



European Institute of Innovation,
Entrepreneurship, and Technology

**Title: Developing Sustainable Tourism Spaces
— Strategies for Balancing Environmental,
Economic & Social Factors**

Student Name: Nitin
Student ID: DE230246

Submission date: 30.11.2025

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
Introduction	3
Literature Review	4
1. Environmental Sustainability in Tourism Planning	4
2. Economic Sustainability and Tourism Development	4
3. Social and Cultural Sustainability	5
4. Integrating the Triple Bottom Line	5
5. Governance, Policy, and Long-Term Planning	6
6. Sustainable Tourism Technologies.....	6
7. Gaps in the Literature	7
Methodology.....	7
1. Research Design.....	7
2. Data Collection	7
3. Analytical Framework	8
4. Limitations of the Methodology	8
Findings.....	8
1. Environmental Protection as a Foundation, Not an Afterthought	9
2. Economic Benefits Must Be Equitably Distributed	9
3. Social and Cultural Sustainability Requires Genuine Community Inclusion.....	9
4. Governance Determines Success More Than Geography or Funding	10
5. Integrated Planning Produces Better Sustainability Outcomes	10
Discussion.....	10
1. Environmental Protection as the Core Principle	11
2. Ensuring Fair and Inclusive Economic Benefits	11
3. Community Participation and Social Inclusion	12
4. Governance as the Decisive Factor	12
5. Integrated and Adaptive Planning	13
6. What Unsuccessful Destinations Have in Common	14
7. The Future of Sustainable Tourism.....	14
Conclusion	14
References (APA Style).....	15

Abstract

The rapid growth of global tourism has brought undeniable economic advantages to many destinations, yet it has also raised serious questions about the sustainability of tourism spaces. This assignment investigates strategies used to develop and manage sustainable tourism environments, focusing on finding an effective balance between environmental preservation, economic viability, and social well-being. Through an in-depth review of academic literature, case studies, and real-world examples from regions such as Costa Rica, Kerala (India), and New Zealand, this paper explores how tourism planning can integrate long-term ecological protection with community-based development models. The study also examines issues such as overtourism, community displacement, and the commodification of culture—challenges that contemporary tourism planners cannot afford to ignore. Recommendations are provided based on the critical evaluation of existing initiatives and emerging best practices that prioritize conservation, empowerment of host communities, and stable economic growth. The ultimate purpose of this assignment is to demonstrate that sustainable tourism is achievable when planning is inclusive, adaptive, and grounded in scientific, cultural, and socio-economic realities.

Introduction

Tourism is frequently portrayed as one of the world's most powerful engines of economic growth, cultural exchange, and regional development. According to the UNWTO (2023), tourism contributed over 7% to global exports and continued to be one of the largest job-creating industries worldwide. However, the notion that tourism is inherently beneficial has increasingly been challenged, especially as many destinations confront environmental degradation, cultural erosion, and unequal distribution of tourism benefits. Places like Venice, Bali, and Barcelona illustrate the darker dimensions of unmanaged growth—overcrowding, pollution, and deep friction between tourists and residents.

It is within this context that the concept of sustainable tourism has gained momentum. Sustainable tourism space planning is not merely about building attractive destinations. It is fundamentally about creating systems that allow tourism to thrive without compromising the needs of the environment or the rights and well-being of local communities. This requires a holistic approach where development is measured not only through revenue but also through conservation outcomes, cultural preservation, and improvements in quality of life.

The aim of this assignment is to analyze the strategies used to develop sustainable tourism spaces that balance environmental, economic, and social priorities. The discussion covers a wide range of real-world examples, academic insights, and global policy frameworks including the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). By evaluating what has worked—and what has failed—

this assignment argues that sustainable tourism is only possible through integrative planning, strong governance, community participation, and long-term ecological thinking. Ultimately, understanding these strategies is crucial for future tourism planners who must confront climate change, biodiversity loss, and socio-economic inequalities while still supporting dynamic and engaging tourism experiences.

Literature Review

The literature on sustainable tourism has expanded dramatically over the last two decades, reflecting the urgency with which destinations and policymakers are attempting to respond to global environmental and social challenges. Three core pillars consistently appear in academic discussions: **environmental sustainability**, **economic sustainability**, and **social/cultural sustainability**. Together, these pillars form the framework that guides most sustainable tourism planning models.

1. Environmental Sustainability in Tourism Planning

Environmental sustainability remains the most widely discussed dimension of sustainable tourism. Scholars like Weaver (2011) argue that tourism must operate within the ecological limits of the destination, which includes respecting carrying capacity, protecting biodiversity, and minimizing resource consumption. The concept of carrying capacity is particularly important. Saveriades (2000) defines it as the maximum number of visitors a destination can host without causing unacceptable environmental or social change. Although measuring carrying capacity is notoriously challenging, many destinations rely on adaptive management strategies that monitor changes in ecosystems, waste levels, and visitor movement.

Protected areas represent some of the most sensitive tourism spaces. Buckley (2012) emphasizes that nature-based tourism can simultaneously support conservation financing and threaten delicate ecosystems if mismanaged. This paradox is seen clearly in places like the Galápagos Islands, where strict visitor limits, zoning strategies, and environmental education campaigns have been implemented to reduce pressure on vulnerable species. Similarly, Costa Rica's ecotourism model is widely celebrated for demonstrating how conservation laws, forest protection incentives, and controlled tourism development can coexist effectively.

Climate change literature highlights an additional challenge for tourism planners. Becken and Hay (2007) note that rising temperatures, coral bleaching, extreme weather, and changing seasons are already reshaping tourism patterns globally. Sustainable tourism planning must therefore integrate climate adaptation strategies such as diversifying tourist offerings, protecting coastlines, and reducing dependence on carbon-intensive activities.

2. Economic Sustainability and Tourism Development

Economic sustainability involves generating stable income, improving employment opportunities, and ensuring that revenue circulates within the local economy. According to

Sharpley (2020), many destinations fall into the trap of economic leakage, where profits flow to external corporations instead of local communities. This problem is common in resort-dominated destinations where international hotel chains capture most of the economic value.

In contrast, community-based tourism (CBT) models offer a more inclusive economic approach. Goodwin and Santilli (2009) propose that CBT enhances local control, encourages entrepreneurship, and reduces financial leakage by involving community members directly in tourism enterprises. Destinations like Mae Kampong village in Thailand and the Guna Yala region in Panama illustrate how CBT can empower communities while attracting culturally curious tourists.

Another important concept is seasonal dependency. Baum and Lundtorp (2001) explain that destinations reliant on peak seasons often experience underemployment, unstable incomes, and infrastructural underutilization. Sustainable tourism planning aims to counteract seasonality through diversification, such as promoting off-season festivals, developing year-round attractions, or targeting remote worker markets who are less tied to traditional holiday periods.

3. Social and Cultural Sustainability

Social sustainability refers to the lived experiences of residents and their ability to maintain cultural integrity despite tourism pressures. According to McCool and Moisey (2008), resident attitudes towards tourism are shaped by perceived benefits and costs, including job opportunities, crowding, rising living costs, and cultural commodification. When communities feel excluded or exploited, resistance grows—as seen in the anti-tourism protests in Barcelona and Amsterdam.

Planners therefore emphasize participatory decision-making. Tosun (2006) identifies community participation as a fundamental factor in achieving long-term sustainability. Participatory planning helps prevent land displacement, protects Indigenous rights, and fosters local ownership of tourism assets. In New Zealand, the integration of Māori worldviews into tourism planning—particularly in regions like Rotorua—illustrates how cultural sustainability can be embedded into national tourism frameworks.

Cultural sustainability also involves safeguarding heritage. UNESCO's heritage tourism guidelines stress that conservation and tourism development must progress hand-in-hand to avoid over-commercialization. The literature repeatedly warns that once culture becomes a mere commodity, its authenticity declines, ultimately weakening the destination's identity and uniqueness.

4. Integrating the Triple Bottom Line

The “triple bottom line” (environmental, economic, social pillars) is widely referenced in sustainable tourism scholarship. Elkington (1997) originally introduced the framework to encourage organizations to measure success beyond profit. Tourism researchers adopted the model to guide holistic planning. The challenge, as Hunter (1997) argues, is that these three pillars often conflict. For example, strict environmental protection may limit economic

opportunities, while mass tourism—highly profitable—may threaten cultural and ecological integrity.

Therefore, sustainable tourism is fundamentally about **balancing** competing interests rather than maximizing a single outcome. Adaptive co-management, as discussed by Plummer and Fennell (2009), is increasingly recognized as the most effective strategy for navigating these trade-offs, especially in environments where ecological and social systems are dynamic and unpredictable.

5. Governance, Policy, and Long-Term Planning

Effective governance has been repeatedly emphasized in the literature as central to sustainable tourism space development. According to Bramwell and Lane (2011), weak governance structures often lead to unregulated development, environmental degradation, and social inequalities. Strong governance is characterized by transparent decision-making processes, collaboration between public and private sectors, long-term land-use planning, and clear sustainability indicators.

For instance, Slovenia’s tourism master planning integrates sustainability at the national level. The country’s “Green Scheme” is based on rigorous sustainability criteria, environmental monitoring, and certifications that encourage hotels, destinations, and tour operators to adopt eco-friendly practices. Mihalič (2016) notes that Slovenia’s success demonstrates how national policies can shape tourism identities that prioritize sustainability over mass-tourism commodification.

Decentralized governance is also significant. Many scholars (e.g., Hall 2011; Ahebwa 2013) argue that local authorities, not national ministries alone, must play an active role since they understand the unique challenges of the communities they serve. This is especially true in rural destinations where tourism development intersects with sensitive ecosystems and Indigenous land rights.

Regulatory tools—such as zoning, visitor caps, taxation, conservation fees, and licensing—are consistently mentioned in academic work as effective mechanisms for managing tourism impacts. For example, Bhutan’s “High Value, Low Impact” tourism policy requires visitors to pay a daily Sustainable Development Fee (SDF), which directly funds environmental protection and cultural preservation. Rinzin (2020) explains that Bhutan’s model proves that limiting tourist numbers can lead to higher-quality experiences, increased revenue, and reduced environmental pressure.

6. Sustainable Tourism Technologies

While Option 3 of the assignment deals more deeply with smart tourism, the literature for this topic also acknowledges how technology supports sustainability. IoT devices, real-time data analytics, GIS mapping, and environmental sensors help planners manage waste, monitor protected habitats, and understand tourist flows. According to Neuhofer (2016), technology is not a replacement for sustainable planning, but it enhances the ability of destinations to implement data-driven, adaptive approaches.

Digital ticketing systems, traffic-monitoring apps, and virtual queuing are already transforming overcrowded destinations. For example, Machu Picchu introduced mandatory timed-entry tickets and digital monitoring systems that track visitor movements to prevent overuse of fragile trails. Such technological interventions align with broader sustainability efforts meant to preserve cultural heritage while allowing economic benefits to continue.

7. Gaps in the Literature

While sustainable tourism literature is extensive, several gaps persist. Researchers like Saarinen (2014) argue that sustainability is often discussed from a Western perspective that may overlook Indigenous epistemologies. Similarly, many studies focus on environmental sustainability while neglecting the lived realities of tourism workers—especially seasonal, migrant, and informal labor forces. Another gap involves long-term evaluation: many destinations adopt sustainability strategies, yet few publish longitudinal assessments demonstrating their effectiveness. These gaps highlight the need for more inclusive, interdisciplinary research moving forward.

Methodology

This assignment uses a qualitative, desk-based research approach that relies on secondary sources including academic journals, tourism reports, case studies, government policy documents, and sustainability frameworks such as the UN SDGs. The goal of this methodology is to analyze how different destinations apply sustainable tourism strategies and evaluate their outcomes.

1. Research Design

A qualitative research design was selected because sustainable tourism is a complex, socio-environmental topic that cannot be adequately assessed using numerical data alone. Qualitative analysis enables a deeper understanding of tourism planning structures, governance models, community attitudes, and environmental outcomes. This approach is consistent with scholars like Creswell (2014), who argue that qualitative research is effective when studying phenomena requiring interpretative, contextual analysis.

2. Data Collection

Data was gathered from:

- Peer-reviewed tourism journals such as *Annals of Tourism Research*, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, and *Tourism Management*
- Reports from UNWTO, UNEP, UNESCO, and World Bank
- Case-study documents from government tourism boards (New Zealand, Bhutan, Costa Rica)
- Online academic databases including Google Scholar and JSTOR

- Sustainability impact reports from certified ecotourism operators

The selection criteria required that sources:

1. Address sustainable tourism concepts directly
2. Involve destinations with recognized sustainability initiatives
3. Provide relevant evaluations or measurable outcomes
4. Were published within the last 20 years

This allowed for a comprehensive and up-to-date overview of sustainable tourism strategies globally.

3. Analytical Framework

The analysis followed a **thematic approach**, identifying patterns and recurring concepts across the selected literature. Three major themes guided the analysis:

1. **Environmental sustainability strategies**
2. **Economic benefit distribution models**
3. **Social inclusion and community participation**

Additionally, the **triple bottom line (TBL)** framework was used as the core theoretical foundation. This allowed an integrated assessment of whether real-world strategies effectively balanced environmental, economic, and social outcomes.

4. Limitations of the Methodology

Several limitations were acknowledged:

- Inability to conduct field research limited access to firsthand community perspectives.
- Case studies depend on the validity of existing reports, which may contain biases.
- Long-term impacts could not always be verified due to incomplete monitoring results in some destinations.
- Sustainability is context-specific; findings may not be universally applicable.

Despite these limitations, the secondary research method remains appropriate for a theoretical and comparative exploration of sustainable tourism planning.

Findings

The analysis of case studies revealed several important insights into how destinations successfully (and unsuccessfully) balance environmental, economic, and social priorities.

1. Environmental Protection as a Foundation, Not an Afterthought

Environmental sustainability emerged as the non-negotiable foundation of tourism planning. Destinations with strict environmental guidelines—such as Costa Rica, Galápagos Islands, and Bhutan—demonstrated significantly better ecological outcomes than those prioritizing rapid growth.

Key findings include:

- **Visitor caps reduce ecological pressure:**
The Galápagos Islands maintain strict visitor limits and require certified guides, reducing habitat disturbance.
- **Zoning helps protect fragile landscapes:**
Costa Rica's national parks segregate areas into zones: "strict protection," "controlled use," and "public use."
- **Conservation funding models matter:**
Successful destinations reinvest tourism earnings into park protection, biodiversity monitoring, and ranger salaries.
- **Environmental education enhances visitor responsibility:**
New Zealand's "Tiaki Promise" encourages tourists to act as guardians of the land.

These examples show that destinations treating conservation as a prerequisite—not a marketing tool—achieve genuine sustainability.

2. Economic Benefits Must Be Equitably Distributed

A major finding was that economic benefits of tourism tend to accumulate unevenly unless strong local-benefit frameworks are implemented.

Evidence shows:

- **Community-based tourism leads to higher local profit retention.**
In Mae Kampong (Thailand), over 70% of revenue stays within the community.
- **High-end sustainable tourism can generate strong revenue with fewer visitors.**
Bhutan's low-volume tourism model produces consistent revenue while avoiding overtourism.
- **Local sourcing multiplies economic impact.**
Eco-lodges in Costa Rica demonstrate that purchasing goods locally strengthens rural economies.
- **Overreliance on foreign-owned resorts increases leakage.**
Many Caribbean islands lose over 60% of tourism earnings to multinational corporations.

Economically sustainable tourism therefore depends not just on profit generation, but on the fairness of distribution.

3. Social and Cultural Sustainability Requires Genuine Community Inclusion

A recurring pattern in the findings was that sustainable tourism fails when communities are excluded from planning decisions.

Strong community participation results in:

- Higher resident satisfaction
- Better resource management compliance
- Preservation of cultural identity
- Increased community trust toward tourism authorities

Examples such as the Māori-centered tourism model in Rotorua illustrate that tourism can strengthen—rather than dilute—cultural identity when partnerships are respectful and inclusive.

Conversely, destinations facing resident hostility (e.g., Barcelona, Bali) showed clear symptoms of top-down planning and local displacement.

4. Governance Determines Success More Than Geography or Funding

One of the most striking findings is that governance—policy consistency, enforcement capacity, and planning vision—plays a larger role in sustainability success than natural resources or economic wealth.

Destinations with strong governance (e.g., Slovenia, Bhutan, New Zealand) consistently outperformed destinations with weak or fragmented governance, regardless of tourism volume.

5. Integrated Planning Produces Better Sustainability Outcomes

The most successful destinations used integrated planning models such as:

- Long-term masterplans
- Public-private partnerships
- Community advisory boards
- Environmental impact assessments
- Digital monitoring systems

These tools ensured that tourism development remained aligned with sustainability goals over time.

Discussion

The findings of this research highlight that sustainable tourism development is neither a singular strategy nor a static model. Instead, it is a dynamic and continuous process that requires balancing multiple interests, adapting to social and ecological changes, and maintaining a long-

term vision. This discussion section expands on the key themes that emerged in the findings: environmental protection, equitable economic distribution, community participation, governance, and integrated planning. Together, these themes offer a clearer understanding of the complexities involved in planning sustainable tourism spaces and why certain destinations succeed while others struggle.

1. Environmental Protection as the Core Principle

The evidence across case studies strongly suggests that environmental protection must remain at the center of tourism planning. In destinations like the Galápagos Islands, Costa Rica, and New Zealand, environmental policies are not peripheral add-ons but foundational principles guiding development. This approach contrasts sharply with destinations that prioritize maximizing tourist numbers, such as Bali or Phuket, where rapid development has exceeded carrying capacity and damaged local ecosystems.

The literature and findings both reinforce that environmental sustainability requires:

- Strict regulation and enforcement
- Visitor caps based on ecological thresholds
- Habitat zoning and land-use planning
- Conservation financing mechanisms
- Continuous ecological monitoring

One important insight is that environmental protection does not hinder tourism growth; rather, it ensures long-term viability. Destinations with fragile ecosystems, such as coral reefs or rainforests, cannot support tourism indefinitely without conscious limits. Planning that ignores ecological boundaries ultimately damages the very assets that attract tourists in the first place.

Furthermore, climate change introduces an additional layer of complexity. Regions dependent on snow tourism, coastal tourism, or wildlife tourism must adapt to rapidly changing environmental conditions. This underscores the urgency of sustainability strategies rooted in climate resilience—such as diversification of tourism products, climate-adaptive construction, and carbon-reduction policies.

2. Ensuring Fair and Inclusive Economic Benefits

A recurring theme in both literature and findings is that economic sustainability extends beyond simply generating revenue. Sustainable tourism must prioritize how income is distributed within the host community. The contrast between community-based tourism (CBT) initiatives and multinational resort-dominated tourism exemplifies this point clearly.

In CBT destinations:

- Local residents own tourism businesses
- Profits stay within the community
- Economic empowerment strengthens cultural identity

- Residents participate directly in decision-making

This contrasts with conventional tourism models where the majority of profits leak out of the local economy. High leakage reduces economic incentives for local conservation efforts, creating a cycle where communities bear tourism impacts without receiving corresponding benefits.

A sustainable model therefore requires:

- Local ownership of tourism enterprises
- Government policies limiting foreign dominance
- Incentives for local sourcing of goods and services
- Skills training for community members
- Creation of year-round employment opportunities

Economic sustainability also links directly to seasonality. Overreliance on peak seasons creates unstable income patterns and reduces community resilience. Sustainable tourism planning involves diversifying offerings—such as agrotourism, cultural festivals, wellness tourism, or remote-work tourism—to stabilize revenue streams throughout the year.

3. Community Participation and Social Inclusion

One of the most important insights from the analysis is that sustainable tourism cannot succeed without community participation. When residents feel heard, respected, and involved in decision-making, they become active partners in sustainability. When they feel excluded or exploited, resistance emerges, as seen in Barcelona’s anti-tourism movements.

The findings show that socially sustainable destinations emphasize:

- Participatory planning forums
- Community advisory boards
- Transparent consultation processes
- Protection of Indigenous land rights
- Cultural preservation policies

Examples like New Zealand’s Māori tourism framework demonstrate how integrating Indigenous worldviews enriches both visitor experiences and local empowerment. In contrast, destinations like Bali illustrate the consequences of ignoring social sustainability. Overcrowding, cultural commodification, and rising living costs push residents away from tourism zones, creating deep social tensions.

One key point worth discussing is the concept of “cultural balance.” While tourism can help preserve cultural heritage, it can also distort or commercialize it. Sustainable tourism planning therefore requires clear guidelines on what cultural elements are appropriate to share, how they should be presented, and who controls the narrative.

4. Governance as the Decisive Factor

Governance emerged as perhaps the single most influential factor determining sustainability outcomes. Even destinations with exceptional natural beauty or strong community values struggle without effective governance. Successful governance is characterized by:

- Consistent enforcement of environmental laws
- Long-term tourism masterplans
- Public-private collaboration
- Transparent regulatory systems
- Stable political and institutional structures

The case studies of Bhutan, Slovenia, and Costa Rica demonstrate how strong governance creates a culture of responsibility and accountability. These destinations use:

- Licensing systems
- Certification programs
- Monitoring technologies
- Conservation laws
- Visitor management frameworks

Destinations with weak governance—characterized by corruption, poor coordination, or conflicting interests—experience unsustainable development, resource exploitation, and social dissatisfaction.

One interesting observation is that governance structures must align with local cultural contexts. Centralized models may work in small nations like Bhutan but may be ineffective in large countries where decentralized, community-driven governance is more suitable.

5. Integrated and Adaptive Planning

The most sustainable destinations employ integrated planning frameworks that consider interconnections between the environment, communities, and economies. This includes:

- GIS-based spatial planning
- Environmental impact assessments
- Waste and water management systems
- Visitor flow analysis
- Smart tourism technologies
- Long-term climate adaptation strategies

Adaptive co-management, where stakeholders continuously revise tourism policies based on real-time feedback, was frequently mentioned in the literature. This approach recognizes that sustainability is not static; it evolves with changing social, environmental, and economic conditions.

Integrated planning also helps reduce conflicts between stakeholders. For example:

- Conservationists often disagree with tourism developers
- Local communities may resist rapid development
- Tourism businesses may push for less regulation
- Government entities may have overlapping jurisdictions

Integrated planning creates spaces for these groups to negotiate and collaborate, minimizing conflict and improving outcomes.

6. What Unsuccessful Destinations Have in Common

Comparative analysis reveals several patterns among destinations struggling with sustainability:

1. **Overdependence on mass tourism**
2. **Weak environmental enforcement**
3. **Limited community participation**
4. **High economic leakage**
5. **Unplanned infrastructure expansion**
6. **Poor waste and water management systems**

Places like Bali, Venice, and Boracay Island illustrate these deficiencies. While some of these destinations are now implementing reforms (e.g., Boracay’s temporary closure and rehabilitation), long-term sustainability remains uncertain without structural changes.

7. The Future of Sustainable Tourism

Looking ahead, sustainable tourism will need to incorporate:

- Climate adaptation and disaster risk reduction
- Increased digitalization and smart tourism systems
- Green infrastructure and renewable energy
- Circular-economy waste management solutions
- Regenerative tourism strategies (going beyond minimizing harm)

There is also a growing global shift from “sustainable tourism” to “regenerative tourism,” which emphasizes restoring ecological and cultural systems, not just preserving them. This transformation requires deeper collaboration between communities, tourists, governments, and private sectors.

Conclusion

This assignment examined strategies for planning and managing sustainable tourism spaces that balance environmental, economic, and social dimensions. By analyzing literature and real-world case studies, it is evident that sustainable tourism is most successful when it is grounded in strong governance, community participation, and environmental protection. The triple bottom

line framework remains relevant, but only when adapted to local contexts and supported by clear policies and long-term planning.

Environmental sustainability cannot be compromised, as ecological degradation ultimately diminishes tourism appeal. Economic sustainability depends on equitable benefit distribution and reducing leakage, ensuring that local communities remain active beneficiaries rather than passive observers. Social sustainability requires genuine community involvement and cultural respect, preventing the alienation and commodification that undermine destination identity.

No single model fits all destinations, but the most effective strategies share common characteristics: inclusion, regulation, monitoring, and adaptability. Destinations like Costa Rica, Bhutan, Slovenia, and New Zealand demonstrate that sustainable tourism is achievable when development is guided by principles rather than profit alone.

Ultimately, the future of tourism depends on how well destinations integrate sustainability into everyday decision-making. Tourism planners must move beyond short-term thinking and embrace models that protect the environment, uplift communities, and foster stable economies. Only then can tourism continue to thrive without compromising the resources and cultures that make destinations unique.

References

- Ahebwa, W. M. (2013). Community-based tourism and governance in Uganda. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(2), 298–313.
- Baum, T., & Lundtorp, S. (2001). *Seasonality in tourism*. Pergamon.
- Becken, S., & Hay, J. (2007). *Tourism and climate change: Risks and opportunities*. Channel View Publications.
- Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2011). Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5), 411–421.
- Buckley, R. (2012). Sustainable tourism: Research and reality. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 528–546.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage.
- Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Capstone.
- Goodwin, H., & Santilli, R. (2009). Community-based tourism: A success? *ICRT Occasional Paper*, 11.

- Hall, C. M. (2011). Policy learning and policy failure in sustainable tourism governance. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5), 649–671.
- Hunter, C. (1997). Sustainable tourism as an adaptive paradigm. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(4), 850–867.
- Mihalič, T. (2016). Sustainable-responsible tourism discourse – Towards ‘responsustable’ tourism. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 111, 461–470.
- McCool, S. F., & Moisey, R. N. (2008). *Tourism, recreation and sustainability*. CABI.
- Neuhofer, B. (2016). Smart technologies for sustainable tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 18, 47–54.
- Rinzin, C. (2020). Bhutan’s high-value, low-impact tourism policy. *Tourism Review*, 75(4), 812–826.
- Saarinen, J. (2014). Critical sustainability: Setting the limits of tourism? *Sustainability*, 6(1), 1–17.
- Saveriades, A. (2000). Establishing the social tourism carrying capacity for the tourist resorts of the east coast of Europe. *Tourism Management*, 21(2), 147–156.
- Sharpley, R. (2020). *Tourism, sustainable development and the theoretical divide*. Routledge.
- Tosun, C. (2006). Expected nature of community participation in tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 27(3), 493–504.
- UNWTO. (2023). *Tourism Highlights*. United Nations World Tourism Organization.
- Weaver, D. (2011). *Sustainable tourism: Theory and practice*. Routledge.