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Abstract
Tourism is a complex and transversal phenomenon of huge social-economic importance that in the last few years has entered the phase of globalization and internationalisation. Furthermore, by virtue of the considerable reinforcement of means of communication, the diffusion of tourism has undergone an unprecedented acceleration and therefore the means of sourcing of information and opportunities of consumption have become numerous. In this direction, distributed hospitality needs investigated, considering that, at the current status, it is not fully understood in terms of inborn potentials by the local policy makers. In general, distributed hospitality represents a form of hospitality that is based on relations of a collaborative nature, especially suitable to generate virtual requalification processes on the territory of residential assets, of repositioning of the tourist destination, as well as reinforcing the attractiveness of the area. Moreover, even though different kinds of inter-company relations exist, the aggregation phenomenon appears to be the answer to the cognitive requirements and the means to activate a modern differential process on the market. The theme of sustainability of tourism development will therefore be faced through the identification of current forms of experience of diffused hotels that exist on an Italian level; subsequently, changing from some morphological indicators deducted by the Network Analysis, a model was proposed in the attempt to define the governance model of diffused hotels. So, the research question is the following: can the formula of distributed hospitality lead to enhancement of a tourist destination with a view to sustainability?
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1. Introduction and Research Question
Tourism is a complex and transversal phenomenon of huge social-economic importance (Hussein Alhroot, 2012; Taleghani, Sharifi & Mousavian, 2011) that in the last few years has entered the phase of globalization and internationalisation (Pechlaner, Pichler, & Volgger, 2012). If, up until just a few years ago, it represented a marginal aspect of the life of a country and it was believed that it was capable of reproducing itself naturally without the need for any structural plan and specific intervention, it is now considered as a strategic activity, able to provide a concrete answer to the request for economic development of the territory (Rispoli & Brunetti, 2009).

Furthermore, by virtue of the considerable reinforcement of means of communication (Kokash, 2012), the diffusion of tourism has undergone an unprecedented acceleration and therefore the means of sourcing of information and opportunities of consumption have become numerous (Pencarelli & Migliaccio, 2011).

In the same way, the numerous amount of demands and forms of behaviour that characterize the demand for tourism are stimulating the development of a much broader and more articulated range of offers. In fact, tourists are currently searching for opportunities that allow them to come into contact with new cultures in an experience based on authenticity and sustainability, without sacrificing the conveniences that they are used to: modern travellers are replacing more and more traditional tourists who enjoy staying in locations that they are familiar with or famous destinations, in the search for holidays that are full of experience (Aziz & Ariffin, 2009).

Among these new tourist offers, the formula of distributed hospitality deserves being investigated into, considering that, at the current status, it is not fully understood in terms of inborn potentials by the local policy makers.
In general, distributed hospitality represents a form of hospitality that is based on relations of a collaborative nature (Himmelman, 2001; Ricciardi, 2010; Porter, 1998), especially suitable to generate virtual requalification processes on the territory of residential assets, of repositioning of the tourist destination, as well as reinforcing the attractiveness of the area. Moreover, even though different kinds of inter-company relations exist (Giaccari, 2003; Grandori, 1995; Normann & Ramirez, 1995; Rullani, 1993), the aggregation phenomenon appears to be the answer to the cognitive requirements and the means to activate a modern differential process on the market.

The theme of sustainability of tourism development will therefore be faced through the identification of current forms of experience of diffused hotels that exist on an Italian level; subsequently, changing from some morphological indicators deducted by the Network Analysis (Carrington, Scott, & Wasserman, 2005; Carley, 2003), a model was proposed in the attempt to define the governance model of diffused hotels.

In consideration of the above, the research question of this contribution is the following: can the formula of distributed hospitality lead to enhancement of a tourist destination with a view to sustainability?

2. Sustainability of Tourist Development and the Formula of Distributed Hospitality: An Analysis of Literature

According to part of the literature related to tourism (Bieger, 1996; Bieger, 1998; Flagestad & Hope, 2001; Bonetti, Petrillo, & Simoni, 2006; Bellagamba, Brunetti, Pencarelli, & Vigolo, 2007; Minguzzi & Presenza, 2010; Franch, 2010; Pechlaner, Paniccia, Valeri, & Raich, 2012; Mazanec, Wöber, & Zins, 2007; Paniccia, Silvestrelli, & Valeri, 2010; Martini, 2005; Keller & Bieger, 2008), this phenomenon is configured as a tourist destination or “as a complex system of offer consisting of the resources available (general and specific) and the tourist services offered in a territory” (Cantone, Risitano, & Testa, 2007, p. 21).

The need to follow an approach oriented towards sustainability by the tourist destinations “originates from the impact of consistent changes in the global context, in terms of tourist demand and offer that in order to be governed in a managerial key need adequate instruments and approaches” (Franch, Martini, & Della Lucia, 2011, p. 2).

Sustainability does, in fact, represent a key factor for re-generation of the tourist offer. In other words: “In order for tourism to be successful, it must be sustainable. In order to be sustainable, it must be carefully planned and handled” (Godfrey & Clark, 2002, p. 20). Furthermore, with reference to the lifecycle of a tourist destination: “(…) we can consider that by applying the principles of sustainability, the lifecycle itself should be modified by extending and moving it in terms of time” (Confalonieri, 2008, p. 26).

From a historical point of view, the first definition of sustainable development has been formalized in the Brundtland Report (Varanini, 2011) in 1987, for which development is sustainable if “(…) it satisfies the requirements of the present without compromising the possibility of future generations in satisfying its own personal needs” (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987).

One year after the International Tourism Organisation extended the concept to tourism, defining tourist development capable of satisfying the demands of today’s tourists and of the relative welcoming regions, allowing for an increasing the opportunities for the future as sustainable (Cater & Lowman, 1994; Perkins & Brown, 2012; Fiorello & Bo, 2012; Saayman, Rossouw, & Saayman, 2012; Baral, Stern & Hammett, 2012; Jamrozy, 2007; Nicely & Palakurthi, 2012; Shikida, Yoda, Kino, & Morishige, 2010; Kennett-Hensel, Sneath, & Hensel, 2010; Zeppel, 2010; Moscardo, 2008; Billington, Carter, & Kayamba, 2008; Giannoni, 2009; Benevolo, 2011; Pencarelli & Splendiani, 2010; Ritchie & Crouch, 2000; Ruozi, 2005). “Therefore, sustainable tourist development attempts to balance out the economic repercussions of tourism with the preservation of the irreproducible resources involved in the production of tourism, the environment and the culture of local communities in primum. This balance is the presupposition for a long-term competitive advantage of the destinations in terms of the attractiveness of flows of visitors and the characteristics of the offer compared with competitors, as well as the quality of the tourist experience and the life of residents” (Franch, Martini, & Della Lucia, 2011, p. 2).

This means that tourist destinations should be able to formulate strategies that take into consideration the existing relationship between sustainability, social responsibility of the company (Matacena, 1984; Coda, 1985; Lee, Fairhurst, & Wesley, 2009; Holcomb, Upchurch, & Okumus, 2007; Cafferata, 2009a; Sciarelli, 2007; Schillaci & Longo, 2010; Tonini, 2010), competitiveness and management. Therefore, for purposes related to tourist development, a careful development policy based on sustainability, focusing on the emerging segments of the market (Weaver, 2000) is necessary and, unlike mass tourism, undertakes ethical behaviour (Caselli, 2003) when on the holiday (Martin & Woodside, 2008; Barbieri & Mahoney, 2010; Tasci & Boylu, 2010; Saraithong
Important authors have sustained that diffused hotels can “represent a truly appropriate example of how to enhance a territory-destination with a view to sustainability, contributing towards maintaining environmental, social and economic balance” (Paniccia, 2012, pages 12-13). A diffused hotel is basically a “hotel that is not built”, “horizontal, sustainable, an attraction for the town centres and districts of our country” (Dall’Ara, 2010, p. 7).

The first form of a diffused hotel was born in Carnia, in the region of Friuli Venezia Giulia, following the earthquake of 1976, with the objective of recovering rural property in small mountain districts characterised by a constant phenomenon of emigration and poor economic dynamism (Battaglia, 2007).

It is a modern form of experience (Pine II & Gilmore, 1999; Carù & Cova, 2003; Cafferata & Cherubini, 2008; Resciniti, 2004; Resciniti & Maggiore, 2009; Pencarelli & Splendiani, 2008; Paniccia, Minguzzi, & Valeri, 2011; Dall’Ara, 2010) (Tidd, Bessant, & Pavitt, 1997) by virtue of the horizontal diffusion of the rooms; it is in fact possible for all guests booked into the various rooms distributed within the territory and close to them to use the hotel services (Dall’Ara & Esposto, 2005). Generally, the buildings of distributed hospitality are inserted within a context of historical-cultural interest; furthermore, the area in which distributed hospitality rises has a small amount of inhabitants, therefore allowing guests to create relations with residents.

In other words, distributed hospitality is characterised by the fact that it has two halls, one inside and one outside of the hotel: “(…) the corridors of distributed hospitality should be the roads; an external hall should be added to the traditional hall, the neighbourhood” (Dall’Ara, 2010, p. 8).

Presuming inclusion in the network of existing houses, this is a kind of horizontal hotel that is characterised by a whole range of requirements (Dall’Ara, 2010):

- Management in an entrepreneurial manner;
- Offer of hospitality and restaurant services;
- Living units located in several separate and existing buildings;
- Common services: the presence of premises set out for common areas for guests is necessary (hospitality, bar, restaurants);
- A distance of no more than 200 or 300 metres between the living units and the structure with the main hospitality services;
- The presence of a welcoming community that favours integration in the territory;
- The presence of an authentic environment, easy to associate with the social reality and local culture;
- The creation of a kind of “symbiotic relationship” (Paniccia, 2012, p. 14) among the homes and the areas in question (Cafferata, 2009b);

Constitution through a private initiative (an entrepreneur or a group of entrepreneurs) or originating from a coalition of public and private actors on the territory (local public authorities such as municipalities, provinces, regions, entrepreneurial associations, cultural and social authorities) (Confalonieri, 2011, p. 276).

3. The Empirical Control: Method of Investigation

The empirical observation that is proposed is focused on the current state of development of diffused hotels in Italy. The decision was made to limit our field of investigation to Italy only because in the current condition the only experience of a diffused hotel abroad can be found in Spain (since 2012).

An example of a hotel form similar to a diffused hotel (but with characteristics that are sometimes drastically different compared with the Italian feature) already exists in Switzerland and in Croatia; here, however, in the current condition legislation does not recognize such form of hospitality. In the same way, on an international level academic interest for diffused hotels has increased (Dropulić, Krajnović, & Ružić, 2008; Grzinic & Saftic, 2012; Avram & Zarrilli, 2012).

It must be pointed out that, dealing with a relatively new topic, an ad hoc framework legislation on a national level does not exist nor do statistic surveys related to the field of diffused hotels in the field of official statistics based on Italian hospitality system exist. Therefore, the survey method followed was that of the case study analysis, of a quality nature and with a view to multiple cases (Yin, 2009), focused on interaction with the individuals investigated into and the specific nature of the phenomenon analysed (Eisenhardt, 1989; Edmondson & McManus, 2007). In this way an analysis of some company cases was carried out that, due to the notoriety
achieved, have succeeded in asserting itself on national and international attention.

In particular, due to the elaboration of the study cases, identification of all of distributed hospitality units currently operating in Italy has been commenced, achieved by comparing the research motors of the National Association of Diffused Hotels, the Association of Authentic Districts of Italy and the Club of the Most Beautiful Districts of Italy, then moving on to consultation of articles originating from national economic magazines as well as academic publications on the topic in question.

4. Results of the Analysis

From the investigations carried out, it has emerged that out of the 57 diffused hotels in Italy the main category is that of hotels in historical districts with 34 structures, followed by hotels in rural ancient hamlets (16) and hotels in period buildings (7) (table 1). With regards to this aspect, it is interesting to see that out of the 212 historical districts that belong to the Club of the Most Beautiful Districts of Italy, only 5 include a diffused hotel; this circumstance highlights how these forms of hospitality in Italy can be diffused even more.

Table 1. Diffused hotels present in Italy during the 3rd quarter 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>N° diffused hotels</th>
<th>Historical district</th>
<th>Period residence</th>
<th>Ancient rural hamlet</th>
<th>Average n° living units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emilia-Romagna</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friuli Venezia Giulia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liguria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piemonte</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Italy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marche</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscany</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Italy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abruzzo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilicata</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molise</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puglia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardinia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Italy and Islands</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Italy</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: our elaboration.

Other observations can be deducted from an analysis of localization of distributed hospitality. The highest concentration is in Central Italy with 25 structures, only 8 of which are located in Umbria, a region with the highest number of units; the role played by the South and by the Islands with 23 hotels should not be neglected, while the North has only 9. In this regard, it is important to point out that, in general terms, the regions with the highest number of distributed hospitality centres are the ones that have regulated these realities before anybody else (the first four regions that have regulated the distributed hospitality centres are Sardinia with the Regional Law n. 27 of 12th August 1998, Friuli Venezia Giulia with the Regional Law n. 2 of 16th January 2002, the Marche region with the Regional Law n.9 of 11th July 2006 and the Umbria region with the Regional Law n.18 of 27th December 2006).

Once again it is important to see how the Abruzzo region, although it has the most famous and studied distributed hospitality in the world, the Sextantio (Avram & Zarrilli, 2012; Silvestrelli, 2011; Paniccia, 2011; Paniccia, Minguzzi, & Valeri, 2011; Paniccia, 2012; Valeri, 2011; Paniccia, Pechlaner, & Valeri, 2007; Paniccia, Pechlaner, & Valeri, 2010; Cavuta, 2007), has not yet organized a specific norm in this field.

According to the dimensions registered, it was acknowledged that in Italy the average number of living units that form distributed hospitality is 8. In detail, the reasons for which higher values have been registered
compared with the Italian average are Friuli Venezia Giulia (21.3), Abruzzo (15.5), Basilicata (13), Tuscany (10.5), Puglia (9-8) and Lazio (9.7).

From a constitutive point of view, the majority of Italian distributed hospitality units have been born due to private entrepreneurial initiatives by individuals strongly rooted with the territory that they belong to. This is the case of the Sextantio, located in the Santo Stefano district of Sessanio in Abruzzo, which has undergone renovation work in order to be used by visitors, or the Corte Fiorita in the Bosa district in the province of Oristano that has allowed for the restoration of private homes and public buildings of historical and architectural interest, leaving local traditions unchanged and, at the same time, revitalizing a centre that is undergoing constant abandonment due to depopulation connected with the search for areas that are much easier to reach and much more attractive from an economic point of view. Further examples of distributed hospitality consisting of private entrepreneurs are represented by La Piana dei Mulini, born from an ancient mill in the Municipality of Colle D’Anchise in the province of Campobasso, and the Muntacea, created in the district of Apricale in the province of Imperia. Only in some cases has distributed hospitality been created from the impulse of a group of local actors; purely as an example, the experience of Smerillo in the Marche region and the Forgaria Monte Prat in the province of Udine are quoted (Mandelli & La Rocca, 2006).

In the field of the touristic field of hospitality, the formula of distributed hospitality definitely represents one of the most modern forms (Rullani, Paiola, Sebastiani, Cantù, & Montagnini, 2007; Chen, Chen, Ho, & Lee, 2009) with regards to the solutions proposed. Among the most interesting initiatives generated by distributed hospitality, the following are highlighted: “distributed lunch” in the Val di Kam of S. Angelo Muxaro in the province of Agrigento; enhancement of the ultra-centenarian in a tourist key by Sardinian distribution hospitality centres; the “unique local dishes” of the Altopiano di Laucu in Friuli Venezia Giulia; the creation of accommodation that recall the medieval history of the hosting district by the already mentioned Sextantio. With specific reference to the Sextantio, the district was transformed into a cultural heritage location where the material dimension and the immaterial dimension of the cultural product are combined in a harmonious manner: the artistic assets, history and traditions on the one hand and culture, experience and expectations of the visitor/tourist on the other hand create a specific and personalized space of experience with marked multi-dimensional characteristics (Silvestrelli, 2011, p. 267).

Therefore a lot of innovation has been produced in Italy even if others should be introduced in order to generate dynamics of development in the area in which the hotel operates. For this purpose, it is believed that distributed hospitality, in the same way as the things that happen with tourist destinations, should be conceived in the same way as a virtual service network, therefore a reticular system (D’Alessio, 2008; Lomi, 1991; Kogut, 2000; Morita, James Flynn, & Ochiai, 2011; Ricciardi, 2010; Porter, 1998; Levanti, 2010; Trequattrini, Russo, & Lombardi, 2012a; Trequattrini, Russo, & Lombardi, 2012b; Gulati, 1998; Håkansson & Snehota, 1995; Trunfio, 2008) of tourist services, handled by a main operator who, on the one hand, stimulates and promotes territorial development as a “catalyst of development” (Schillaci & Gatti, 2011, p. 30) and, on the other hand, creates the presuppositions for inter-organisational cooperation, defining the times and methods (Pechlaner, Reuter, & Bachinger, 2010).

In brief, the study of Italian distributed hospitality shows that it is possible to enhance a tourist destination with regards to its artistic-cultural and environmental heritage as well as the mainly entrepreneurial aspects related to the generation of profit by the organizations operating within the territory. All of this depends on the abilities of the territorial decision makers in promoting and developing cultural orientation towards co-development between the territories, tourist companies operating in it, tourists and local communities, focusing the right amount of attention on the benefits generated (Paniccia, Minguzzi, & Valeri, 2011).

5. The Network Diffusion Hotel-NDH Model

Research carried out, whose results should induce local policy makers to reflect on the potentials deriving from recourse to the formula of distributed hospitality, has highlighted the deficiency, on a managerial level, of specific models aimed at highlighting the governance system of this form of hospitality. In the same way, the “Network Diffusion Hotel- NDH” model is proposed, according to the representation shown below (table 2).
Table 2. The “network diffusion hotel-NDH” model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure indicators</th>
<th>Mini questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of NDH</td>
<td>IQ. 1 Proprietor situation of the NDH network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of companies-entrepreneurs involved</td>
<td>IQ. 2 Level of participation in decisions by members of the NDH network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of human capital involved</td>
<td>IQ. 3 Level of control of the proprietor (principal) on management (agent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of territorial concentration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of NDH regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density of relations between companies and entrepreneurs involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover achieved in the centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: our elaboration.

The first part of the model is based on some indicators of a structural nature, explanatory of the intrinsic characteristics of distributed hospitality:

- The number of NDH’s consists of the quantity of distributed hospitality units present within one specific area;
- The number of companies-entrepreneurs involved is explicative of the number of companies and/or entrepreneurs that have created each single production unit and that deal with operating in the network through common activities;
- The quantity of human capital (Epifani, 2003; Flamholtz, 1986; Flamholtz, 1989; Lev & Schwartz, 1971; Zanda, Lacchini, & Oriccchio, 1993) provides the number of employees involved in carrying out their own network activities;
- The level of territorial concentration can be achieved by using the Gini or Herfindahl-Hirschman index of concentration;
- The number of NDH regulations indicates the number of acts aimed at regulating internal operation of the distributed hospitality units;
- For calculation of the density of relations between companies-entrepreneurs involved, reference can be made to some morphological indicators taken from the Network Analysis (Carrington, Scott, & Wasserman, 2005; Carley, 2003; D’Alessio, 2008; Borgatti, Everett, & Freeman, 2002): density, centrality, length, heterogeneity and connection. The indicator of density registers cohesion of the network through mutual and reiterated connections in time between the aggregated companies; centrality reveals the presence of a leader company or more than one company that guides the network; length measures the extension of territorial boundaries; heterogeneity summarises the number of companies (Bertini, 1990; Zanda, 2009) belonging to the network and classified together in a homogeneous manner; connection increases as the number of knots and/or arches that, leaving the network, create its fragmentation, reduce;
- The turnover achieved during the year is an indicator of an economic nature that expresses the turnover produced by the distributed hospitality units.

In the second part, however, the distributed hospitality units included in the study are compared with the Italian hospitality companies, from all of the aspects previously considered.

The third and last part includes three indicators of quality (IQ.1, IQ.2 and IQ.3) that are formed according to the opinions expressed by owners and/or managers (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Grossman & Hart, 1988) through the presentation of a mini questionnaire (table 3).

Table 3. The mini questionnaire of the “Network Diffusion Hotel – NDH” model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Range of points per question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IQ. 1 Proprietor situation of the NDH network</td>
<td>According to the governance and control structure of the company, to which of the following categories should the</td>
<td>1 (property of one or few individuals involved actively in company management); 2 (shareholder majority owned by one shareholder who mainly has interests of a financial nature (for example, private equity fund, bank)); 3 (total ownership or control (more than 51%) by another company (for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
current proprietor situation be attributed? 4 (company listed in the stock exchange with a stable control package)

IQ. 2 Level of participation in decisions by members of the NDH network

- How many members of the NDH network take part in decisions?
  - 1 hybrid governance (non defined governance);
  - 2 centred governance (just one member of the NDH network makes the decisions for the NDH network);
  - 3 distributed governance (all members of the NDH network take part in the decisions)

IQ. 3 Level of control of property (principal) on management (agent)

- In the case of separation between property and management, how many annual controls does property carry out with regards to the manager?
  - 1, 2 (rare controls);
  - >2 ≤12 (very few controls);
  - 12 (monthly controls);
  - >12 ≤24 (frequent controls);
  - >24 (very frequent controls)

Source: our elaboration.

The answers assigned to each questionnaire can be analysed in general or for each single indicator. In the first hypothesis, in providing an opinion on the governance system of the distributed hospitality unit investigated, the three indicators can consist of several configurations according to the indications provided in table 4: when the points of IQ. 1, IQ. 2 and IQ. 3 are low, the distributed hospitality unit is characterised by not such an extensive governance; if these points are average, it is the case of an extended governance; if they are high, governance is very extended.

Table 4. The governance system according to the “network diffusion hotel – NDH” model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points for IQ.1, IQ.2 and IQ.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed hospitality with small governance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: our elaboration.

This is an instrument of dynamic assessment as it can be compared with other future years or with results that have emerged from other distributed hospitality centres using the same model.

6. Conclusions and Hints for Future Research

From a study carried out in this field it has emerged that distributed hospitality represents a form of hospitality that has not been investigated into from a company governance point of view (Lacchini, 2002; Sheikh & Chatterjee, 1995; Trequattrini, 1999).

The reality of Italian distributed hospitality units investigated also highlights how small companies (Cafferata, 2010), if correctly governed, can play a role in the process of economic, cultural and social growth of the territory. In order to achieve this result a careful plan of intervention on a training and organizational level should be carried out.

In this direction, it is important to focus on training aimed at providing knowledge, abilities and skills in a field of constant development such as tourism. The objective of training is to increase and improve knowledge, of the specific field and also of several transversal disciplines such as foreign languages, new technologies, communication, public relations and relations based on trust (Fukuyama, 1995; Luhmann, 2002).

Moreover, the challenge for the future of distributed hospitality can be based on the ability to sustain reticular development models (Barabasi, 2002; Bastia, 1989), in which tourism can act as a propulsive social and economic power.
Therefore, regardless of the territorial planning process and the real availability of resources for the creation of projects, it is vital that local communities are able to diffuse, especially among the new generations, a greater inclination to innovation (Gollin, 2008) and be much more inclined to enhance local cultural traditions.

In conclusion, the cases of distributed hospitality units presented in this report show that for one tourist destination sustainability and the creation of value (Guatri, 1991; Turco, 2004) do not clash between them but form variables that are closely interconnected: on the one hand, enhancement of a destination in a tourist key may make a context sustainable from a social-economic and environmental profile; on the other hand, the achievement of sustainability creates value on a territorial value, to companies, to the local community and to tourists themselves. Subsequently this contribution can also be interpreted as the first level of a much broader investigation for our future research in this field.
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