

November 2015

Sustainable tourism: a critique of the academic feasibility of the concept

Mirosław Mika

Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Instytut Geografii i Gospodarki Przestrzennej

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digijournals.uni.lodz.pl/turyzm>

Recommended Citation

Mika, Mirosław (2015) "Sustainable tourism: a critique of the academic feasibility of the concept,"

Tourism / Turyzm: Vol. 25 : Iss. 1 , Article 2.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/tour-2014-0015>

Available at: <https://digijournals.uni.lodz.pl/turyzm/vol25/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Social Sciences Journals at University of Lodz Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Tourism / Turyzm* by an authorized editor of University of Lodz Research Online. For more information, please contact agnieszka.kalowska@uni.lodz.pl.

Mirosław Mika

Uniwersytet Jagielloński
Instytut Geografii i Gospodarki Przestrzennej
miroslaw.mika@uj.edu.pl

SUSTAINABLE TOURISM: A CRITIQUE OF THE ACADEMIC FEASIBILITY OF THE CONCEPT

Abstract: The aim of the article is to raise and discuss, according to contemporary research findings, the most important reservations regarding the concept of sustainable (harmonious) tourism development as well as the barriers to the implementation of its principles in practice. The author points to ambiguities in the interpretation of the term 'sustainability' and, as a result, the methodological implications for tourism studies including the problem of measuring and evaluating 'sustainability' in tourism development processes. In addition it considers the social hostility towards limiting consumption in tourism and the growing climatic, economic and political instability at tourism destinations hindering its implementation of the concept of sustainability. In conclusion, the author proposes a new paradigm for sustainable tourism which does not directly relate to the imperative of harmonious interconnection between differing development goals and values in tourism.

Keywords: sustainable tourism, tourism research, methodology.

1. INTRODUCTION

The question of how to appropriately shape the relationships between tourism activities and the natural and social environment at a destination has been the topic of academic and research debate for years. For over two decades academic discussion on the relationships between environmental, cultural, social and economic values in tourism development has been based on the principles behind the concept of sustainable development (BUTLER 1999, DURYDIWKA *et al.* 2010, GÖSSLING, HALL & WEAVER 2009, HUNTER & GREEN 1995, HUNTER 1997, 2002, IWICKI 1998, JĘDRZEJCZYK 1995, 2000, KIDON 2002, LIU 2003, MIKA 2014, NIEZGODA 2006, PANFILUK 2011, SAARINEN 2006, SHARPLEY 2000, 2002A, STABLER 1997, WEAVER 2006, 2009). The factors that contributed to the incorporation of tourism issues into the worldwide debate on a search for the mechanisms of facilitating harmony in social and economic development came about in the second half of the 20th century. This is when the environmental and social impacts of large-scale tourism investments at destinations began to be discussed. The environmental and associated social implications of rapidly growing tourism activities have become an incentive for some researchers to formulate limits to growth in tourism development.

This issue, and the thinking that follows from it, has set the main course of the debate on the relationships between development goals and values in tourism right through to the present.

Originating from the 'limits to growth' concept, the idea of sustainable tourism has been enthusiastically adopted by part of the academic world as a potential solution to the dilemma of linking different development goals with often contradictory forms of tourism activity which are impossible to reconcile, both in the context of 'man-environment' relationships as well as the expected social and economic functions of tourism at destinations. In reference to the key idea of sustainable development, i.e. linking the environmental, social, and economic orders, a holistic approach has been embedded in the concept of sustainable tourism. In turn, social support for the idea of environmental and heritage protection as well as facilitating equal access to the benefits from tourism for local communities, has brought the concept of sustainable tourism into the mainstream as normative. In most tourism research, the interpretation of sustainability as harmonious development has become the paradigm defining the academic approach and perception of tourism as well as the functions of tourist destinations.

Intense academic debate on the definition of sustainable tourism has only led to a reconciliation of its basic principles with a general way of interpretation (HUNTER 2002, LANE 2009, SHARPLEY 2000, 2002a). Despite the fact that the essence and the goals of sustainability are still not accurately defined, the concept of sustainable tourism has been adopted as the theoretical foundation and the interpretive reference point in tourism research. It also serves as a determinant in planning and management at various spatial scales of tourism development (KOWALCZYK 2010).

Since the 1990s, there have been attempts to apply the idea of sustainable tourism in practice. A number of projects financed by international institutions have been developed and yet these have only proven the serious mismatch between its principles and the realities of tourism and socio-economic development. The inability to match theory with practice has found reflection in a handful of implemented so-called 'sustainable' tourism projects which raises questions about the feasibility of this concept. Moreover, it calls for critical reflection on the academic usefulness of the concept of sustainable tourism itself.

The aim of this article is to present, in accordance with the current state of research, some of the most crucial methodological dilemmas which have arisen within sustainable tourism, as well as the practical limitation to implementing the principles of this concept in social and economic life.

2. MAIN RESERVATIONS

A critical discussion of the issue should be preceded by pointing to the significant differences between the ideas of sustainable tourism and the perception of tourism as a sustainability factor in socio-economic development. Both concepts, seemingly similar in their content, are in fact separate issues requiring specific solutions in both theoretical and methodological aspects. It is something quite different to seek ways for sustainability in tourism, for instance, in terms of forms of tourism, means of transport, tourism facilities or the various categories of tourism destination (from protected areas to multifunctional urban centres). It is completely different to try and use a tourism activity and its accompanying effects to implement the concept of sustainability in local development (socio-economic development). Naturally, it is impossible to elaborate on both issues at this point. Narrowing the discussion down to the dilemmas that have grown around the core and goals of sustainability in tourism, it is necessary to emphasize the fact that today it is difficult to connect

the concept of sustainable tourism to socio-economic development in a situation of weakened faith in its universal formula. Additionally, it is cumbersome to connect the concept of sustainable tourism with interpretations of socio-economic development that emphasize the non-linearity of development processes as well as the multiplicity and divergence of values (CHOJNICKI 2008, DOMAŃSKI 2004).

The academic value of the concept of sustainable (harmonious) tourism development has been questioned since the beginning of the debate on its principles and many critical arguments have been put forward by geographers (BUTLER 2005, SHARPLEY 2002a). The field of academic debate on sustainability in tourism has been determined by the discussion and reservations voiced against its foundations, ambiguity in the interpretation of 'sustainability', difficulties in the operational development of its theoretical principles in the research process, the analytical tools used to assess the implementation of sustainable principles in tourism as well as proposals for regulatory limits to tourism consumption and the functioning of tourism businesses put forward by some 'as heralds' of sustainability (BUTLER 2005, CERON & DUBOIS 2003, GÖSSLING, HALL & WEAVER 2009, GÖSSLING *et al.* 2013, SAARINEN 2006, SHARPLEY 2002a, b, WEAVER 2009). Moreover, there are serious concerns about the policies of institutions supporting the implementation of green growth principles in tourism, especially true in a situation of change in the global climate that significantly complicates the development of many world tourism destinations (PEETERS, GÖSSLING & LANE 2009, UNEP 2011). It is also important to bear in mind the question of the depth of the concept of sustainable tourism in the culture of the West and the resulting problem of its appropriacy in other socio-cultural contexts.

3. SUSTAINABILITY – THE INTERPRETIVE RANGE

In the case of concepts related to the principles of sustainable development, the basic methodological issue is the ambiguous interpretation of the English word 'sustainability'. In Polish, there are various interpretations each putting emphasis on different aspects of the relationship: environment – economy – society. The meaning of sustainability is understood differently in various academic disciplines. For example, in reference to biological systems, sustainability means the ability to support and preserve divergence and life processes over time. From the perspective of territorial systems, sustainability means preserving a correct relationship between the environmental,

economic and social subsystems that determine the development desired by local communities, provided it takes place within the limits of acceptable environmental change. In reference to the mainstream and spatial economies, the implied meaning of sustainability is in sustaining factors of growth in local development, whereas in ecological economy it means sustaining future generations' access to the natural and socio-cultural environment as well as the pursuit of inter- and in-generational justice in access to goods (BORYS 2011, DOMAŃSKI 2005, 2007, POSKROBKO 2011, ROGALL 2010). Each discipline that deals with sustainable development has created a set of concepts which are operational interpretations of 'sustainability', which in turn has led to terminological confusion in the academic literature (MIKA 2014).

4. DICHOTOMY OF 'SUSTAINABLE' VALUES IN TOURISM

The multi- and interdisciplinary approach to sustainability in tourism has revealed a clear dichotomy in the formulation of its goals, depending on the point of view on development issues and values (BUTLER 2005). In environmental (ecological) and humanistic approaches it is assumed that the primary purpose of sustainability is to maintain the conditions at destinations, including its value for tourism values and the local socio-economic context of tourism. The goals of sustainable development are perceived in a different way compared to an economic perspective, here, durability and continuity of tourism development is emphasized in terms of the stability of local tourism business (tourist entities, tourist attractions), which in turn facilitates realisation of the social and economic goals for local communities. In practice this means the existence of two contradictory and mutually exclusive interpretations of sustainability in tourism (!) as from the standpoint of tourism businesses (tourism market), the requirement of maintaining a balance between environmental, social and economic systems, creates *de facto* a barrier to its development (SHARPLEY 2002a, b). Thus, the dichotomy of 'sustainable' values (goals) that results from different interpretations, suggests that at least one of two academic perspectives or research strategies has to be chosen: either one that focuses on evaluating the vulnerability and protection of the natural and socio-cultural environments from the impacts of tourism, or the one which concentrates on the optimal use of local tourism development in order to improve the level and quality of the lives of individuals and social groups.

5. THE QUESTION OF ESSENCE AND MEASURES OF SUSTAINABILITY IN TOURISM

The complexity of conditions and features of socio-economic development determines why one of the most serious methodological dilemmas is to identify the actions and processes which can be considered as 'sustainable', and to measure and evaluate them. If, in the dimension of the tourism-environment relationship, a difficulty like this can be solved by referring to the concept of limits of acceptable change (LAC), then in the case of social and economic relationships attempts to evaluate the degree of sustainability of certain forms of tourism activity face a barrier which can be difficult, if not impossible, to cross that in turn allows such attempts to fall easily into the traps of relativism and idealism.

In practice, detailed questions about what sustainability is and what it is not are asked predominantly when developing local plans and programmes for tourism development. It can be found that these are left unsettled when analysing so-called measures of sustainability included in various strategic documents, those measures are either vague and difficult, impossible to evaluate, or characterized by triviality as a result of an over-simplified structure (MANNING 1999, ONZ 2007, UNWTO 2004, PAWLUSIŃSKI, MIKA & FARACIK 2008, SCHIANET &, KAVANAGH 2008). The impossible-to-solve dilemma of the harmonious combination of differing goals in tourism development is the primary reason why the main emphasis of evaluation is moved towards the protection of space as a resource, the result is that the proposed measures of sustainability, by reference to concepts of limits to growth, create in fact a tool to control the development of tourism, the purpose of which is to demonstrate the degree to which tourism activities and investments disrupt the local natural, social and economic environments. Even when such a narrow approach is adopted, the problem of selecting an appropriate set of indicators with subsequent effective evaluation and interpretation of results arises.

6. OBJECTION TO REGULATORY LAW

Questions about the purpose and practical means of achieving sustainability relate directly to tourism demand, tourism facilities and transport systems (DICKINSON *et al.* 2013, GÖSSLING *et al.* 2012, HALL 2010). One of the primary principles of sustainability is to limit the consumption of goods and services to a level acceptable in terms of ecology (WHEELER 1993).

At the turn of the 1990s, a number of publications emphasized the need to change the model of tourist activity. At first, the concern to make it possible for future generations to have access to the environment and its values was expressed by promoting the idea of alternative development (e.g. eco-tourism). This in time has been transformed into proposals for implementing and disseminating regulations in the area of social and tourism business activities, either by means of voluntary acceptance or by applying institutional inspection procedures. Such proposals have been inspired by the increased social sensitivity to the issues of environmental protection observed in post-industrial societies.

The reality of the tourism market has shown that the changes in tourism demand which have been taking place for the last two decades, while heading towards individualism and conscious consumption, have not yet brought about an increase in social interest in alternative (ecological) ways. What is more important, empirical research shows that leisure time spent on tourist activities is the aspect of social life in which proposals for imposing any limits on the extent of the fulfilment of tourists' needs contradict the vested interest of individuals and groups (GÖSSLING *et al.* 2013, WEAVER 2006, 2009). There is a conflict of values, i.e. achieving ecological goals through the development of so-called sustainable forms of tourism decreases the value of goals realized by the majority of tourists. This highlights a clear discrepancy between the concept of harmonious sustainability and the very nature of tourism consumption (!). Social disapproval of proposals for regulations which, in accordance with the principles of sustainability, should set norms of behaviour and limits to tourism consumption, stems from the belief that travelling is not a privilege but a fundamental right of any individual.

The majority of consumer studies conducted in developed countries indicate that tourists are unwilling to see any structural change favouring sustainability in tourism (COHEN & HIGHAM 2011, HARES *et al.* 2010, MCKERCHER *et al.* 2010). The social acceptance of the concept of environmental protection and sustainable development, with the latter being only vaguely understood, is not supported by a willingness to personally sacrifice and waive the freedom to make decisions when on holiday (WEAVER 2009). Participation in tourism creates opportunities for individuals to detach from various forms of social control and laws which are present in both professional and every day life. Reaching the state in which people would voluntarily limit the need to fulfill their tourism needs requires a dramatic behavioral change in a social dimension which is hardly possible in a culture of consumerism (BARR *et al.* 2010, COHEN *et al.* 2011, HIGHAM & COHEN 2011, GÖSSLING *et al.* 2009, MILLER

et al. 2010). Additionally, promoting such attitudes and solutions is thought to be insufficiently justified and even unnecessary (GÖSSLING *et al.* 2013). The reason for this is that regulatory law is contrary to the social expectations of tourists. Since changes towards sustainability cannot be expected in those societies which entered a post-industrial phase in the 20th century, then legitimizing sustainability as an imperative of tourism behaviour seems even more unattainable where modernisation processes are still pending (e.g. in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe). The question of how the concept of sustainability is going to be received in societies which are governed by values which are different to the West remains unanswered, especially in Asian countries whose significance on the worldwide tourism market is continuously growing.

The discrepancy between values declared and the actual attitudes and behaviour of individuals should be taken for granted as an immanent and inevitable feature of tourism consumption. This is the most serious barrier in a holistic approach to the issue of sustainability as it undermines the validity and meaning of implementing the principles of harmonious sustainability in tourism. It seems that the subordination of tourism activity to the regulatory system could only be marginally socially approved only in certain situations, e.g. in legally protected areas.

Voluntary acceptance of regulatory law is also rejected by tourism businesses (BRAMWELL & LANE 2013, BUCKLEY 2012, *Tourism. Investing in...* 2011). They explain it by referring to the competitive tourism market which is subjected to regulatory law, and to the excessive growth of inspection procedures which negatively affect the competitiveness of tourism companies. In the tourism sector, short-term schemes are predominant, they are set on maximizing profits at times of greatest demand (annual, seasonal). The principles of market self-organization are thought to be the best mechanism for moulding the behaviour of businesses in a situation of insecure tourism demand. Another reason which determines why it is impossible to implement regulatory law in the tourism sector is the considerable involvement of multinational companies in the tourism business as their organisational system is corporate. The caution and distancing of tourism businesses from voluntary or legal imposition of regulations is based upon negative experiences related to the development of eco-tourism (ROSS & WALL 1999). This, in many cases, has become a 'trap' for tourism investors and local authorities in developing countries.

In spite of aversion promotional activity can be found in the media, implementation of so-called sustainable business practice by some tourism businesses and sectors. These predominantly take the form

of participation in partnership programmes or eco-certification initiatives. Such 'ecological' solutions essentially represent mere labelling of the activities that aim to create a positive image of the businesses involved, an attempt to create positive PR or attract a certain group of customers (FILIMONAU *et al.* 2011, GÖSSLING 2009, WEAVER 2009). In reality, they do not create new policies for businesses towards expected sustainability and they do not have any influence on the reduction of the negative effects on the natural or social environments.

7. SUSTAINABILITY VERSUS GROWTH FACTORS IN LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

Sustainability which strives to promote a synergy between tourism development and limitations imposed on tourism consumption seems incompatible with the policies of local authorities at tourism destinations whose activities aim at supporting economic growth and creating employment (DODDS 2007, HALL 2011). Integrating the principles of sustainable development into local policies and creating strategies for development based on these principles, inevitably leads to a conflict of goals. As a result, all activities aiming at finding new factors for local development, as well as supporting existing ones, inevitably lead to changes in social and natural environments. There is a justified concern of local decision-makers i.e. that a law is going to cause an excessive growth in inspections for both individuals and businesses. The inspections in turn will limit initiatives which can lead to continuity in the local economy and meet the needs of local communities. The reasons for such an attitude are the radical measures undertaken by some non-governmental organizations which narrow the interpretation of harmonious development solely to ecological dimensions (DODDS & BUTLER 2009).

One of the most important problems associated with the implementation of the principles of sustainable development in tourism concerns reaching a common agreement about local development (BEETON 2006, BERITELLI 2011, BUCKLEY 2012, DREDGE 2006, MILLER *et al.* 2010). Two issues can be pointed to: firstly, the idea of the harmonious combination of differing tourism development goals is incompatible with the varied goals of actors (stakeholders) at a local level. Locally there are social lobbying groups as well as individuals who, to a varied extent, are able to take advantage of the opportunities created by the achievement of certain goals in local policies. From the perspective of the actors in tourism development, the common goals should in theory lead to an agreement on key issues locally. Reality shows that self-

interest and unconnected individual goals represent serious barriers to the design of optimal solutions which would generate benefits to all interested parties. These barriers in cooperation are of a market, social and institutional nature: the first is a result of the rules of competition, the second relates to the heterogeneity and disagreement between local development actors, and the latter a result of the lack of rapport in cooperation among businesses. Secondly, in many cases local communities have problems formulating their own priorities in reference to the strategic goals of local development. The principle of governance, which the concept of sustainable development makes an explicit reference to, creates circumstances in practice that promote confrontation between extreme attitudes and the views represented by groups or individuals with conflicting interests. The situation of internal conflict in a group of local development actors creates a situation in which local authorities cannot guarantee the results of proposed solutions and whether these results are in accordance with a common interest. The results will always be inconsistent with the goals of some local stakeholders.

8. SUSTAINABILITY VERSUS INSTABILITY IN TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

Unstable climatic processes, as well as the economic and political instability, are a key decisive factor in global socio-economic development. The first priority nowadays is the ability to sustain those local economic structures which play a key role in producing economic and social benefits. In such a situation the debate on harmonious development must account for such issues as competitiveness, efficiency and flexibility of business. The tourism sector is especially vulnerable to the influence of negative natural, economic and socio-political phenomena. The issues which relate to the safety of travel and a guarantee of satisfaction of tourism needs have a fundamental meaning in an area of tourism demand.

In times of climatic change, as experienced by the public, the practical implementation of the principles of sustainable development have become impossible in the eyes of a part of the academic community (WEAVER 2009). There is an opinion that the global tourism sector is neither prepared, nor fit to face the consequences of such changes (REDDY & WILKES 2013, SCOTT 2011, SCOTT, HALL & GÖSSLING 2012). Such phenomena as a rise in air temperatures during a tourism season, a rise in sea water temperatures, an increased threat from extreme weather events and insufficient snow cover have become the decisive factors responsible for the instability of development

of many tourism destinations in the world as well as in those regions which play the key part in the global tourism system (AMELUNG & VINER 2006, ELSASSER & BÜRKI 2002, JONES & PHILLIPS 2011, *Climate change and tourism. Responding...* 2008, KRZESIWO 2014, PATTERSON, BASTIANONI & SIMPSON 2006, PERRY 2006, SCOTT, SIM & SIMPSON 2012, STEIGER 2012, STEIGER & MAYER 2008).

The alteration (instability) of weather or, more broadly, climate, is difficult to predict and becomes an increasingly important factor determining tourism demand. Forecasting behaviour in mass tourism, especially for leisure, is the subject of more frequent research and analyses including some of the institutions which co-finance tourism investments (BECKEN 2007, BUZINDE 2010b, *Climate change and tourism, Where...* 2008, DICKINSON, ROBBINS & LUMSDON 2010, GOH 2012, GÖSSLING *et al.* 2012, PETERS & DUBOIS 2010). The rise of investment risk in the tourism sector and the higher cost of accommodating the increasing instability may affect and modify business strategies, excluding the issues of structural sustainability connected with their functioning (BUZINDE *et al.* 2010a, BRAMWELL & LANE 2009, KLINT *et al.* 2011).

9. IS THE HARMONIOUS DEVELOPMENT OF TOURISM AT ALL POSSIBLE?

There are a number of signs showing that general tourism activities, both in reference to social interaction and economic processes, are an exceptional phenomenon which 'by its nature' are inconsistent with the idea of sustainable development. This inconsistency is not just a matter of disliking legal and institutional regulation. A detailed analysis of various forms of local tourism development in many parts of the world provides evidence for this. The tourism service sector in a situation of mass tourism, i.e. a highly commercialised and resource-draining type of development, is characterized by its 'inherent' inability to form socially desired and anticipated relationships in the socio-economic field as well as in human vs. environment relationships. This phenomenon affects many factors that strongly depend on the local conditions in which the development of tourism takes place.

Aside from the social, economic and political limits already mentioned, and those which represent the outcome of the increasing instability of economic trends in the global tourism market, important problems that contribute to the inharmonious development of mass tourism are the high and rapidly increasing commercialization of tourism activities, the considerable involvement of multinational corpora-

tions in tourism, the conflict between 'internal' and the 'external' forces in local development and the inability of local social structures to join the chain of economic benefits derived, especially in developing countries. Almost any tourism destination possesses a separate set of obstacles and barriers which, to a different extent and with differing intensities, limit or prevent the implementation of the principles of harmonious (sustainable) development. Yet, it does not stop the search for opportunities to implement these principles in other types of tourism development, at smaller scales and in reference to certain categories of tourism. Tourism activities and investments are, after all, subject to regulatory law in conservation areas, under a so-called strict protection regime, in this way, achieving the principle of sustainability and renewability of resources in geographical space, and at the same time providing for its social function (MATEI 2011, PTASZYCKA-JACKOWSKA 1993, ZAWILIŃSKA 2010). Potentially favourable conditions for developing regulatory mechanisms exist in some historic cities. Additionally, previous experience shows that the so-called small-scale development projects that introduce innovative solutions in accordance with the principles of sustainability and which are created on the grounds of well-documented studies of local conditions, have the highest chances of success.

10. TOWARDS A NEW PARADIGM IN TOURISM SUSTAINABILITY

In view of the methodological shortcomings outlined and the practical limits to implementation of the principles of sustainable (harmonious) development in tourism, a justified question arises on the degree and scope to which the concept of sustainable tourism matches the challenges of today's changing world. There are many demonstrations that the theoretical concept, based on a holistic and normative approach as well as on attempts to combine the manifold goals of tourism development effectively with environmental, social and economic values, has mostly exhausted its power on the direction and the method of solving research problems in the study of tourism. Reducing the academic usefulness of this concept does not suggest its rejection. It is rather the effect of false and illusory assumptions made by promoters of sustainability in tourism that the idea of harmonious development can 'cover' all manifestations of tourism activity and simultaneously achieve success in all of them.

Academic rationality calls for verification of the symptoms of speculative thinking that can lead academic discourse into intellectual traps. The long

debate on sustainability in tourism lasting more than two decades has brought about a situation in which certain patterns of thinking, based on a belief in its correctness, has become a norm. It is only empirical research and the exchange of experience on implementing this concept practically that has provided arguments objecting to this. As a result, demand for a new paradigm within the concept of sustainable tourism has been created with no reference to the imperative of harmonious linking of environmental, social and economic systems with the development of tourism.

The variety and the multitude of forms (social, organizational, spatial) and the uniqueness of the local situations in which the processes of tourism development take place, create a favourable background to the formulation of innovative conceptualizations of the term 'sustainability' – being the foundation of a theory of sustainable development. The English word 'sustain', in the context of providing future generations with access to the resources and value of space, requires a new interpretation in tourism studies. The reconceptualisation of sustainability in tourism should be equally based on emphasizing the necessity to protect spatial resources as well as values, but what is deeply 'rooted' in tourism, i.e. standing for what is necessary to achieve the needs of tourists, as well as the result of achieving socio-economic success at tourism destinations, need to be considered. Adopting such an interpretation allows the development of tourism destinations to be perceived as a value in itself. The proposal for a new interpretation of sustainability is introduced for instance by the concept of sustaining 'life processes' in local tourism development (MIKA 2014), in which, alongside what accompanies the development of tourism, the author names the factors and mechanisms that determine this development. The meaning of sustainability is manifested in the long-term sustenance of tourism that determines the stability of local socio-economic structures, it is of the highest importance to mature tourism destinations which rely on a so-called 'lock-in' within the socio-economic development path.

The variety of tourism destinations prompts the core of the discussion around sustainability in tourism to be shifted to a local level and the specific conditions (local context) in which the development of tourism takes place. It is necessary to abandon the interpretation of sustainable development of tourism destinations perceived as their 'ideal' state (which is impossible to determine in practice), in favour of an evolutionary process of change based on rational economic premises which does not lead towards a predetermined objective. In turn, the new concept of sustainability should, to achieve social goals, take into account to a greater extent the actual attitudes and

behaviour of individuals and social groups that participate in tourism. In both it is essential to adopt a bottom-up and evolutionary approach to the analysis of tourism as well as limiting the evaluation of features and directions based solely on ideological premises which is especially important when an academic perspective is applied.

FOOTNOTES

¹ The complexity of this issue is shown by merely using the term 'appropriately' which can be interpreted in many ways, depending on the adopted evaluation standards.

REFERENCES

- AMELUNG B., VINER D., 2006, Mediterranean tourism. Exploring the future with the tourism climatic index, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14(4), pp. 349-366.
- BARR S., SHAW G., COLES T., PRILLWITZ J., 2010, A holiday is a holiday. Practicing sustainability, home and away, *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18, pp. 474-481.
- BECKEN S., 2007, Tourists' perception of international air travel's impact on the global climate and potential climate change policies, *Journal of Transport Geography*, 15(4), pp. 351-368.
- BEEON S., 2006, *Community development through tourism*, Landlinks Press, Collingwood.
- BERITELLI P., 2011, Cooperation among prominent actors in a tourist destination, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(2), pp. 607-629.
- BORYS T., 2011, Interdyscyplinarność ekonomii zrównoważonego rozwoju, [in:] B. Poskrobko (ed.), *Teoretyczne aspekty ekonomii zrównoważonego rozwoju*, Wyższa Szkoła Ekonomiczna w Białymstoku, Białystok, pp. 134-151.
- BRAMWELL B., LANE B., 2009, Economic cycles, times of change and sustainable tourism, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(1), pp. 1-4.
- BRAMWELL B., LANE B., 2013, Getting from here to there. Systems change, behavioural change and sustainable tourism, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(1), pp. 1-4.
- BUCKLEY R., 2012, Sustainable tourism. research and reality, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), pp. 528-546.
- BUTLER R.W., 1999, Sustainable tourism. A state-of-the-art review, *Tourism Geographies*, 1(1), pp. 7-25.
- BUTLER R.W., 2005, Problemy miejsc recepcji ze zrównoważonym rozwojem, [in:] R. Winiarski, W. Alejsiak (eds), *Turystryka w badaniach naukowych*, Akademia Wychowania Fizycznego w Krakowie, Wyższa Szkoła Informatyki i Zarządzania w Rzeszowie, Kraków-Rzeszów, pp. 35-48.
- BUZINDE C.N., MANUEL-NAVARRETE D., KERSTETTER D., REDCLIFF M., 2010a, Representations and adaptation to climate change, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(3), pp. 581-603.
- BUZINDE C.N., MANUEL-NAVARRETE D., YOO E.E., MORAIS D., 2010b, Tourists' perceptions in a climate of change. eroding destinations, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(2), pp. 333-354.
- CERON J., DUBOIS G., 2003, Tourism and sustainable development indicators. the gap between theoretical demands and practical achievements, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 6(1), pp. 54-75.
- CHOJNICKI Z., 2008, Rozwój społeczno-ekonomiczny i jego aspekty aksjologiczne, [in:] J.J. Parysek, T. Strykiewicz

- (eds), *Region społeczno-ekonomiczny i rozwój regionalny*, Bogucki Wyd. Naukowe, Poznań, pp. 21-36.
- Climatic change and tourism. *Responding to global challenges*, 2008, United Nations World Tourism Organization, United Nations Environment Programme, World Meteorological Organization (UNWTO-UNEP-WMO), UNWTO, Madryt.
- Climate change and tourism, Where will the journey lead?*, 2008, Deutsche Bank Research, Current Issues, Frankfurt am Main.
- COHEN S.A., HIGHAM J.E.S., 2011, Eyes wide shut? UK consumer preceptions on aviation climate impacts and travel decisions to New Zealand, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(4), pp. 323-335.
- COHEN S.A., HIGHAM J.E.S., CAVALIERE C.T., 2011, Binge flying. Behavioral addiction and climate change, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(3), pp. 1070-1089.
- DICKINSON J.E., ROBBINS D., FILIMONAU V., HARES A., MIKA M., 2013, Awareness of tourism impacts on climate change and the implications for travel practice. A Polish perspective, *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(4), pp. 506-519.
- DICKINSON J.E., ROBBINS D., LUMSDON L., 2010, Holiday travel discourses and climate change, *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18(3), pp. 482-489.
- DODDS R., 2007, Sustainable tourism & policy implementation. Lessons from the case of Calviá, Spain, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(1), pp. 296-322.
- DODDS R., BUTLER R.W., 2009, Inaction more than action barriers to the implementation of sustainable tourism policies, [in:] S. Gössling, M. Hall, D.B. Weaver (eds.), *Sustainable tourism futures perspectives on systems, restructuring and innovations*, Routledge, Londyn-Nowy Jork, pp. 43-57.
- DOMAŃSKI B., 2004, Krytyka pojęcia rozwoju a studia regionalne, *Studia Regionalne i Lokalne*, 2(16), pp. 7-23.
- DOMAŃSKI R., 2005, Samowzmacnianie rozwoju miast i regionów w gospodarce intensyfikującej wykorzystanie wiedzy. Wnioski z nowej teorii wzrostu endogenicznego, *Przegląd Geograficzny*, 77(2), pp. 131-138.
- DOMAŃSKI R., 2007, Podtrzymywalny (trwały) rozwój społeczno-gospodarczy w środowisku ziemskim jako problem integrujący nauki geograficzne i zespół nauk o Ziemi, [in:] B. Ney (ed.), *Aktualne i perspektywiczne problemy nauk o Ziemi i nauk górniczych*, Polska Akademia Nauk, Wydział VII, Warszawa, pp. 172-209.
- DREDGE D., 2006, Networks, conflict and collaborative communities, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14(6), pp. 562-581.
- DURYDIWKA M., KOWALCZYK A., KULCZYK S., 2010, Definicja i zakres pojęcia „turystyka zrównoważona”, [in:] A. Kowalczyk (ed.), *Turystyka zrównoważona*, Wyd. Naukowe PWN, Warszawa, pp. 21-43.
- ELSASSER H., BÜRKI R., 2002, Climate change as a threat to tourism in the Alps, *Climate Research*, 20(3), pp. 253-257.
- FILIMONAU V., DICKINSON J.E., ROBBINS D., REDDY M.V., 2011, A critical review of methods for tourism climate change appraisal. Life cycle assessment as a new approach, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(3), pp. 301-324.
- GOH C., 2012, Exploring impact of climate on tourism demand, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(4), pp. 1859-1883.
- GÖSSLING S., 2009, Carbon neutral destinations. A conceptual analysis, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(1), pp. 17-37.
- GÖSSLING S., HAGLUNDB L., KALLGRENB H., REVAHLB M., HULTMANB J., 2009, Swedish air travellers and voluntary carbon offsets. Towards the co-creation of environmental value?, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 12(1), pp. 1-19.
- GÖSSLING S., HALL C.M., WEAVER D.B., 2009, *Sustainable tourism futures. Perspectives on systems, restructuring and innovations*, Routledge, Nowy Jork.
- GÖSSLING S., SCOTT D., HALL C.M., 2013, Challenges of tourism in a low-carbon economy, *WIREs Clim Change*, 4, pp. 525-538.
- GÖSSLING S., SCOTT D., HALL C.M., CERON J.P., DUBOIS G., 2012, Consumer behaviour and demand response of tourists to climate change, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), pp. 36-58.
- HALL C.M., 2010, Changing paradigms and global change. From sustainable to steady-state tourism, *Tourism Recreation Research*, 35(2), pp. 131-144.
- HALL C.M., 2011, Policy learning and policy failure in sustainable tourism governance. from first and second to third change order?, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4-5), pp. 649-671.
- HARES A., DICKINSON J., WILKES K., 2010, Climate change and the air travel decisions of UK tourists, *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18(3), pp. 466-473.
- HIGHAM J., COHEN S.A., 2011, Canary in the coalmine. Norwegian attitudes towards climate change and extreme long-haul air travel to Aotearoa/New Zealand, *Tourism Management*, 32(1), pp. 98-105.
- HUNTER C., 1997, Sustainable tourism as an adaptive paradigm, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(4), pp. 850-867.
- HUNTER C., 2002, Aspects of the sustainable tourism debate from a natural resources perspective, [in:] R. Harris, T. Griffin, P. Williams (eds), *Sustainable tourism. A global perspective*, Butterworth-Heinemann, Burlington, pp. 3-23.
- HUNTER C., GREEN H., 1995, *Tourism and the environment a sustainable relationship?*, Routledge, Londyn.
- IWICKI S., 1998, *Turystyka w zrównoważonym rozwoju obszarów pojeziernych*, Akademia Techniczno-Rolnicza, Bydgoszcz.
- JĘDRZEJCZYK I., 1995, *Ekologiczne funkcje i uwarunkowania turystyki*, Wyd. Śląsk, Katowice.
- JĘDRZEJCZYK I., 2000, *Nowoczesny biznes turystyczny. Ekostrategie w zarządzaniu firmą*, Wyd. Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- JONES A., PHILLIPS M., 2011, *Disappearing destinations. Climate change and future challenges for coastal tourism*, CABI Publ., Wallingford.
- KIDOŃ E., 2002, *Zasady kształtowania uzdrowisk Beskidu Śląskiego w świetle idei zrównoważonego rozwoju*, doktors thesis, Instytut Geografii i Gospodarki Przestrzennej, Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków, (typescript).
- KLINT L., WONG E., JIANG M., DELACY T., HARRISON D., DOMINEY-HOWES D., 2011, Climate change adaptation in the Pacific Island tourism sector. Analysing the policy environment in Vanuatu, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 15(3), pp. 247-274.
- KOWALCZYK A. (ed.), 2010, *Turystyka zrównoważona*, Wyd. Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- KRZESIWO K., 2014, *Rozwój i funkcjonowanie stacji narciarskich w Karpatach Polskich*, Instytut Geografii i Gospodarki Przestrzennej, Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków.
- LANE B., 2009, Thirty years of sustainable tourism drivers, progress, problems and the future, [in:] S. Gössling, C.M. Hall, D.B. Weaver (eds.), *Sustainable tourism futures perspectives on systems, restructuring and innovations*, Routledge, Londyn-Nowy Jork, pp. 19-32.
- LIU Z., 2003, Sustainable tourism development. a critique, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 11(6), pp. 459-475.
- MANNING T., 1999, Indicators of tourism sustainability, *Tourism Management*, 20(2), pp. 179-182.
- MATEI E., 2011, The ecotourism's development in the Romanian Carpathians' protected areas. Facts, figures and needs, *Human Geographies - Journal of Studies and Research in Human Geography*, 5(2), pp. 31-39.
- MCKERCHER B., PRIDEAUX B., CHEUNGA C., LAW R., 2010, Achieving voluntary reductions in the carbon footprint of tourism and climate change, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(3), pp. 297-318.
- MIKA M., 2014, *Założenia i determinanty podtrzymywalności lokalnego rozwoju turystyki*, Instytut Geografii i Gospodarki Przestrzennej, Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków.

- MILLER G., RATHOUSE K., SCARLES C., HOLMES K., TRIBE J., 2010, Public understanding of sustainable tourism, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(3), pp. 627-645.
- NIEZGODA A., 2006, Obszar recepcji turystycznej w warunkach rozwoju zrównoważonego, „Prace Habilitacyjne” 24, Wyd. Akademii Ekonomicznej w Poznaniu, Poznań.
- ONZ, 2007, *Indicators of Sustainable Development. Guidelines and Methodologies*, Nowy Jork.
- PANFILUK E., 2011, Problemy zrównoważonego rozwoju w turystyce, *Ekonomia i Zarządzanie*, 3(2), pp. 60-72.
- PATTERSON T., BASTIANONI S., SIMPSON M., 2006, Tourism and climate change. Two-way street, or vicious/virtuous circle?, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14(4), pp. 339-348.
- PAWLUSIŃSKI R., MIKA M., FARACIK R., 2008, *Plan rozwoju i zarządzania turystyką w regionie Babiej Góry*, Instytut Geografii i Gospodarki Przestrzennej, Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków.
- PEETERS P., DUBOIS G., 2010, Tourism travel under climate change mitigation constraints, *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18(3), pp. 447-457.
- PEETERS P., GÖSSLING S., LANE B., 2009, Moving towards low-carbon tourism. Opportunities for destinations and tour operators, [in:] S. Gössling, C.M. Hall, D. Weaver (eds.), *Sustainable tourism futures*, Routledge, Londyn, pp. 240-257.
- PERRY A., 2006, Will predicted climate change compromise the sustainability of Mediterranean tourism?, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14(4), pp. 367-375.
- POSKROBKÓ B. (ed.), 2011, *Teoretyczne aspekty ekonomii zrównoważonego rozwoju*, Wyższa Szkoła Ekonomiczna w Białymstoku, Białystok.
- PTASZYCKA-JACKOWSKA D., 1993, *Kształowanie stref ochronnych przyrodniczych obszarów ochronnych*, Wyd. Instytutu Kształowania Środowiska, Warszawa, Kraków.
- REDDY V., WILKES K., 2013, *Tourism, climate change and sustainability*, Routledge, Abingdon.
- ROGALL H., 2010, *Ekonomia zrównoważonego rozwoju. Teoria i praktyka*, Wyd. Zys i S-ka, Poznań.
- ROSS S., WALL G., 1999, Ecotourism. towards congruence between theory and practice, *Tourism Management*, 20(6), pp. 123-132.
- SAARINEN J., 2006, Traditions of sustainability in tourism studies, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(4), pp. 1121-1140.
- SCHIANETZ K., KAVANAGH L., 2008, Sustainability indicators for tourism destinations. A complex adaptive systems approach using systemic indicator systems, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(6), pp. 601-628.
- SCOTT D., 2011, Why sustainable tourism must address climate change, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(1), pp. 17-34.
- SCOTT D., HALL C.M., GÖSSLING S., 2012, *Tourism and climate change. Impacts, mitigation and adaptation*, Routledge, Londyn.
- SCOTT D., SIM R., SIMPSON M., 2012, Sea level rise impacts on coastal resorts in the Caribbean, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(6), pp. 883-898.
- SHARPLEY R., 2000, Tourism and sustainable development. exploring the theoretical divide, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8(1), pp. 1-19.
- SHARPLEY R., 2002a, Sustainability. A barrier to tourist development?, [in:] R. Sharpley, D.J. Telfer (ed.), *Tourism and development. Concepts and issues*. Channel View Publ., Clevedon, pp. 319-337.
- SHARPLEY R., 2002b, The consumption of tourism, [in:] R. Sharpley, D.J. Telfer (eds), *Tourism and development. Concepts and issues*. Channel View Publ., Clevedon, pp. 300-318.
- STABLER M.J., 1997, *Tourism and sustainability. principles to practice*, CAB Intern., Wallingford.
- STEIGER R., 2012, Scenarios for skiing tourism in Austria. integrating demographics with an analysis of climate change, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(6), pp. 867-882.
- STEIGER R., MAYER M., 2008, Snowmaking and climate change. future options for snow production in Tyrolean ski resorts, *Mountain Research and Development*, 28(3/4), pp. 292- 298.
- Tourism. Investing in the green economy*, 2011, [in:] United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) and United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), *Towards a Green Economy*, UNEP, Genewa, pp. 409-447.
- UNEP, 2011, *Towards a green economy. Pathways to sustainable development and poverty eradication – a synthesis for policy makers*.
- UNWTO, 2004, *Indicators of sustainable development for tourism destinations. A guidebook*, World Tourism Organization, Madryt.
- WEAVER D.B., 2006, *Sustainable tourism. Theory and practice*, Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, Burlington.
- WEAVER D.B., 2009, Reflections on sustainable tourism and paradigm change, [in:] S. Gössling, C.M. Hall, D.B. Weaver (eds.), *Sustainable tourism futures perspectives on systems, restructuring and innovations*, Routledge, Londyn-Nowy Jork, pp. 33-40.
- WHEELER B., 1993, Sustaining the ego, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1(2), pp. 121-129.
- ZAWILIŃSKA B., 2010, *Możliwości rozwoju turystyki w parkach krajobrazowych Karpat Polskich w świetle idei zrównoważonego rozwoju*, „Monografie i Prace Doktorskie”, 10, Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny, Kraków.