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ABSTRACT

A POLICY NETWORK IN SMART TOURISM POLICYMAKING:
A KOREA CASE

DoYoung Kim
University of Guelph, 2016

Advisor: Dr. H.S. Chris Choi

Because of recognition of the dearth of research into policy networks in tourism, the case study method was used to investigate a network in smart tourism policymaking (STP) in Korea. Data were collected from in-depth interviews with two groups of participants and relevant documents, which were reviewed to confirm consistency of findings. This study revealed features of networks in tourism policymaking (TP) and STP. TP and STP networks in Korea were characterized by the institutional structure of administrative agencies, their dominance, the lack of balance in information exchanges between public and private sectors despite the significance of the private sector. The findings suggest that effective TP requires strategies that use multiple networks across cutting agencies or industries, facilitate interactions and sustain communication with the private sector. This study implies that defining a policy agenda clearly and setting up a framework for policy formulation are essential for effective TP.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Tourism policy outlines the overall direction for developing tourism and provides guidelines not only for the public sector but also for the private sector (Inskeep, 1994). Tourism policy as a public policy is generally high-level or national policy, having “intent on careful planning and control of tourism development to mitigate potentially undesirable socioeconomic and environmental impacts” (Inskeep, 1988, p. 361). Tourism policy can be found in legislative and other official documents like tourism development plans.

Tourism policy is formulated with the involvement and interactions of various organizations (actors) in both the public and the private sectors. The actors involved in TP shape tourism policy. In this sense, TP is dynamic and complex process (Dredge, 2006a, 2006b; Hall, 1999; Pforr 2005, 2006; Thatcher, 1998). A cluster or group of actors interact, communicate, and develop complex relationships during TP. This cluster of interacting actors is called a “policy network” (Berry et al., 2004; Börzel, 1998; Klijn, 1996; Rhodes & Marsh, 1992). In essence, TP takes place within the actors’ networks (Klijn, 1996).

Tourism policy for smart tourism becomes more significant for the competitiveness of tourism destinations and industry (Gretzel, Koo, Sigala, & Xiang, 2015; Wang, Li, & Li, 2013). Smart tourism has received attention from the research community and from governments because technological progress and the convergence of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) across industries, including tourism, bring potentials (Buhalis & Amaranggana, 2014; Gretzel, Koo, et al., 2015; Gretzel, Sigala, Xiang, & Koo, 2015; Hunter, Chung, Gretzel, & Koo, 2015). As a strategic tool for competitive destinations and a growth engine for economic development, the Chinese government established smart tourism destination initiative in 2009, and South Korean government did smart tourism development initiative in 2011. The aim was to support convenient tourism activities, enrich tourist experience, and enhance the competitiveness of corporations and destinations (Wang et al., 2013; Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism [MCST], 2011).

Smart tourism policymaking (STP) should encompass a variety of actors because smart tourism relies on integrating technologies and businesses as well as on convergence (Buhalis & Amaranggana, 2014). Tourism itself is interdisciplinary, so policymaking in tourism,
especially STP, is typified by a comprehensive approach of involving many different actors. For instance, central governments typically have administrative bodies for tourism, transport, agriculture, environment, and foreign affairs, all involved in making tourism policy and shaping it using the various structures and institutional mechanisms of policymaking of different countries. In addition, the particular focus of STP is on the importance of ICT (e.g., ICT-embedded infrastructure in tourism destinations), the private sector’s roles and cooperative relationships (or partnership) between the government and members of the private sector to develop smart tourism (Buhalis & Amaranggana, 2014; Gretzel, Sigala, et al., 2015).

A body of literature on TP investigated actors and the structure of their relationships in national or regional tourism development planning (Pforr, 2002, 2006). Much attention has gone to how to involve community stakeholders to eventually achieve sustainable tourism using a collaborative approach in the planning process (Dredge, 2006a; Hall, 1999). Understanding how policy networks operate and function for TP is critical, but little research in the tourism arena has explored how policy networks form and operate nor how they are associated with policymaking (Dredge, 2006a; Pforr, 2005). Furthermore, the study of TP, especially contemporary and emerging policy issues (e.g., smart tourism) has been neglected. In fact, scholarly work on smart tourism has fallen behind, remaining at conceptualization stage (Buhalis & Amaranggana, 2014; Gretzel, Koo, et al., 2015; Huang, Yuan, & Shi, 2012; Wang et al., 2013).

Therefore, the research for this thesis investigated actors and their networks and their effect on tourism policy. The focus is on a particular TP issue (or case), STP at the central governmental level, the Smart Tourism Development Initiative (STDI) of Korea. The policy network approach was the analytical tool used to explore the complexity of the networks among various actors in this case study. The policy network approach is useful in achieving deeper understanding of the complexity of TP (Dredge, 2006a; Pforr, 2005). Moreover, the research analysis focused on the policymaking process, as applied by Pforr (2002, 2005, 2006) in a case study on Australia and consisting of three stages (i.e., agenda-setting, policy formulation and decision-making).

The study provides a better understanding of policymaking in tourism using policy network approach, so I focused on three research questions in attempting to identify strategies
for effective policymaking: 1) what are the characteristics of policy networks in TP of Korea and how do they present in STP; 2) how does an STP network influence policymaking; and 3) how can an administrative agency manage the STP process and networks. Research findings should help policy-makers manage TP more effectively.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Policy Network Approach

I first review the literature on policy network theory and policy network analysis conducted in tourism. Next, the strengths of policy network approach informed by policy network theory and public management field of study are discussed with specific focus on effective network management and effective policymaking. This section concludes with the TP research framework that reflects the key concepts and main discussion of policy network approach so as to provide a strong guidance for TP network study and analysis.

2.1.1 Policy network theory

Using policy network theory as an analytical tool or as a theoretical framework has increased the understanding of public policymaking over the last few decades. Policy network theory emerged in political science and public administration/management to explain the high degree of interdependency between governments and various actors in the public and private sectors in making public policy (Berry et al., 2004; Klijn, 1996; Thatcher, 1998).

Amid decentralization and fragmentation of the state, and the blurring boundaries between the public and private sectors in policymaking, coordinating organizations and exchange relationships is increasingly important (Thatcher, 1998). Policy processes and policy decision-making take place within networks of actors that depend on each other (Klijn, 1996). Governments cannot handle issues and address uncertainty in total isolation from other actors (e.g., other public administrative agencies, local governments and businesses), so public administrators must cope with networks of stakeholders (O’Toole, 1997). Businesses, not-for-profits organizations and other administrative bodies are involved in policymaking and program operations.

Although definitions of policy networks differ to some extent, policy networks themselves can refer to public-private or state-society relationships (Agranoff & McGuire,
1999a, 1999b; Klijn, 1996). Notwithstanding various definitions of policy networks, they commonly feature a structure of interdependence involving multiple organizations (Agranoff & McGuire, 1999a, 1999b; O’Toole, 1997) or a cluster of organizations interconnected to one another (Börzel, 1998; Klijn, 1996; Rhodes & Marsh, 1992).

Policy networks have been criticized because they lack of clear definition; moreover, researchers have found little agreement on methodological approaches (Dredge, 2006a; 2006b). Thus, renowned researchers struggle to pull together a vast amount of knowledge, spur discussion over typology and methodology, and to present theoretical development (Börzel, 1998; Thatcher, 1998). Thatcher (1998) summarized the development of policy network theory covering four phases over more than two decades: policy networks as specific types of state-interest group relationships; the appearance of network typologies; inter-organizational analysis; and the diversified frameworks.

As policy network theory has developed over time, the inter-organizational approach gained popularity. This approach views public policymaking as an example of decision-making by interdependent actors engaging in information and communication exchange relationships (Thatcher, 1998). This approach focuses more specifically on intergovernmental and inter-organizational relationships. Seeing policy as a product of complex interactions among organizations in the public and private sectors, this approach investigates the relationships of organizations and their interactions in policymaking.

Thatcher (1998) noted that the policy network theory has broadened its scope to develop analytical frameworks. Extending the policy network theory primarily affected two circumstances: (1) changes in policy networks in specific contexts, and (2) the influence of policy networks on policy itself. In particular, environment or context has been extensively researched. Political, administrative, and institutional settings can change existing policy networks (Marsh & Smith, 2000; Rhodes & Marsh, 1992; Thatcher, 1998). Marsh and Smith (2000) emphasized the interaction between a policy network and its context. While investigating case studies in Britain, Rhodes and Marsh (1992) identified four environmental factors (i.e., economic/market, ideological, knowledge/technical, and institutional), which can constitute influential environment and provide impetus for change in establishing or operating policy networks.
Also, policy network studies call attention to policy process and the effect policy networks have on policymaking and policy itself (Berry et al., 2004; Thatcher, 1998). The type of policy network, state-directed networks, for instance, influences policy change (e.g., paradigm shifts through dramatic change) as can be network of actors (Thatcher, 1998). In this sense, actors, especially the state as an actor, play an important role to establish, support or exclude other actors, which is crucial for public policy because actors not only shape policy networks but establish the primacy of their members. The literature stresses the strategies that organizations use in policy networks to affect policymaking (Klijn, 1996).

Furthermore, some actors have privileged positions in shaping and creating relations. In a comparative study of nine policy areas in British government, Rhodes and Marsh (1992) argued that only a few actors enjoyed privileged access to policy-making. Economic position and knowledge were the key resource, providing privileged access to policymaking. Business groups, professional groups, and governments typically dominate policy networks.

In sum, recent developments in policy network theory focus on the following: (1) the inter-organizational approach; (2) emphasizing how context influences policy networks; (3) how policy networks influence policymaking or policy itself; and (4) strategies used by some actors to, among others, include or exclude other actors. Investigating a policy network in STP using these four approaches could lead to a better understanding of the dynamics and complexity of TP in certain contexts.

2.1.2 Analysis of policy networks in tourism

Surprisingly, few empirical studies have addressed policy networks in tourism policy. In particular, few researchers have investigated networks associated with tourism planning. However, “a small but steady increase” in using policy network theory over the last decade has contributed to understanding TP or planning (Dredge, 2006a).

Dredge and Pforr attempted to examine the relationships between public and private sectors and the influence of policy networks on implementing policy (Dredge 2006a, 2006b; Pforr, 2002, 2006). While their research methods vary, the main subjects of their studies are the public-private relationships surrounding political problems or issues in tourism (e.g., establishing a local tourism association) or actors and their relationships in tourism planning (e.g., tourism destination development planning).
Recognizing the limitations of quantitative research methods, Dredge (2006b) used the case study method to investigate policy networks establishing a local tourism association. She found that without a clear network structure and a limited agreement on the roles and responsibilities of both local government and local tourism association affected those relationships, making them unstable and inhibiting public-private partnerships.

In another study, Dredge (2006a) applied the policy network theory to explore the interrelations among multiple policy networks and collaborative planning processes in Redland Shire, Australia, developing practical suggestions for collaborative planning. After discussing the strengths and weaknesses of both the policy network theory and the collaborative planning theory, she presented a framework with specified factors, like inclusion/exclusion of actors in policy space where planning of selected issues occurred. Using the proposed framework, she reported her findings. She concluded that policy network theory was useful in explicating the policymaking process, “inject[ing] a level of political reality” into “normative” and “idealistic” planning processes by identifying boundaries of networks and diagnosing conflicts during planning.

Pforr (2006) examined actors and the structure of policy networks in tourism development planning, focusing on policy formulation stage rather than the implementation or evaluation stage. Policy network theory was used as an analytical tool, along with the policy cycle model, to describe the complex interactions between public-private actors in the Northern Territory Development Master Plan. Pforr measured the density and centrality of policy networks, using a quantitative research method, called the social network analysis. He found that typical political and industry actors, along with their interactions, are prominent in policy networks.

2.1.3 Advantages of policy network approach in tourism research

Tourism inherently involves relationships and interdependence among various organizations (Zhang, Song, & Huang, 2009). Such interdependence in tourism necessarily involves networking and different approaches or theories have been used to explain networks, among them the social network approach (Scott, Cooper, & Baggio, 2008; Lemmetyinen & Go, 2009; Novelli, Schmitz, & Spencer, 2006; Pavlovich, 2003) and the supply chain management theory (Zhang et al.).
In recent years, however, policy network theory has received more attention. The policy network theory allows researchers to analyze both actors and the various aspects of policy networks using the dimensions and properties of policy networks, namely actors, functions, and structure (refer to the sensitizing concepts in p. 23). Dredge (2006a) and Pför (2005) both argued that the policy network theory is a “flexible” and “creative”, giving it an advantage in explaining the dynamics and complexity of TP in certain circumstances. Moreover, the theory allows investigation of the relationships between context and policy networks (Marsh & Smith, 2000; Thatcher, 1998).

Second, the policy network approach provides researchers with a useful analytical lens to investigate policy networks along the policymaking process. This approach, in combination with policy cycle model, typically consisting of five phases (agenda-setting; policy formulation; decision-making; policy implementation; and policy evaluation), enables researchers to analyze the dynamics of policymaking from both the perspective of the network and from the perspective of the process (Thatcher, 1998). For instance, Pför (2005) created a framework for analyzing tourism policymaking, using the policy network approach combined with the policy cycle model. The analytical focus was on the policymaking process, including the first three phases in the policy cycle.

Third, the policy network approach can capitalize on strategies used by actors and informed by network study in public administration/management. Berry et al. (2004) encouraged interdisciplinary communication across fields of study (i.e., social network analysis, policy network research, and network research in public management). They argued that network research can incorporate insights and ideas from other fields. In public management, renowned researchers have discussed the roles of network members (e.g., public agencies) in the public policy domain and how they manage networks effectively and handle complex policymaking processes (Agranoff & McGuire, 2001; Klijn, 1996). Agranoff and McGuire (2001) suggested four general tasks after a review of the literature and categorizing managers’ tasks in organizations for the network to work effectively (see Table 1).
### Table 1. Actor's strategies for managing the network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activating</td>
<td>Identifying and activating potential and necessary participants, and resources (e.g., money, information, and expertise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing</td>
<td>Framing rules, values, and context of the network (e.g., creating shared purposes or visions; recommending an alternative decision-making mechanism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilizing</td>
<td>Mobilizing the participants toward a holistic purpose and strategies (e.g., inducing actors to commit to the joint undertaking and forging an agreement on roles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td>Synthesizing or facilitating participants for effective interaction in pursuit of a common goal (e.g., reducing complexity and uncertainty by encouraging information exchange; changing relations and roles of participants)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Adapted from Agranoff & McGuire (2001)*

Finally, the policy network approach helps answer a question about effective network management in the policymaking process in conjunction with public management. Public management considers networks as serving as “an effective decision-making mechanism” to reduce the complexity and encourage interdependency among actors in pursuing common goals (Hanf & O’Toole, 1992). In other words, the literature in public management discussed how well managed networks affected decision-making and policy output (Berry et al., 2004). The effectiveness underlying network management can be understood as the pursuit of common goals, not individual ones; active interactions among participating actors; sustaining communication channels; and seeking agreement among actors in the policy network (Klijn, 1996).

#### 2.1.4 TP network research framework

The research framework shown in Figure 1 was developed through the literature review of policy network theory and network approach in public management. Regarding the purposes of the study and research questions, the framework reflects key concepts such as policy network as a cluster of connected organizations. The definition of policy network used in this research largely refers to work of key authors as follows. Rhodes and Marsh (1992) defined a policy network as “a cluster or complex of organizations connected to each other by resource dependencies and distinguished from other clusters or complexes by breaks in the structure of resources dependencies” (Rhodes & Marsh, 1992, p. 182). Klijn (1996) built on
this definition and focused on inter-organizational relationships with dynamic view of policy processes in policymaking, which is the result of interactions of actors involved. Klijn (1996) argued that actors make attempt to influence policy processes through strategic behavior. Börzel (1998) mentioned that there is the shared understanding of policy network concept between different disciplines by pointing out interdependency among various actors.

The framework shows the influence of contexts, especially the institutional setting, on policy networks (Marsh & Smith, 2000; Rhodes & Marsh, 1992; Thatcher, 1998). Tourism policymaking varies depending on structures and the institutional mechanisms for tourism-related administration bodies in each country. Rhodes and Marsh (1992) argued institutional factor influenced policy network changes.

The framework also includes the key strategy to manage the network. Deciding whether to select actors and to include actors in the network is the far most important among actor’s strategies during organizing a policy network (Dredge, 2006a, 2006b; Waarden, 1992). It influences the pattern of relationships in the network, in other words, the structure of the network. Actors, administrative agencies for example, play important roles relating to including actors and structuring the relationships whereas some actors remain excluded from policymaking. Identifying potential actors and involving them into policy networks are also described as “activating the network” in public management study.
In addition, the process perspective of policymaking is reflected on the framework. Policymaking processes take place within policy networks of actors (Klijn, 1996). On the other hand, policy networks centered on policy issues or problems are formed and function along policymaking processes. In this sense, policy networks are analyzed in conjunction with policymaking processes (Thatcher, 1998) or at a certain stage of processes like policy formulation (Pforr, 2002; 2005; 2006). According to Klijn (1996), managing policy networks include managing policymaking processes; they are not considered separately.

All in all, the TP network research framework reflects the key concepts and recently discussed policy network approach. It also includes key strategies of managing the network and the process perspective. In particular, the framework implies propositions that contexts, specifically institutional environment, have influence on policy networks and there are the relationships between policy networks and policymaking.

2.2 Smart Tourism

This research specifically focuses on STP as a research case for analyzing a policy network so it needs to define smart tourism and understand the areas smart tourism policy involves. In the following pages, I outlined the impact of ICTs on tourism, which explains the background of smart tourism. Then, the term smart tourism is defined and smart tourism policy is discussed in a comprehensive approach.

2.2.1 Background of smart tourism

Tourism, to be successful, relies on information (Dimanche & Jolly, 2009). Information is “the lifeblood of tourism” (Buhalís, 1998). Tourists, moreover, rely heavily on ICTs to get the information they need. Information about tourism products and services is presented to them with supports of ICTs (Zhang et al., 2009).

The development and proliferation of ICTs has significantly transformed tourism (Buhalís & Law, 2008). Implementing tourism ICTs has changed travel planning and enhanced the co-creation of tourism experiences (Neuhofer, Buhalís, & Ladkin, 2012). Tourism has also seen rapid changes. Organizations have shifted their marketing and management strategies, moving to interactive and instant communication with customers (Law, Buhalís, & Cobanoglu, 2014; Wang et al., 2013). The advent of new services like AirBnB and TripAdvisor mean a variety of distribution and sales channel platforms are
available both online and on mobile devices, so that the landscape of the market is transformed (Neuhofer, Buhalis, & Ladkin, 2015).

More specifically, smart tourism is heavily indebted to the wide spread use of smart devices and mobile applications (Gretzel, Koo, et al., 2015; Hunter et al., 2015). Mobile technologies are used in many fields and industries, including tourism, which facilitates the integrating technologies, services, and businesses across industries. The rise of mobile travelers equipped with smart devices and mobile applications gave rise to the term, “smart tourism” (Dimanche & Jolly, 2009).

Thus, it comes as no surprise that a body of the literature has addressed a wide range of topics related to ICTs in tourism from both consumer and supplier perspectives. Among consumer-oriented papers, dominant are studies about consumer behavior (e.g., information searches, trip planning, and post-purchase behavior), decision making, and adopting technology. Studies on the supplier perspective mainly focus on e-Marketing through a website; social media or eWOM; and e-Strategic management or web design (Law et al., 2014). By contrast, the academic community has not kept up with the rapid development of smart tourism either at a destination level or in the tourism policy domain (Gretzel, Koo, et al., 2015; Huang et al., 2012).

2.2.2 Defining smart tourism and smart tourism policy

The study of policy networks is domain or issue specific; the specific policy domain or issue must be defined at the beginning of the study. In our research, the focus is on STP, so first we must define smart tourism itself and what area smart tourism policy addresses.

Some research has attempted to define smart tourism using conceptual or theoretical foundations (Gretzel, Sigala, et al., 2015). Gretzel, Sigala, et al. (2015) pointed out that theory lags behind reality; governments and industries have already implemented smart tourism development projects.

Simply put, smart tourism means “smarter” tourism. Smart or smartness refers to the ability to infer and reason. However, when it is used as a buzzword, smart becomes fuzzy or difficult to define exactly (Gretzel, Sigala, et al., 2015). Depending on how the key aspects of smartness are defined, smart tourism definitions may vary. Reviews of the relevant literature
like the released official document\(^1\) of STDI released recently (MCST, 2011) and the published research report\(^2\) on smart tourism (KCTI, 2013), the key aspects underlying “smart” were as follows:

- convenient or user-friendly; quality visits or experience;
- regardless of time or place; real-time or at the same time interval;
- connected to the Internet or easily accessible information and services;
- personalized information and services; and
- intelligent or accurate

Thus, smart tourism in our research is defined as *tourism that provides personalized information/services in real-time, enabling users to take advantage of the information/services regardless of time or place, thereby supporting convenient tourist activities and enriching the experience through a technological environment.* The definition is built using demand-side and public policy perspectives. However, the definition does not underestimate the supply-side because suppliers in the industry actually provide information and service. Rather, the definition indicates that businesses must promote and facilitate the convergence of technology to fulfill the promise of smart tourism.

While this definition of smart tourism relies heavily on the demand-side goals or objectives of public policy in tourism, definitions in the tourism literature focus more on the supply-side and aggregating and integrating information that creates value for various stakeholders, especially private corporations (Gretzel, Sigala, et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2013).

Using a more comprehensive approach, Buhalis and Amaranggana (2014) discussed smart tourism in the destinations. They built a framework of smart tourism destinations based on the concept of a smart city. They conceptualized smart tourism in destinations as an integrated platform on which stakeholders interconnect and information related to tourism

---

1 STDI (2011) conceptualized smart tourism in the Korean context and highlighted 5 aspects: standard-based compatibility; multi-functionality on the basis of convergence; accessibility to information/services regardless of time or place; reliability of data and information; and time-saving for tourist convenience.

2 The research report (2013), titled “Current Status of Smart Tourism and Future Direction for Smart Tourism Policy”, included the trend analysis of markets and technologies, definition of smart tourism, evaluation of undertakings in smart tourism policy and the future direction for smart tourism policy.
activities could be exchanged instantly. In this framework, they suggested necessary components of smart tourism destinations, called Buhalis’s six destination components (i.e., attractions, accessibility, amenities, available packages, activities, and ancillaries) and six dimensions of a smart city, namely Smart People, Smart Economy, Smart Environment, Smart Governance, Smart Living, and Smart Mobility. These components provide guidance for a comprehensive approach in developing smart tourism at the destination level and evaluating what must be done more in actual practice. In accordance with their framework for smart tourism in destinations, public-private sector partnerships and cooperation in public policy are necessary to develop smart tourism.

Smart tourism should bring opportunities for tourism destinations, businesses, and the country’s economy as long as technological progress and evolution continue (Gretzel, Sigala, et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2013). Conventionally, destination images, attributes, or attractors help explain the competitiveness of tourism destinations (i.e., regions or one country as a whole) (Enright & Newton, 2004). However, recent research suggests that the competitiveness of a destination can be viewed as part of smart tourism, with destination infrastructure and the technology for both tourists and businesses (Wang et al., 2013). Thus, the government of each country recognizes smart tourism and attempts to develop it.

In tourism policy domain, smart tourism reflects policy goals or objectives and strategies can enhance the competitiveness of tourism destinations and businesses, revolutionizing how a destination creates tourist experiences and helping tourism businesses grow (MCST, 2011; China’s smart tourism destination initiative as cited in Wang et al., 2013). Although they use different terms (e.g., smart tourism, smart tourism destination, and smart city), regional or central governments around the globe have implemented programmatic policies or projects in smart tourism. For instance, Barcelona (http://smartcity.bcn.cat/en) and Amsterdam (http://amsterdamsmartcity.com) have instituted a variety of citywide or destination-wide projects known as “Smart City” (e.g., embedded iBeacons along streets or in tourism attractions and open access to public data bases). The European Commission (2015) has established “European Initiatives on Smart Cities”. Recently, Seoul (www.digitalseoul2020.org) announced a strategic plan, “Seoul Digital Plan 2020”, which includes free Wi-Fi zones in all public places by 2017, integrated parking systems, and encouraging start-ups in the Internet of Things (IoTs) (The Korea Times, 23/02/2016). In
essence, smart tourism focuses more on tourism destination components developed under the umbrella of smart city or ICT-related policy in a comprehensive and holistic approach.

In summary, smart tourism policy is not merely about developing travel guide applications for visitors or digitizing private or public organizations; rather, it compasses policies in infrastructure and business promotion across industries. STP may need to consider a wider range of stakeholders or actors like ICT-related governmental agencies and public agencies as well as local authorities as infrastructure is established. As the literature shows, government agencies and businesses have already started along the path to smart tourism. Academic research using a case study and policy network analysis may provide additional guidance to those already pursuing smart tourism or convergence of ICTs in tourism and perhaps help in anticipating and avoiding problems due to issues within policymaking.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology and Context

3.1 Case Study

This study used the case study research method. A case study allows a researcher to investigate “a contemporary phenomenon (the case) in depth and within its real-world context” (Yin, 2013, p.16). According to Yin, the case study should be used when understanding a case involves understanding the important contexts of the case. Unlike administering a survey or performing an experiment, the case study takes real-world situations (i.e., the context) into account. In a case study, the case and context are likely not always clearly distinguishable. Thus, the case study becomes appropriate for an empirical inquiry into both the phenomenon and the relevant context; policy networks in a certain policy domain fall into this category.

This research explores a policy network presented in STP of Korea. The inquiry about into a policy network should consider its real-world context. Because a policy network can vary depending on the specific policy domain or issue, the research context must first be defined (Dredge, 2006a; Pforr, 2002, 2005, 2006). For instance, Pforr (2002, 2006) delimited the research context for the case study describing policy networks at work during specific tourism planning, “the Northern Territory Tourism Development Masterplan” (TDMP), in Australia.
The case study approach is informed by so-called theory-before-research approach (Berg & Lune, 2012), as endorsed by Yin (2013). Yin emphasized a theoretical proposition or framework in designing the case study and in analyzing the collected data. Theoretical propositions or frameworks based on a literature review can provide “a strong guidance in determining the data to collect and the strategies for analyzing the data” (Yin, 2013, p.38). Therefore, in this study, the research framework (see Figure 1) was developed using the policy network theory and approach while designing the case study before gathering and analyzing the data. This framework also provided direction in designing interview questions and coding the data.

In particular, the single case study approach was selected as a suitable design for this study of “an extreme case or an unusual case” (Yin, 2013, p.52). Findings derived from analyzing an unusual case can give insights into normal cases. In this study, STP of Korea was selected as a case because:

- smart tourism is an emerging field of interest and contemporary policy issue, important to the competitiveness of tourism destinations as well as economic development, although it has been understudied;

- STP provides a relevant context for studying policy networks in the tourism policy domain from a different angle. STP at the level of the central government occurred only once over a certain period; as a result of STP, the Policy Development and Implementation Plan (PDIP) in tourism was established, termed the STDI of Korea; and

- this Korean case provided the researcher with access to participants who had been active in establishing the STDI and to the key informants who have been involved in various TP in Korea.

3.2 Research Context

The STP process began in April, 2010, led by the Presidential Council on the Information Society (the Council) and concluded when the STDI was adopted on June 27, 2011, at the sixth Council Meeting (Doc. 138) (National Information Society Agency [NIA], 2011; MCST, 2011). STP took almost one year from concept to formulating programmatic policies or practices, in the process, defining smart tourism, setting an agenda, and identifying and refining strategies. STP involved the following processes:

- Kick-off meeting (April, 2010):

  Upon the request of the Council’s IT service sub-committee, U-Tourism Information
Team of Korea Tourism Organization (KTO) briefed the committee on current projects of ubiquitous tourism being carried out by KTO.

- 2nd ~ 4th internal consultative meetings (April to July, 2010):

The Council and KTO shared the need to establish a (tentative) ubiquitous tourism plan. One travel agency recommended by KTO was involved in STP as of the 3rd meeting. Participants decided KTO would be responsible for drafting the plan. At the meetings, KTO presented inputs from its own consultation with academia and travel agencies.

- Progress meetings (August, 2010 to February, 2011):

The Council met with participants regularly to check progress in drafting the document. The MCST accepted responsibility for drafting the initiative as of August. KCTI, a public research institute, in the tourism sector, participated in STP intermittently. The term smart tourism was finally chosen instead of ubiquitous tourism.

- Consultation with professionals (November, 2010):

The MCST invited Online Travel Agencies (OTAs), web or mobile app service providers, and web portal operators to receive information about areas in which the public sector would invest in promoting smart tourism. Academics as well as KCTI and KTO (two pivotal public agencies in tourism sector) also participated in consultation organized by the MCST.

- Organizing TF (April, 2011) and consultations with businesses (April to May, 2011):

The MCST organized a TF comprising the staff from 3 public agencies, including KCTI and KTO, to speed up reviewing and revising the draft based on the feedbacks and inputs received throughout the STP process. Private corporations in the ICT industry (e.g., OTAs, web or mobile app service providers, and information systems firms) were invited to provide further inputs.

- Draft circulation (May, 2011):

Revisions were based on the feedbacks received as the draft circulated within the MCST and relevant public agencies.

- STDI document was submitted to the Council for policy adoption process (June, 2011):

It is noteworthy that the term of the discussed policy changed from ubiquitous tourism to smart tourism as the draft progressed.

The smart tourism agenda started out as part of the national IT policy discussion. The Council initiated discussion of smart tourism, announcing the “Service Innovation Initiative” as IT converged with various other industries including tourism, education, and health at the second Council Meeting (Doc. 52) in March, 2010 (NIA, 2011). The Ministry of ICT was
disbanded in 2008, so the Council was established under the jurisdiction of the President in 2009 to integrate and control IT policies of the government in various sections as well as “to deliberate on matters related to the promotion of national informatization” according to Article 9 in “Framework Act on National Informatization” (No. 9705, May 22, 2009). The Council worked to respond to the paradigm shifts in IT around the globe; suggest a framework and principles for national informatization and IT policies; and contribute to fulfilling the needs of an information-based society. Article 9 stipulated the functions of the Council as follows:

- Establish basic plans and implementation;
- Modify important matters as prescribed by Presidential Decree on basic plans and implementation;
- Adjust national informatization policies and projects;
- Analyze and inspect records on implementation of major polices; and
- Establish a mid-to-long term plan for managing information resources.

The Prime Minister and a professional in national informatization commissioned by the President jointly chaired the Council. According to the Act, the Council meeting consisted of “the heads of central governmental agencies (including the MCST) and local governments” as well as “persons commissioned by Presidential Decree, among those who have extensive professional expertise and experience in national informatization”. Under the Council, special committees including IT service sub-committee were established for its efficient operation and to reviews submitted agendas. The Council, in other words, established structural relationships with relevant organizations in IT through institutional policymaking and decision-making mechanisms (e.g., Council Meetings and subordinate special committees).

However, the personnel of special committees were not full-time and were seconded by others from relevant agencies in the public sector or academia for short periods. In addition, the Council was not authorized to adjust or deliberate on the IT budget of administrative agencies in the central government during the process of annual budgeting. The Council was only authorized to review the IT budget as it was developed and submitted by central governmental agencies and then to issue non-binding recommendations to the finance authority of the central government. Because of their advisory status, the Council had only a
budget for its own operation.

The term smart tourism did not officially exist until the STDI was released in 2011. Until then, several terms, namely digital tourism, ubiquitous tourism, or tourism information services, and tour guide on mobile devices, were used widely instead, and all are found in official documents (e.g., Third Tourism Five-year Promotion Plan) (MCST, 2009). After the STDI was established, the term smart tourism was adopted not only by the central government (Etnews, 12/02/2014), but also in research (Kim & Kim, 2014) as well as by local authorities like Jeju and Seoul (Yonhapnews, 26/06/2015). KTO established smart tourism action plan in conjunction with Korea Culture Information Service Agency (KCISA) to reflect up-to-date trends, rearrange its programs, and suggest future directions for developing smart tourism (KTO, 2015). New pilot projects on smart tourism have been carried out in provincial and regional destinations to improve ICT infrastructure and better serve prospective visitors to the mega event, Pyeongchang Winter Olympic Games 2018 (Yonhapnews, 22/02/2016).

In accordance with the “Special Act on Promotion of Information and Communications Technology, and Activation of convergence” (No. 12032, August 13, 2013), the Council was changed to the “Strategic Committee for Information and Communication Technology” under the jurisdiction of the Prime Minister, which was effective as of February 14, 2014. The Prime Minister chairs the Strategic Committee, and the Minister of Science, Information, and Communications Technology and Future Planning (MSIP) serves as the executive secretary.

3.3 Data Gathering

The research relied on the two main sources of the data: (1) individual, semi-constructed interviews; and (2) secondary data gathering from documents. In a case study, multiple sources of the data are required for a deep examination of the case and to ensure the study is as robust as possible (Berg & Lune, 2012; Yin, 2013). Triangulation of data converging on the same findings enables a researcher to verify facts (Berg & Lune, 2012; Cho & Trent, 2006; Khan, 2014; Yin, 2013).

In-depth interviews are a primary data source, and the various forms of documentary information (e.g., publicly available government documents, agendas, and news releases) (see Appendix C: List of Reviewed Documents) are secondary data (Smith, 2010; Yin, 2013).
**Interviews**

To increase the reliability of the case study, Yin (2013) suggested developing the case study protocol to include an overview of the case study; data collection procedures; and data collection questions. This research followed a uniform interview protocol to ensure reliability (see Appendix A: Interview Protocol).

Twenty semi-constructed interviews were conducted with two groups of participants:

- First Group (8): participants had been actually involved in the case, involved in establishing the STDI between 2010 and 2011. A total of 8 interviews were conducted. Participants came from different backgrounds. Two were from the former Council; five from public agencies; and one from the private sector.

- Second Group (12): participants were actually involved with TP. A total of 12 interviews were conducted. Four participants were in the central government; two were from public agencies; two from academia; and four from the private sector. In particular, four participants were, or are, to a great extent, in charge of implementing smart tourism projects in various organizations.

Purposeful sampling and snowball sampling were used to identify and recruit interview participants. Despite the relatively small sample size, purposeful sampling ensures the quality of the research by helping the researcher focus in depth on the case and to learn more about the case (Coyne, 1997). Through purposeful sampling, the researcher could include 18 key informants in the tourism or ICT domain who had information essential to the research topic and were involved in TP. Through snowball sampling, which seeks information from key informants, two more participants were recruited. These two informants eventually emerged because two key names were mentioned over and over by other participants.

The first round of interviews was conducted with participants in the first group during October, 2015. The eight participants were identified by referring to the documents circulated by the Council or the MCST during STP. The second round of interviews was conducted in November and December, 2015. The potential participants were identified by referring to publicly available documents on the websites of the MCST or KCTI, including released PDIPs in tourism field, tourism agendas, tourism research reports, and news releases between 2009 and 2015. Two potential participants in the second group declined invitations to the interview. During each interview, each participant was asked to recommend other potential participants. Through this step of snowball sampling, two more participants in the private...
sector were recruited and included in the research samples.

Participants were asked by email if they resided in Korea. After they accepted the invitation for the interview, they were sent the interview questions, a consent form (see Appendix B), and a brief explanation about the concept of smart tourism by email before they were interviewed. Of 20 participants, 4 participants asked to be interviewed by email. Four interviewees wrote the answers to the interview questions in a Word file and returned the file via email. The other interviews were conducted either using Skype software (9) or face-to-face (7), if necessary. Interviews lasted 40 minutes to one hour and 10 minutes. With participant approval, 16 interviews were voice recorded. Once each interview was concluded, each recording was transcribed into Korean as soon as possible.

The background and first language of participants, required that we develop three sets of interview questions; they were developed initially in English, and then they were translated into Korean. The first set of interview questions targeted participants in the first group; the second set was for participants in the second group; and the third set was specifically tailored for officials of the central government in the second group. To gain more insights into how the TP process and networks were managed from their perspectives, questions were slightly modified for the second group of participants.

As a first step in the interview process, each participant was reminded of the purpose of the study, their right to withdraw from the study at any time, and the privacy and confidentiality of the interview. I introduced myself as a researcher and interviewer, so participants were aware of my dual roles. My professional experience and background as a government official have been both a strength and a potential source of bias in this study.

All participants were asked about questions about (1) personal experience with policymaking process and policy; (2) their perception of how a policy network functions and what influence a policy network has on policymaking; (3) their perception of the interactions among actors; and (4) their thoughts about the concept of smart tourism and their input for future STP. In the interviews with the second group of participants, the modified questions in the third set of questions could be covered as a part of the second set of questions. Therefore, the second and the third sets of questions were integrated. In addition, we made small adjustments to clarify the meaning of questions through a reflexive process after interviewing
the 8 participants in the first group.

**Collecting documents**

Although interviews were primary sources of data, documents were collected and reviewed as secondary sources of the data. They include the released PDIPs in tourism, tourism research reports, meeting agendas, news releases, and news articles available on the websites (see Appendix C: List of Reviewed Documents).

Looking through documentary information helped in constructing questions about personal experience with the TP process and policy networks during the in-depth interviews. Documents were reviewed thoroughly before selective coding to help identify significant themes for participating actors, policy networks, and the policymaking process. Also, I reviewed the documents a second time to substantiate participants’ responses and to confirm that coded themes from the interviews were consistent with the selective coding during document review, thus aggregating significant themes into core themes.

3.4 **Data Analysis**

Both primary and secondary data were collected in the Korean language, so data analysis was conducted without translating the raw data into English to capture the nuances and the original subtleties. Corbin and Strauss (2008) discussed translating interview data into other languages issue during the coding process. They advised “minimal translating”. In other words, only key passages (or quotes) and codes should be translated to give readers a sense of what interviewees were saying and what the coding looks like.

Data analysis in a case study is the process of “searching for promising patterns, insights or concepts” to produce findings based on empirical evidence (Yin, 2013). It is a creative and dynamic process (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) with “few fixed formulas or cookbook recipes” (Yin, 2013). However, experienced qualitative researchers and case study researchers have suggested data analysis and coding procedures. This research followed customized coding procedures largely informed by Corbin & Strauss (2008), Smith (2010), and Strauss (1987).

Coding procedures in this study consisted of (1) preliminary coding, (2) axial coding, (3) between-group analysis, and (4) selective coding. The procedures are explained in more details in the following sections. Although the procedures are presented in linear order, the
The coding process is not static nor linear; rather, it is iterative.

Preliminary coding and axial coding were done within each of the two respondent groups. Coding the data from the first group was completed first, followed by coding the data from the second group. Mind mapping and the collected document analysis preceded selective coding to compare coded themes between the two groups and integrate them across groups. In selective coding, significant themes were selected and aggregated into core categories, which became the core themes presented as research findings. To help readers understand the coded themes, coding tables are presented in Appendix E. They include the list of preliminary codes, axial codes, codes from between-group analysis, and selective codes, all of which are associated with the core themes in this research.

3.4.1 Preliminary coding

Preliminary coding is “line by line” or “word by word” coding used to scrutinize the interview data very closely, note concepts (or themes), and produce provisional codes (Smith, 2010; Strauss, 1987). Data analysis involves coding, “taking raw data and raising it to conceptual level” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Coding allows deriving and developing concepts from the data; and codes are simply names given to concepts derived through coding.

The interview data was made readable for data analysis; that is, each audio recorded interview was transcribed immediately after each individual interview. All transcripts were saved in a Word file format. During the first round of interviews with the first group, transcripts were color-coded manually to become intimately acquainted with the data and make sense of concepts as they began to appear. After completing the second round of interviews, the Word files were transferred to Excel to facilitate data management and additional analysis in using NVivo 10 computer software. Each transcription was indexed with a unique number and separated into an Excel spreadsheet to make retrieving files and referencing them easier.

Sensitizing concepts were used in searching for concepts, interpreting transcripts, and helping organize preliminary codes into the categories developed at the axial coding stage (Smith, 2010). The sensitizing concepts below were derived from the dimensions and properties of a policy network as outlined by Dredge (2006b).
- Actors: type of actors involved, needs and interests of actors, capacities and resources, professionalization, perceived roles and attitudes of actors, interdependencies among actors;

- Functions of the network: access to the decision-making process, consultation and exchange between actors, negotiation, coordination, cooperation in policy formulation;

- Structure of the network: size of the network, (open or closed) boundaries, membership, pattern of linkages, strength of relations, clustering, centrality of the network;

- Characteristics of institutionalization: ad-hoc, temporary or informal organization to formal, stable, permanent coalition structure;

- Power relations: capture of state agencies by business interests, autonomy of the state, capture by private interests, balance of power between state and interest groups; and

- Actor strategies: to structure relations within the network, to influence the selection of actors in the network, to influence the function of the network, to create or nurture certain convention or interests.

At this point, the data in Excel were imported into NVivo10 to facilitate developing codes within each group and managing the large volume of the data. The interview data gathered from each group of participants were analyzed as independent sets. The coded themes and related data sources were managed in a separate folder within NVivo 10 to better understand the experience and perception of each group; identify consistencies or inconsistencies; and manage the data and themes more easily.

NVivo10 software is a tool that helps piece together the coded themes or evidence, called “nodes” in NVivo software, into broader categories. All nodes in preliminary coding were labeled in English: for example, “public agencies serving as a bridge between the government and the private sector” and “pre-defining a framework to manage the tourism policy networks and tourism policymaking process effectively.” The nodes or coded themes continued to be refined as preliminary coding progressed.

### 3.4.2 Axial coding

The focus of axial coding is sorting codes or themes into categories (Berg & Lune, 2012; Strauss, 1987). Successive sorting involves linking categories with sub-categories as well as categorizing or sub-categorizing all themes. Categories or sub-categories were made within each group in NVivo 10 software. At the axial coding stage, the research framework
presented in Figure 1 helped to in forming tentative categories like “managing TP networks during the TP process” and “understanding Korean contexts.” The following categories were formed within each group:

- The first group (14 categories): characteristics of TP networks; differences in STP networks; functions and influences of STP networks; importance of figuring out the needs of tourists through the data; inclusion or exclusion of actors; interactions between actors; issue-based policy networks; key actors in STP networks; key aspects of smart tourism and suggestions for the STP process and networks; motivation behind actor participation; multiple policy networks during the STP process; relationships and interactions; smart tourism background and its development in Korea; and suggestions for STP.

- The second group (14 categories): approaches to smart tourism policy and its development in Korea; characteristics of TP networks; features of STP networks; functions and influences of TP networks; gathering and analyzing data about tourists; inclusion or exclusion of actors and limited membership; issue-based policy networks; key actors in TP networks; key aspects of smart tourism and suggestions for STP process and networks; managing TP networks during the TP process; motivation and obstacles to participation; multiple policy networks at multi-levels; relationships and interactions among actors; and understanding Korean contexts.

3.4.3 Between-group analysis

Themes were then compared across the two groups, and data were integrated into similar higher level or between-group themes. This step formed more comprehensive themes.

At this stage, mind mapping helped in finding hidden or underlying themes. Mind maps contributed to between-group comparisons and identified commonalities or differences. Mind maps were drawn manually using the categories and coded themes found in each group at the axial coding stage. Until this point, coded themes were categorized hierarchically within each group. In contrast, mind mapping in a diagram or figure enables a researcher to view the coded themes across all categories and compare them horizontally. In addition, the collected documents were reviewed and analyzed. The specific focus of the document analysis was to identify consistencies and confirm between-group themes with evidence from the documents.
As a result of recursively comparing the two groups, the integrated mind map of the attributes of core actors (see Appendix D) and integrated themes at the a higher level were developed as follows:

As a result of the recursive comparing between two groups, the integrated mind map about the attributes of core actors (see Appendix D) and integrated themes at the higher level were developed as follows:

- Core actor types;
- Stages of the TP process and actor management;
- Multi-policy networks;
- Top-down smart tourism agenda initiated by the newly established Council in IT policy domain;
- Two leading administrative agencies for STP;
- Structural changes in STP networks during the STP process;
- Lack of adequate preparation in setting the agenda and policy formulation stage for STP;
- Not leveraging multi-policy networks for STP;
- Understanding the broad scope of smart tourism policy;
- Future STP across-agency (or across-industry) approach as well as using multi-policy networks.

3.4.4 Selective coding

Selective coding highlights coding for the core category or theme (Strauss, 1987). Strauss argued that coding selectively means “the analyst delimits coding to only those codes that relate to the core codes in sufficiently significant ways.” Significance was determined based on specific criteria: frequency (common or repeated themes across two groups), importance (offering a unique or deep insight into the case and research context), and relevance to research questions.

In recognition of these criteria, I selected significant themes among from the integrated themes based on the between-group analysis and aggregated them into the following core themes in Table 2:
Table 2. Aggregated (core) themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between-group themes</th>
<th>Aggregated (core) themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Core actor types</td>
<td>[Common TP Networks]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stages of the TP process</td>
<td>● Core actors and TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multi-policy networks</td>
<td>● Stages of TP process and actor management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Top-down smart tourism agenda initiated by the newly</td>
<td>[Unique Aspects of STP Networks]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>established Council in IT policy domain</td>
<td>● Newly created structure of national IT policy networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Two leading administrative agencies for STP</td>
<td>● Core actors and STP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Structural changes in STP networks during the STP</td>
<td>● Stages of STP process and actor management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of adequate preparation in setting the agenda and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at policy formulation stage for STP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not leveraging multi-policy networks for STP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Research Quality and Trustworthiness

The following strategies were used to increase the quality and trustworthiness of the case study findings:

- **Documentation**: Developing the data collection procedures and data collection questions before doing the field work (Yin, 2013). The interview data protocol (see Appendix A) was developed in advance, along with an interview guide and questions, so the research could maintain consistency in the interviews and conform to the research goals.

- **Triangulation**: Using multiple sources of data or data collection methods to verify facts as well as confirm emerging findings and consistencies (Berg & Lune, 2012; Cho & Trent, 2006; Khan, 2014; Yin, 2013). Primary data were collected from two groups of interviewees from diverse backgrounds with knowledge about the research topic and involvement in TP. Document analysis was used as a secondary and complementary data source.

- **Reflexivity**: Examining both oneself as researcher, and the research relationship. Reflexive practices involve critical self-reflection on bias and the relationships to the inquiry or the respondent, which may affect how questions are selected and worded, how participants responded, and research outcomes (Nadin & Cassel, 2006). The following were recorded in reflexive journals: personal concerns about contacting and recruiting interview
participants; research assumptions, preconceptions, and impressions; and circumstances during interviews. In addition, memo-writing allowed self-reflection on the researcher’s observations and thoughts throughout the coding process (Smith, 2010). Self-reflection about interpretations of emerging themes and thoughts about coding development were also recorded in memos.

- **Peer Review**: Discussing the progress of the study, emerging themes and tentative interpretations with supervisor and committee members.

- **External Validity (or generalizability)**: Designing the case study and analyzing the data gathered by resorting to a theory, or theoretical framework (or propositions) (Berg & Lune, 2012; Yin, 2013). Analyzing a qualitative set of data with a combination of theoretical framework and propositions helps the researcher to overcome problems with generalizing the research findings (Khan, 2014). To establish external validity, the case study research was designed by relying on policy network approach and the research framework (see Figure 1), and the data gathered from multiple sources were analyzed in part by reflecting on the discussion of policy network theory and approach.

### 3.6 Potential Sources of Bias

In case study research, a researcher is the primary tool for data collection and analysis. The researcher must acknowledge her own role and consider bias, limitations, and personal views throughout data analysis, interpretation, and research reporting phases. Explicitly announcing the researcher’s role against as opposed to maintaining a secret or covert role is discussed with emphasis on ethical concerns on deceiving research subjects (Berg & Lune, 2012).

I have been a government official as well as the case study researcher. I have spent more than fifteen years working for the central government of the Republic of Korea, particularly nine years working for the Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism, which has given me access to key informants and insight into the data. As a tourism policy maker with the position of Deputy Director, professional experience with various TP, including STP, allowed me to investigate the data in depth and interpret them with a sound understanding of the administrative and institutional settings in Korea.

My current position and working experience with TP are valuable for understanding actors, their policy networks, and the TP process in the Korean context, but those same roles
might create bias as well. I put forth all efforts to decrease my subjectivity by discussing the research data and provisional themes with my thesis supervisor and committee members. Also, I stated my role overtly in the consent form (see Appendix B) that was sent to potential interview participants during recruitment, and I explained to participants that I was conducting this research as a graduate student researcher to minimize the impact of my position on interviewees and their responses.

Chapter 4: Research Findings and Discussion

In this chapter, I present the research findings and discussion in two main parts: common TP networks; and the unique aspects of STP networks. These core themes emerged while comparing coded themes across both interview groups and aggregating the themes at the selective coding stage of data analysis. Analysis identified common features in the responses of both interview groups. The commonalities were confirmed and supported by evidence from the collected documents. Each part of this section reflects one core theme that illustrates the research goals and answers the research questions. The first part focuses on common characteristics of policy networks found in TP and STP. The second part underscores the unique aspects identified of STP.

Both parts cover the following sub-sections: (1) core actors and TP (or STP) networks; and (2) stages of the TP (or STP) process and actor management. The second adds a subsection related to STP, the newly created structure in national IT policy. This subsection comes first to explain structural changes in the IT policy network of governmental agencies in administrative and institutional setting, which should help in understanding structural changes critical to the context, especially for core actors and their policy networks in STP.

To protect the confidentiality of respondents, the combination of numbers and letters as in Table 3 is used to indicate data source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Group</th>
<th>Numbering of participants</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I (the first group)</td>
<td>1, 2, 3,……7, 8</td>
<td>CG (Central Government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II (the 2nd group)</td>
<td>1, 2, 3,……11, 12</td>
<td>PA (Public Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A (Academic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IC (Individual Corporation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA (Business Association)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Common Tourism Policymaking (TP) Networks

This core theme emerged in both interview groups and is discussed in two parts: (1) core actors and TP networks, and (2) stages of the TP process and actor management. The first part elaborates on core actors; their resources; and the relationships and interactions featured in TP networks. In the second part, the three stages of the TP process are outlined and then actor management is explained for the agenda-setting and policy formulation stages. Management is associated with how to organize, operate, and interconnect TP networks for policymaking.

4.1.1 Core actors and TP networks

The responses of both interview groups and the document analysis indicate an actor is an organization or individual involved in the TP process, and is classified as three core actor types as shown in the Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Actor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>- Central governmental agencies (e.g. the Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism); - Public agencies (e.g. Korea Tourism Organization; Korea Culture &amp; Tourism Institute); and - Local governmental agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Community</td>
<td>- Individual academics; and - Academic research associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>- Individual corporations; and - Business associations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before moving to the discussion of the main findings, I want to point out that customer groups or tourist groups were not perceived as actors in policy networks (I1PA; I4IC; I8PA; II2BA; II4A); instead, they are stakeholders with general interests in policy issues, remaining outside the policy network boundary. Instead, MCST, which with holds administrative responsibility for tourism, conducted surveys\(^3\) in the general public during the TP process and then referred to the results after analyzing the survey data.

---

\(^3\) Telephone surveys while establishing the “Third Tourism Development Master Plan” (2011); surveys on the perception of domestic tourism while formulating “Domestic Tourism Invigoration and Tourism Industry Competitiveness Enhancement Plan” (2014).
Community groups or individuals based on geographical locations were considered important stakeholders for regional tourism development planning that focused on community engagement and collaboration (Dredge, 2006a; Hall, 1999). In contrast, tourism policymaking for contemporary issues (e.g., smart tourism) at the central government level is more likely to reflect indirectly the needs of the general public for tourism policy by using surveys and relevant data analysis.

**MCST and public agencies in tourism sector**

The MCST and other public agencies, especially KCTI, were prominent actors in both TP and STP. They were dominant entities with assigned roles and responsibilities as stipulated in tourism-related legislation⁴. They are charged with promoting tourism and developing the tourism industry. The MCST and its public agencies were involved in the TP process because of their lawful position and their authority over tourism budgeting and budget execution. They are also responsible for undertaking, monitoring, and evaluating tourism policy.

These political and public actors correspond to the core actors listed by interview participants when answering the questions “What agencies or actors were key actors in the TP (or STP) process and the networks?” and “Were there changes in key actors?” (I5CG; I6CG; II1BA; II2BA; II3A; II4A; II8CG; II9CG). Based on their resources, particularly their lawful position and their administrative power over the tourism budget, the MCST is perceived as a leader in TP networks and leads the TP process as well as the operation of policy networks. For instance, the MCST determines necessary processes and actors who should be involved in the TP process.

In addition, respondents perceived public agencies as supporting organizations that reinforce the TP process driven by the central government and complement TP networks with their expertise and experience (I6CG; II5PA; II8CG). Public agencies were viewed as “the bridge between the government and the private sector” (I1PA; II5PA). In fact, they are more

---

likely to establish a close linkage as well as intermittent or regular cooperative relationships with various stakeholders (e.g., local authorities, academics, the private sector, and tourists) by carrying out various projects or project-level activities (IIPA).

According to participants’ perceptions, networks of core actors in the tourism sector are prominent in frequent and high-quality interactions; active information exchange; shared understanding of policy; acceptance of the outcomes; and intensive and continuous involvement throughout the TP process. The central governmental body usually takes advantage of these relationships with public agencies as communication channels for consultation, coordination, and cooperation with the private sector.

Tourism-related central governmental agencies

Other prominent players are administrative bodies relating to tourism like the Ministry of Strategy and Finance, and the Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries. To some degree, policy networks of relevant central governmental agencies, including the MCST, have been structured. Policy networks of governmental agencies usually follow a formalized policymaking and decision-making system, established through a series of meetings of the ministers and meetings where the President presided. For instance, policy networks of relevant administrative agencies were formed and operated through a formal tourism policymaking and decision-making mechanism established during three meetings for “Tourism Industry Competitiveness Enhancement5” (Shim, 2012) and two meetings for “Tourism Promotion6” (Korea Herald, 17/07/2013, 03/02/2014).

To prepare for the meetings and effectively manage the TP process, relevant administrative agencies of the central government organized task forces (TF) (e.g., Prospective Service Task Force) or working group (WG) (e.g., Tourism Promotion Cooperation Working Group), comprising representatives of ministries or of major departments within ministries as well as officials of public agencies (II4A; II8CG). TFs or WGs served as platforms. That is, the policy networks of relevant administrative bodies and

5 The first meeting was held in March, 2008; the second in December, 2008; and final one in November, 2009.

6 The President Park chaired the meetings. The first meeting was held in July, 2013. Tourism related-ministers presented each ministry’s plan and course of action to ease inconvenience and promote tourism, cruises, and medical tourism. The second meeting was held in February, 2014. The relevant ministers presented each ministry’s plan to boost domestic tourism and enhance tourism industry competitiveness.
public agencies could communicate, exchanging information actively; coordinate and negotiate conflicting interests through TFs or WGs. Moreover, the policy networks of relevant agencies in the public sector contributed to mobilizing the resources of the actors for instance, human resources.

The structure of policy networks involves “the pattern of relations between actors” (Waarden, 1992). Waarden suggested a number of important variables or properties of this structure, including patterns of linkages (i.e., chaotic or ordered) and linking patterns or types of coordination (i.e., hierarchic authority or horizontal consultation and bargaining). Hall (1999, p. 276) referred to the Mandell’s work, which identified the nature types of linkages between actors on a continuum “ranging from loose linkage to more lasting structural arrangements and relationships”. Dredge (2006b, p. 273) synthesized the scholarly work of Waarden, Klijn and others on policy networks and outlined characteristics of institutionalization: “ad-hoc,” “temporary or informal organization” and “formal, stable, permanent coalition structures.” The TFs or WGs are features of the ordered linking pattern and horizontal consultation and negotiation linkages among central governmental agencies. At the same time, these networks were also ad hoc or temporary but had simultaneously formal structure instead of long-lasting structure.

Unlike TP networks of core actors in the tourism sector, the policy networks of relevant administrative agencies are more likely to function in negotiating different perspectives and interests because each entity has its own organizational missions and policy goals relating to sectoral tourism policies (e.g., tax reductions, cruise tourism, agricultural tourism, and medical tourism).

Commonly, the MCST became the dominant actor; as the formal and institutionalized tourism secretariat of the nation at the highest-level. The MCST managed the TP process and incorporated sectoral policies into tourism policy. In other words, the policy networks in the public sector illustrated a high degree of centrality with a central unit (i.e., focal agency) (Waarden, 1992).

The presence of a focal organization in TP networks is part of the nature of TP in Korea. The central governmental agency initiates policy and drives policymaking with power and resources. According to the research, policy networks are characterized by power.
relationships that reflect unequal resources and needs among actors (Rhodes & Marsh, 1992; Waarden, 1992). Rhodes and Marsh (1992) divided actors within a policy network into two tiers: core and a periphery. The former has resources and influence, but the latter does not. In TP networks, the central governmental agency is the dominant actor; the balance of power between the governmental agency and actors of the private sector tipped in favor of the governmental agency (II4A; II5PA). In discussing power relationships, Hall (1999) noted that different actors in a policy network “occupy different position[s] and can carry different weight[s].” In fact, actors do not have the same resources, “leading to differences in their relative power to influence policy processes.”

Individual academics as prominent actors

Certain individual academics in the tourism and hospitality discipline were perceived as prominent actors in TP networks. Some respondents pointed out individual academics as core actors (II2BA; II3A; II4A; II9CG). This was also noted in the collected documents. For instance, the “Prospective Service Task Force” was organized within the MCST to identify potential agendas for economy innovation planning. This TF included individual academics as well as relevant administrators in the central government and local governmental agencies (MCST news release, February 2014). With professional expertise and previous experience with the TP process and TP networks, individual academics tended to become frequently and intensively involved in policymaking (I1PA; II4A; II8CG). The academic actors established close and strong relationships with the public sector through public research projects or through the conferences of academic research associations (I1PA; II7CG; II8CG; II9CG).

These prominent individual academics in the Korean context contradict Pforr’s finding (2002, p. 135) that “no important individual actors could be identified who would have played a significant role in the process” during tourism planning in Australia.

Whether policy networks are the clusters of individuals and organizations or not is the subject of different arguments in the literature. Those who view policy networks from an inter-organizational approach emphasized the analysis of intergovernmental relations and relations between the public and private sector (Pforr, 2002, 2006; Rhodes, 1990; Thatcher, 1998). Individual actors were not considered in the analysis of exchange relations and interactions in policy networks. In contrast, in the USA, groups of professions were identified
as key actors, exercising influence on policymaking (Rhodes, 1990). Hall (1999) criticized the inter-organizational approach in policy network study as underplaying the importance of individuals during planning or tourism development.

Policy networks for TP in Korea illustrated a cluster that includes both interacting individual and organizational actors, not a cluster of connected organizations. The roles of individual academics become less important in an era of convergence whereas individual corporate actors are more prominent in TP networks in Korea (II4A; II5PA; II9CG). Nevertheless, individual academics are still perceived as important actors in Korea.

The private sector becoming more significant to TP

The paradigm shift and accelerated convergence in tourism, mean the private sector is recognized as a significant actor in TP. Business associations in tourism, especially associations stipulated in tourism laws, were perceived as important or core actors that should be involved in the TP process and included in TP networks (II2BA; II3A; II8CG). Korea Tourism Association (KTA) and Korea Association of Travel Agents (KATA), Korea Hotel Association (KHA) were commonly mentioned as core actors among associations in the tourism sector. With existing institutional positions and in representing the sector, business associations are also involved in TP and prominent in the TP networks. Some associations like KTA and KATA, as part of the apex of the tourism industry, had frequent and intensive interactions as well as active communication with actors in the public sector. To the public sector, policy networks that included business associations are communication channels to various industry actors and vice-versa (II5PA).

However, a participant from the private sector evaluated overall communication and interactions with core actors, in particular central governmental agencies, by noting it was “one-way communication or more likely to be instruction” (I4IC). Unbalanced information interchange occurred during TP as well as STP (I4IC). As it turned out, how much information was disclosed depended on the situations during the TP process. Actors from the private sector mentioned that they received limited information, and administrative bodies provided little follow-ups after receiving feedbacks from the private sector (I4IC; II1BA; II2BA), a result of government concerns about confidentiality (II4A; II8CG).
Specially, participants noted that individual corporations do not understand how to channel access in the TP process (II7CG; II11IC; II12IC). Certain corporations enjoyed privileged access to the TP process whereas others, especially small firms or start-ups, have no idea of how to participate in the TP process or in TP networks. The combination of both aspects can explain unequal access to TP. The involvement of individual corporations was usually decided by recommendation from a public agency and confirmation from an administrative body (I1PA; I4IC; I5CG; I6CG; I7PA; I8PA; II10CG; II11IC). Public agencies recommended certain corporate actors who were accustomed to project-level activities (e.g., developing tour guide applications) or were selected and subsidized by the public sector. In addition to relying on recommendations, the administrative agency had weak linkage with the private sector, relying heavily on the recommendations of the public agency. This weak linkage with the private sector was clear in the phrase: “it seems like no direct linkage between the central government and the private sector” (II7CG).

Rhodes and Marsh (1992) argued that policy network can be captured by certain interests or interest groups with close and continuing linkage to the bureaucracy. They insisted policy networks tended to be exclusive, mentioning that:

“All the case studies identify policy networks which were, to a greater or lesser extent, exclusive. In each area, a limited number of groups enjoyed privileged access to policymaking; shaping both the policy agenda and policy outcomes.” (p. 199)

Meanwhile, administrative actors emphasize the selection of actors as a strategy (Dredge, 2006a, 2006b; Waarden, 1992). Providing certain organizations privileged or exclusive access to policymaking was of critical importance because certain actors then received advantages over other interested parties. Selecting certain actors or providing them exclusive access has huge influence “shape[s] of …the relations with these actors” (Waarden, 1992). Administrative agencies may decide to include both business associations and individual firms or to include either. If access to policymaking is restricted or exclusive to certain actors in the private sector, the policy network may function in their interests. Thus, administrative agencies and public agencies use provision of exclusive access to certain actors. However, caution may be necessary when recommending specific private corporations for policy networks and selecting participating actors. One participant commented that attempts of the administration to identify new actors in the private sector and include them may provide a counterbalance to the exclusiveness of current policy networks (II8CG).
4.1.2 Stages of TP process and actor management

As described, administrators of the central government, in particular the MCST, were perceived as leaders of the TP networks. The MCST played led the TP process and the operation of policy networks. In the context of Korea, managing policy networks is conventionally or institutionally performed by administrative agencies with power. In recognition of this context, findings about actor management are elaborated from the perspective of the public sector with specific focus on the stages of the TP process.

This part has four sub-sections: (a) three stages of TP process; (b) organizing the policy networks pertinent to the research for setting an agenda; (c) taking advantage of policy networks clustering around public agencies; and (d) interlocking policy networks when the agenda is set and at the policy formulation stage.

Three Stages of TP process

The tourism policy is formulated and implemented along a series of stages, although reality may involve some overlap and parallels (Pforr, 2005). Clearly differentiating between the stages, is difficult; most participants understood that tourism policy, including smart tourism, is formulated and developed throughout successive series of the process, specifically agenda-setting, policy formulation, and policy adoption by the central government (I2PA; I8PA; I13A; I15PA) (see Figure 2).

![Figure 2. Three stages of TP process](image-url)
TP networks function more actively at the agenda-setting stage as well as with influence on the policy formulation stage through channels of communication, consultation, coordination, or cooperation. Thus, policy networks of actors have influence on agenda-setting and policy formulation, not policy adoption or decision-making (I3PA; I13A; I16PA).

**Organizing policy networks pertinent to the research for setting an agenda**

Policy networks particularly pertinent to research on agenda-setting were found during TP. This research analyzed trends or challenges and set direction for the policy agenda before administrative bodies formulated policy. For example, the KCTI, a public research institute, organized and managed an advisory committee and forum at the public agency level in collaboration with the MCST (I15PA). An advisory committee and forum was created comprising various organizations or individual professionals in the public and private sectors. Temporary and informal (or formal in some cases) advisory committees or forums formed a policy network or networks of actors involved in research and agenda-setting.

The MCST and public agencies in the tourism domain established close relationship, and interacted frequently and continuously with a variety of actors through research networks contributing to the project and clustered around the public research institute. TP networks pertinent to the research project were identified at the agenda-setting stage for the “Fourth Five-Year Tourism Promotion Plan” (MCST, 2013). Simultaneously or in parallel, actors in the public sector continued to share progress on policymaking, exchanging information, coordinating issues, and cooperating as they prepared the Tourism Promotion Plan (I15PA). Sub-networks for research like the research networks for the “Third Tourism Development Master Plan” (MCST, 2011) were also found in other TP processes, for setting up the agenda for the “Tourism Doore” (MCST, 2012) and for “Industrial Tourism” (MCST, 2012).

**Taking advantage of policy networks clustering around public agencies**

In the sub-networks at the agenda-setting stage, public agencies served to connect the central governmental agencies with local authorities, the academic community, and the private sector. This is congruent with participant perceptions of public agencies as a “bridge”

---

7 Korean terminology indicating a local tourism management community involving residents
or “link” between the government and private sector (I1PA; I5CG; I6PA). Among public agencies, two organizations (i.e., KCTI and KTO) were significant to TP and frequently and intensively involved in the TP process because of their missions and functions according to tourism laws. By making use of the linkages clustering around public agencies, the administrative agency, the MCST, could encompass more stakeholders. To this end, the MCST has leveraged the sub-policy networks through public agencies not only for agenda-setting but to help formulate involving a range of stakeholders, and thereby receiving inputs and feedbacks about on tourism policy as it was created.

**Interlocking multi-policy networks at the agenda-setting and policy formulation stage**

Unsurprisingly, organizational actors and individual professional actors overlapped across TP networks, and the TP networks were interlocked. For instance, various actors were involved in the “Relay Forums” on formulating the “Fourth Five-year Tourism Promotion Plan” (I5PA). This cluster of interacting organizations and individuals, which was directed to formulate the Tourism Promotion Plan, had operated independently for a time. In parallel, the sub-policy networks became connected to other policy networks organized by the MCST for formulating the “Domestic Tourism Invigoration and Tourism Industry Competitiveness Enhancement Plan” (MCST, 2014). In other words, the MCST intentionally interlocked the sub-policy networks to effectively manage the networks during TP and to shape tourism policy (I5PA; I8CG).

At the policy formulation stage, the MCST participated actively in conferences of academic research associations or business associations. At the conferences, the MCST and public agencies introduced an outline or draft of the tourism policy (I4A). Professionals participating in the conferences provided inputs and feedbacks on this tourism policy. The conferences, especially academic conferences in hospitality and tourism, were considered platforms where the public sector could reach professional groups (e.g., academics and private corporations), communicate with them, and develop relationships. Additionally, actors in the public sector created or nurtured the interests of other stakeholders.

In addition, before creating the final draft, the central government held forums or seminars like the seminar held while the “Fourth Five-Year Tourism Promotion Plan” was established, the forum for establishing the “Green Tourism Promotion Plan” (MCST news
releases, April 2010), and the forum held as the “Industrial Tourism Development Strategies” were established (MCST news release, July 2012). The occasions served as public hearings welcoming anyone with a general interest in tourism policy as well as professionals in relevant fields (II3A; II5PA).

In this study, at agenda-setting and policy formulation stage, the TP process presented multiplex policy networks at different levels: at the central governmental level and at the public agency level. Multiplex policy networks were formed and managed largely by the central government and can be explained from the perspective of effectiveness. Multiple policy networks allow policy makers to involve a variety of stakeholders in the TP process through policy networks, thereby tailoring tourism policy and eventually ensuring effective implementation (I3PA; II4A; II8CG). In the Korean context, the TP process is generally complete within one year. During a given period, multiple policy networks, either at the central government level or the public agency level, contribute to effective and timely policymaking (II4A).

Dredge (2006a) discussed the multiple networks that existed at local and regional levels. Certain actors may move out of one policy network and into another. For example, chambers of commerce, and community and environmental groups overlap in policy networks. Moreover, multiple networks in the institutional space within which tourism planning takes place interlocked: “they operate independently and interdependently” (Dredge, 2006a, p. 568) as well as being interrelated. The interrelationships of networks may change as policy issues change. In tourism policymaking of Korea, multiple policy networks also existed at different levels. These networks overlapped with some actors participating in more than one policy networks. The MCST, KCTI, and KTO overlapped across various TP networks throughout the TP process. Certain networks operated principally for specific policymaking yet were interrelated with other policymaking networks.

Furthermore, core actors, in particular administrative agencies, employed several strategies like activating, framing, and mobilizing suggested by Agranoff and McGuire (2001) to effectively manage TP networks. They identified and included necessary actors in policy networks; built policymaking mechanisms; structured the policy networks; and mobilized the resources of actors, managing policy networks effectively through interlocking multi policy networks. However, much room for improvement remains in facilitating interactions and
promoting information exchange between the public and private sectors. Active interactions, sustained communication, consensus among actors are key elements in managing policy networks (Klijn, 1996).

4.2 Unique Aspects of Smart Tourism Policymaking (STP) Networks

The second core theme is discussed in three parts: (1) newly created structure of national IT policy networks; (2) core actors and STP networks; and (3) the stages of the STP process and actor management. The first part is associated with the research context, referring to the structure of the policy networks of administrative agencies, including the two core actors of STP networks: the Council and MCST. The second and third parts are further divided into sub-sections to capture and synthesize the perceptions of the first interview group, especially pertaining to the STP process and STP networks. To explain and highlight the unique aspects of STP, responses of the second group will be included as necessary.

4.2.1 Newly created structure of national IT policy networks

In this section, I explain the modified administrative and institutional settings and the newly created structure of the group of administrative agencies related involved in the national IT policy of Korea. The findings are drawn from an analysis of the secondary documents including “Framework Act on National Informatization” (the Act) and the responses of the first group (I1PA; I5CG; I6CG).

As explained in the research context, existing policy networks of governmental agencies involved with national IT policy were restructured when the Council was established according to the amended Act. Based on the Council mandate, IT policymaking and the convergence of IT at the central government level took place within policy networks that clustered around the Council. Until the establishment of the Council, IT-related policymaking had occurred independently within a policy network led by each autonomous ministry, which resulted in a fractured approach to developing IT industry, not a holistic approach (Chung, 2009).

As a cluster or clusters of organizations connected to each other by resource dependencies and distinguished from other clusters, policy networks can be put into a context. In policy networks, especially given the complexity of central governmental agencies, member actors change, as does the structure of inter-organizational relations, as exogenous
changes occur (institutional changes, for instance) (Rhodes & Marsh, 1992). Waarden (1992) approached changes in policy network structure from a government perspective, explaining how the government could modify existing structures or create new ones, by creating an administrative agency or intermediary organization. This is called structure building strategy.

This structural shift in policy networks of government agencies takes place at the macro-level. Rhodes (1990) noted three levels for analyzing policy networks: macro-level, meso-level, and micro-level. The macro-level approach queries the political economy environment with a broad analytical scope whereas the meso-level approach for analyzing policy networks focuses on inter-organizational or inter-governmental analysis. The primary concern of the macro-level approach is administrative arrangements or the environment of the policy arena.

In this case, under the institutional and structural changes in national IT policymaking by the government, the Council became the focal organization of the policy network to cope with policy issues or topics related to the convergence of IT with industries (e.g., smart tourism). However, government agencies, including the MCST, were not familiar with the new structure and the policymaking process. Moreover, the MCST and public agencies in the tourism domain had little understanding of the Council and the new structure for IT policymaking (I1PA).

4.2.2 Core actors and STP networks

Participants in the first interview group had been actually involved in the STP, more specifically the STDI of Korea. They talked of their perceptions and experiences with actors and the networks. Their responses indicated two features: (a) two leaders in STP networks and (b) the prominence of the private sector.

Two leaders in STP networks

In responses to questions about smart tourism and STP, participants spoke of being “unaccustomed” or “not familiar topic,” “new area which has never been put into practice,” “smart tourism in its infancy,” “new paradigm in tourism,” or “proactive policy” (I1PA; I2PA; I6CG; I7PA). Without mention of the policy topic (smart tourism), participants noted two leaders of STP networks: the Council and the MCST. The first was the focal organization within the newly structured policy networks of administrative agencies under the modified
institutional setting and the second was the nation’s highest-level tourism secretariat, charged with overall TP processes and networks.

Normally, one leader (or center unit) is more common to facilitate TP and manage the TP process effectively and efficiently. Generally, the MCST was identified as a leader, although occasionally, a relevant ministry, usually the Ministry of Strategy and Finance with its authority over government budgets and the funding to intervene in the tourism sector, could be considered a leader, especially when policy is emphasized in the nation’s economic development.

For STP, participants saw the Council as a core actor because the Council managed the policymaking process and made decisions which actors to include in the STP network. However, the Council had limited budget resources and few internal human resources with regard to its mandated functions and position as an advisory organization (refer to the detailed explanation in p. 17) ; thus, participants saw its power as weak (I1PA; I4IC; I5CG; I6CG; I8PA). The Council could not involve necessary actors and induce them to make a commitment to STP without the support of other administrative agencies and public agencies. One participant described the Council as an “observer” (I4IC).

The other leader was the MCST. However, it had little interest in STP. Participants reported that the MCST did not share the sense of the importance of smart tourism and policymaking within the organization (I1PA; I2PA; I3PA; I5CG; I6CG). Considering the background of STP, the smart tourism policy agenda came from the top down; it was completely new from to the stakeholders in the tourism domain, so it failed to arouse the interest of the MCST. The top-down and convergence agenda was regarded as a lower priority than other tourism policies. For this reasons, the MCST became involved in STP networks in the middle of policy formulation. As a leader, it was charged with drafting smart tourism policy and led the way:

- to organize a new STP network through a TF within the MCST; and
- to identify potential stakeholders in smart tourism and involve them in the STP network

The MCST took on the roles associated with actor strategies as described by Dredge (2006b) and Waarden (1992). The first role is related to structuring relations within the network. The second role is associated with influencing the selection of actors in the network.
Waarden (1992) in particular emphasized selection of actors by mentioning that this first part of the process is highly important, influencing the shape of relationships within the network.

In combination with the two leaders, the eager initiator of STP but little power versus the passive administrative agency with available resources, the responses showed that the tasks and roles of the actors in STP networks, in particular the public agencies, were allocated first to one agency, and then to another. Once the MCST became involved, the MCST attempted to clarify the roles of the actors (I2PA). However, our participants stated that unclear role allocation and the subsequent delay in coordinating those unclear roles made work between the actors more difficult (I1PA; I2PA; I3PA; I4IC; I5CG). Dredge (2006a) discussed this lack of role clarity in tourism, emphasizing that the lack of clear roles and responsibilities negatively affected ownership of tourism policy or plan. Moreover, when roles and responsibilities were unclear, conflict and tensions could arise among actors. Therefore, we can infer that the STP process continued without ownership of smart tourism policy.

The structure of the STP networks changed noticeably once the MCST became involved (see Figure 3). The STP networks that once clustered around the Council centered the MCST once the change occurred (I2PA; I8PA). The change occurred at the meso-level (Rhodes, 1990). The MCST organized a temporary TF with KCTI, KTO, and KCISA and involved different actors from ICT-related industries. Thus, revisions to the drafted policies for smart tourism reflected stakeholder’s input (I8PA). TF comprised officials from public agencies in tourism as well as cultural information/content fields with expertise and experience in the area. Actors in TF interacted frequently and developed a shared sense of smart tourism policy. Individual firms did participate in the STP process through consultations and exchanged relevant information with the MCST and public agencies. However, the frequency of interactions was very low, as was the duration, because different stakeholders were invited to each consultation.
Prominence of the private sector:

Individual firms were significant contributors to the STP networks during the STP process; in contrast, the less than noticeable contributions of academics in the STP networks. Business associations are conventionally involved in TP networks and serve as a communication channel between individual firms and the public sector, especially the central government. In general, such associations as KTA, once they were established and began operations on tourism laws, have been a prominent actor in TP policy networks representing their sector. However, in STP networks, no business association participated.
In contrast, one individual travel agency was involved at the time the Council formed the STP network by the Council and had frequent interactions and active information exchanges with the core actors (i.e., the Council, MCST, KTO, and KCTI). This illustrated the strong relationship the travel agency had with core actors because it was frequently and continuously involved in the STP networks. Although participants reported that this single travel agency did not sufficiently represent the travel industry, they recognized the travel agency as a prominent actor (I1PA; I2PA; I5CG; I6CG; I8PA). Moreover, online travel agencies (OTAs), online tourism service/content providers and ICT firms were invited to consultations organized by the MCST in the process of producing the STDI. Respondents even stressed the participation of corporate stakeholders, especially online service platforms and mobile carriers, reflected their needs on policies for infrastructure, business promotion, and tourism applications, which sustain services to tourists (I3PA; I8PA).

The prominence of individual firms with no similar involvement of business associations can be explained two ways. First, smart tourism policy topic was a new and convergent issue. The agenda was also proactively initiated in the public policy domain. Few professionals in the academia and industry understand both the tourism industry and the ICT industry. Participants in the public sector mentioned how difficult it was to identify professionals in smart tourism (I5CG). The participating travel agency was recommended as an actor in the STP networks because it had launched digital tour guide services on tourism attractions (I1PA; I4IC). The public sector therefore expected it would understand market trends and tourist needs thus imbuing smart tourism policy with reality and on-site experience (I1PA; I4IC; I5CG; I6CG; I8PA).

Second, business associations in tourism, especially travel agencies, are slow to accept technological changes and developments (I8PA). This perception resonates in the second interview group’s responses: business associations failed to keep up with the paradigm shift in ICT and tourism (II5PA; II6PA; II9CG); they lacked the capacity to suggest appropriate strategies and viable practices during policymaking as representatives of member businesses (II1BA); and they resisted changes (II12IC) or remained complacent with their economic interests in tourism funding or subsidies (II9CG).
4.2.3 Stages of STP process and actor management

This part underscores of the ways in which STP is unique in its process and how the two leader agencies manage the process and networks. The synthesis of responses and the confirmation in the analyzed documents show three features: (a) the absence of a research policy network for STP at the agenda-setting stage; (b) deficient preparation at the policy formulation stage; and (c) failure to interlock multiple STP networks.

Absence of a research policy network at the agenda-setting stage

The STP process did not use independent research in setting an agenda for tourism policy although conducting such research is important. According to the document analysis, the MCST usually conducted its own research on new agendas like “industrial tourism” and “Tourism Doore” in collaboration with KCTI or KTO to prepare TP. Research networks, including the cluster of interacting public agencies, academics, and business associations, enable the government to identify issues or challenges and set directions for tourism policy agendas. Moreover, research networks allow the government to include various stakeholders and their input.

Without independent research and policy networks for that research, actors involved in STP had to identify issues or challenges themselves as well as analyze trends surrounding in “smartness” or technologies in related industries. As a result, research in the STP network added to the burden of actors in the network, causing delays in the policymaking process (I1PA; I2PA; I6CG). The absence of research, the additional tasks suffered by actors, and how well STP network functioned under these circumstances were perceived negatively in the following interviews:

“It would have been better if STP had been prepared through research in advance. Without research, it was difficult to formulate the STDI by solely relying on the discussion and consultations within the STP networks.” (I2PA)

“... [we] conceptualized smart tourism and made the new paradigm of smart tourism through the discussion and consultations in the STP networks.” (I4IC)

“The actors involved did play the roles beyond just consulting.” (I5CG)

“... we did not just rely on existing concepts; rather, we established the new concept through the discussion of the actors involved. Conceptualizing smart tourism was done first. At the very beginning, there was the concept of ubiquitous tourism. Then, the actors made attempt to identify a proper title for the agenda and establish suitable policies and practices for developing smart tourism. Too much time
was spent on conceptualizing smart tourism and setting direction for smart tourism policy. In this sense, the STP policy network did more than consulting.” (I6CG)

**Deficient preparation at the policy formulation stage**

Both interview groups noted that setting up a pre-defined framework for policy formulation was important. However, the two leaders, the Council and MCST, did not develop a pre-defined framework for formulating smart tourism policy. In other words, the STP process and networks were contingent on unforeseen situations.

Respondents acknowledged having a framework for the TP process and for the networks would affect policymaking. The pre-defined framework may include budgeting for policy formulation; human resources; timeframe; policy network plan; and policy adoption and release plan. The following phrases indicated elements that should be considered in the framework: “budgeting for consulting expenses,” “available personnel,” “organizing TF,” “timeframe,” “planning in advance which organization or expert participates in policymaking” and “defining roles of agencies” (I1PA; I2PA; I5CG; I6CG; I8CG; I9CG).

With no pre-defined framework, additional actors (e.g., KCISA) were invited to participate in the STP process depending on circumstances. Public agencies were involved with unpredictable timeframe, and the uncertainty of policy adoption (I1PA). In the first group, respondents perceived roles and responsibilities of administrative bodies and public agencies in the STP networks differently, which can be attributed to a lack of agreement on roles among actors.

Eventually, the failure of administrators to identify potential actors and manage STP networks effectively as well as manage the STP process within the defined timeframe caused problems (I1PA; I2PA; I4IC). As explained above, the MCST organized TF in cooperation with several public agencies inside the Ministry and attempted to identify relevant stakeholders and involve them in STP (I2PA; I8PA). However, this occurred at the end of the STP process in the process of revising and expanding the draft of the STDI. Deficiencies in preparations for policy formulation created the unpredictable STP process and in particular, the “small size of the STP networks” (I1PA; I2PA; I8PA).
Failure to interlock multiple STP networks

Four clusters of connected and interacting actors for STP (i.e., the STP networks) were identified at the administrative level, public agency level, and in the private sector throughout the STP process (see Figure 3): a policy network centered on the Council; one centering on the MCST; one clustering around the KTO; and the travel agency network called the “Technology Committee of Travel Agencies.”

Most actors involved in these networks overlapped and were involved in other policy networks as well. Surprisingly, the existence of a business network surfaced during the interviews (I4IC). As already mentioned, the individual travel agency involved frequently and intensively in STP was also an actor in the business network, which consisted of IT managers from major travel agencies and officers of KATA. The Council and MCST, however, did not make use of this network overlap as a communication channel. Through the business network, they could have brought in travel agencies, one of the significant stakeholders in tourism in Korea. Furthermore, the two administrative bodies leading the initiative did not attempt to interlock multiple networks, which would have made managing the STP process more effective and allowed tailoring smart tourism policy to the needs of relevant stakeholders. Even after establishing TF within the Ministry, the MCST did not maintain a strong and intensive relationship with the Council. Instead, the MCST managed TF and consultations independently without the involvement of the Council.

All in all, STP did illustrate an ineffective policymaking process that lacked strategies for managing policy networks. In particular, administrative agencies showed weakness in exercising the strategies of framing, mobilizing, and facilitating the network (Agranoff & McGuire, 2001). After organizing an STP network by identifying and involving actors, administrators failed to discuss and agree on the roles and responsibilities of actors. Linkages and interconnections among multiple STP networks were clearly non-functional.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Implications

5.1 Conclusions

This chapter summarizes the findings and discussion. It also provides suggestions for policy makers in government. This chapter concludes with implications for future research.
5.1.1 Research questions answered

The purpose of this study was to investigate a policy network in smart tourism policymaking (STP) in a Korean context using a case study and, ultimately, to suggest strategies for effective network management and, in turn, effective policymaking for tourism. The three questions framing this research were answered:

1. What are the characteristics of policy networks in TP of Korea and how do they present in STP?
2. How does an STP network influence policymaking?
3. How can an administrative agency manage the STP process and networks?

Question 1: What are the characteristics of policy networks in TP of Korea and how do they present in STP?

Two core themes, common TP networks and the unique aspects of STP networks, provided the answers to the first research question. Policy networks in TP, including STP networks, illustrated four common characteristics: (1) dominant administrative agencies of the central government; (2) structured policy networks among administrative agencies, (3) a mixture of individual professionals and organizational actors; and (4) increasing significance of actors in the private sector.

First, central government agencies were dominant actors in TP networks. They were equipped with resources (e.g., lawful position and budgets) and power over budgeting. The central governmental agencies were also primarily responsible for including or excluding actors as well as managing the policymaking process. In this sense, these agencies are called ‘core actors’ in TP networks.

Second, policy networks of administrative agencies had an ordered and formalized structure that was established over time. Although TP networks were not at the same level of institutionalization as permanent organizations established by legislation, they still presented structured, stable, and formal linkages.

Third, in the data analysis of both interviews and documents, TP networks are clearly clusters of interacting individuals and organizations. Individual academics were perceived as prominent actors in the Korean context. They participated actively in TP and were
experienced in policymaking as well as having professional expertise in tourism. This finding shows their close relationships with the central government, established by frequent interactions through public research projects or academic conferences.

Finally, the interviews revealed that actors in the private sector became more important in TP over time. Business associations in the tourism sector have been significant in TP networks as representatives of member businesses. Individual corporate actors were perceived as important actors in TP. However, interactions and communication between the public and private sectors in the TP networks were restricted. In addition, the findings showed that individual corporations are more likely to be excluded from access to policymaking because of weak linkages between the administrative body and the private sector as well as the current procedures for including actors in policy networks, which rely heavily on the recommendations of public agencies.

In contrast, policy networks formed and operated in STP had different characteristics: (1) two leading organizations, which was unusual, (2) structural shifts in STP networks at the macro-level and meso-level, and (3) prominent individual corporate actors with the additional involvement of ICT corporations.

First, unlike the usual TP, two organizations (i.e., the Council and the MCST) led in STP. The former initiated STP in a modified administrative and institutional setting but was perceived as having little power. The latter had available resources but was only peripherally interested in STP in the new setting. Without a clear focal unit, STP networks were organized and managed during the STP process. STP networks lacked clarity in the roles and responsibilities of actors and lacked ownership of smart tourism policy.

Second, this study provided insight into the effect of the absence of a central unit in STP as well as structural changes in STP networks. The Council became the focal organization because of amended institutional arrangements in national IT policymaking. This structural shift in policy networks among government agencies took place at the macro-level. Under the macro-level shift in policy networks for national IT policy, neither the Council and nor the MCST had experience in formulating and shaping tourism policy that converged with IT, in the case of smart tourism. Later, the MCST participated actively in the STP process and networks. This caused another structural change in the STP network at the meso-level. That is
to say, the STP network that once centered on the Council now centered on the MCST.

Finally, in the interviews, individual corporate actors from the travel industry were perceived as prominent actors. In contrast, no academics or business associations were prominent in STP. This was explained by the nature of smart tourism policy: it is brand-new and convergent. Few academics had the expertise or knowledge in this area, and the business associations did not catch up with the proliferation of smart tourism either. Noticeably, the STP network included corporate stakeholders from the IT industry, not the usual significant stakeholders in tourism policy. This finding is also associated with the nature of smart tourism, largely based on convergence of ICT. The participation of corporate stakeholders from the ICT industry in STP was also emphasized in the responses of interview participants.

**Question 2: How does an STP network influence policymaking?**

Policy networks in tourism policymaking function as communication channels. Particularly, private corporations recognize TP networks as access channels to the policymaking process in the public tourism domain. Through the interactions of actors within or across TP networks, tourism policy was formulated or coordinated. Particularly, the policy networks facilitated negotiations among central government agencies.

On the whole, TP networks influenced policy agenda-setting and policy formulation. The MCST and public agencies organized TP networks associated with research projects or policy formulation. Individual academics, business associations, and corporate actors were involved in the TP networks as consultants providing input or feedback.

STP networks influenced agenda-setting and policy formulation in much the same way. In fact, STP networks had great influence on agenda-setting through research role of the network at the policy formulation stage because there was no independent research and research network. Thus, respondents remarked that their roles in and the function of the STP network went “beyond consulting.” Although actors other than the MCST could not participate in policy adoption itself, participants in the STP networks stated that their input, feedback, and recommendations were reflected in smart tourism policy, i.e., the STDI.

However, negotiating the conflicting interests of administrative agencies was not part of STP policy networks. Normally, negotiation took place in the TP network of administrative
agencies of the central government. Although the Council was established as the focal organization for reviewing and aligning national IT-related policy among administrative agencies of the central government, STP networks did not function for negotiation during policymaking. Moreover, the MCST interacted with the Council and but not interact with other administrative agencies for STP.

In addition, it must be stressed that this case study illustrated a new IT policymaking mechanism with leading actors under the modified setting affecting both the STP process and the structure of STP networks. This result aligned with the policy network approach that a contextual condition, especially an institutional factor, contributed to a change in a policy network (Rhodes & Marsh, 1992).

**Question 3: How can an administrative agency manage the STP process and networks?**

This research provided insight not only into actors and their networks but also into how actors managing manage networks during the TP process. In fact, the policy network approach was a useful tool, as shown in the literature, to analyze the dynamics of policymaking actors, networks, and processes. Two core themes provided answers to this research question by revealing how the administrative agency managed the policymaking process and policy networks according to two stages of the policymaking process: agenda-setting and policy formulation.

The responses of interview participants showed they perceived tourism policy, in general, was formulated and adopted using the three stages of the policymaking process. They stated they saw no difference in the policymaking process itself but in which actors were involved in TP and in STP. Different actors were involved in STP and their management was also different.

First, at the agenda-setting stage, the administrative agencies did not form a research policy network to analyze trends and set the direction for an agenda for smart tourism policy. Thus, research was conducted within the STP network itself, which delayed the process and added burdens to the actors.

Second, when policy was actually formulated, our research revealed that the two organizations leading the STP process and networks did define the framework for policy
formulation before beginning; the framework should have included budgeting for policy formulation; mobilizing human resources; timeframe; and policy network plan. This lack of preparation at the policy formulation stage caused interview participants to evaluate the STP process as neither systematic nor effective. Additionally, this deficiency resulted in smaller STP networks.

Finally, regardless of stages of the policymaking process, multiple networks formed and operated. However, the two administrative agencies did not use these networks effectively for STP. Furthermore, these agencies did not pay due attention to the business network of travel agencies, one of which was involved intensively in the STP network led by the Council. By failing to interconnect multiple networks in STP, the administrative agencies could not involve a range of stakeholders or create or nurture the interests of relevant stakeholders by taking advantage of multiple networks.

5.1.2 Conclusions

The results of this study of policy networks in STP in Korea, as an extreme case, illustrated the unique features of STP networks; and at the same time, the results successfully accentuated common features of policy networks in the tourism field. TP networks were to a great extent affected by administrative and institutional settings. In the Korean contexts, tourism policymaking took place in a policy network dominated by the central government featuring unequal positions among actors; unbalanced interactions and information exchanges between actors; and to some extent, providing exclusive access to certain stakeholders.

The administrative agency has great influence on the policymaking process as well as the function and structure of policy networks. The administrative agency usually managed TP networks throughout the policymaking process by using strategies for activating, framing, and mobilizing (refer to Table 1). It played leading roles to identify actors and involve them in networks to activate networks. Also, the agency used and interconnected multiple policy networks. Structuring the relationships of actors in policy networks occurred during TP. However, this study shows that for effective tourism policymaking, more efforts should be expended on facilitating interaction and communication among actors, especially private sector actors, and reducing complexity and uncertainty by pre-defining a framework for policy formulation, clear roles and responsibilities of actors, and agreement on roles among actors.
5.2 Limitations

The sample selection criteria included persons with experience in tourism (or smart tourism) policymaking. The samples included participants from various backgrounds although those affiliated with local authorities were not recruited for this research. Thus, the researcher could not consider their experiences with and perception of TP and networks. They might demonstrate different perceptions than other participants. Moreover, the five samples from the private sector were relatively small compared to the seven from public agencies and the six from the central government.

While collecting the interview data, more efforts went to keeping interview questions consistent and minimizing the impact of the researcher’s subjectivity. However, existing rapport or relationships with some interview subjects might have affected the interviews. Also, identifying concepts or themes and interpreting heavily depended on the researcher’s insight and subjectivity, so the researcher identified and selected those themes of interest in the research project; rival themes might not be considered.

It would be ideal to perform member checking by sending participants a copy of their interview transcripts and asking them to verify the accuracy of content (Cho & Trent, 2006) and to receive feedback on research findings from participants. However, time limitations did not permit member checking or getting feedback on the findings.

Lastly, a policy network study relies heavily on the judgement of participants (Pforr, 2006). Because participants were somewhat limited in what they know about the policymaking process and which organizations were involved in TP, we must note the possibility of subjectivity among participants about the actors involved and their networks although the researcher attempted to triangulate the findings.

5.3 Implications for Tourism Policymaking

The tourism industry has been at the forefront of technology and is enormously affected by the development and proliferation of technologies (Dimanche & Jolly, 2009). Integration and convergence of ICTs in the tourism industry continues and will accelerate as long as technologies advance and the convergence of technology creates opportunities for developing tourism further and for competitiveness of tourism destinations (Gretzel, Koo, et al., 2015). Gretzel, Sigala, et al. (2015) projected that the convergence of ICT in tourism or more
specifically smart tourism in destinations is indeed “an incredibly promising scenario.” In this vein, public policy in tourism must continue to respond to convergent policy issues like smart tourism, and tourism policy makers may encounter convergent policy issues or problems, some of which may be taken up as policy agenda.

The results of this study have several implications for policy makers in tourism or relevant fields. First, policy makers need to reduce complexity and uncertainty by defining clearly the direction for policy agenda; setting up a framework for policy formulation; and making agreement on roles. Defining a new tourism policy agenda and setting the direction for that policy agenda should precede policy formulation. This smart tourism policymaking case indicated that policy formulation process began and policy networks were organized without enough preparation in setting the agenda. Even the concept of smart tourism was not defined, so the direction changed from “ubiquitous” to “smart” as policymaking progressed. In addition to defining the policy agenda, pre-defined framework is needed before beginning policy formulation, especially to help identify necessary stakeholders in policymaking. Defining the agenda and setting up a framework are closely connected; if the focus or direction changes, those organizations that should be involved in policymaking change as well. That is to say, actors and the group of connected actors, in other words, the policy network, would change.

Second, the formal and institutionalized policy networks of government agencies must be apparent. Tourism policymaking inevitably involves agencies relevant to tourism, and their interactions can help establish tourism policy. In general, the cluster or clusters of interacting government agencies have structured and institutionalized relationships. Therefore, identifying institutional arrangements of central government and their policy networks is absolutely necessary in creating a new or convergent policy agenda. Then, a focal unit should be chosen to lead overall policymaking and charged with organizing and managing policy networks (e.g., clarifying actor roles and changes the in structure). As in the literature and findings showed, policy agenda of convergence in tourism requires comprehensive approach by involving many different agencies; deciding a focal unit is very important for effective policymaking. A convergent policy agenda may fall under another administrative agency’s purview, and the focal organization may not be the administrative agency for tourism. For instance, policymaking for smart tourism should more likely be led and managed by an
administrative agency in charge of national ICT policies, such as the MSIP, in light of present administrative and institutional settings in Korea.

Third, a cross-agency or cross-industry approach should be used to establish tourism policy. The development of smart tourism depends to a large extent on ICT (e.g., the ICT infrastructure in cities or destinations) and its application for businesses (e.g., online/mobile platforms with tourism information and services) (Buhalis & Amaranggana, 2014; Gretzel, Sigala, et al., 2015). Therefore, the administrative agency and stakeholders in the tourism sector would be involved in a policy network driven by actors in a non-tourism domain (e.g., ICT), and those networks may differ from typical tourism policy networks. Furthermore, it would be beneficial to identify and use multiplex policy networks operating either at ministry level or at public agency level for tourism-related issues, namely land and location information as well as ICT infrastructure. As the results of this study show, leveraging networks of public agencies, to serve as a “bridge,” connecting agencies across various domains would also likely help with convergence issues in tourism policy.

Last but not least, more effort should be made to create and sustain communication channel with the private sector, especially ICT industry. Private corporate stakeholders in the ICT industry are significant to tourism policymaking in this era of smart devices and convergence. Their participation in policymaking was stressed in this case study. Specifically, they are essential to addressing contemporary policy issues for collecting and analyzing big data on individual customers or visitors (Gretzel, Sigala, et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2013). Most interview participants saw big data as a critical policy issue for the policy agenda to address jointly with the public sector. Interviews suggested that tourist data could represent them because the digital traces and footprints of tourism activities, travel routes, purchases, and information searching patterns, which are accumulated as a form of data, is more likely to remain on online platforms in the private sector than the public sector. Interview participants emphasized that tourism policy must be established using systematic data collection and analysis. Hence, tourism policy makers should be aware of the importance of stakeholders in the ICT industry; consider how to involve them in tourism policymaking; and find a strategy to facilitate interactions with ICT professionals. More importantly, when forming a policy network, primary actors should emphasize building communication channels and provide policymaking access to stakeholders in ICT (Waarden, 1992).
5.4 Implications for Future Research

Relatively little research has been conducted on tourism policymaking involving such contemporary policy agendas as smart tourism. Of the research that has investigated tourism policymaking, in general, tourism planning for territorial or regional tourism development has been selected as a case to delineate collaboration between the public and the private sectors (or community groups) as well as to measure and map interactions among the actors involved by analyzing social networks.

This case study looked closely at smart tourism policymaking in the Korean context by adopting the policy network approach, combining policy network theory, policymaking process, and public network management strategies informed by a body of literature in public management. Beyond identifying the actors involved and describing their interactions, this research showed how policy networks could be influenced by the administrative and institutional context and how core organizations, particularly administrative agencies, managed the policymaking process and the multiple networks that formed during the process. This research has suggested changes to effective network management and policymaking itself. The comprehensive approach and TP network research framework to tourism policymaking would benefit future studies of policy networks in tourism or other fields in other contexts.

Future studies may be needed to investigate tourism policymaking driven by other administrative agencies. The findings could be compared to the results of this study. Additionally, it might be interesting to see how to connect multiple networks for certain types of policymaking and what problems might occur while operating multiple networks. Also, exploring a network of linked organizations (e.g., public agency agencies and business associations) using the policy network approach would provide more insight into policy networks.

It might also be intriguing to investigate policy networks from the perspective of business stakeholders. Since the selected policymaking case was driven by the administration and my professional background is related to central government, I had focused on the perspective of the central government. As reported in this study, business stakeholders perceived an unbalanced information exchange and limited access to policymaking, so exploring policy networks from their perspective would benefit active interactions and
communications with the private sector.
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Appendix A: Interview Protocol

A. Date Collection Procedures

1. Participant Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I (first set of questions) | Those who were agents involved in establishing the STDI between 2010 and 2011 | All participants in this group should be involved in establishing the STDI. | - Reflect and review on STP  
- Gain insightful information and listen to their experience with STP |
| II (second set of questions) | Those who have knowledge of the research topic and have been involved in TP | Participants in this group are not involved in establishing the STDI. However, they are professionals with knowledge and expertise in TP. | - Investigate the characteristics of TP in a Korean context from different perspectives  
- Examine, in particular, administrative agency strategies |

2. Data Collection

[Secondary Data collection]
- Identify accessible or available documents
- In particular, review news releases of the MCST from 2009 to 2015
- Review relevant laws and regulations

3. Preparation for In-depth interviews
- Review relevant documents to prepare questions on participants’ experience or probing questions
- Receive Ethics Approval of Research Ethic Board (REB), the University of Guelph
- Prepare an informed consent form in English and then, translate it in Korean
- Make sure to have participant’s consent before the interview
- Recruit a participant and schedule an individual interview
- Provide participants in advance with a brief introduction of the smart tourism trend and the concept of smart tourism to allow them enough time to think about this topic
- Ask participant’s preference in computer software (e.g., Skype, Zoom, or Hangout) for computer-assisted interviews
B. Interview Guide

Recording Format, Confidentiality and Disclosure:

- [Remind audio recording] recording our conversation will allow me to focus entirely on your responses
- [Reaffirm confidentiality] all data and transcripts will be secured
- Ask the following questions before beginning the interview:
  - “Do you have any questions before we begin?”
  - “Do you agree to participate?”

C. Questioning: two sets of questions

[First set of questions]

(1) Personal experience with policymaking process and policy networks
- Can you explain your involvement in creating the STDI between the years 2010 and 2011?
- What role did you play during STP? What was your responsibility?
- Were the role and responsibility clear to you when you became involved in STP?
- How did you become a participant?
- What criteria do you think the administrative agency usually considers in choosing an agency or actor?
- What agencies or actors were key actors in the STP process and the networks? Can you tell me the reason?
- Were there changes in key actors?
- Which agency selected actors or included a new actor?
- Do you think that the STP process worked systematically?
- Was there any conflict or tension during STP?

(2) Perception of the functions and influence of a policy network
- How can you describe the overall function of STP networks? (e.g., consultation and coordination)
- To what extent did the networked organizations had influence on establishing the
STDI?
- Do you feel input and discussion during policymaking were reflected in the smart tourism policy? Can you give a specific example?

(3) Perception of the interactions among actors
- Were you given access to information such as the policymaking progress and minutes?
- Did participating organization(s) communicate frequently and actively?
- Is it flexible to be a participant or a member of TP network?

(4) Thoughts about the concept of smart tourism and input for future STP
- What was a missing (or overlooked) organization in STP?
- What makes you mention this/these organization(s)?
- Can you recommend a relevant organization (professional) which/who should be interviewed for STP or TP? (Snowball sampling)
- In terms of STP, were different actors involved compared to TP?
- What is your opinion of the concept of smart tourism in this study? Is it necessary to involve customer group(s) or individual tourist group(s)?
- If necessary, how could they get involved in TP?
- When you look back now, what could have been done better in STP?
- For future policymaking for smart tourism, what else would you like to suggest?

[Second set of questions]

(1) Personal experience with policymaking process and policy networks
- Can you explain your experience in TP?
- What role did you play during TP? What was your responsibility?
- Were the roles and responsibilities of actors clear when you got involved in TP?
- Did you recognize participating agencies’ roles and responsibilities at the beginning of the policymaking process? *(specific question for II group)*
- How did you become a participant?
- What criteria do you think the administrative agency usually considers in choosing
- What agencies or actors were key actors in the TP process and the networks? Can you tell me the reason?
- Were there changes in key actors?
- Which agency selected actors or included a new actor?
- What is the reason that existing organizations included a new actor in the policy network during policymaking?
- Do you think that the TP process worked systematically?
- Was there any conflict or tension during TP?
- How did you form a network of actors for TP? *(specific question for II group*)

(2) Perception of the functions and influence of a policy network

- How can you describe the overall function of TP networks? (e.g., consultation and coordination)
- To what extent did the networked organizations had influence on establishing tourism policy?
- Do you feel input and discussion during policymaking were reflected in the smart tourism policy? Can you give a specific example?
- Of three phases of policymaking, namely agenda-setting, policy-formulation, and decision-making, on which phase did TP networks have more influence?

(3) Perception of the interactions among the actors

- Were you given access to information such as the policymaking progress and minutes?
- Did you share information like the policymaking progress and purposes of meetings with participating agencies during policymaking? How? *(specific question for II group*)
- Did participating organization(s) communicate frequently and actively?
- Is it flexible to be a participant or a member of TP network?
- How do organizations in tourism and relevant industries become involved in policymaking? What about the involvement of academics? *(specific question for II group*)
- What have you done to promote information exchange and interactions between
(4) Thoughts about the concept of smart tourism and input for future STP

- What agency should be considered for involvement in future STP?
- What makes you mention this agency?
- Can you recommend a relevant organization (professional) which/who should be interviewed for STP or TP? (Snowball sampling)
- Are the actors involved in STP different from those in TP?
- What is your opinion of the concept of smart tourism in this study? Should customer group(s) or individual tourist group(s) be involved?
- If necessary, how could they get involved in TP?
- When you look back now, what could have been done better in TP?
- For future policymaking for smart tourism, what else would you like to suggest?
Appendix B: Informed Consent Form

Consent Form for In-depth Interview

Dear ____________________,

My name is DOYOUNG KIM, graduate student of the University of Guelph in Canada. I am also an employee of the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism of Korea.

DOYOUNG KIM, Graduate Student, School of Hospitality, Food and Tourism Management, College of Business and Economics, University of Guelph, do@uoguelph.ca

As a graduate student, I am conducting a research project to investigate interacting organizations involved in Smart Tourism policymaking, which is called the policy network.

You are being invited to take part in an individual interview because you were involved in Smart Tourism policymaking or you have expertise in Smart Tourism (or tourism) policymaking in Korea.

The goal of the research project is to understand the features of the Smart Tourism policy network in Korea contexts and suggest strategies for managing the policy network.

While there are no direct benefits to you, your participation will contribute to a body of knowledge about analyzing the policy network within Smart Tourism policymaking in Korean contexts by applying the policy network theory into the tourism field.

The interview will only take 1 hour of your time. The researcher may contact you mainly by email at a later date. Interview will be conducted via email or computer-assisted software such as Skype. You will be connected and interviewed through software at the date you prefer. The researcher will ask your experience of involvement in Smart Tourism (or tourism) policymaking. I would like to audio record an interview, but this is up to you, and I can take notes instead. For your reference, interview questions will be provided in advance.

Your participation in this research project is entirely voluntary. Participant may refuse to participate, may refuse to answer a question during interviewing, or may withdraw at any time. If you wish to withdraw, you may also withdraw any data you have provided.

Since I will be asking you questions about your professional experience, there are few risks to taking part. The information I am collecting will be used for Master’s thesis. Your identity will remain confidential. Your name, affiliation, role or job title, telephone number and email address will be collected and served as a reference for linkage to coding data. These data will be kept by the researcher in the encrypted laptop.

Audio recordings will be stored in the encrypted laptop and destroyed at the point of completion of the research project. Interview transcripts will be also stored in the encrypted laptop and destroyed at the point of releasing findings. In the final report, no information that discloses your identity will be released without your specific consent to disclosure. However, indirect identifiers such as job title may be included in the final report. Unless you indicate the job title or role, you will be referred to as
“Participant A–Z”. How would you like to be referred to in the final report?

**Please indicate your job title or role**

Participants will be re-contacted and provided the aggregate research results.

If you have any questions about the project, please feel free to contact through either hwchoi@uoguelph.ca or 1-519-824-4120, ext. 53370)

If you agree to participate in an individual interview for this research, please write your name in the blank and sign on the signature line below.

--------------------------- Consent form with signature section ---------------------------

I, ____________________________ [INSERT PARTICIPANT NAME] agree to take part in an individual interview for the research of “A policy network in Smart Tourism policymaking: A Korea case”.

_________________________________________ __________________________
Participant Signature Date

*NB –please email your consent to the researcher DOYOUNG KIM (do@uoguelph.ca)
Appendix C: List of Reviewed Documents

- Third Five-Year Tourism Promotion Plan, 2009-2013 (2009)
- Research report of the “Third Tourism Development Master Plan” (2009)
- Green Tourism Promotion Plan (2010)
- Research report of “Industrial Tourism” (2009; 2011)
- Industrial Tourism Development Strategies (2012, 36th Crisis Management Meeting)
- Inconvenience Alleviation and Tourism Industry Promotion Plan (2013, 1st Tourism Promotion Meeting)
- Domestic Tourism Invigoration and Tourism Industry Competitiveness Enhancement Plan (2014, 2nd Tourism Promotion Meeting)
- Research report of “Local Tourism Management System” (2013)
- Plan for Fostering Tourism Doore (2013)
- MCST news releases:
  - “Green Tourism Forum will be held” (April, 2010)
  - “Industrial Tourism Forum will be held” (July, 2012)
  - “Establishing Tourism Promotion Cooperation Working Group” (July, 2013)
  - “Organizing Prospective Service Task Force” (February, 2014)
  - “The 75th Conference will be held by Tourism Science Society of Korea” (February, 2014)
  - “Co-hosting Sustainable Tourism Meeting” (December, 2014)
  - “Organizing Working Group for Official Development Assistance (ODA) consultation” (May, 2015)
- Legislation:
  - Framework Act on National Informatization (No. 9705, May 22, 2009)
  - Special Act on Promotion of Information and Communications Technology, and Activation of convergence (No. 12032, August 13, 2013).
Appendix D: Integrated Mind Map

*The color blue represents data from the 1st group, yellow shows the responses of the 2nd group, green illustrates common responses in both groups*
Appendix E: Coding Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Between-group coding</th>
<th>Selective Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>key actors continue to be involved in the policy network and policymaking from the beginning to the end</td>
<td>(1st) key actors in STP networks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core actors &amp; TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less changes in key actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governmental agencies leading a policy network and playing a main role relating to managing the policy network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governmental agencies' willingness and eagerness push public agencies involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information exchange more active between the actors of the public sector compared to interactions between the public and private sector</td>
<td>(2nd) relationships and interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information exchange taking place actively between governmental bodies and public agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>key actors including governmental bodies, public agencies and associations in tourism</td>
<td>(2nd) key actors in TP networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration as a core actor to decide inclusion or exclusion of actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision-making by governments with consideration of opinions or discussions of the policy network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governmental agencies constantly coordinating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governmental agencies jointly organizing and administering a policy network (e.g. forum) in collaboration with public agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managing multi-policy network (e.g. forum) along the tourism policymaking process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>8</sup> Parenthesis indicates data source. (1<sup>st</sup>) stands for the first group of interview participants and (2<sup>nd</sup>) indicates the second group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding</th>
<th>Between-group coding</th>
<th>Selective Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>governmental agencies taking advantage of various formats of policy networks (e.g. forum or conference of research associations) to make strategies and garner feedbacks</td>
<td>(2nd)managing TP networks during the TP process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agencies playing a policy supporting role and being included in the key actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governmental agencies have to play a role of coordinating conflicts and different interests as well as to clarify actors' roles</td>
<td>(2nd)managing TP networks during the TP process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governmental agency coordinating conflicting interests or different interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roles of the government coordinating tensions or conflicts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actors' position and power are not necessarily equal</td>
<td>(2nd)relationships and interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>key actors having shared sense of tourism policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agencies as a linkage (or bridge) to the industry</td>
<td>(1st)key actors in STP networks_public agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agencies being involved to reflect the various needs on tourism policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agencies involved to identify main projects and review viability of them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agencies supporting and complementing the tourism policy network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agencies to support policymaking are important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public research institute should be involved for better policymaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior to main discussion, public research institute playing a role to build a theoretical or legitimate foundation</td>
<td>(2nd)key actors in TP networks_public agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Coding</td>
<td>Axial Coding*</td>
<td>Between-group coding</td>
<td>Selective Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agencies moderating tones of opinions against the government direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core actors &amp; TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roles and missions of public research institute to support tourism policymaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core actors &amp; TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serving as a linkage or bridge with academics or industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core actors &amp; TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exchanges being active between public agencies in tourism domain</td>
<td>(1st)relationships and interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core actors &amp; TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information given enough to public agencies in tourism domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core actors &amp; TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more active interactions between actors of the public sector, especially in tourism domain but less active interactions between the public and private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core actors &amp; TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation of public and of private sector should be viewed differently in terms of public good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core actors &amp; TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academics and actors from private sector do not have the responsibility of decision-making</td>
<td>(2nd)key actors in TP networks_academics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core actors &amp; TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academics being actively involved in agenda-setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core actors &amp; TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected roles of academics to give the direction to tourism policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core actors &amp; TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual academics sometimes playing a leading role with the government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core actors &amp; TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roles of academics being clear such as proposing alternatives and suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core actors &amp; TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actors from the industry expecting specific data and reliable information during the policymaking process</td>
<td>(1st)relationships and interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core actors &amp; TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry experiencing instruction rather than two-way communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core actors &amp; TP networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Coding</td>
<td>Axial Coding*</td>
<td>Between-group coding</td>
<td>Selective Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry rarely receiving follow-ups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry's complains about the unbalanced information exchanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actors from industry participating once or less compared with other actors</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2nd)key actors in TP networks_private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actors from industry playing a role to check technical or practical aspects of strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actors from industry telling pitfalls or expected problems of proposed strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actors of the private sector involved with relatively restricted information and uncertainty</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2nd)relationships and interactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerns about giving feedbacks to the actors from the private sector in terms of confidentiality and perks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confidentiality concerns making less active information exchange between public and private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roles of business associations delivering situations and opinions of members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roles of business associations proposing alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roles of the industry to make suggestions for improving smart tourism with field experience and knowledge of technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roles of the industry to present ideas and ask the governmental supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actors from industry telling problems and experience on the spot</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2nd)key actors in TP networks_private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actors from industry telling reality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Coding</td>
<td>Axial Coding</td>
<td>Between-group coding</td>
<td>Selective Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associations as a representative of member businesses and individual businesses, especially major travel agencies and hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business associations to propose alternatives, strategies and projects in viable forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associations frequently or continuously being involved as a key actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associations of tourism industry as a representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associations stipulated in tourism laws being considered to be a key actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry having no idea about how to be involved in policy networks and policymaking process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associations being regarded as a formal channel so that the government works closely with them to present formal opinions publicly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision-making done by the government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managing the tourism networks during the tourism policymaking process needs administrative supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy networks most influence on policy formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the research being conducted prior to the policy formulation stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smart tourism policy networks being viewed in the line with the tourism policymaking processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourism policymaking being not different in terms of processes but different in the actors involved in the policy networks of smart tourism policymaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourism policy networks mainly influencing agenda-setting and policy formulation phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Coding</td>
<td>Axial Coding*</td>
<td>Between-group coding</td>
<td>Selective Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smart tourism policy networks being not different from tourism policy networks but different in the actors, especially industry actors</td>
<td>(2nd)features of smart tourism policy networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consultations with different purposes (e.g. brainstorming or reviews) via forums and seminars</td>
<td>(2nd)functions and influences of tourism policy networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different opinions or directions being coordinated through discussions in policy networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direction can be modified and modified direction is adopted with consideration of opinions in the policy network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion during the forum was reflected on the tourism strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion of policy networks reflected on strategies or practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experts' suggestions were reflected on the projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little influence on decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>main function of policy networks is consultation at the policy formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy network giving a guidance to tourism policy through consultations rather than decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourism policy networks being active at the agenda-setting stage and influencing it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourism policy networks having influence on policy formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourism policy networks influencing both agenda-setting and formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having the prearranged framework for tourism community policymaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2nd)managing TP networks during the TP process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Coding</td>
<td>Axial Coding*</td>
<td>Between-group coding</td>
<td>Selective Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having the pre-defined framework for the first and second planning regarding Tourism Promotion Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it needs to have a guideline for the consistent tourism policymaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-defining a framework to manage the tourism policy network and tourism policymaking processes effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourism policy formulation requiring internal supports (e.g. money, personnel and interests of decision-makers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proceeding the tourism policymaking procedures according to a framework or phases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business network called &quot;Technology Committee of Travel Agencies&quot; in the smart tourism policymaking process</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1st)multiple policy networks during the STP process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agency-driven policy network for consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy networks assuming various formats (e.g. TF, Relay forums and Seminars) to involve various actors</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2nd)characteristics of TP networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agency-driven policy networks are helpful to take advantage of the personnel and external experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agency-driven policy networks being administered by the government to some extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relay forums for the 5-year planning as a type of policy network are related to another planning or policymaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force consisting of key actors and being under the control of the government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourism policy networks assume various formats which are managed usually by key actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourism policymaking process entails various policy networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1st)multiple policy networks during the STP process

Multi-policy networks

(2nd)characteristics of TP networks

Stages of TP process and actor management
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding</th>
<th>Between-group coding</th>
<th>Selective Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>working group being able to discuss the topic or issue in more details rather than consultation meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working group being organized and convened by the government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working group for recommendations and suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working group to review a draft and garner actors’ opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working group was organized depending on a policy issues or topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective policymaking means making results in a given time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective policymaking is understood in terms of making the strategies in a timely manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic research association and the government jointly organizing the forum in which the government is involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forum to identify a new project from the different point of views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jointly organizing the forum with academics, which serves as a medium to garner opinions and feedbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple tourism policy networks are interconnected for the same or higher-level planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy networks being organized by public agencies in collaboration with the ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agency-driven policy networks consisting of external experts from business associations and academics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agency-driven policy networks for the 5-year tourism promotion planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Coding</td>
<td>Axial Coding&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Between-group coding</td>
<td>Selective Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public research institute organizing a policy network for doing the research in collaboration with the ministry</td>
<td>(1st)functions and influences of STP networks</td>
<td>Top-down smart tourism agenda initiated by the newly established Council in IT policy domain</td>
<td>Newly created structure of national IT policy networks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| sustainable tourism forum is a policy network relating to higher-level planning                                                                                                                                    | (1st)key actors in STP networks_governmental agencies                                      | Core actors 
& STP networks                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                               |
<p>| Task Force for tourism law revision is a policy network relating to higher-level policymaking                                                                                                                  | (1st)smart tourism background                                                             | two leading administrative agencies for STP networks                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                               |
| smart tourism policy networks functioning more than just consulting and they leading the paradigm shift                                                                                                        |                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                               |
| the ministry having little understanding of ICT and smart tourism                                                                                                                                            | (1st)key actors in STP networks_governmental agencies                                      |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                               |
| the ministry having low commitment to the involvement in the smart tourism policymaking process                                                                                                               |                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                               |
| the ministry having little interest and little awareness of smart tourism as well as showing low willingness of participation in the smart tourism policymaking process                                           |                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                               |
| smart tourism discussed as a part of IT policies and service innovation through the convergence of ICT                                                                                                       | (1st)smart tourism background                                                             |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                               |
| smart tourism policy agenda being discussed as a part of IT policies and as the convergence of IT to various domains including tourism industry                                                              |                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                               |
| smart tourism was at the very early stage                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                               |
| smart tourism was the brand new and unprecedented concept                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                               |
| smart tourism was top-down agenda                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                               |
| participation of the private sector was too limited and not enough                                                                                                                                            | (1st)differences of STP networks                                                         |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                               |
| lawful status, weak power, inactive interactions and low commitment to participation                                                                                                                              | (1st)key actors in STP networks                                                           |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding</th>
<th>Between-group coding</th>
<th>Selective Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>perception of core actor’s status and its power in terms of budgets and the influence on budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>belated coordination of unclear roles</td>
<td>(1st)key actors in STP networks_governmental agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Council changing the counterpart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core actor's failure to clarify the roles of actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delay in decision-making and putting core actor's role on public agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited resources or administrative tools to manage smart tourism policymaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Council motivating the public agency by mentioning prospective budget supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclear roles between the council and the ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unusual role allocation among actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual corporation being included in key actors and acting as the representative of travel agencies but one corporation was not enough</td>
<td>(1st)key actors in STP networks_private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more involved, more clearly the corporate actor recognized its roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the council being regarded as an observer by participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>key actors (public agencies) unsatisfied with their roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1st)key actors in STP networks_public agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more involved, more clearly public agencies recognized their roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Coding</td>
<td>Axial Coding*</td>
<td>Between-group coding</td>
<td>Selective Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agencies enduring extra burdens coming from the involvement and the allocated roles</td>
<td>(1st)motivation behind actor participation</td>
<td>Structural changes in STP networks during the preparation stage for STP policy formulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agency regretted the involvement because of additional burdens</td>
<td>(2nd)motivation and obstacles to participation</td>
<td>Lack of adequate preparation in setting the agenda and at the actor management stage of STP process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budget incentive changing the attitude of public agency from passive to active participation in smart tourism policymaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agencies anticipating the increase in budgets as being involved in tourism policymaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more willing to be involved in tourism policymaking with expectation of budget and personnel increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more willing to participate when strategies are in congruence with actor's or organization's interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agencies not willing to participate because they have current projects to do; they do not want to challenge a new one such as smart tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agencies participating with own interests and expectation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there were some changes in the policy network through multi-policy network approach at the later part of policymaking</td>
<td>(1st)issue-based STP network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the ministry decided to involve ICT-relevant actors (e.g. OTAs) in the smart tourism policy network</td>
<td>(2st)key actors in TP networks_governmental agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there was not the pre-defined framework for smart tourism policymaking</td>
<td>(1st)differences of STP networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the core actor failed to identify necessary processes and policy networks and manage the policymaking process according to the time frame</td>
<td>(1st)key actors in STP networks_governmental agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Coding</td>
<td>Axial Coding*</td>
<td>Between-group coding</td>
<td>Selective Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Council not having the framework for the smart tourism policymaking and policy network management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scope of the smart tourism policy network was too small</td>
<td>(2st)features of STP networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governmental agencies are not good at identifying important networks in businesses</td>
<td>(1st)key actors in STP networks_governmental agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business network called &quot;Technology Committee of Travel Agencies&quot; in the smart tourism policymaking process</td>
<td>(1st)multiple policy networks during the STP process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agency organizing the policy network by relying on its own networks with the industry and academics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>