

November 2014

Tourism space: an attempt at a fresh look

Marek Więckowski

Polish Academy of Sciences, Institute of Geography and Spatial Organization

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

Recommended Citation

Więckowski, Marek (2014) "Tourism space: an attempt at a fresh look," *Tourism / Turyzm*: Vol. 24 : Iss. 1 , Article 2.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/tour-2014-0002>

Available at: <https://digijournals.uni.lodz.pl/turyzm/vol24/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.

Marek Więckowski

Institute of Geography and Spatial Organization
Polish Academy of Sciences
marekw@twarda.pan.pl

TOURISM SPACE: AN ATTEMPT AT A FRESH LOOK

Abstract: In this article, the author is trying to answer the fundamental question: what is present-day tourism space like at a time of highly increasing flows of people or even a shift from the space of a 'place' to the space of a 'flow'? The article puts special stress on how to define the current unique multi-functional space. The author attempts to define tourism space as a new entity, founded on poly-functionality (i.e. different functions and use of the same space both at the same time and in different seasons), multi-scale (overlapping of tourism spaces depending on the scale concerned), multi-layer, as well as the multi-motivation of its creators and users, or even multi-relativity.

Keywords: tourism space, tourism, poly-functionality, multiple motivation, multi-relativity.

1. INTRODUCTION

The theoretical, conceptual and empirical aspects of tourism space have an important and well-deserved place in Polish geography. Present-day changes in tourism space require, on the one hand, the current definition to be checked, and on the other, new research methods to be applied. Adopting the concept of the social production of space as the point of departure (LEFEBVRE 1974), the author attempts to arrive at the essence of tourism space, a space differing from other types of space (especially in social and economic terms) – because, as is stressed by HARVEY (1973) – each form of activity defines its own space (HARVEY 1973). Based on previous works by Polish authors, in particular S. LISZEWSKI 1995, 1998 2005, B. WŁODARCZYK 2007, 2009, 2012, and A. KOWALCZYK 2011, the author tries to answer the fundamental questions: are the definitions of tourism space proposed by Polish authors still relevant in the light of the changing conditions underlying the development of the modern world?; are they needed?; and what is present-day tourism space like at a time of huge increases in flow or even a shift from a space of a 'place' to a space of a 'flow' (CASTELLS 1996), taking into consideration that tourism space changes and is shaped by multiple bodies? The creators and administrators of space also change, as do tourists (they are mobile), whereas 'territory' remains in the same place (it is immobile).

2. BASIS OF DISCUSSION

Discussion of tourism space has continued for many years in the Polish literature. The first definition, proposed by J. WARSZYŃSKA & A. JACKOWSKI (1978), seems to be comprehensive enough not to have lost its relevance, on condition that one of the terms, 'tourism phenomena', is defined. Of course the key question is: can we define tourism phenomena today in the same way as we did over 30 years ago?

In the geography of recreation and tourism, tourism space can be considered a 'mega-concept' (LISZEWSKI 1995). This component is also stressed by B. WŁODARCZYK (2009), who further specifies that in geography tourism space is the ultimate concept of the study of tourism and tourism phenomena. In this context, we should be able to define it and try to formulate concepts and theories taking account of current change.

3. TOURISM SPACE – DISCUSSION

Tourism has an important impact on the development of space and tourism space can be identified wherever it occurs. Each form of activity defines its own space (HARVEY 1973), as a result of which an infinite number of spaces and definitions may be established. Referring to the concept of the social production of space (LEFEBVRE 1974), it can be concluded that it is humans who create space and its elements. Consequently, social space may be defined as a set of elements taken

from many other spaces: topographic, biological, economic, demographic, cultural and racial (CHOMBART DE LAUWE 1952), but at the same time, social space consists of a set of emotions and the imaginary ideas of individuals about the spatial symbolism that surrounds them and the relations it evokes (HARVEY 1973). Tourism space is above all part of the geographical and socioeconomic spaces where tourism phenomena occur (WARSZYŃSKA & JACKOWSKI 1979, p. 31). The authors of the definition do not explain what 'tourism phenomena' actually are, and the understanding of the notion has become increasingly intuitive (thus differing from author to author). Tourism space is a subspace of general geographical space, i.e. made up of natural and social components (LISZEWSKI & BACHVAROV 1998). Tourism space is an overarching notion, covering all manifestations of tourism occurring within a given area (LISZEWSKI & BACHVAROV 1998). According to B. WŁODARCZYK (2007, 2009), tourism space is the part of geographical space where tourism activity occurs. Clearly, and quite rightly from the perspective of research, the definition creates a need to delineate the area where tourism occurs and to define it¹. Tourism space may be determined on the basis of tourism characteristics and may be understood as the area where tourism products and services are created, distributed and consumed. Depending on its use, it may be divided into destination (receptive) space, transit space, seasonal space, annual space, and specialised or multi-functional space (CAZELAIS *et al.* 2000). A broader definition of tourism space is proposed by B. MEYER (2008), who concludes that it is "identified using the criterion of function, which means that each area where tourism functions develop or other manifestations of tourism exist, is tourism space" (MEYER 2008, p. 42). As B. WŁODARCZYK (2007, 2009) concludes, the presence of tourists (tourism activity) is the necessary condition, while the presence of tourism facilities is an additional condition, the size and nature of which allows tourism space to be defined and delimited (WŁODARCZYK 2007, 2009).

It is debatable whether tourism phenomena should be taken into account and whether any phenomenon should be considered predominant, as tourism space is a place used by tourists, and tourism space can be identified wherever tourists appear. In these terms, on the one hand, tourism space is strictly connected with tourism activity, and this being given, its main characteristic is seasonality and spatial non-continuity. In almost any case, it is subject not only to multi-annual and annual cycles, but also weekly and daily, and seasonality as well. Tourism space is non-continuous because it is related to phenomena creating strong and extensive systems of interconnections, functioning in places distant from one another and characterised by seasonality and a cyclical nature.

According to Z. KUREK (2008) the characteristics of tourism space are lack of stability (resulting from change and cyclical development), high diversity and non-continuity (a set of functionally-linked, dispersed elements) (KUREK 2008). On the other hand, tourism activity is manifested or encouraged by tourism facilities. In such a case, tourism space may be defined as an area with tourism facilities (as a consequence tourism activity does not need to be taken into account). Tourism space is also the area of interaction between the individual 'tourism' elements created by tourism facilities and tourists. When such differentiation is adopted, tourism space has mainly a functional importance.

What is also important in defining tourism space is its separation from non-tourism space. According to B. WŁODARCZYK (2007), non-tourism space may be defined as that which tourists take no interest due to its inaccessibility. However, tourism activity itself does not seem to be a sufficient condition for tourism space to be delimited. Currently, even when occurring sporadically, tourism activity is present, with varying intensity, nearly everywhere. It would be difficult to find a tourism *anecumene*, understood as a place or area which has not been reached by anybody (tourists). Therefore it is crucial to determine whether a given activity is related to tourism or has some other nature and what its seasonality is, etc. This also provokes the question whether an area can be considered as tourism space at times when there are no tourists there (e.g. off season)?

Tourism means travel away from one's home environment (HUI 2008). As J. Urry adds, tourism means going away from your place of residence or "away from everyday life", to places geographically and ontologically distant from one's work or home which differ from places linked to everyday routine (URRY 2002). Consequently, tourism space will be understood as space located beyond one's daily rhythm.

Tourism space is also delimited on the basis of the functionality criterion which means that each area where the tourism function develops, or where there are other signs of tourism, may be considered a tourism space. In order to facilitate research, it can be assumed that tourism space is an element of reference. Tourism space is traditionally understood as a part of the surface of the Earth where tourism phenomena, activity and facilities occur and where tourists are served. Investigating tourism space involves analysing its appearance, functioning and change. What is relevant from the geographical point of view is the study of tourism within the physical space of the Earth, where the phenomena occur, and why there. Tourism space should be seen from four perspectives: a) physical (spatial) attributes, b) the user, c) functionality and d) perception.

a) Physical (Cartesian) space. After analysing a range of definitions of space, one can distinguish several important aspects which characterise (social and economic) space and which are important elements used to determine, describe and research it. These in particular include the location of features, and the distances and interrelations between features (spatial structure, networks, and hierarchies). By analogy, these characteristics can define tourism space.

b) User space requires the determination of who is a tourist and at what time and place. From the perspective of the user, tourism space is a space of consumption (of a view, experience, products or services), whereas from the perspective of a service it is a space of production. As such, tourism space is a system of features, services and events used by tourists and prepared for them.

c) Functional space, refers to tourism space considered from the perspective of 'territory': where, when and why does it fulfill tourism functions? It represents an area that fulfils tourism functions, and which is currently hard to clearly identify. With the growing diversity of the present world, it is easier to identify elements than to clearly identify a phenomenon or concept (this is discussed in more detail in the section devoted to 'multi-functionality').

d) Perceptual space, strongly related to marketing, the image created (symbols, branding, etc.) and described in specific terms (e.g. in guidebooks). To a growing extent, space is represented by symbols and ideas (more and more frequently differing from reality in the destination – but becoming stronger and more common).

4. CONDITIONS CHANGING TOURISM AND TOURISM SPACE

Tourism has a clear spatial dimension. Like many sectors of the economy, it tends to pick the best locations, concentrate strongly, and is very diverse in its methods of functioning. As in any sector, tourism uses elements (e.g. the natural environment, investment, historical heritage), contributes to the transformation of existing elements and the creation of new ones. Tourism is shaped by a number of aspects, including tourists' decisions regarding their place of destination, duration of stay and voluntary choices. The above elements keep changing. After an era of passive mass tourism, tourists increasingly cater for their individual needs, motivations and specific preferences for spending leisure time. The following changes lead to a divergence in popularity between individual locations (URRY 1990). Areas with poor

potential and no innovation lose customers, while those that develop dynamically and keep up with trends, attract them. Currently, as a result of social and economic changes, an active and individualised model of tourism tends to prevail in post-industrial societies (URRY 2002). As H. HUGHES (2003) observes, while the model of the industrial era was characterised by change, commercialisation and commodification, post-industrial tourism is oriented towards meaning, novelty and identity. The 4A attractiveness model also tends to prevail, (attractions, amenities, accommodation, access). Another important change is the declining role of the 3S model of tourism (sun, sea, and sand) and its replacement by the 3E model (entertainment, excitement, education). The changes are not sudden and do not occur to the same extent in all countries or in the entire society within a country. However, they have consequences for areas receiving tourists. What mattered most in traditional tourism were natural and cultural factors (as well as tourism infrastructure), currently, elements that are not representative of traditional tourism are gaining in importance. In simple terms, they can be defined by the non-material aspects of the product: attending an event, participating in community life, delighting in the atmosphere of a place (KOZAK 2009, p. 109). To an increasing extent, modern tourism inclines towards experiencing (something). More and more often it involves visiting places that are of low attractiveness from the perspective of traditional tourism. The tourist's commitment is gaining in significance, too. Modern life also has an impact on tourism, which is becoming increasingly inauthentic and superficial (MACCANNELL 1976, 2002). The demand, which grows from year to year, the ever greater variety of forms of leisure and the changing cross-section of tourists mean that tourism facilities undergo continuous transformations both in structural and in spatial terms. The related changes affect both tourism space understood in the traditional way, and the way it is perceived – and to some extent – defined.

To a certain degree tourism is a reflection of society. Changes in society cause changes in tourism and choices of destination. The prevailing motivation nowadays is people's desire to experience, participate or simply be somewhere away from home and day-to-day responsibilities. Commitment and education are also gaining in importance. Present-day tourists are becoming consumers: they buy souvenirs, experience things and go shopping. Visits to acquaintances, friends and family, which often take place outside traditional tourism space, are also gaining in significance. Sometimes, tourists do not visit any particular attraction and instead spend their time exclusively with their family and friends, often away from their own place of residence.

Transformations of tourism are influenced by a range of factors of which the following are pre-eminent: demographic and social factors (numbers of people, their age, leisure time available, life cycle position, style and fashion), increasing income, improvement in transport and communications, as well as political transformations (e.g. change in the function of borders, openness, integration) (WILLIAMS & HALL 2002). The following are considered to be the main drivers transforming tourism: globalisation, fast diffusion of innovation (technologies), and change to traditional tourism (distribution and functioning) (CACCOMO & SOLONANDRASANA 2001). The characteristics of the economy are also significant for the functioning of tourism. The following can be considered as crucial: global character of the economy, acceleration (shortening of product life cycle), increasing importance of the knowledge-based economy (growing significance of innovation, experience, emotion), and enhanced importance of network connections. Furthermore, increasingly mobile societies are growing in significance. As a consequence, tourism space is becoming both an ordinary place for recreation, but also part of the creative and cultural sector.

To sum up, the current changes which have an impact on the transformation of tourism space, its functioning, perception and definition include increasing mobility, new technologies, the individualism of users, the relativity of spatial relations, and the preferences (of tourists, other users and creators), increasing diversification (of regions, combined with growing competition between them), as well as the enhanced importance of marketing (including branding, symbolism, advertising – which foster perceptual tourism space).

5. THE DIVERSITY OF TOURISM SPACE

Tourism space is an entity that is ever more difficult to define, being poly-functional (different functions and uses of the same space at the same time and in different seasons), having multiple scales (the overlapping of tourism spaces depending on the scale under examination), being multi-layered and characterised by the multiple motivations of its creators and users, and even by multi-relativity.

A. Poly-functional space

Poly-functionality (multi-functionality) refers to the diversity of functions, as well as uses, of the same area both at the same time and in different seasons. At present, tourism is characterised by an unprecedented variety of forms and functions, although the same applies to the functions considered in economic terms. Tourism space is part of a wider (e.g. geographical)

space, but it is not fully isolated and delimited. It is interrelated hierarchically, functionally and in time. Tourism space does not exist without tourists, and consequently not without economic and social space. Economic space is made up of spatial-functional systems. Furthermore, different functional spaces (e.g. industrial space, agricultural space, etc.) clearly overlap. In the modern world, the variety of ways in which societies and the economy function may (and do) cause space to be used by many areas of socio-economic activity. In the current conditions of socio-economic development a tourism function is present in most places, having different intensity, importance and impact on socio-economic life. In the simplest terms, the impact of tourism and leisure on the economy may be subdivided into basic, supplementary or marginal. According to many authors, tourism space nowadays is relatively more frequently present within other human activities (LISZEWSKI 2005, WŁODARCZYK 2007, MEYER 2008). Undoubtedly, this happens within areas of high economic stability, for instance in metropolitan areas, as well as in areas undergoing functional transformation where tourism is considered to have the potential to replace existing (or previous) forms of economic activity that lie at the root of recession (e.g. post-agricultural, post-industrial, post-fisheries areas). In many instances, peripheral or border areas are examples of places where tourism space may currently develop as a fully natural space, as long as the function of nature conservation is not considered. It may also evolve as a re-naturalised space after the disappearance of any functions previously existing and before access to the area was restricted for political reasons, the redrawing of national borders, etc. (WIĘCKOWSKI 2010a).

Tourists are attracted to places that are fully natural ('primeval'), have a history of past human use (usually for a different function), are transformed historic sites or, finally, are constructed from scratch (e.g. amusement parks). Similarly, tourism businesses may spring up in different places. Using space, tourism may:

- explore undeveloped areas and become the primary function compared to other forms of human activity,
- co-use a space that has other functions (e.g. churches, city centres),
- push out (usually with the intention to dominate) previous functions (e.g. industrial, housing or agricultural functions, etc.) as a result of segregation processes,
- replace other functions after the latter's retreat (e.g. industrial plants, state border security facilities), and in specific conditions, use places that had a tourism function and lost it, but where the tourism function can be reintroduced (WIĘCKOWSKI 2010b).

B. Multi-layered (multi-level) space

Tourism space also occurs on many levels – in a vertical system – which renders the identification, analysis and mapping of the space difficult. In a sense, this differentiation is part of the multi-functionality, does not apply to the same degree, but rather to a place on different underground and above-ground levels. Generally, our world is functioning on multiple levels: over the Earth, on its surface and underneath (this applies to nearly all ‘spheres’, e.g. atmosphere, lithosphere and hydrosphere). Thus, multi-level facilities are formed which increasingly cater for different functions at different levels (e.g. housing, hotel, catering, shopping). Tourism and recreational functions (e.g. restaurants, swimming pools, wellness centres) are delivered both by underground levels and ‘aboveground’ levels (e.g. hotel and housing facilities), with some even using the roof surface (e.g. swimming pools, restaurants with a view). Examples of underground facilities include mines made fit for visiting, as well as modern museums which are interconnected with aboveground facilities performing other functions. Transport routes may have many layers, too.

C. Multi-scale space

Tourism space also depends on the scale under investigation, ranging from an individual (person) to the global. Actual imaginary tourism space is becoming diversified, depending on the scale on which it is examined. Tourism spaces overlap depending on the scale concerned, with the overlap not only applying to different areas, facilities, infrastructure or services, but also to the scales themselves. Scales may overlap so strongly that separating them may prove a challenge. On the scale of Poland, the Tatras represent a tourism space. However, on a local (micro) scale some areas may not be tourism space because there are no tourists or tourism facilities there (WIĘCKOWSKI 2010b). In particular, perceptual space depends on scale since, being a concept, its functioning depends on the area concerned and is strongly dependent on the knowledge of the individual. The same Tatras may be considered tourism space only as a given place – a symbol, e.g. Mt. Kasprowy Wierch (which will stand in for the mountains as a whole), either the Polish part or the area on both sides of the border.

Scale, as it is investigated, also determines the possibility of defining the function fulfilled by a given area – as a solely tourism area or one with a dominance or minority share of tourism operations. When different scales of tourism space are taken into account this involves seasonality, a factor which does not apply with the same strength to all places. It is also related to the temporary closure of certain areas, e.g. legally protected natural areas in border zones (WIĘCKOWSKI 2013).

D. Poly-motivational space

Tourism space is multi-motivational, since it consists of individualised spaces and their ‘personalisations’. Differentiation needs to be made between the poly-motivation of space creators and that of the users who perceive space in different ways. To understand the essence of tourism space, the tourists’ perspective must be adopted, because it is tourists who use it and determine its shape (expansion, transformation). Naturally, creators change tourism space and they do it by using their own ideas and visions, and knowledge of the needs of the tourists targeted.

There are two types of motivators when it comes to travel: push factors and pull factors, mentioned in the Polish literature by L. MAZURKIEWICZ (2007) and others. The push factors refer to people’s own needs, whereas pull factors are related to external forces and refer to attributes associated with the destinations (GITELSON & KERSTETTER 1990, YUAN & McDONALD 1990). Regardless of the tourist’s motivation, the goal of tourism is “the use of tourism ‘goods’ located in areas distant from the place of residence” (MEYER 2008). This allows trips or elements of them (even poly-motivational ones) to be identified as tourism trips when such ‘goods’ are used. Literature proposes many typologies of motivation (*cf.* PRZEĆLAWSKI 1979), the main ones include those of education and culture, relaxation and pleasure, ethnic heritage and others (SMITH 2001, p. 57). Changes of tourism motives are significant, and elements that mattered decades ago are losing importance today, with new ones appearing. The theory of consumer behaviour, which deals with motivations representing individual drivers of action (SCHIFFMAN & KANUK 1978), contributes to the understanding that tourist motivations are determined by individual decisions and choices of destination (MOUTINHO 1987, SIRAKAYA, MCLELLAN & UYSAL 1996, KIM & LEE 2002), which in turn shape tourism space.

Leisure and cognition needs are at the root of tourism. This leads to space appropriation and development in order to satisfy them, a starting point for the formation of tourism space (MEYER 2008). Tourism space is an effect of the satisfaction of people’s needs and motivations, as well as the opportunities a specific area gives to them. Thus the functions of tourism space depend not only on the space itself, i.e. the qualities and the offer proposed, but also on the people (tourists) who use (or do not use) it. Depending on their nationality, social group, sex and age, etc, tourists have various needs and opportunities to use different places (URRY 1990). Furthermore, fashion, tastes, needs, and potential, all change. As a consequence everybody understands tourism space differently. Since tourism is a reflection of society, i.e. the people who use it, it may play the same role for tourism space.

E. Multi-relativity.

The typology of tourism spaces also gets complicated as a result of their relative nature. The following types of tourism space may and should be additionally differentiated: real, functional (expression of activity) and perceptual (virtual representation). The way a tourist imagines the tourism destination is gaining in importance when it comes to choices. Destinations have a capacity for evoking emotions and feelings. They facilitate learning processes and have a post-modern nature. All these properties may be created.

As tourists search for ever-newer experience, non-material values are gaining an ever greater importance as they reflect the individual's willingness to spend their leisure time in active pursuits regardless of the place (or at least the place is of secondary importance). Classic or traditional attractions (genuine historic heritage, works of art or natural features) tend to disappear, being replaced by substitutes. This is because the originals are subject to ever stricter protection (*cf.* COHEN 1995, MACCANELL 1976). Genuine attractions are being closed (e.g. national park centres, the Lascaux cave, precious relics in churches, mosques) and are replaced by substitutes which become part of the tourism space themselves.

In shaping tourism space, perception is of crucial importance, with people and their preferences coming to the fore. Space, or rather the way it is imagined, develops in accordance with tourism space perception theory, founded on the assumption that tourism activity is generated by city residents, and thus tourism behaviour depends predominantly on the way they perceive extra-urban surroundings. Currently, the development of tourism space is coming under growing pressure from tourists (their arrival, fashion and expectations, as well as choices of other destinations and the resultant loss of customers in a given place). The shaping of space is influenced both by individual human actions (i.e. an individual's personality system), society (the social system) and culture (the cultural system), both in areas of emission and reception. This also happens because of the growing importance of the perception of destinations by tourists. The perception of places by tourists is largely determined by expert opinions (URRY 2002), as a result, people perceive places in a subjective way and value them according to their own liking, needs and knowledge.

In addition to experts, the media and advertising, guidebooks also shape expectations and the image of tourism space, describing, praising or negating the attractiveness of places in a selective way. Guidebooks create knowledge and imaginary ideas about tourism space. If some areas are not covered by guidebooks, this limits knowledge of these areas and marginalises

them, as a result of which they often cease to function as tourism space.

Advertising and brands are among the most important factors in the development of space, including tourism space. There is de-differentiation of public information and private advertising, education and entertainment (hence 'learning by entertainment') and, most importantly, textual information and visual imaging. Perhaps virtual space exists in people's minds, with various perceptual interrelations, but it is also made up of ideas created by photos, films, advertisements, descriptions, etc. We live at a time of simultaneity, in an epoch of rankings, close and distant things next to one another, dispersed (FOUCAULT 2005, p. 117). In consequence, the actual elements and imaginary ideas of tourism spaces tend to intermix, causing the understanding of tourism space to become even more blurred.

6. SUMMARY AND FURTHER RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Tourism develops in places where there are attractions and where tourists may come or may want to come. Areas in which tourism activity occurs and tourism facilities are developed, have tourism functions. The functioning of tourism space depends on its qualities and on the offer prepared, but also on the tourists themselves who use the space – they have their own needs and potential for spending their leisure time. Thus tourists themselves decide about the development of tourism space by bringing the fashion trends and customs prevailing in emission areas into reception areas. This is because the choice of places where tourists go and the proximity of emission markets matter, as they determine the intensity of tourism activity required for areas delivering tourism functions. Social transformations change tourism space and there are still many questions to which answers are becoming ever more difficult. How can one define the uniquely multi-functional space of today? Can actual, functional and perceptual spaces still be delineated – especially when interfering relativity of assessment impedes precise definition? Finally, is the presence of the tourist as the main user of tourism space a sufficient element to distinguish such space from other types (i.e. non-tourism spaces)? If the tourist is of crucial importance, how should his/her presence within tourism space be defined? Clearly, a tourist's stay is temporary or even seasonal when considered in collective terms. What kind of tourism presence will allow us to delimit an area as a tourism space: permanent or seasonal?

Further changes in the way the world functions will create new needs for defining tourism space. J. URRY (2000) has already distinguished four types of travel: corporeal travel, physical movement of objects, imaginative travel and virtual travel. As long as we define tourism merely as corporeal, understanding of tourism space will be more specific in nature. When the other three types are added, then we can even speak of tourism cyberspace. As shown in this article, nowadays we deal with imaginary space that overlaps physical space, even to the point of erasing it. Tourism cyberspace will not only be a type of space in which – thanks to multi-tasking – staying in two or three places practically at the same time is something commonplace, but will also include virtual imagination and surfing via a ‘real’ internet network.

Undoubtedly, tourism space is something more than just a piece of the Earth’s surface that has a tourism function. It is a complex network of such elements as the presence of tourists, the infrastructure they use, the places they visit, the way such places are marked and the tourism service (service providers, owners, managers and creators), but also a network of imaginary ideas and experience.

Tourism space is increasingly mobile. It moves, is flexible, changeable, elusive and difficult to define. Tourism activity and tourism facilities, as well as tourism attractions and products, all represent traditional travel by a means of transport, e.g. rail, sea or even by coach. It is a moving ‘feature-place-space’ all at once. In the present day, tourism space can be identified in outer space.

Perhaps tourism space may be understood as a network or the space of a flow. What matters in such an understanding are the nodes of the network (e.g. tourism centres, specific and relatively located attractions), while the rest is just network and flows. There are no fixed interconnections, as they are variable, seasonal and created, served and used by various people (often once only). The elements discussed above will be of growing importance in tourism research.

FOOTNOTES

¹ What raises doubts is the question why locations within emission areas do not represent tourism space. After all tourism, tourism services and creation, etc., as well as the journey, occur there too. It is hard to define the place and moment when somebody becomes a tourist – for some the moment is when an individual leaves his or her own home (cf. HUI, 2008).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CACCOMO J.L., SOLONANDRASANA B., 2001, *L'innovation dans l'industrie touristique. Enjeux et stratégies*, L'Harmattan, Paris.
- CASTELLS M., 1996, *The rise of the network society – the information age*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- CAZELAIS N., NADEAU R., BEAUDET G. (eds), 2000, *L'espace touristique*, Presses de l'Université du Québec, Sainte-Foy.
- CHOMBART DE LAUWE P.H., 1952, *Paris et l'agglomération parisienne*, PUF, 2, Paris.
- COHEN E., 1995, Contemporary tourism – trends and challenges, [in:] R. Butler, D. Pearce (eds), *Change in Tourism. People, Places*, Routledge, Processes, London–New York.
- FOUCAULT M., 2005, *Inne przestrzenie*, Wyd. Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- GITELSON, R.J., KERSTETTER, 1990, The relationship between socio-demographic variables, benefit sought and subsequent vacation behavior: a case study, *Journal of Travel Research* 28 (Winter), pp. 24-29.
- HARVEY D., 1973, *Social justice and the city*, London.
- HUGHES H., 2003, *Arts, Entertainment and Tourism*, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford–Burlington.
- HUI A., 2008, Many homes for tourism: Re-considering spatializations of home and away in tourism mobilities, *Tourist Studies*, 8, pp. 291-311.
- KIM S.S., LEE C.K., 2002, Push and pull relationships, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 1, pp. 257-260.
- KOWALCZYK A., 2011, „Geograficzne” aspekty przestrzeni turystycznej (nowe spojrzenie na koncepcję przestrzeni turystycznej), [in:] M. Durydiwka, K. Duda-Gromada (eds), *Przestrzeń turystyczna. Czynniki, różnorodność, zmiany*, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Wydział Geografii i Studiów Regionalnych, Warszawa, pp. 29-38.
- KOZAK M.W., 2009, *Turystyka i polityka turystyczna a rozwój: między starym a nowym paradygmatem*, Wyd. Naukowe Scholar. EUROREG, Warszawa, pp. 325.
- KUREK W. (ed.), 2008, *Turystyka*, Wyd. Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- LEFEBVRE P., 1974, *La production de l'espace*, Anthropos, Paris.
- LISZEWSKI S., BACZWAROW M., 1998, Istota i właściwości przestrzeni rekreacyjno-turystycznej, *Turyzm*, 8, 1, pp. 39-67.
- LISZEWSKI S., 1995, Przestrzeń turystyczna, *Turyzm*, 5, 2, pp. 87-103.
- LISZEWSKI S., 2005, Przestrzeń turystyczna w ujęciu podmiotowym. Przyczynek do dyskusji o przestrzeni w geografii, [in:] W. Maik, K. Rembowska, A. Suliborski (eds), *Geografia jako nauka o przestrzeni, środowisku i krajobrazie*, t. 1: Podstawowe idee i koncepcje w geografii, Łódzkie Towarzystwo Naukowe, Łódź, pp. 50-60.
- MACCANNELL D., 1976, *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. Schocken Books, New York.
- MACCANNELL D., 2002, *Turysta. Nowa teoria klasy próżniaczej*, Warszawskie Wydawnictwo Literackie, Muza SA, Warszawa.
- MAZURKIEWICZ L., 2007, Model przestrzennego zachowania turystów, *Przegląd Geograficzny*, 79, 1, pp. 99-114.
- MEYER B., 2008, *Kształtowanie układów przestrzenno-funkcjonalnych przez turystykę*, Rozprawy i Studia, t. 676, Wyd. Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego, Szczecin.
- MOUTINHO L., 1987, Consumer behaviour in tourism, *European Journal of Marketing*, 21, 10, pp. 5-44.
- PRZECLAWSKI K., 1979, *Socjologiczne problemy turystyki*, IW ZZ, Warszawa.
- PRZECLAWSKI K., 1996, *Człowiek a turystyka. Zarys socjologii turystyki*, Alis, Kraków.

- SIRAKAYA E., MCLELLAN R.W., UYSAL M., 1996, Modeling Vacation Destination Decisions: A Behavioral Approach, *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 5, 1-2, pp. 57-75.
- SMITH V.L., 2001, The nature of tourism, [in:] V.L. Smith, M. Brent (eds), *Hosts and Guest Revisited: Tourism Issues of the 21st Century*, Cognizant Communication Corporation, New York.
- SCHIFFMAN L.G., KANUK L.L., 1978, *Consumer Behavior*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- URRY J., 1990, *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*, Sage, London.
- URRY J., 2000, *Sociology beyond Societies, Mobilities for the Twenty First Century*, Routledge, London.
- URRY J., 2002, *The Tourist Gaze*, 2nd edition, Sage Publications of London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi.
- WARSZYŃSKA J., JACKOWSKI A., 1978, *Podstawy geografii turystyki*, PWN, Warszawa.
- WIĘCKOWSKI M., 2010a, *Tourism development in the borderlands of Poland*, *Geographia Polonica*, vol. 83, issue 2, pp. 67-81.
- WIĘCKOWSKI M., 2010b, *Turystyka na obszarach przygranicznych Polski*, *Prace Geograficzne*, 224.
- WIĘCKOWSKI M., 2013, *Eco-frontier in the mountainous borderlands of Central Europe. The case of Polish border parks*, *Journal of Alpine, Research/Revue de géographie alpine* 101, 2, pp. 12, <http://rga.revues.org/2107>.
- WILIAMS A.M., HALL C.M., 2002, *Tourism, migration, circulation and mobility*, [in:] C.M. Hall, A.M. Williams (eds), *Tourism and migration. New relationships between production and consumption*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, London, pp. 1-52.
- WŁODARCZYK B., 2007, *Przestrzeń turystyczna - pojęcie, wymiary i cechy*, *Turyzm*, 17, 1-2, pp. 149-162.
- WŁODARCZYK B., 2009, *Przestrzeń turystyczna. Istota, koncepcje, determinanty rozwoju*, Wyd. Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź.
- WŁODARCZYK B., 2012, *Processes of tourism space formation*, *Tourism/Turyzm*, 21, 1-2, pp. 59-65.
- YUAN S., McDONALD C., 1990, *Motivational Determinants of International Pleasure Time*, *Journal of Travel Research*, 29 (Summer), pp. 7-13.