism, in which the organizational characteristics are modified toward a growing compatibility with features of the environment. According to Machado-da-Silva and Gonçalves (2007), the isomorphic mechanisms – based on the different types of existing links between institutional environment and Scott’s (1999) organizational structures – allow to understand the nature of the influence of the environment on the dynamics of institutional change.

The isomorphic behavior adopted by organizations can be developed, as pointed out by DiMaggio and Powell (1983), from the compulsory, mimetic, and normative mechanisms. Compulsory isomorphism occurs when there are formal and informal pressures exercised by the state, market, and/or society, forcing organizations to adopt similar strategies, procedures, and techniques. This type of isomorphism spreads out by means of law enforcement, governmental determinations, inter-organizational power games, finally, factors that lead to interdependence.

The mimetic isomorphism occurs throughout the diffusion of experiences and successful organizational models, which, in an environment of uncertainty, are adopted by other organizations that actuate in their specific

environment. And finally, normative isomorphism mainly refers to professionalization. This mechanism encompasses certain patterns and techniques considered to be more efficient and up-to-date by the professional community. The three mechanisms are present in isomorphism processes, varying only the degree of performance and mutually reinforcing each other.

According to DiMaggio and Powell (1983), the isomorphic processes result from the structuring of organizational fields, mostly assisted by the state and professions. We understand organizational field to be the group of organizations that constitutes a recognized area of the institutional life, which – in a more specific way – includes:

un grupo de organizaciones que crean productos y servicios similares, pero incluyen también a los socios determinante para sus intercambios, las fuentes de financiamiento, los grupos reguladores, las asociaciones profesionales y comerciales y otras fuentes de influencia normativa o cognoscitiva, las relaciones no locales y locales, los vínculos verticales y horizontales y las influencias culturales y políticas, así como los intercambios técnicos, están incluidas en el campo organizacional de fuerzas que se consideran pertinentes (Scott, 1999, p. 227).

In its initial stage, the organizational field is composed of isolated and specialized organizations and, as time goes by, the field begins to be structured and the organizations begin to recognize the importance of each other, narrowing relationships and, consequently, increasing the interaction. Once established, the isomorphism grows because of the inter-organizational relationships of cooperation and competition (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Holanda, 2003).

As far as the organizational field is concerned, the isomorphic process is bigger and faster: i) the more the field depends on a single resource; ii) the bigger the field of interaction with the state; iii) the smaller the organization-model number; iv) the bigger the technological uncertainty; v) the bigger the professionalism within the group. We can say the two first ones are related with compulsory isomorphism, the third and fourth ones refer to the mimetic isomorphism and the two last ones to normative isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

Scott (1999) suggests a few “different types of environmental forces” that affect organizations and institutional change dynamics, as a way to refine the indicators of institutional changes and help to better understand isomorphic processes.

The characteristics of the two first mechanisms (Frame 1) are described in a context wherein an organizational field contains environmental agents that are strong enough to impose structural forms on subordinated organizations. These are processes which take place by “imposition” and “authorization”. In the remaining mechanisms, the organizational field does not introduce agents with power and authority on local organizational forms.

Another important issue we want to emphasize is that, despite the isomorphic actions, the organizations do not become all alike because – by having several interpretative schemes and specific power relations – they respond differently. So, in observing the emphasis on the power asymmetry of the organizations associated to the running and development of the institutions, it is important to highlight how institutional analyses situate the state role in this process. In these analyses, the state is neither the central actor (criticism of the Marxist model) nor a neutral agent arbitrating these competing interests (criticism of the pluralist model). Here are Marques' explanations:

State autonomy is not a structural feature of the capitalist state that can be a priori defined, (...) it varies from case to case. This because the autonomy is defined in each historical situation (...) that surrounds the state autonomous actions by the strategies of the various actors and the changes implemented by the state itself in the administrative organization and coercion. The affirmation of state autonomy does not presuppose the rationality of the state as an actor, but just its non-subordination to interests present in society (Marques, 1997, pp. 80-81).

Frame 1 – Links between institutional environments and organizational structures

Environment Mechanisms	Characteristics
Imposition of organizational structure	By law enforcement or by the creation of a new class of administrative agencies. Similar to compulsory isomorphism. In this case, the state is an example of powerful agent.
Authorization of organizational structure	The subordinated unit is voluntarily subject to the norms that support and legitimate the exercise of authority on the part of another agent. This looks for the attention and approval of the authorizing agent. Here the professional associations are an example of change-inducing agents.
Inducement of organizational structure	Offers incentives to the organizations that are willing to adjust to the agents' conditions. Inducement strategies create organizational structures that do not have lasting effects on performance they are intended to affect. The funding agencies are examples of change-inducing agents.
Acquisition of organizational structure	There is the deliberate choosing of structural models on the part of the local organizations from patterns considered to be more modern, suitable, or rational. Compatible with mimetic isomorphism.
Imprinting of organizational structure	The structural characteristics (mainly those of new organizations) are not acquired by superior decision or rational design, unless they are perceived as a given fact, tied up to the period in which they were created.
Incorporation of organizational structure	It occurs by means of a wide set of non-intentional adaptation processes, which happens during a certain period.
Avoiding organizational structure	In highly institutionalized environments, in which beliefs are shared and the procedures are already seen as a fact, there is little environmental influence on the organizational structure.

Source: Elaborated by the authors adapted from Scott (1999)

This way, the effectiveness of the policies depends on the actors' strategies, inside and outside the state. The analyses related with the political and social processes are not solely restricted to the observation of state strategies, but include the correlation of power (resources and positions) of state and non-state actors within these processes. Therefore, as per the SNA perspective, a priori attributes of the actors do not matter, but rather the characteristics of the relationships which link and position them within the political process (Sañudo, 2015; Marques et al., 2014). Thus, SNA represents the more dynamic conception of the social action by emphasizing the social/institutional relationships established on the borders of the political public networks and, in the case of this article, woven by the spaces of participation established by the federal programs of tourism in Brazil.

The network formed by these spaces, which delimits the organizational field of the tourism activity in Paraíba, represents the forms of articulation among government agencies, private organizations, or groups that allow them to face social problems and implement the desired actions. They are like political structures, representing a new form of governance network (Nunkoo, 2017; Gonzalez, 2014; Hall, 2011 Schneider, 2005).

5 PUBLIC POLICY NETWORK AND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL FIELD OF TOURISM IN PARAIBA


To understand how institutions constraint behaviors in order to have them adjusted to the legitimacy of their actions, as well as the participation, we need to identify the main actors and the role they play in the arrangements generated in the implementation process of the Program for Tourism Regionalization – PRT in Paraíba.

The delimitation of the network (Figure 1) and the organizational field of the local tourism (Figure 2) led to the analysis of the meeting minutes: the Paraíba State Council for Tourism Development – CONDETUR between the years 2003 through 2011; the João Pessoa Municipal Tourism Council – COMTUR; the Coastal Tourism Forum, representing one of the Regional Governance Instances of PRT in Paraíba; and the Management Group of the 65-Regional Tourism-inducing Destinations – GG65 DI. Excepting CONDETUR, the analyzed records of the other three participation spaces have to do with the meetings carried out between the years 2009 through 2011, period of their establishment.

The registration of the actors' presence and meeting dates were inputs to the analysis of networks and originated the presented sociograms. We used Unicet6 software for Windows to calculate centrality measures and Netdraw for the sociograms (Quiroga, 2006; Borgatti, Everett & Freeman, 2002). The sociograms (Figures 1 and 2) were produced by mathematical treatment and were carried out over incidence and adjacency matrices (Scott, 2005; Hanneman, 2001).

The first sociogram (Figure 1) was obtained through the incidence matrix (also called rectangular, affiliation or two-mode) in which the lines and columns refer to the actor and affiliation relationships, wherein the organizations are the actors in the Paraíba Tourism Sector and the spaces of participation are the formally institutionalized affiliation (CONDETUR, COMTUR, Fórum do Litoral [Coastal Forum] and GG65). The analysis of the meetings minutes of all the studied spaces led to the making of a single list of state and non-state organizations – in the three government levels – that were at the meetings. The lines represent the relationships among the actors (nodes) in the same institutional environment, constituted by the four spaces of participation.

Figure 1 – Sociogram of the Paraíba public tourism policies network (2009-2011)



Note: the black square nodes represent the spaces of participation; the green square nodes, the private entities; the red round ones, those of the public sector and the blue triangles, the organizations of the third sector.

The sociogram shows the central actors, since they are present in – at least – three spaces of participation. These are positioned in the sociogram diagonal, starting with the Tourism Guide Union – SINGTUR, the Brazilian Association of Tourism Journalists – ABRAJET, the João Pessoa Municipal Tourism Secretariat – SETUR, the Brazilian Association of Bars & Restaurants – ABRASEL, the Union of Hotels, Restaurants, Bars and Similar Entities – SHRBS, João Pessoa Convention and Visitors Bureau - JPCVB, the Brazilian Hotel Industry Association – ABIH, the Brazilian Association of Travel Agencies – ABAV, Secretariat of Tourism and Economic Growth – SETDE, and the Brazilian Service Support for Micro and Small Enterprises – SEBRAE. All these entities are exclusively from Paraíba or its division or representation in Paraíba. It also includes the Federal University of Paraíba – UFPB, the Brazilian Association of Bachelors in Tourism – ABBTUR, and the Bank of Northeast Brazil – BNB, which are located on the extreme diagonal, also related with the three spaces of participation.

All these organizations representatives were interviewed in two moments (2011 and 2017) and provided precious information on the political actions developed between 2003 and 2016. The narratives showed the importance the trade and public sector give to the model of participative management that the tourism policies and PRT adopt. Yet, many complaints still hover over the program methodology of the federal government and disseminated by the state managing personnel among the municipalities.

The problems pointed out by the participants were related with: i) the Coastal Forum's termination, in 2012, which failed to overcome the lack of material and financial resources reported in several studies (Nóbrega & Figueiredo, 2014; Trentin, 2016) that happened in other instances of the PRT governance; ii) the scandals on the bad use of the MTUR resources, which started in 2011 and shook the relationships between government and non-governmental entities; iii) the end of the GG65 activities due to the federal-level deactivation of 65-Regional Tourism-inducing Destinations Project, which included a large number of market-representing organizations; and iv) the imposition of a new categorizing methodology of the municipalities from the PRT re-organization at national level, between the years 2013 through 2015. Overall, these factors discouraged post-2012 participation.

The analyses also indicate that the same organizations that had an advantageous and central position in the network presented up to 2011 still detain power and influence on the political decisions about tourism in Paraíba State. Until completion of this research in 2017, CONDETUR was the main space of participation directing state tourism. Further to the network central actors, the State Council begins to aggregate a few actors that were linked to the extinguished spaces. Yet, the representatives of the Regional Tourism Forums (Regional Instances of the PRT Governance) that aggregate city councils, still struggle for a counselor position officially instituted by the state government.

Observed in the analyzed spaces, the experience of the new arrangements is an indicator for the institutional processes of change and consolidates the maintenance of these organization forms, which contributed to the practice of the participative processes. However, the effectiveness of this network goes through the understanding that the bigger the possibility of disseminating the information and the resources by means of the relationships or links amid the actors inside the network, the bigger the chances to institute these spaces and good governance practices they bring in within themselves.

We also understand that, in this network analysis, a presupposition – which must be taken into account – is that not only the rationality of these spaces efficiency and their arrangements support, reproduce themselves, and are legitimated, but also because these are shaped by institutional requirements arising from the public opinion, social prestige, and laws, among other elements of the social reality, which lead them to change and/or maintenance.

To be participative is to be democratic and – in the case under analysis – the institutional maintenance or change is stimulated by the formal rituals (rules) of participation spaces, which are seen as ceremonies that strengthen the participative and decentralized practices, understood as rationalized myths, which has reinforced the legitimacy of organizations thereby present as well as that of the maintained arrangements, despite the change in their momentary contours.


This is possible because, since 2009, networks are more interconnected and possess a strong legal framework and leaderships such as SETDE and CONDETUR itself, while collegiate organ aggregating the more central actors of the private sector. These play an active role in the conformation of this context, mainly when subjected to MTUR guidelines, which also fall upon local government bodies to adapt themselves to the structure of their arrangements and their relationship patterns. And it is inside these dynamics that the rules and rationalized procedures involved in the isomorphic processes are increasingly converted into institutional requirements.

Therefore, participation is the main institutional requirement even if based on imposition, authorization, and inducement of environmental mechanisms, as proposed by Scott (1999), on which the network was established and still holds it to today's date.

These dynamics can also be studied out as per institutionalization of the organizational field, wherein the organizations belonging to this network are inserted, that becomes structured as the organizations acknowledge one another's importance, bringing the relationships closer and, consequently, increasing the interaction that can be perceived by both in the network and in interviews with the actors.

Thus, we can state that the organizational tourism field in Paraiba, represented by the sociogram in Figure 2, has been institutionalized, allowing the isomorphic processes to be more quickly reproduced, either by cooperation and/or inter-organizational competition.

Figure 2 – Organizational field of the Paraiba tourism sector



Notes: the green squares nodes represent the private sector entities; the red rounds ones, those of the public sector and the blue triangles, the organizations of the third sector. The applied rate informs the total quantity of the relationships which an actor establishes with the remaining ones, so that the size of the nodes represents the actors' degree of centrality in the field.

This sociogram was made from the adjacency matrix (one-mode) with data contained in the incidence matrix (two-mode), which generated the sociogram in Figure 1. This adjacency or square matrix identifies the relationships established among actors from its presence in the analyzed spaces of participation and has served, more specifically, to determine the measures of centrality that indicate which are the most influent organizations in the field. Furthermore, they show a pattern of relationships characterized by the power asymmetry between state and non-state organizations in the Paraiba tourism planning process. This asymmetry is represented by actors who have a higher degree of centrality in the network, identified proportionally in the sociogram by the size of the nodes.

In the delimited organizational field, the most intense isomorphic processes are the mandatory ones, since the arrangement between organizations strongly depends on public sector resources, as is the case of those from SETDE and SETUR, which generate a strong interaction with the state. And, in a smaller scale, we also notice mimetic reproduction, considering the field structuring from the professionalism of the private sector organizations found within it, represented by the nine green nodes in the field center.

This conclusion is also in accordance with the results of Scott's studies (1999), in which the analysis searches for identifying the most specific mechanisms that cast this isomorphism, such as that of imposition, authorization, and inducement.

Very similar to mandatory isomorphism, the first one happens when changes occur by law enforcement. In the second one, the changes are voluntarily supported by local organizations, which provides the one demanding of such norms with the legitimacy to exercise the power. Finally, inducement mechanisms offer incentives to organizations willing to adjust to their conditions.

Overall, we have noticed that all three mechanisms – which try to explain the different aspects of how institutional changes happen within an organizational field – are present in the way organizations and relationships unfolded throughout time to today's configuration of the Paraiba tourism organizational field.

6 FINAL REMARKS

The support that the MTUR promised to the states and municipalities has coincidentally cooled down when the federal government started to become politically unstable, in 2017, and the Brazilian economy presented the first signs of the economic crisis, which would soon show up with unseen strength. This led to the dismantlement of some spaces of participation, as was the case of the Joao Pessoa Management Group of the 65-Regional Tourism-inducing Destinations and the Coastline Tourism Forum, that stopped receiving funds and expertise to continue some PRT actions in Paraiba. The actors who participated in these spaces are still looking to be formally aggregated to CONDETUR, mainly the city halls via representation of the new regional governance instances in the Council, also gathering together the Forums actuating in the state.

The arising of these spaces of participation and the constituted relationships among their members, including those resulting from the imposition of their institutionalization, has defined the organizational field of tourism in Paraiba, which is achieved by the construction and maintenance of a new governance. We cannot state whether the management will be a democratic fact, but we can infer that these spaces (instituted by the post-2012 tourism policies and the reflection of the institutional arrangement) contributed to a participation exercise and are able to change the local and regional situation. Till the end of 2017, CONDETUR was strengthened, while concentrating the main actors contained in the delimited organizational field in the same space of participation, which gives it more legitimacy.

The trend is that the actors' behavior changes increasingly from the acceptance and assimilation of the norms of behavior supporting the arrangements. In the established network, we observe that these arrangements are forced into behaving as expected by the other members, in a participative and engaged way. The institutional link built up among members (by means of participation and encounters in meetings) has given rise to the establishment of other links, such as friendship and work ties. And, together, these links have reinforced a more proactive behavior.

In this sense, we observed that the more cohesive the network formed by these links is, the more powerful the organizations are in satisfying their interests – not only to their own advantage, but in the belief that everyone is benefitted when working in cooperation. This notion stops being an empty discourse to become the responsibility of all actors that, as a part of the network, are accountable for and evaluated, because the social order is to be proactive and efficient.

In recent years, a few manifested demands start to become a reality, as is the construction of the modern Paraíba Convention Center (already functioning in a partial but increasing manner) and the tourism interiorizing in the state, which strengthens the actors' sense of prominence, thus generating a virtuous circle and accomplishing what is expected from these spaces: instituting values and norms to strengthen the direction of this new governance.

From the institutional and relational analyses developed in this article, we can conclusively state that the new arrangements – outlined by the creation of various participation spaces – affect the actions and strategies of local actors. In practical terms, the governance structure (established by tourism policies) has allowed the strengthening of the tourism sector in Paraíba, even if following guidelines from other spheres. Yet, it is still early to assess if these spaces do produce significant institutional changes to deepen the actual participative, legitimate, and more efficient processes. After all, formal institutions are more open to change than informal institutions, based on social practices and values which, by being dynamic, will always require new studies to fit in the new realities.

REFERENCES

- Avelar, L. M.; Cintra, A. O. (Org.). (2007). *Sistema político brasileiro: uma introdução*. São Paulo: Rio de Janeiro: UNESP/Konrad-Adenauer.
- Avritzer, L. et.al. (2009). *Experiências nacionais de participação social*. Belo Horizonte: Cortez.
- Blasco, D. et al. (2014) Emergence of governance in cross-border destinations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 49, 159-173. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.09.002>
- Borgatti, S. P.; Everett, M. G; Freeman, L. C. (2002). *Ucinet 6 for Windows: Software for social network analysis*. Harvard: Analytic Technologies.
- Brasil (1994). Ministério da Indústria, do Comércio e do Turismo – MICT. Instituto Brasileiro de Turismo – EMBRATUR. Ministério da Indústria, do Comércio e do Turismo. *Desenvolvimento de turismo sustentável: manual para as organizações locais*. Brasília.
- _____. (2003). Ministério do Turismo. *Plano nacional do turismo: diretrizes, metas e programas 2003/2007*. Brasília.
- _____. (2004). Ministério do turismo. *Programa de regionalização do turismo: roteiros do brasil*. Brasília.
- _____. (2006). Ministério do Turismo. *Plano nacional do turismo 2007/2010: uma viagem de inclusão*. Brasília.
- _____. (2013). *Programa de regionalização do turismo: roteiros dos Brasil*. Brasília.
- Carvalho, A. C.; Vieira, M.; Silva, S. (2012). A trajetória conservadora da teoria institucional. *Gestão Organizacional*, 10, 469-496.
- Czernek, Katarzyna (2013). Determinants of cooperation in a tourist region. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 40, 83-104. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2012.09.003>
- Der Zee, E.v. (2017). Complexity in the governance of tourism networks: balancing between external pressure and internal expectations. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idmm.2017.07.003>

DiMaggio P. J.; Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48 (2), 147-160. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>

DiMaggio, P. J.; Powell, W. (eds.). (1991). *Introduction*. The new institutionalism in organizational analysis. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Draibe, S. (2014). Policy analysis in Brazil: emergence and institutionalization. *Brazilian Political Science Review*, 8(2), 118-122. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/1981-38212014000100014>

Endres, A. V. (2014). As políticas de turismo no Brasil e os novos arranjos institucionais: o papel das organizações locais. In: Pimentel, T. D.; Emmendoerfer, M. L.; Tomazzoni, E. L. *Gestão pública do turismo no Brasil: teorias, metodologias e aplicações*. Caxias do Sul, EDUSC, 91-124.

Evans, P. (1995). *Embedded autonomy: states and industrial transformation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

_____. (2004). Development as institutional change: the pitfalls of monocropping and the potentials of deliberation. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 38, 30-52. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02686327>

Ferreira, T.; Vitorino Filho, V. (2010). Teoria de redes: uma abordagem social. *Revista Conteúdo*, Capivari, 1 (3), jan./jul.

Frey, K. (2000). Políticas públicas: um debate conceitual e reflexões referentes à prática da análise de políticas públicas no Brasil. *Planejamento e política públicas*, 21, 211-259.

_____. (2004). Governança interativa: uma concepção para compreender a gestão pública participativa? *Política & Sociedade*, Florianópolis, 5, 117-136

Gomes, R. C.; Secchi, L. (2015). Public Administration in Brazil: structure, reforms, and participation. In: Massey, Andrew; Johnston, Karen. (Org.). *The International Handbook on Public Administration and Governance*. 1ed. Cheltenham: Edgar Elgar, 1, 226-246.

González, M. V. P. (2014). Gobernanza turística: ¿Políticas públicas innovadoras o retórica banal? *Caderno Virtual de Turismo*. Edição especial: Hospitalidade e políticas públicas em turismo, 14(1), 9-22.

Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91, 481-510. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1086/228311>

Hall, C. M. (2011). Typology of governance and its implications for tourism policy analysis. *Journal of sustainable tourism*, 19(4-5), 437-57. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.570346>

Hall, P. A.; Taylor, R. (1996). Political science and the three new institutionalism. *Political Studies*, 44 (5), 936-957. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb00343.x>

Hanneman, R. A. (2001). *Introducción a los métodos del análisis de redes sociales*. Disponível em: <<http://revista-redes.rediris.es/webredes/textos/cap8.pdf>> Acesso em: 15 abr. 2016.

Holanda, L. A. (2003). *Formação e institucionalização do campo organizacional de turismo em Recife – PE*. Recife: Universidade Federal de Pernambuco. (Dissertação de mestrado.)

Jesus, C.; Franco, M. (2016). Cooperation networks in tourism: A study of hotels and rural tourism establishments in an inland region of Portugal. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 29, 165-175. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2016.07.005>

Kimbo, A. N.; Ngoasong, M. Z. (2013). Centralised decentralisation of tourism development: a network perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 40, 235-259. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2012.09.005>

Knupp, M. E. C. G. (2014). Análise de políticas públicas de turismo: uma abordagem metodológica baseada em redes sociais. In: Pimentel, T. D.; Emmendoerfer, M. L.; Tomazzoni, E. L. *Gestão pública do turismo no Brasil: teorias, metodologias e aplicações*. Caxias do Sul: EDUSC.

Lavalle, A. G.; Castello, G.; Bichir, R. M. (2007). Protagonistas na sociedade civil: redes e centralidades de organizações civis em São Paulo. *Dados* [online], 50 (3), 465-498. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0011-52582007000300002>

Lin, D.; Simmons, D. (2017). Structured inter-network collaboration: Public participation in tourism planning in Southern China. *Tourism Management*, 63, 315-328. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.06.024>

Lopes, F. D.; Baldi, M. (2009). Redes como perspectiva de análise e como estrutura de governança. *RAP - Revista de Administração Pública* (Impresso), 43, 1007-1035. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-76122009000500003>

Machado-da-Silva, C. L.; Gonçalves, S. A. (2007). Nota Técnica: A Teoria Institucional. In: Stewart Clegg et al.; Miguel Pinto Caldas et al. (Orgs.). *Handbook de Estudos Organizacionais: modelos de análise e novas questões em estudos organizacionais*. São Paulo: Atlas, 1, 220-226.

March, J. G.; Olsen, J. P. (1984). The new institutionalism: organizational factors in political life. *The American Political Science Review*, 78 (2), 734-749.

Marques, E. C. (1997). Notas críticas à literatura sobre Estado, políticas estatais e atores políticos. *BIB. Revista Brasileira de Informação Bibliográfica em Ciências Sociais*, 43.

_____.; Bichir, R.; Moya, E. (2014). Notas sobre el análisis de redes sociales en Brasil. *REDES – Revista Hispana para el Análisis de Redes Sociales*, 25(1).

_____. (2000). *Estado e redes sociais: permeabilidade e coesão nas políticas urbanas do Rio de Janeiro*. Rio de Janeiro: Revan; São Paulo: Fapesp.

Meyer, J. W.; Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340-363. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1086/226550>

Mizruchi, M. (2006). Análise de redes sociais: avanços recentes e controvérsias atuais. *RAE – Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 46(3). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-75902006000300013>

Nóbrega, W. R. M.; Figueiredo, S. (2014). Turismo e gestão pública: uma avaliação das instâncias de governança no oeste do estado do Pará. In: Pimentel, T. D.; Emmendoerfer, M. L.; Tomazzoni, E. L. *Gestão pública do turismo no Brasil: teorias, metodologias e aplicações*. Caxias do Sul: EDUSC, 431-461.

North, D. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic development*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press North. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808678>

Nunkoo, R. (2017). Governance and sustainable tourism: What is the role of trust, power and social capital? *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2017.10.003>

Ostrom, E. (1986) An agenda for the study of institutions. *Public Choice*, 48 (1), 3-25. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00239556>

Pastras, P.; Bramwell, B. (2013). A strategic-relational approach to tourism policy. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 43, 390-414. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2013.06.009>

Paula, A. P. P. (2005). *Por uma nova gestão pública: limites e potencialidades da experiência contemporânea*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da Fundação Getúlio Vargas.

Peres, S. P.(2008) Comportamento ou instituições? A evolução histórica do neo-institucionalismo da ciência política. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, 23 (68), 53-71. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-69092008000300005>

Peters, B. G. (2000). *Institutional theory: problems and prospects*. *Political Science Series*. Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna

_____. (2003). *El nuevo institucionalismo: la teoría institucional en ciencia política*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

Prates, A. A. (2000). Organização e instituição no novo institucionalismo. *Teoria & Sociedade*, 5, 123-146.

Quiroga, Á. (2006). El análisis de redes sociocéntricas con Unicinet 6 y Netdraw. In: Molina, José Luis. *Talleres de autoformación con programas de análisis de redes sociales*. Barcelona: Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, Server de publicaciones. 23-55.

Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The new governance: governing without government. *Political studies*, 652-667. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb01747.x>

Sañudo, J. E. P. (2015). 7 lecturas para iniciarse en análisis de redes sociales. Una selección de REDES. *REDES – Revista Hispana para el Análisis de Redes Sociales*, 26(1).

Schneider, V. (2005). Redes de políticas públicas e a condução de sociedades complexas. *Civitas – Revista de Ciências Sociais*, 5(1).

Scott, J. (2005). *Social network analysis*. London: SAGE.

Scott, W. R. (1999). Retomando los argumentos institucionales. In: Powell, W. & DiMaggio, P. (Orgs.) *El nuevo institucionalismo en el análisis organizacional*. México D. F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 217-236.

Secchi, L. (2009). Modelos organizacionais e reformas na administração pública. *RAP. Revista Brasileira de Administração Pública*, 43, 347-369. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-76122009000200004>

_____. (2010). Entrepreneurship and participation in public management reforms at the local level. *Journal local government studies*, 36 (4), 511-527.

_____. (2016). Policy analysis in Brazil: a comparison of rationalist and argumentative approaches. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 18 (1), 88-101. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2015.1110962>

Sipioni, M. E.; Zorzal e Silva, M. (2013). Reflexões e interpretações sobre a participação e a representação em Conselhos Gestores de Políticas Públicas. *Revista de Sociologia e Política*, 21(46), 147-158. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-44782013000200009>

Skocpol, T. (1985). *Bringing the state back in: strategies of analysis in current research*. In: Evans, P.; Rueschemeter, D.; Skocpol, T. *Bringing the state back in*. Sage: London, 1985 . DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511628283.002>

Théret, B. (2003). As instituições entre as estruturas e as ações. *Lua Nova: Revista de cultura e política*, 58, 225-252. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-64452003000100011>

Trentin, F. (2016). Governança turística em destinos brasileiros: comparação entre Armação dos Búzios/RJ, Paraty/RJ e Bonito/MS. *PASOS. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, 14(3), 645-658. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25145/j.pasos.2016.14.042>

Vale, N. O.; Lobo, C. G. A. (2007). Legitimidade e eficiência nos modelos institucionais. *Anais. XIII Congresso Brasileiro de Sociologia*. UFPE, Recife.

Wellman, B. (2000). El análisis estructural; del método y la metáfora a la teoría y la substancia. *Política y sociedad*, Madrid, 33, 11-40.

Informations about the authors

Ana Valéria Endres

PhD in Political Sociology. Department of Tourism and Hospitality – DTH, Federal University of Paraíba – UFPB

E-mail: valendres@hotmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7694-5014>

Elbio Troccoli Pakman

PhD in Economics. Department of Tourism and Hospitality – DTH, Federal University of Paraíba – UFPB.

E-mail: elbiopakman@hotmail.com

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2217-2511>