

PRETHODNO PRIOPĆENJE

PRELIMINARY COMMUNICATION

UDK: 338.484:502.131.1](497.5)

338.48-44(1-21)(497.5)

JEL classification: Z32; Q01

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22598/at/2018.30.1.43>

Tomislav KLARIN*

**PRETPOSTAVKE USPJEŠNE IMPLEMENTACIJE KONCEPTA
ODRŽIVOG RAZVOJA TURIZMA: PRIMJER URBANIH DESTINACIJA
REPUBLIKE HRVATSKE**

**ASSUMPTIONS FOR A SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCEPT
OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT: EXAMPLE OF URBAN
DESTINATIONS OF THE REPUBLIC OF CROATIA**

SAŽETAK: Razvoj turizma u gradovima posljednjih godina sve više dovodi do negativnih ekoloških, socio-kulturnih i ekonomskih učinaka. Gradovi u Hrvatskoj suočeni su s istim problemima pa stoga svoj turistički razvoj moraju planirati prema načelima koncepta održivog razvoja kako bi smanjili negativni utjecaj turizma. Cilj ovog rada je utvrditi pretpostavke uspješne implementacije koncepta održivog razvoja turizma u hrvatskim urbanim destinacijama. U tu svrhu provedeno je kvalitativno istraživanje na dionicima osam urbanih destinacija Republike Hrvatske. Rezultati istraživanja pokazuju da implementacija koncepta ovisi o različitim čimbenicima, poput strateškog planiranja razvoja, razvijenog sustava za mjerenje i praćenje razvoja, razvijenog participativnog odnosa dionika u upravljanju destinacijom, poticajnog institucionalnog okruženja i proaktivnoj lokalnoj upravi, angažiranosti lokalnog stanovništva te educiranosti dionika o upravljanju i načelima održivog razvoja.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: održivi razvoj turizma, urbane destinacije, Republika Hrvatska

ABSTRACT: Urban tourism development has been leading increasingly to negative ecological, socio-cultural and economic effects over the recent years. Croatia's cities in are facing the same problems, and hence they have to plan their tourism development according to the principles of the concept of sustainable development aiming to reduce the negative effects of tourism. The objective of this paper is to identify the assumptions of successful implementation of the concept of sustainable tourism development in Croatian urban destinations. For this purpose, a qualitative survey was carried out in eight urban destinations in Croatia. The research results show that the implementation of the concept depends on various factors, such as strategic development planning, developed system for measuring and monitoring development, developed participatory stakeholder relationship in destination management, stimulating institutional environment and proactive local governance, engagement of local population, and education of stakeholders on management and the principles of sustainable development.

KEY WORDS: sustainable development of tourism, urban destinations, Republic of Croatia

* Tomislav Klarin, PhD, postdoctoral researcher, University of Zadar, Department of Tourism and Communication Studies, Croatia, e-mail: tklarin@unizd.hr

1. UVOD

Turizam u urbanim destinacijama predmet je istraživanja proteklih dvadesetak godina (Ashworth, 1989, 2003; Edwards *et al.*, 2008; Ashworth i Page, 2011). Zbog bolje prometne povezanosti, razvijene infrastrukture i resursno-atraksijske osnove te drugih obilježja, gradovi ostvaruju znatan porast turističkog prometa (Ashworth i Page, 2011). Izvještaj ITB-a (2014) navodi kako je trenutno najveći porast urbanog turizma pa su tako turistički dolasci u urbanim područjima u proteklih pet godina porasli za 58% te stvaraju udio od 20% na turističkom tržištu. Veliki gradovi posebno su prepoznati kao privlačne turističke destinacije, a u pojedinim gradovima godišnji turistički dolasci nekoliko puta premašuju ukupnu populaciju grada (ITB, 2014; Maxim, 2015). Postoje različiti tipovi urbanih destinacija, a prema osnovnoj podjeli tri su tipa urbanih destinacija: gradska naselja, turističko-povijesni gradovi i prenamijenjeni gradovi (Spirou, 2011:109). Nešto složeniju podjelu daju Page i Hall (2003) koji razlikuju povijesne, kulturne, poslovne, sportske, noćne, *shopping* i turističke gradove. Razvoju turizma u gradovima je pridonio proces pojačane urbanizacije, bolje cestovne dostupnosti i zračne povezanosti gradova, kraći boravak na putovanjima (*short breaks* ili *city breaks*) i veći broj putovanja na razini godine (Sharpley, 2009:1; Ashworth i Page, 2011; UNWTO, 2011). Zbog ovih obilježja mnoga urbana područja mogu gotovo samostalno funkcionirati u okviru regija ili država kojima pripadaju (Ashworth i Page, 2011). Mullins (1991:331) pojašnjava kako se turizam u gradovima ili urbani turizam temelji na potrošnji i odmoru u urbanim područjima koja se geografski i demografski razlikuju, a nalaze se na različitoj društveno-ekonomskoj razini razvoja te imaju različite karakteristike, atrakcije i sadržaje kojima privlače turiste. Putovanja u gradove na svjetskoj se razini

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past twenty years, tourism in urban destinations has been the subject of various research papers (Ashworth, 1989, 2003; Edwards *et al.*, 2008; Ashworth and Page, 2011). Due to better traffic connections, developed infrastructure, resource and attraction bases, and other features, cities exercise a significant increase in tourist traffic (Ashworth and Page, 2011). ITB (2014) estimates that currently urban tourism increase is the highest, thus hiking the number of tourists in urban areas by 58% in the past five years and accounting for a 20% share on tourism market. Major cities are especially recognized as attractive tourism destinations, and in some cases, the annual tourist arrivals exceeded total local population by several times (ITB, 2014, Maxim, 2015). According to the basic classification, there are three types of urban destination: resort cities, tourist-historic cities and rebranded cities (Spiro, 2011:109). A more complex classification is given by Page and Hall (2003) who distinguish historical, cultural, business, sports, nightlife, shopping and tourist cities. The development of city tourism was facilitated by increased urbanization, better roads and flight connections, short breaks or city breaks, and a higher number of trips at an annual basis (Sharpley, 2009:1; Ashworth and Page, 2011; UNWTO, 2011). Due to these, many urban areas can operate almost independently in their respective regions or countries (Ashworth and Page, 2011). Mullins (1991:331) explains that city tourism or urban tourism is based on spending vacations in urban areas that are geographically and demographically different, that are at different socio-economic development levels, and that have different features, tourist attractions and facilities. Traveling to cities globally is usually linked with visiting friends and relatives, or with business motives to attend congresses and conferences, or getting acquainted with oth-

poduzimaju posebice zbog posjeta prijateljima i rodbini, poslovnih razloga, kongresa i konferencija, upoznavanja drugih društava, kultura i religija, rekreacije i opuštanja na otvorenom, zabave, razgledavanja znamenitosti i kupovine (Blank i Petkovich, 1987; Page, 1995). Zbog slobodnijeg izražavanja seksualne orijentacije gradovi su mjesta pronalaska partnera, ali i prostitucije u „crvenim područjima“ i noćnim klubovima (Law, 2002:23).

Gradovi proživljavaju različite probleme uvjetovane turizmom, a morfološke i sadržajne posebnosti grada dodatno utječu na intenzitet utjecaja turizma u gradovima. Zbog kratka vremena zadržavanja i većeg broja godišnjih putovanja, turisti vrše znatan pritisak na gradove jer užurbano i parcijalno konzumiraju urbanu ponudu u svrhu maksimizacije svoje koristi (Law, 2002:54). Ovdje treba istaknuti da je pritisak na javnu urbanu infrastrukturu, arhitekturu i kulturnu baštinu još izraženiji, a proizlazi iz temeljnih obilježja javnih dobara prema kojima ne postoji konkurentnost i isključivost u njihovoj potrošnji. Veliki gradovi zbog svojih sadržaja privlače više stanovnika i turista, pri čemu kulturni turizam znatno konzumiraju turisti treće dobi organizirani u grupe. Velik broj turista posjećuje rodbinu i prijatelje, koji se katkad ne smatraju turistima, jer zbog svojih korijena imaju drukčije obrasce ponašanja od tipičnih turista u destinaciji (Ben-Dalia *et al.*, 2013). Osim toga, urbane destinacije imaju određene administrativne, ali i prirodne granice, što nije potpuno svojstveno drugim tipovima destinacija. Svaka urbana destinacija ima i svoje središte koje je najčešće prostor intenzivnoga društveno-gospodarskog života i bogate kulturno-povijesne baštine (europski model grada). Ashworth i Page (2011) ukazuju na važno obilježje postmodernističkih gradova, uzrokovano procesom globalizacije i urbanizacije, ali i prilagodbe turističkim aktivnostima. To je kontinuirani protok kapitala koji omogućuje stalno redefiniranje opsega, oblika i sadržaja

er societies, cultures and religions, or for outdoor recreation and entertainment, sightseeing, and shopping (Blank and Petkovich, 1987; Page, 1995). Due to more liberal expression of sexual orientation, cities are places of finding partners, but also encourage prostitution in red light districts and nightclubs (Law, 2002:23).

Urban destinations are experiencing diverse tourism-related problems, and the morphological and content-specific features of the city additionally affect the intensity of tourism's impact on the cities. With their shorter stays and greater number of annual trips, tourists make significant pressures on cities because in a hurried and partial way they consume the urban offer maximizing their benefits while doing so (Law, 2002:54). It should be emphasized here that the pressure on public urban infrastructure, architecture, and cultural heritage is even more intense and derives from the underlying features of public goods where there is no rivalry and excludability in their consumption. Big cities with various facilities attract more locals and tourists, whereupon cultural tourism is mostly consumed by senior tourists organized groups. A large number of tourists visit relatives and friends, and sometimes they are not even considered tourists because their roots encourage different patterns of behaviour in comparison to typical tourists in the destination (Ben-Dalia *et al.*, 2013). In addition, urban destinations have certain administrative as well as natural boundaries, which is not completely typical of other destination types. Every urban destination also has its centre, which is most often an area of intense socio-economic life and rich cultural and historical heritage (the European city model). Ashworth and Page (2011) point out an important feature of postmodernist cities, caused by globalization and urbanization, as well as by adaptation to tourist activities. This continuous flow of capital allows for a constant redefinition of the city size, shape and contents, along with reper-

gradova, te prenamjenu i prilagodbu potrebama i potrošnji lokalne zajednice i turista u čemu gradovi mijenjaju ili pak gube svoja posebna obilježja. Gradovi pružaju različita iskustva sadržajno raspršena po prostornim jedinicama namijenjenim potrošnji, a koncentracija kapitala i investicija omogućuju njihovo nadmetanje u pružanju jedinstvenih sadržaja i atrakcija. Nadmetanje se očituje i u organiziranju velikih događanja, poput Olimpijskih igara, koji turistima pružaju jedinstveno i neponovljivo iskustvo. Upotrebom odgovarajućih marketinških alata, gradovi tako postaju prepoznatljiviji i drukčiji na turističkom tržištu, čime dodatno privlače turiste.

Urbanizacijom i razvojem turizma u gradovima, posebice mediteranskim, često dolazi do neplanskog i ilegalnog urbanog razvoja te s time povezanog prostornog iskorištavanja zemljišta, loše kvalitete infrastrukture i gradskih usluga, a posljedica toga procesa prostorno je i ekološko propadanje gradova (PAP/RAC, 2004). Uz navedeno, Law (2002:49) navodi kako su gradovi pogođeni procesom globalizacije i decentralizacije, pri čemu su se mnogi gradovi morali nositi s problemima društvene i ekonomske tranzicije koja je utjecala na proizvodnju i nezaposlenost. Stoga su razvijali druge djelatnosti koje bi omogućile investicije i zaposlenost te time pomogle njihovoj gospodarskoj i fizičkoj obnovi. U tome procesu mnogi gradovi su se usmjerili na turizam. Takvim su razvojem doprinijeli urbanoj regeneraciji s ciljem oživljavanja gradova prenamjenom gradskih područja i obnavljanjem aktivnosti primjerenih gradskom životu, odnosno povratkom „života gradu“, poboljšanjem kvalitete njegova okoliša i održivim razvojem (Law, 2002; PAP/RAC, 2004). Ovome se može pridodati utjecaj visoke stope urbanizacije koja je državama u razvoju omogućila razvoj turizma u gradovima osiguravši investicije te različite prilike za održavanje visoke stope rasta učinkovitom upotrebom resursa, razvojem proizvodnje i usluga te povećanjem domaće

posing and adapting to demands and consumption of local communities and tourists, whereupon cities change or lose their special features. Cities provide different experiences dispersed by space-based consumption units, and capital and investment concentration enables them to compete in providing unique contents and attractions. Competition is also the theme of organising major events such as the Olympic Games that provide tourists with unique and unprecedented experiences. By using the appropriate marketing tools, cities become recognizable and different on the tourism market, thus attracting more tourists.

Urbanization and the development of tourism in cities, especially on the Mediterranean, often results in unplanned and illegal urban development, followed by the spatial exploitation of land, poor quality of infrastructure and city services – the consequence of this process being spatial and ecological degradation of cities (PAP/RAC, 2004). In addition, Law (2002:49) states that cities are affected by the processes of globalization and decentralization, where many cities have had to deal with the problems of social and economic transition affecting production and unemployment. Hence, they have developed other activities that would enable investment and employment and ultimately help their economic and physical renewal. In this process, many cities have focused on tourism, whose development has contributed to urban regeneration. Such development has enabled revitalization of cities through the transformation of urban areas and the restoration of activities that are suitable for urban life, i.e. the return of “life to the city”, improving its environmental quality and sustainable development (Law, 2002; PAP/RAC, 2004). It is necessary to mention also the impact of high urbanization rates that enabled the development of city tourism especially in developing countries, providing investments and various opportunities to maintain high growth rates through efficient use of resources, development of production and services, and

potražnje (Ismail i Baum, 2006; Kumar *et al.*, 2016; Ming *et al.*, 2016).

Osim pozitivnih učinaka turizma u gradovima poput povećane zaštite urbanog prostora, kvalitetnijeg održavanja javnog prostora, investicija i zaposlenosti, jačanja kulturnog identiteta i drugog, postoje i negativni učinci koji se očituju u degradaciji i uništavanju urbanog prostora, promjeni urbanog prostora i lokalne kulture, monocentralizacije i prevelike ovisnosti o turizmu i drugih negativnih učinaka turizma (Nunkoo i Ramkissoon, 2010). Razmatranjem negativnih učinaka turizma može se uočiti da oni znatno ovise o intenzitetu i stupnju razvoja turizma u gradu te razvijenosti drugih gospodarskih djelatnosti u gradu i regiji, odnosno stupnju ovisnosti grada o turizmu i intenzitetu usmjerenosti na turizam. Iz ovoga proizlazi da je za ublažavanje ili anuliranje negativnih učinaka turizma potrebna regulacija, posebice utvrđivanje kapaciteta nosivosti urbane destinacije, definiranje namjene i korištenja prostora te postavljanje standarda potrebnih za održavanje kvalitete života građana i kvalitete proizvoda i usluga namijenjenih turistima.

2. ODRŽIVI RAZVOJ TURIZMA

Butler (1999) navodi da je razvoj koncepta održivog razvoja utjecao na promjene u turizmu, dok Weaver i Lawton (1999) te Hardy i suradnici (2002) pojašnjavaju kako je turizam u svojoj evoluciji stvorio određene pretpostavke za prihvaćanje održivog razvoja turizma. Bramwell i Lane (1993) te UNEP i UNWTO (2005) ističu da je održivi razvoj turizma nastao kao pozitivan pristup razvoja s ciljem dugoročnog održavanja kapaciteta resursa i kvalitete okoliša te smanjenja napetosti i problema proizašlih iz složene interakcije dionika turističke destinacije i okoliša. Koncept održivog razvoja turizma se razvijao u uskoj vezi s konceptom održivog razvoja postavljenog 80-ih godina prošloga stoljeća (WCED, 1987; UNDSO, 1992; WTTC, UNWTO i EC, 1996; UNDESA, 1999; UN,

increased local demand (Ismail and Baum, 2006; Kumar *et al.*, 2016; Ming *et al.*, 2016).

Apart from the positive effects of city tourism, including increased urban area protection, better public area maintenance, investment and employment, strengthening cultural identity etc., there are also negative impacts manifested in the degradation and destruction of urban areas, changes of urban areas and local culture, monocentralization and excessive dependence on tourism, etc. (Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2010). When analysing the negative effects of tourism, it is noticeable that they depend heavily on the intensity and degree of development of city tourism and the development of other economic activities in the city and region, i.e. the degree of city's dependence on tourism and the intensity of tourism orientation. Consequently, mitigation or annulation of the negative effects of tourism requires regulation, in particular the determination of the supporting capacity of the urban destination, the purpose and use of the area, and definition of standards necessary to maintain the quality of life of the citizens and the quality of the products and services offered to tourists.

2. SUSTAINABLE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

Butler (1999) states that the development of the concept of sustainable development has affected the changes in tourism, while Weaver and Lawton (1999) and Hardy and Associates (2002) argue that tourism in its evolution created certain preconditions for accepting sustainable tourism development. Bramwell and Lane (1993) and UNEP and UNWTO (2005) point out how sustainable tourism development has emerged as a positive approach of development aiming to maintain the long-term sustainability of the resources and environmental quality and to reduce the tension and problems raised from the complex interaction between the tourism destination stakeholders and the environment.

2002; World Charter for Sustainable Tourism +20, 2015). Sukladno s razvojem turizma evoluiralo je i promišljanje o održivom razvoju turizma (UNWTO, 1998:21), pa je prvotna definicija nešto izmijenjena, a prema aktualnoj održivi turizam je „turizam koji razumije, uvažava i brine se o sadašnjim i budućim ekonomskim, društvenim i ekološkim utjecajima turizma, zadovoljavajući pri tome potrebe turista, industrije i okoliša receptivnih zajednica“ (UNWTOSTD, 2015). U skladu s temeljnim načelima koncepta održivog razvoja te ravnoteži između ekološke, socio-kulturne i ekonomske održivosti, ciljevi održivog razvoja turizma su smanjivanje negativnih utjecaja turizma na društvo i okoliš uz njihovo očuvanje i zaštitu te povećanje blagostanja lokalne zajednice i zadovoljstva turista (WTTC, UNWTO i EC, 1996; UNDESA, 1999; UNEP i ICLEI, 2003; UNEP i UNWTO, 2005; UNWTO, 2007; UNWTO, 2013). Održivi razvoj turizma se temelji na uravnoteženom upravljanju ekološkim, socio-kulturnim i ekonomskim razvojem koji će očuvati socio-kulturni identitet lokalne zajednice, unaprijediti njihovu kvalitetu života i osigurati im blagostanje, dok će razvojem kvalitetnih turističkih proizvoda i usluga unaprijediti kvalitetu i zadovoljstvo doživljaja turista, a sve to uz racionalnu upotrebu i očuvanje resursa za dugoročno generiranje navedenoga i mogućnosti da se tim resursima koriste budući naraštaji.

Međutim, Sharpley (2000) tvrdi da se usprkos znatnom interesu teorije i prakse za održivi razvoj turizma često pogrešno interpretirala veza koncepta održivog razvoja i turizma, a kao rezultat toga ostala je upitna stvarna primjena koncepta održivog razvoja u turizmu, jer modernističko poimanja turizma i ekonomska funkcija turizma nadilazi načela održivog turizma, zbog čega se načela i ciljevi koncepta održivog razvoja ne mogu primjereno integrirati s posebnostima turizma. Butler (1999) također ističe da moguće nejasnoće u razumijevanju održivog razvoja turizma proizlaze iz nedostataka samog kon-

The concept of sustainable tourism development occurred in close connection with the concept of sustainable development occurring in the 1980s (WCED, 1987; UNDSO, 1992; WTTC, UNWTO and EC, 1996; UNDESA, 1999; UN, 2002; World Charter for Sustainable Tourism +20, 2015). In line with the development of tourism, reflection on sustainable tourism development evolved (UNWTO, 1998: 21) from somewhat changed original definition to the current definition stating that sustainable tourism is “tourism that takes full account of its current and future economic, social and environmental impacts, addressing the needs of visitors, the industry, the environment and host communities” (UNWTOSTD, 2015). In accordance with the fundamental principles of the concept of sustainable development and the balance between ecological, socio-cultural and economic sustainability, the goals of sustainable tourism development are to reduce the negative impacts of tourism on society and the environment along with their preservation and protection and to enhance the local community’s well-being and tourist satisfaction (WTTC, UNWTO and EC, 1996; UNDESA, 1999; UNEP and ICLEI, 2003; UNEP and UNWTO, 2005; UNWTO; 2007, 2013). Sustainable tourism development is based on balanced management of ecological, socio-cultural and economic development that will preserve the socio-cultural identity of the local community, improve their quality of life and ensure their prosperity, while the development of quality tourist products and services will improve the tourists’ satisfaction and bring quality experiences – all of that including rational use and preservation of the resources for long-term maintenance of the above-mentioned and the prospects to use the resources for future generations.

However, Sharpley (2000) argues that, in spite of the considerable interest of theory and practice for sustainable tourism development, the link between the concept of sustainable development and tourism has often been misinterpreted, which resulted in doubts about the real application of the concept of

cepta održivog razvoja. Isto tako, održivi turizam i održivi razvoj turizma često postaju sinonimi, a dodatno se održivi turizam definira kao alternativni turizam ili specifični oblik turizma, poput zelenog ili ekoturizma. Usprkos pogrešnim interpretacijama, pažnju je ipak potrebno posvetiti operacionalizaciji koncepta održivog razvoja kako bi bio primjenjiv u turizmu jer održivi turizam nije turizam koji se automatski razvija po načelima održivog razvoja. Stoga Butler (1999) ističe potrebu definiranja kapaciteta nosivosti turizma, kontrole razvoja turizma te razlike između masovnog i konvencionalnog turizma kao najvećih izazova implementacije održivog razvoja turizma.

Liu (2003) također uviđa temeljne nedostatke koncepta održivog razvoja turizma, među kojima se ističu prevelika usmjerenost na turiste umjesto na resurse turističke destinacije, usmjerenost na međugeneracijsku jednakost, uz zanemarivanje distribucije društveno-ekonomske koristi dionicima lokalne zajednice, naglasak na gospodarski učinak turizma u lokalnoj zajednici, uz izbjegavanje negativnog socio-kulturnog utjecaja te neuspješno definiranje granica razvoja, kapaciteta nosivosti i pokazatelja održivog razvoja turizma. Hall (2009, 2010) predlaže rekonceptualizaciju održivog razvoja turizma koji će se usmjeriti na obuzdavanje rasta turizma jer je i dalje izražen njegov negativan utjecaj na okoliš i klimatske promjene. To ne znači da turizam treba prestati, već treba zaustaviti emisiju štetnih plinova i gubitak prirodnih područja. Analizom radova iz održivog razvoja turizma Ruhanen i suradnici (2015) ističu kako se pojedine rasprave samo vrte u krug, no autori ipak smatraju da radovi pomažu u izučavanju problematike održivog razvoja turizma. U konačnici, McCool i suradnici (2013) preispituju učinke radova iz području održivog razvoja turizma i bez puno optimizma izražavaju zabrinutost i žaljenje, jer im se čini da radovi akademske zajednice nisu pronašli plodno tlo za primjenu. Razmatrajući konkretne rezultate

sustainable development in tourism. Namely, modernist notions of tourism and economic function of tourism go beyond the principles of sustainable tourism, which is why the principles and goals of the concept of sustainable development cannot be adequately integrated with the specific nature of tourism. Butler (1999) also points out that the possible ambiguities in understanding sustainable tourism development arise from the shortcomings of the concept of sustainable development. Likewise, sustainable tourism and sustainable development of tourism often become synonymous, and additionally sustainable tourism is defined as alternative tourism or a specific form of tourism, such as green or ecotourism. Despite the misinterpretations, however, attention needs to be paid to the operationalization of the concept of sustainable development in order to be applicable in tourism, since sustainable tourism is not a type of tourism that automatically develops on the principles of sustainable development. Therefore, Butler (1999) emphasizes the need to define the supporting capacity of tourism, the control of tourism development and the differences between mass and conventional tourism, as the biggest challenges for the implementation of sustainable tourism development.

Liu (2003) also notices the fundamental shortcomings of the concept of sustainable tourism development, including: being tourist-oriented rather than being tourist-destination-resources-oriented, the focus on intergenerational equality, while neglecting the distribution of socio-economic benefits to local community members, the emphasis on the economic impact of tourism in local community, while avoiding negative socio-cultural impacts, and failing to define the boundaries of development, supporting capacity and indicators of sustainable tourism development. Hall (2009, 2010) suggests the reconceptualization of sustainable tourism development, which will be aimed at limiting tourism growth, as its negative impact on the environment and climate change is still obvious. This does not mean that tourism should

održivosti turizma i održivosti općenito, trenutnu svjetsku situaciju i projekcije budućeg smjera razvoja, autori su svjesni složenosti okruženja u kojem održivi razvoj turizma općenito nije moguće implementirati, stoga ističu kako je možda održivi razvoj turizma utopija jer je teorijski idealan, ali praktično nemoguć.

cease to exist, but it suggests that the emission of harmful gases and the loss of natural areas must be stopped. By analysing the papers on sustainable tourism development, Ruhanen and Associates (2015) point out that individual discussions only go in circle, but the authors still believe that those papers help to study the issues of sustainable tourism development. Finally, McCool and Associates (2013) re-examine the effects of papers in the area of sustainable tourism development and with little optimism express their concern and regret because the academic papers do not seem to find fertile ground for their application. When thinking about the concrete results of sustainability of tourism and sustainability in general, the current world situation and the projections for future development directions, the authors are aware of the complexity of the environment in which sustainable development of tourism is generally not feasible. Thus, they point out that the sustainable tourism development might be a utopian concept as it is theoretically ideal but practically impossible (McCool *et al.*, 2013).

3. PRETPOSTAVKE USPJEŠNE IMPLEMENTACIJE ODRŽIVOG RAZVOJA TURIZMA

Mnogi autori navode kako je temeljna pretpostavka implementacije održivog razvoja turizma donošenje i provedba strateških dokumenata razvoja (Page i Thorn, 1997; Weaver i Lawton, 1999; Manning i Dougherty, 2000; Liu, 2003; Choi i Sirakaya, 2006; Ruhanen, 2008; Wray, 2011; Gössling i Scott, 2012; Phillips i Moutinho, 2014; Dredge i Jamal, 2015). Operacionalizacija koncepta održivog razvoja turizma ovisi o formuliranom planu u okviru kojega će se postaviti ciljevi održivog razvoja, definirati upravljačka struktura i partneri, definirati akcije za provedbu ciljeva, definirati relevantni pokazatelji i mjere usmjerene kontroli pokazatelja i vrednovanju ostvarenja razvojnog plana (Weaver i Lawton, 1999).

3. ASSUMPTIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUSTAINABLE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

Many authors argue that the underlying assumption for implementing sustainable tourism development is the adoption and implementation of strategic development documents (Page and Thorn, 1997; Weaver and Lawton, 1999; Manning and Dougherty, 2000; Liu, 2003; Choi and Sirakaya, 2006; Ruhanen, 2008; Wray, 2011; Gössling and Scott, 2012; Phillips and Moutinho, 2014; Dredge and Jamal, 2015). The operationalization of the sustainable tourism development concept depends on a defined plan within which sustainable development goals should be set to define the administrative structure and partners, determine the ac-

Neki gradovi su prepoznali važnost planiranja razvoja turizma, poput grada Barcelone (Španjolska) koji je od 1990. do 2003. godine izradio i proveo četiri strategije razvoja turizma (d'Angella, 2007). Istovremeno, Ruhanen (2009) je u Australiji utvrdila postojanje razvojnih planova turizma samo kod 30 od 125 uprava gradova. Međutim, stvarna uspješnost strategija je upitna, jer proces izrade (formulacije) strategije nije zahtjevan naspram njene praktične primjene za koju nedostaju potrebna znanja (Ruhanen, 2008). Znanje i učenje su također nužni prilikom definiranja zajedničke strateške vizije dionika destinacije, koja predstavlja ključan aspekt planiranja razvoja destinacije (Ruhanen, 2012). U tom kontekstu postavlja se pitanje za čije se interese izrađuju planovi razvoja te uključuju li usklađene ciljeve svih dionika, stoga je u planiranje razvoja potrebno uključiti sve dionike kako bi se mogli angažirati u praktičnoj implementaciji (Liu, 2003; Byrd, 2007; Wray, 2011).

Usprkos različitim složenim integriranim, dinamičnim, hijerarhijskim i prilagodljivim modelima strateškog planiranja razvijenim u posljednjih 30-ak godina (Gössling i Scott, 2012), u turizmu još uvijek postoji jaz između teorijskih modela i praktične primjene planova. Uzrok tomu je dinamična, turbulentna i nepredvidljiva okolina. No, upravo zbog ovih čimbenika, u turizmu je potrebno strateško planiranje koje će uključiti društvena pitanja te omogućiti vidljive i mjerljive koristi cijele lokalne zajednice (Phillips i Moutinho, 2014). Ipak, vidljivi su pozitivni pomaci u strateškom planiranju jer nude određena rješenja za društveno-gospodarska i ekološka pitanja. Međutim, još su nedovoljno povezani teoretičari koji postavljaju okvire i praktični korisnici koji postavljeno zaista mogu provesti u stvarnost (Dredge i Jamal, 2015). Choi i Sirakaya (2006) navode temeljne pretpostavke uspješnom planiranju i provedbi planova održivog razvoja turizma, a to su: implementacija načela održivog razvoja, višedionički pristup, političko i insti-

tivities for the implementation of goals, and define the relevant indicators and measures aimed at controlling indicators and evaluating the achievement of the developmental plan (Weaver and Lawton, 1999). Some cities have recognized the importance of tourism development planning, such as the city of Barcelona (Spain) which developed and implemented four tourism development strategies in the period from 1990 to 2003 (d'Angella, 2007). Concurrently, Ruhanen (2009) found the tourism development plans only in 30 out of 125 Australian city councils. However, the actual success of the strategy is questionable, as the process of creating (definition) the strategy is not demanding compared to its practical application which lacks the necessary knowledge (Ruhanen, 2008). Knowledge and learning are also important in defining the shared strategic vision of the stakeholders, which implies a key aspect of the destination development planning (Ruhanen, 2012). In that context the question remains as for whose interests the development plans are being developed and if they include adjusted goals of all members. Thus, all members need to be included in the development planning so that they can engage in practical implementation (Liu, 2003; Byrd, 2007; Wray, 2011).

Despite the variety of complex integrated, dynamic, hierarchical and adaptable strategic planning models developed over the past 30 years (Gössling and Scott, 2012), there is still a gap between theoretical models and practical implementation of the plans in tourism. The reason for this is a dynamic, turbulent and unpredictable environment, but because of these very factors tourism needs strategic planning that will involve social issues and enable visible and measurable benefits of the entire local community (Phillips and Moutinho, 2014). Of course, there are visible positive shifts in strategic planning, as they offer certain solutions to socio-economic and ecological issues, but the theoreticians who set the frameworks and practical users who can really implement those frameworks are still not sufficiently connected (Dredge and

tucionalno vodstvo, dugoročna orijentiranost te usmjerenost na praćenje i mjerenje održivog razvoja turizma prema postavljenim cijeovima i relevantnim čimbenicima destinacije.

Neizostavan element strateškog planiranja i održivog razvoja turizma je definiranje i primjena pokazatelja prema postavljenim razvojnim ciljevima. Navedeno od samog početka ističu Svjetska turistička organizacija UNWTO i druge organizacije izdajući različite priručnike i metodologije vezane uz primjenu pokazatelja namijenjene lokalnim upravama i upravljačkim strukturama razvoja turizma (UNWTO, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2004; UNEP i UNWTO, 2005; Eurostat, 2006ab; TSG, 2007; European Commission, 2013ab; GSTC, 2013). Pokazatelji održivog razvoja turizma kvantitativni su podaci vremenskih serija (UNWTO, 2004:8), a temeljna svrha im je prikazati uzročno-posljedičnu vezu turizma i okoliša te ocijeniti utjecaj turizma na okoliš i njegove učinke u okolišu (UNWTO, 1996:5). Budući da razvojni procesi izazivaju i negativne učinke, pokazatelji bi trebali pomoći menadžerima da pravodobno identificiraju određene probleme i na vrijeme ih spriječe ili ublaže njihov učinak, odnosno da prepoznaju određene utjecaje kako bi poduzeli potrebne akcije prije nego dođe do stvarnih problema (UNWTO, 2004:9). Dakle, pokazatelji održivog razvoja turizma ključni su u postavljanju, mjerenju i praćenju razvojnih ciljeva, zbog čega služe kao podrška upravljanju razvojem turizma destinacije. Međutim, mjerenje i praćenje održivog razvoja destinacije je moguće samo uz primjenu odgovarajućih pokazatelja održivog razvoja turizma (Krajinović, 2015). Svrha razvijanja različitih metodologija i sustava pokazatelja za mjerenje i praćenje održivog razvoja turizma bila je stvaranje jedinstvenog sustava pokazatelja koji će biti primjenjiv i usporediv na svim destinacijama, no usprkos svemu, to se još uvijek nije ostvarilo.

Jamal, 2015). Choi and Sirakaya (2006) list the basic preconditions for successful planning and implementation of sustainable tourism development, including: implementation of sustainable development principles, multidimensional approach, political and institutional leadership, long-term orientation and focus on monitoring and measuring sustainable tourism development according to the defined goals and relevant destination factors.

An indispensable element of strategic planning and sustainable tourism development is the definition and application of indicators according to the set development goals. From the very beginning, these requirements have been emphasized by the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) and other organizations which issued various manuals and methodologies related to the use of indicators for local governments and governance structures for tourism development (UNWTO, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2004; UNEP and UNWTO, 2005; Eurostat, 2006ab; TSG, 2007; European Commission, 2013ab; GSTC, 2013). Sustainable tourism development indicators are quantitative data of time series (UNWTO, 2004: 8), and their main purpose is to show the causal connection between tourism and the environment, and to assess the impact and effects of tourism on the environment (UNWTO 1996: 5). Since development processes also have negative impacts, indicators should help managers to timely identify the problems and prevent or mitigate their impact or recognize certain impacts in order to take the necessary actions before real problems arise (UNWTO 2004: 9). Thus, the indicators of sustainable tourism development are key to setting, measuring and monitoring development goals, which is why they serve as a support to managing the development of tourism destinations. However, measuring and monitoring sustainable destination development is possible only if appropriate sustainable tourism indicators are implemented (Krajinović, 2015). The purpose of developing different methodologies and indicator systems for measuring and monitoring the sustainable

Postojanje višedioničke mreže u destinaciji pretpostavka je učinkovitog upravljanja održivim razvojem turizma destinacije (Byrd, 2007; Timur i Getz, 2008; Scott i Cooper, 2010). Mreža predstavlja strukturu definiranu kombinacijom uloga i međudionosa dionika mreže. Potencijalne koristi suradnje u mreži su manji troškovi upravljanja, učinkovitije upravljanje razvojnim ciljevima destinacije te učinkovitije zajedničko nastupanje na turističkom tržištu. Što su koristi veće, izraženija je želja za suradnjom među dionicima (d'Angella, 2007). Osim toga, mreža doprinosi transparentnosti rada i javnom interesu, rješavaju se sukobi i izgrađuje povjerenje te se dijeli i nadograđuje znanje (Byrd, 2007). Dodatne koristi su učinkovitije upravljanje resursima i infrastrukturom te stvaranje turističkih proizvoda usmjerenih zadovoljstvu turista, ali i društveno-ekonomskom napretku te očuvanju okoliša (Europska komisija, 2000). Scott i Cooper (2010) ističu kako je za stvaranje učinkovite razvojne mreže destinacije potrebno maknuti hijerarhijske, geografske i funkcijske granice te dijeliti informacije među dionicima mreže. Glavni korak u ostvarivanju suradnje u mreži je identifikacija dionika i njihovo uključivanje u mrežu (Hardy i Beeton, 2001). Mreže pojednostavljuju složeni sustav odnosa, a ujedno promoviraju učinkovitost suradnje dionika te time i učinkovitost i izvrsnost destinacije.

Cooper i suradnici (2009) ističu kako je u mreži nužno definirati uloge dionika (glavne i sporedne), jakost veza (od slabe do jake) te resurse koji se izmjenjuju među dionicima (materijalni, financijski, ljudski). Sukladno tome, Timur i Getz (2008) pronalaze različite karakteristike mreža koje mogu imati gusti ili rijetki broj veza među dionicima, a mreže s gustim brojem veza rezultiraju učinkovitijom komunikacijom i interakcijom. Osim toga, mreže mogu biti centralizirane, s određenim brojem centralnih dionika koji šire veze od centra, te decentralizirane s nekoliko međusobno povezanih grupa koje

development of tourism was to create a unique system of indicators that would be applicable and comparable to all destinations, but, in spite of everything, this has not yet been achieved.

The existence of a multi-stakeholder network in the destination is a prerequisite for an effective management of sustainable destination development (Byrd, 2007; Timur and Getz, 2008; Scott and Cooper, 2010). The network represents a structure defined by the combination of roles and interdependence of network members. The potential benefits of networking are lower management costs, more efficient management of destination's developmental objectives, and more effective joint participation in the tourism market. The bigger the benefits, the greater the desire for cooperation between members (d'Angella, 2007). In addition, the network contributes to transparency of work and the public interest, resolving conflicts and building confidence while sharing and upgrading knowledge (Byrd, 2007). Additional benefits include more efficient management of resources and infrastructure, and the creation of tourist products for the satisfaction of tourists as well as for the socio-economic progress and the preservation of the environment (European Commission, 2000). Scott and Cooper (2010) point out that it is necessary to remove hierarchical, geographical and functional boundaries to create an effective development network and to share information among stakeholders. The main step in networking is the identification of stakeholders and their inclusion in the network (Hardy and Beeton, 2001). Networks simplify the complex system of relationships, while promoting the efficiency of members' collaboration and consequently the efficiency and excellence of the destination.

Cooper *et al.* (2009) point out the need to define the role of the stakeholders in a network (main and secondary), the strength of relationships (from weak to strong), and the resources that are exchanged among the stakeholders (material, financial, human). Ac-

imaju podjednaku ulogu. Temeljni su dionici mreže javni sektor, turistički sustav i lokalna zajednica. No, unutar mreže mogu biti razni drugi subjekti i klasteri koji su izravno i neizravno uključeni u turizam te imaju utjecaj i interes u destinaciji, a destinacijski se menadžment, ako postoji, najčešće nalazi u centralizirano uređenoj mreži. Pozicije dionika centralnog dijela mreže relativno su stabilnije nego onih na perifernom dijelu (Timur i Getz, 2008), a ovisno o društveno-gospodarskom i političkom sustavu države u kojoj destinacija djeluje, u mrežama može biti istaknuta uloga javnog ili privatnog sektora (d'Angella, 2007). Komunikacija i suradnja u mrežama može se odvijati formalno i neformalno, no bitno je da svi dionici sudjeluju u svim fazama kreiranja plana i provedbe održivog razvoja turizma (Byrd, 2007).

Različiti autori ističu kako je upravljanje održivim razvojem turizma vrlo zahtjevno i složeno i to upravo zbog velikog broja različitih dionika turističkog sustava. Međutim, problemi se također javljaju zbog nerazumijevanja samog koncepta održivog razvoja i nemogućnosti njegove implementacije (Hardy i Beeton, 2001; Ko, 2005; Choi i Sirakaya, 2006; Byrd *et al.*, 2008; Koutsouris, 2009; Miller *et al.*, 2010). Implementacija uvelike ovisi o obilježjima dionika, a osnovna pretpostavka upravljanja održivim razvojem turizma jest poznavanje načela održivog razvoja. Stoga dionici turističkog sustava moraju razumjeti što održivi razvoj znači za pojedinog dionika i za zajednicu. Nadalje, ovakav koncept upravljanja ovisi o međusobnoj komunikaciji, suradnji i razumijevanju među dionicima, a nedostatak funkcionalnog kanala komunikacije navodi se kao dodatan problem (McKercher, 2003; McDonald, 2009). Procesu implementacije održivog razvoja turizma nameću se dodatni problemi, poput fizičkih i prirodnih ograničenja, pa je teško precizno procijeniti granice tolerancije prirode i prostora s obzirom na stalne promjene koje se događaju. Složenost odnosa između različitih interaktivnih čim-

cordingly, Timur and Getz (2008) find different network characteristics, which may have a dense or limited number of connections among the members, while networks with a large number of connections result in more effective communication and interaction. In addition, the networks can be centralized, with a certain number of central members spreading connections from the centre, and decentralized with several interconnected groups of the same rank. The main stakeholders of the network are the public sector, the tourism industry and the local community, but within the network there can be different other subjects and clusters that are directly and indirectly involved in tourism and have an impact and interest in the destination, while destination management, if any, is most commonly found in centrally arranged networks. The positions of the central part in the network are relatively more stable than those in the peripheral part (Timur and Getz, 2008), and depending on the socio-economic and political system of the country in which the destination is active the roles of the public or the private sector can be highlighted (d'Angella, 2007). Communication and networking can take place on a formal and informal basis, but it is important for all stakeholders to participate in all phases of the creation of the plan and implementation of sustainable tourism development (Byrd, 2007).

Various authors point out that managing sustainable tourism development is very demanding and complex, due to a large number of different stakeholders in the tourism system. However, problems also arise due to the lack of understanding of the very concept of sustainable development and the inability to implement it (Hardy and Beeton, 2001; Ko, 2005; Choi and Sirakaya, 2006; Byrd *et al.*, 2008; Koutsouris, 2009; Miller *et al.*, 2010). Implementation largely depends on the specific stakeholders' characteristics, and the basic assumption of sustainable tourism development management knows the principles of sustainable development. Therefore, the tourist system members need to understand what sustainable development means for a

benika, vremenski odgođene pojave posljedica uzrokovanih djelovanjem u prošlosti i asimilacijski period čimbenici su koji smanjuju preciznost procjene granica tolerancije prirode, a navedeno istovremeno zahtijeva i podrazumijeva prilagodbu čovjeka novim situacijama kroz određeno razdoblje (Vujić, 2005; Blažević i Peršić, 2009).

Nedostatak određenih znanja također predstavlja problem. Ruhanen (2008) je utvrdila nedostatak znanja u privatnom i javnom sektoru potrebnog za transformiranje teorijskih postavki koncepta u praktičnu primjenu održivog razvoja turizma. Nešto kasnije Ruhanen (2013) je došla do sličnih rezultata, utvrdivši istraživanjem na lokalnim upravama koje imaju razvojne dokumente da lokalne uprave nisu znale kako teorijska načela koncepta održivog razvoja turizma provesti u praksi. Slično je utvrdila i Maxim (2016). Naime, lokalna uprava u Londonu je iskazala pozitivan stav o nužnosti uključivanja načela održivog razvoja u razvojne dokumente turizma grada, međutim, samo nekoliko dokumenata ta načela zaista sadrži, pri čemu je upitna i njihova praktična implementacija.

U održivom razvoju turizma sve se više ističe uloga vlasti, iako doprinos i potreba sudjelovanja ostalih dionika u planiranju i provedbi održivog razvoja turizma nije zanemariva. Hall (2011) ističe važnost države i njene politike održivog razvoja koja bi morala znati balansirati između politika razvoja svih dionika. Dodatno, sve je jača uloga pojedinih ključnih dionika destinacije koji zajedno ili na čelu s javnim sektorom stvaraju kritičnu masu za poduzimanje i provedbu ciljeva održivog razvoja turizma (Scott i Cooper, 2010). Potrebu preuzimanja veće uloge lokalne uprave povezane s višim razinama vlasti u održivom turizmu ističu također Bramwell i Lane (2010, 2011). Bramwell (2011) ovo argumentira činjenicom da vlast posjeduje mehanizme i instrumente potrebne za poduzimanje kolektivnih akcija, pregovaračku moć u ostvarivanju suradnje i koordinaciju dionika, intervencijsku i regu-

particular stakeholder and for the community. Furthermore, such concept of management depends on mutual communication, collaboration and understanding, while the lack of functional communication channels is referred to as an additional problem (McKercher, 2003; McDonald, 2009). The process of implementing sustainable tourism development implies additional problems such as physical and natural constraints, so it is difficult to estimate accurately the limits of tolerance of nature and space given the constant changes that are taking place. The complexity of the relationships between different interactive factors, the delayed appearance of past effects and the assimilation period are factors that reduce the precision of assessing the boundaries of tolerance of nature, while at the same time requiring and implying adaptation of humans to new situations over a certain period (Vujić, 2005; Blažević and Peršić, 2009).

Lack of certain knowledge is also an issue. Ruhanen (2008) found that the lack of knowledge in the private and public sectors needed to transform the theoretical concepts into the practical application of sustainable tourism development. Somewhat later, Ruhanen (2013) came up with similar results based on the research on local governments with development documents. Namely, the local governments did not know how to implement the theoretical principles of the concept of sustainable tourism development. Maxim (2016) had a similar conclusion when the local government in London expressed a positive view of the necessity of incorporating the principle of sustainable development into the development documents of the city tourism, but only a few documents really contained these principles and their practical implementation was thus questionable.

In the sustainable development of tourism, the role of government is increasingly emphasized, although the contribution and the need for other members to plan and implement sustainable tourism development are not negligible. Hall (2011) emphasizes

lativnu moć u slučaju eksternalija te društveno-gospodarsku osjetljivost i odgovornost. Slično navodi i McDonald (2009) koji zbog složenosti i heterogenosti turističkog sustava, predlaže određeni okvir unutar kojeg država ima ulogu ključnog dionika. Maxim (2015) je u svome istraživanju utvrdila čimbenike koje prema lokalnoj vlasti utječu na uspjeh razvoja i implementacije održivog razvoja turizma. Predstavnici lokalne uprave istaknuli su da na navedeno najviše utječe suradnja i partnerstvo s drugim odjelima uprave te s turističkim poduzećima i drugim organizacijama lokalne zajednice, a posebno ističu podršku lokalnog stanovništva. Sljedeći čimbenici koji utječu na razvoj i implementaciju održivog razvoja turizma su donesene politike razvoja turizma, a zatim kvaliteta infrastrukture javnog prijevoza i unutarnje mobilnosti, te održavanost i kvaliteta atrakcija s kojima su usko povezane marketinške aktivnosti i promocija grada. Nedostatak financijskih sredstava i znanja te utjecaj političke moći ograničenja su koja se nalaze na posljednjem mjestu. Ove aspekte je svakako potrebno promatrati s obrnutog aspekta jer ako ovi čimbenici izostanu, tada postaju nedostatak i ograničenje su u razvoju i implementaciji održivog turizma.

Bornhorst i suradnici (2010) svojim istraživanjem također pokazuju kako je za uspjeh održivog upravljanja destinacijom bitno vodstvo te međusobna komunikacija i razumijevanje svih dionika. Međutim, to posebno zahtjeva ulogu dionika privatnog sektora koji zajedničkim marketinškim aktivnostima stvaraju turistički proizvod i privlače turiste. U tome je izrazito bitna podrška i prihvaćanje lokalne zajednice bez koje nema turizma. Slična stajališta iznose Dwyer i suradnici (2009) te utvrđuju ulogu lokalnog stanovništva, ali i poslovnih subjekata u turizmu upotrebom inovativnih tehnologija usmjerenih smanjenju negativnih učinaka poslovanja. Takvo poslovanje zahtijeva integraciju načela održivog razvoja od strane upravljačkih struktura i drugih dionika iz kojih će slijediti

the importance of the state and its sustainable development policy, which should be able to balance between the policies of all stakeholders. Additionally, it is seen a growing role of certain key members who together or within the public sector create a critical mass for undertaking and implementing the goals of sustainable tourism development (Scott and Cooper, 2010). Bramwell and Lane (2010, 2011) also emphasize that local governments linked with higher governance levels should take over a more prominent role in assuring sustainable tourism. Bramwell (2011) argues that the authorities have the mechanisms and instruments necessary to undertake collective action, negotiating power in cooperating and coordinating members, intervening and regulating power in the case of externalities, and socio-economic sensitivity and accountability. Similarly, McDonald (2009) suggests a certain framework within which the state plays a key role in the complexity and heterogeneity of the tourist system. Maxim (2015) identified the factors that, according to local authorities, influence the success of the development and implementation of sustainable tourism development. Representatives of the local administration emphasized that the above is most affected by the cooperation and partnership with other departments of the administration, with the tourism entities and other local community organizations, and especially the support of the local population. The following factors influencing the development and implementation of sustainable tourism development are: tourism development policies, followed by the quality of public transport infrastructure and internal mobility, and the maintenance and quality of attractions, closely related to marketing activities and the promotion of the city. Lack of financial resources and knowledge, and the influence of the political power of constraints occupy the last position. These aspects have to be viewed from the opposite perspective as well because if they are absent, then they become a disadvantage and a constraint in the development and implementation of sustainable tourism.

atraktivni turistički proizvodi, posebice oni vezani uz zeleni turizam i oblike turizma koji doprinose njegovu održivom razvoju, s obzirom da za time postoji sve veći interes turista. Poslovanje sa smanjenim negativnim utjecajem na okoliš svakako doprinosi životu lokalne zajednice i odgovornom ponašanju svih dionika jer potiče takvo ponašanje drugih dionika unutarne okoline destinacije, ali i privlači turiste kojima je navedeno u skladu s njihovim svakodnevnim obrascima ponašanja (Andereck, 2009; Yüzbaşıoğlu *et al.*, 2014; Miller *et al.*, 2015; Zhang *et al.*, 2015).

Čini se da je uloga lokalnog stanovništva u turizmu zanemarena. Jačina uloge lokalnog stanovništva povezana je sa stupnjem uključenosti u turističke aktivnosti, pa tako Nunkoo i Ramkissoon (2010) u literaturi pronalaze vanjske i unutarne čimbenike koji utječu na stavove lokalnog stanovništva o turizmu. Vanjski se čimbenici odnose na obilježja i jačinu uloge koju stanovnici imaju u turističkoj destinaciji, a na njih utječu stupanj razvoja turizma u destinaciji, jačina sezonalosti, vrsta turista koji posjećuju destinaciju te omjer turista i lokalnog stanovništva. Unutarnji čimbenici obuhvaćaju karakteristike stanovnika unutar lokalne zajednice koji su pod utjecajem lokalnih čimbenika, poput razine zaposlenosti, blizine turističkih zona i sl. Sukladno s ovim, Weaver i Lawton (2001) pronalaze tri osnovne grupe lokalnih stanovnika: oni koji podržavaju turizam, koji su neutralni prema njemu i oni koji ga ne podržavaju. Slične rezultate donose Nunkoo i Ramkissoon (2010), prema kojima zadovoljstvo stanovništva s utjecajem turizma ovisi o njihovoj uključenosti u turizam. Choi i Murray (2010) potvrđuju navedeno te dodatno argumentiraju kako lokalni stanovnici uključeni u turizam vide pozitivne učinke turizma i zbog toga se žele još više uključiti u budući razvoj turizma, dok se oni koji ne vide pozitivne učinke turizma ne žele uključiti u njegov razvoj. Zbog ovoga autori implicitno navode potrebu uključivanja lokalnog

Bornhorst and Associates (2010) also claim that the key factors for the success of sustainable destination management are: leadership, mutual communication and understanding of all stakeholders, however, this requires the role of private sector members, which creates tourism products and attracts tourists through their joint marketing activities. Very important here is the support and acceptance of the local community without which there is no tourism. Similar views are expressed by Dwyer *et al.* (2009) who determine the role of local population as well as business entities in tourism by using innovative technologies aimed at reducing the negative effects of running business. Such business operation requires integrating the principles of sustainable development by management structures and other stakeholders, followed by attractive tourism products, in particular those related to green tourism and forms of tourism that contribute to its sustainable development, given that there is an increasing interest of tourists for those products. Running a business with a reduced negative impact on the environment certainly contributes to the life of the local community and to the responsible behaviour of all stakeholders, as this promotes such behaviour of other stakeholders in the destination's interior environment, but also attracts the tourists who find the above-mentioned in accordance with their daily patterns of behaviour (Andereck, 2009; Yüzbaşıoğlu *et al.*, 2014; Miller *et al.*, 2015; Zhang *et al.*, 2015).

The role of the local population in tourism seems to be neglected. Nevertheless, it is linked to the degree of involvement in tourism activities and Nunkoo and Ramkissoon (2010) find the external and internal factors that influence the attitudes of the local population on tourism. The external factors relate to the characteristics and strength of the role that the locals have in a tourism destination, influenced by the degree of tourism development in the destination, the seasonality, the types of tourists who visit the destination, and the ratio of tourists and local popula-

stanovništva u proces planiranja održivog razvoja turizma.

Istraživanje Wesley i Pforra (2010) pokazalo je veliku ulogu lokalne uprave koja zbog svojih nedostataka nije uspjela provesti načela održivog razvoja turizma u praksi, dok je istovremeno pokazivala političku moć i određene interese u upravljanju nametnuvši se lokalnom stanovništvu. U sličnom je istraživanju Ruhanen (2009) uvidjela da prilikom izrade razvojnih planova turizma gradova nisu sudjelovali svi dionici pojedine destinacije, među kojima nije znatno ili nije uopće sudjelovalo lokalno stanovništvo. Barrutia i Echebarria (2015) također ukazuju na nedovoljnu uključenost lokalnog stanovništva, što autori pronalaze u činjenici da stanovništvo ima premalu moć u ostvarenju svojih ciljeva zbog institucionalnih barijera i spore provedbe te stoga relativno indiferentno participira u postavljenim planovima razvoja. Neuključenost lokalnog stanovništva još je više izražena u nekim istočnim manje razvijenim državama jer dominantnu ulogu u politici razvoja ima vlast, a lokalno stanovništvo gotovo da nema pravo glasa (Begum *et al.*, 2014).

Problemi koji se također javljaju su nepovjerenje prema državi (vlasti, upravi) ili nedovoljna podrška države, uključivanje politike, prevelika administracija i birokracija, prevelik utjecaj ključnih interesno-utjecajnih skupina, nedovoljno uključivanje pojedinih interesnih skupina, nedovoljna osviještenost o potrebi participiranja, nedostatak vodstva, pogrešno definirani prioriteti, ciljevi i strategije provođenja i sl. (Andereck *et al.*, 2005; Byrd *et al.*, 2009ab; Hall, 2011; Waligo *et al.*, 2013, 2014). Nadalje, između dionika se javljaju različiti sukobi i izostanak suradnje između razina vlasti, postoji nedostatak organizacije i znanja menadžmenta te loša infrastruktura i neriješeni imovinsko-pravni odnosi (Pakdeepinit, 2007). Choi i Sirakaya (2006) navode kako održivi razvoj turizma ovisi o borbi države i politike, dok Liu i Wall (2006) isto povezuju s lokalnom zajednicom koja je najčešće izmanipulirana političkim

tion. Internal factors include the characteristics of residents within the local community that are influenced by local factors such as employment rates, vicinity of tourist zones, etc. In accordance with this, Weaver and Lawton (2001) find three basic groups of local residents: those who support tourism, those who are neutral to it and those who do not support it. Similar results are shown in Nunkoo and Ramkissoon (2010) who suggest that the satisfaction of the locals with the influence of tourism depends on their involvement in tourism. Choi and Murray (2010) confirm the above, and further argue that locals engaged in tourism see the positive effects of tourism and therefore want to get even more involved in the future development of tourism while those who do not see the positive effects of tourism do not want to be involved in its development. For this reason, the authors implicitly state the need to involve the local population in the process of sustainable tourism development.

Research by Wesley and Pforr (2010) showed a major role of the local government which, due to its shortcomings, has failed to implement the principles of sustainable development of tourism in practice while demonstrating political power and particular interests in management by imposing itself on the local population. In a similar research, Ruhanen (2009) found that during the creation of city tourism developmental plans not all stakeholders of a certain destination participated, among which the local population was not significantly or not at all involved. Barrutia and Echebarria (2015) also point to insufficient local population involvement, which they support by the fact that the locals have too little power to achieve their goals due to institutional barriers and slow implementation, and therefore participate relatively indifferently in the pre-defined developmental plans. Non-involvement of the local population is even more obvious in certain eastern, less developed countries, as the dominant role in development policy belongs to the government, and the local population has almost no right to say anything (Begum *et al.*, 2014).

strankama na vlasti i njihovim politikama. Međusobni konflikti političkih stranki i česte promjene vlasti također onemogućuju kvalitetno postavljanje planova i stvaraju određena ograničenja u njihovoj provedbi (Hall i Jenkinns, 1995). UNEP i UNWTO (2005:71) definiraju različite instrumente i preporuke kako vlade mogu utjecati na održivi razvoj turizma, pri čemu državu ističu kao važnog ili pak ključnog dionika upravljanja tim razvojem. Argumenti koji se navode su, između ostalih, fragmentiranost turizma i veliki broj dionika, uključenost javnih dobara u održivi razvoj i postojanje različitih instrumenata koji služe u regulatorne i poticajne svrhe (UNEP i UNWTO, 2005:3). U konačnici, Burns (2008) navodi kako je učinkovito planiranje i provedba održivog turizma posljedica suradnje višesektorskih dionika koji djeluju unutar složenog društveno-političkog okvira, a ako pri tome zakaže država koja bi trebala poticati dionike i uključiti ih u planiranje razvoja destinacije, posebice lokalno stanovništvo koje proživljava stvarne učinke turizma, održivi razvoj nemoguće je ostvariti (Choi i Murray, 2010).

Iako je održivi razvoj postao imperativ u razvoju turizma, praktična primjena koncepta održivog razvoja još se uvijek preispituje, sukladno s Wheelerovim (1993) pesimističnim, ali relativno točnim navodom da je održivi razvoj turizma intelektualno privlačan koncept s malo praktičnih primjena. Slično se može utvrditi i za sam koncept održivog razvoja na kojemu se temelji održivi razvoj turizma jer je, usprkos donošenju mnogobrojnih planova, postavljanju različitih politika, definiranju pokazatelja i drugih instrumenata, još uvijek aktualan problem njegove implementacije. Osnovna ograničenja implementacije proizlaze iz stupnja društveno-gospodarskog razvoja s kojim su usko povezani nedostatak financijskih sredstava i tehnologije (Weaver, 2006; Drexhage i Murphy, 2010). Usprkos svim problemima, UNWTO (2000) temeljem 49 studija slučaja diljem svijeta potvrđuje se kako je imple-

Problems that also arise are distrust of the state (government, administration) or insufficient state support, policy inclusion, excessive administration and bureaucracy, the overwhelming influence of key interest and influential groups, insufficient involvement of particular interest groups, insufficient awareness of the need to participate, lack of leadership, misdefined priorities, goals and implementation strategies, etc. (Andereck *et al.*, 2005; Byrd *et al.*, 2009ab; Hall, 2011; Waligo *et al.*, 2013, 2014). Furthermore, there are various conflicts among the stakeholders and there is a lack of cooperation between the levels of government and of management organization and knowledge, as well as poor infrastructure and unresolved property and legal relations (Pakdeepinit, 2007). Choi and Sirakaya (2006) state that sustainable development of tourism depends on state and policy struggles, while Liu and Wall (2006) also refer to the local community that is most often manipulated by current political parties and their policies. Interpersonal conflicts of political parties and frequent changes of government also prevent the quality definition of plans and create certain limitations in their implementation (Hall and Jenkinns, 1995). UNEP and UNWTO (2005:71) define different instruments and recommendations how governments can influence sustainable tourism development, whereby the state is seen an important or even a key stakeholder in managing this development. The arguments cited are, among other things, the fragmentation of tourism and a large number of stakeholders, the involvement of public goods in sustainable development and the existence of various instruments serving for regulatory and incentive purposes (UNEP and UNWTO, 2005:3). Finally, Burns (2008) states that effective planning and implementation of sustainable tourism is the result of cooperation between multisectoral stakeholders operating within a complex socio-political framework, and if the state that should encourage stakeholders (especially locals who feel real tourism effects) and involve them in

mentacija održivog razvoja turizma moguća, a uspjeh je postignut uključivanjem cijele lokalne zajednice u proces planiranja, upravljanja i provedbe razvojnih ciljeva, partnerskom suradnjom u mreži dionika, snažnom orijentiranošću prema održivom razvoju te kontinuiranim praćenjem i vrednovanjem pokazatelja ostvarenja razvojnih ciljeva.

Temeljem ovih saznanja moguće je utvrditi preduvjete uspješne implementacije održivog razvoja turizma. Ključne pretpostavke uspješne implementacije su: 1) strateško planiranje razvoja; 2) razvijeni sustav za mjerenje i praćenje razvoja; 3) razvijeni participativni odnos dionika u upravljanju destinacijom; 4) poticajno institucionalno okruženje i proaktivna lokalna uprava; 5) angažiranost lokalnog stanovništva i 6) educiranost dionika o upravljanju i načelima održivog razvoja.

planning the destination development fails, sustainable development cannot be realized (Choi and Murray, 2010).

Although sustainable development has become an imperative in the development of tourism, the practical application of the concept of sustainable development is still under consideration, according to Wheeler's (1993) pessimistic but relatively correct statement that sustainable tourism development is an intellectually attractive concept with little practical application. The same goes for the concept of sustainable development, on which sustainable development of tourism is based as, despite the adoption of numerous plans, the setting of different policies, the definition of indicators and other instruments, the problem of its implementation is still current. The main constraints stem from the socio-economic development with which the lack of financial resources and technology are closely linked (Weaver, 2006; Drexhage and Murphy, 2010). Despite all that, UNWTO (2000) confirms that on the basis of 49 case studies across the globe the implementation of sustainable tourism development is possible, and that success has been achieved through the involvement of the entire local community in planning, management and implementation of developmental goals, through partnerships and networking, strong orientation towards sustainable development and continuous monitoring and evaluation of indicators of achievement of developmental goals.

These findings allow determining the preconditions for a successful implementation of sustainable tourism development. The key assumptions for this are: 1) strategic development planning, 2) developed system for measuring and monitoring of development, 3) developed participatory stakeholder relationship in destination management, 4) stimulating institutional environment and proactive local governance, 5) engagement of local population and 6) education of stakeholders on management and the principles of sustainable development.

4. METODOLOGIJA ISTRAŽIVANJA

Prostorni obuhvat i turistička razvijenost temeljni su kriteriji za odabir gradova u uzorak istraživanja. Prema nomenklaturi prostornih jedinica za statistiku (fra. *Nomenclature des unités territoriales statistiques* – *NUTS*), Hrvatska je kao članica Europske unije podijeljena na dvije statističke regije NUTS 2 razine – Kontinentalna Hrvatska i Jadranska Hrvatska, dok Republika Hrvatska (država) predstavlja NUTS 1 razinu, a županije NUTS 3 razinu (HGK, 2015). Jadranska Hrvatska znatno je turistički razvijenija u odnosu na Kontinentalnu Hrvatsku. U mjestima Jadranske Hrvatske nalazi se čak 95% smještajnih kapaciteta (DZS, 2015a) u kojima je u 2015. godini ostvareno 12.508.905 dolazaka i 68.299.167 noćenja turista, što čini 87% ukupnih turističkih dolazaka i 95% noćenja ostvarenih u Hrvatskoj (DZS, 2016). Kontinentalna Hrvatska zauzima samo 5% u ukupnim smještajnim kapacitetima Hrvatske te je u istoj godini ostvarila 1.834.418 dolazaka i 3.306.148 noćenja turista, odnosno 13% u ukupnim dolascima i 5% u ukupnim noćenjima turista u Hrvatskoj. Po pitanju ukupnog turističkog prometa Hrvatske, od 2009. do 2015. godine broj ostvarenih turističkih dolazaka povećao se za 31%, a broj noćenja za 27%, pri čemu se oko 50% ukupnih dolazaka i 60% ukupnih noćenja ostvaruje u srpnju i kolovozu, dok se oko 80% ukupnih dolazaka i 90% ukupnih noćenja ostvaruje od svibnja do rujna (Ministarstvo turizma RH, 2014, 2015, 2016), što ukazuje na izraženu sezonalnost turizma u Hrvatskoj. Turizam Hrvatske koncentriran je u gradovima, s obzirom da je deset hrvatskih gradova s najvećim turističkim prometom u 2014. godini ostvarilo 35% ukupnih turističkih dolazaka i 27% noćenja, a u 2015. godini 36% ukupnih turističkih dolazaka i 28% noćenja.

U svrhu cjelovitog obuhvata prostora Republike Hrvatske te različitih urbanih destinacija koje se nalaze na različitom stupnju turističkog razvoja, NUTS 2 i NUTS 3 razi-

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The scope of the city area and the level of tourism development were the basic criteria for selecting cities in the research sample. According to the nomenclature of spatial units for statistics (French: *Nomenclature des unités territoriales statistiques*, *NUTS*), as a member of the European Union, Croatia is divided into two statistical regions of NUTS 2 level – Continental Croatia and Adriatic Croatia, while the Republic of Croatia (the state) represents NUTS 1 level, and Croatian counties NUTS 3 level (CCE, 2015). Tourism is considerably more developed in Adriatic Croatia than in Continental Croatia. The settlements of Adriatic Croatia cover as many as 95% of accommodation capacities (CBS, 2015a), marking 12,508,905 arrivals and 68,299,167 overnight stays in 2015, which makes 87% of total tourist arrivals and 95% of total overnight stays in Croatia (CBS, 2016). Continental Croatia accounts for only 5% of its total accommodation capacities, recording 1,834,418 arrivals and 3,330,148 overnight stays in the same year, i. e. 13% in total arrivals and 5% in total overnight stays in Croatia. Regarding the total tourist turnover in Croatia, from 2009 to 2015 the number of tourist arrivals increased by 31% and the number of overnight stays by 27%, with about 50% of total arrivals and 60% of total overnight stays in July and August, and about 80% of total arrivals and 90% of total overnight stays from May to September (Ministry of Tourism of the Republic of Croatia, 2014, 2015, 2016), which reflects the pronounced seasonality of tourism in Croatia. Tourism in Croatia is concentrated in cities, as the ten of them with the highest tourist turnover in 2014 marked 35% of total tourist arrivals and 27% of total overnight stays, while in 2015 they marked 36% of total tourist arrivals and 28% of total overnight stays.

For the purpose of the full coverage of the territory of the Republic of Croatia and of various urban destinations at different levels of tourism development, NUTS 2 and NUTS 3 levels are a spatial criterion that

ne prostorni su kriterij koji uzorak gradova treba zadovoljiti. Prema posljednjem popisu Ministarstva uprave Republike Hrvatske (2016), u Hrvatskoj postoji 127 gradova i Zagreb koji ima status grada i županije. Svi ti gradovi ne mogu se promatrati kao urbane turističke destinacije jer se nalaze na različitom stupnju turističkog razvoja. Primjerice, Rovinj je u 2015. godini ostvario najviše turističkih noćenja u Hrvatskoj (3.141.925), dok je istovremeno Grad Belišće ostvario samo 300 dolazaka i 1.140 noćenja. Neki gradovi (npr. Zabok, Kutina, Ivanec i dr.) nisu ostvarili niti jedno noćenje jer nemaju registriranih smještajnih kapaciteta (DZS, 2016). Ovakva situacija u skladu je i s Butlerovim (1980) modelom životnog ciklusa destinacije prema kojemu destinacija ima svoje razvojne faze. Stupanj turističkog razvoja destinacije može se utvrditi na temelju određenih sekundarnih podataka, ali i podataka empirijskog istraživanja. Obilježja destinacije, specifičnosti marketinških aktivnosti te ekonomski, društveni i ekološki utjecaj turizma na destinaciju kategorije su kojima je moguće utvrditi stupanj turističkog razvoja (Buhalis, 2000).

Broj smještajnih kapaciteta te broj turističkih dolazaka i noćenja temeljni su pokazatelji turističkog prometa (turističke razvijenosti) (Vukonić, 2001) koji se danas najčešće prikupljaju (DZS, 2015ab). Ovi pokazatelji ujedno su pokazatelji kapaciteta nosivosti destinacije, pri čemu je broj ostvarenih turističkih noćenja ključan za pitanje nosivosti i održivosti urbanih destinacija jer utječu na intenzivnost turizma i turističku gustoću. S obzirom na različiti stupanj turističkog razvoja pojedinih destinacija i dostupnost podataka, ali i kako bi se izbjegla moguća ograničenja u istraživanju, u uzorak su odabrane turistički najrazvijenije urbane destinacije NUTS 2 i NUTS 3 razine. Prema definiranim kriterijima u Kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj i Jadranskoj Hrvatskoj (NUTS 2 razina) uključene su po četiri županije (NUTS 3 razina) s najvećim brojem ostvarenih noćenja (prema statističkim podatcima iz 2015.

the sample of cities should meet. According to the latest register of the Ministry of Public Administration of the Republic of Croatia (2016), there is a total of 127 cities in Croatia, along with Zagreb whose status is both city and county. All these cities can hardly be regarded as urban tourism destinations due to the different levels of tourism development. For instance, in 2015 Rovinj achieved a maximum of overnight stays in Croatia (3,141,925), while at the same time the town of Belišće marked only 300 arrivals and 1,140 overnight stays. Some towns (e.g. Zabok, Kutina, Ivanec etc.) did not record a single overnight stay as they do not have registered accommodation capacities (CBS, 2016). This situation agrees with Butler's (1980) tourism life cycle model of a destination. The level of tourism development of a particular destination can be determined on the basis of certain secondary data, as well as on the empirical research data. The characteristics of the destination, the specificity of marketing activities and the economic, social and ecological impacts of tourism on the destination present the categories through which it is possible to determine the degree of tourism development (Buhalis, 2000).

The number of accommodation capacities and the number of tourist arrivals and overnight stays are the main indicators of tourist traffic (tourism development) (Vukonić, 2001), most frequently obtained today (CBS, 2015ab). These are also indicators of the carrying capacity of the destination, whereby the number of overnight stays is crucial for the issue of capacity and sustainability of urban destinations, as they affect tourism intensity and tourism density. Due to the different degrees of tourism development of individual destinations and the availability of data, but also to avoid possible limitations in the research, the sample included the most developed urban destinations of NUTS 2 and NUTS 3 levels. According to defined criteria, the sample included four counties (NUTS 3 levels) of Continental Croatia and four counties of Adriatic Croatia (NUTS 2 level) with

godine), a u uzorak ulaze urbane destinacije koje u tim županijama ostvaruju najveći broj turističkih noćenja (prema statističkim podacima iz 2015. godine). Odabir osam od 128 gradova opravdava se složenošću i zahtjevnošću istraživanja, vremenom potrebnim za provođenje istraživanja i drugim ograničenjima istraživanja. U *Tablici 1.* definiran je uzorak gradova, odnosno urbanih destinacija koje su obuhvaćene istraživanjem.

highest numbers of overnight stays (according to the statistical data from 2015), including urban destinations that marked the largest number of tourist overnight stays (according to the statistical data from 2015). Choosing eight out of 128 cities is justified by the complexity of the research, the time required to conduct research and other research constraints. A sample of cities, i. e. urban destinations covered in the survey is defined in Table 1.

Tablica 1: Uzorak gradova kao urbanih destinacija uključenih u istraživanje (prema podacima u 2015. godini)

REGIJA (NUTS 2)	Županija (NUTS 3)	Broj noćenja	Grad – destin.	Broj noćenja	Turist. gust.	Turist. intenz.	Turist. funkc.
Kontinentalna Hrvatska	Karlovačka	395.348	Karlovac	39.834	99,09	0,72	0,79
	Krapinsko-zagorska	215.831	Krapina	5.473	125,73	0,43	0,89
	Osječko-baranjska	158.226	Osijek	84.806	498,86	0,78	0,99
	Varaždinska	129.882	Varaždin	50.882	855,73	1,08	2,30
Jadranska Hrvatska	Istarska	20.966.561	Rovinj	3.141.925	35.703,69	219,81	257,74
	Splitsko-dalmatinska	13.288.805	Split	1.339.598	16.886,40	7,52	12,02
	Primorsko-goranska	13.070.148	Mali Lošinj	1.827.232	8.193,87	217,84	288,04
	Zadarska	7.816.872	Zadar	1.433.701	7.390,21	19,10	29,16

Izvor: obrada autora prema podacima DZS-a, 2016

Table 1: A sample of cities as urban destinations included in the survey (according to 2015 data)

Region (NUTS 2)	County (NUTS 3)	Number of overnights	City – destin.	Number of overnights	Tourism density	Tourism intensity	Tourism funct.
Continental Croatia	Karlovac	395,348	Karlovac	39,834	99.09	0.72	0.79
	Krapina-Zagorje	215,831	Krapina	5,473	125.73	0.43	0.89
	Osijek-Baranja	158,226	Osijek	84,806	498.86	0.78	0.99
	Varaždin	129,882	Varaždin	50,882	855.73	1.08	2.30
Adriatic Croatia	Istria	20,966,561	Rovinj	3,141,925	35,703.69	219.81	257.74
	Split-Dalmatia	13,288,805	Split	1,339,598	16,886.40	7.52	12.02
	Primorje-Gorski Kotar	13,070,148	Mali Lošinj	1,827,232	8,193.87	217.84	288.04
	Zadar	7,816,872	Zadar	1,433,701	7,390.21	19.10	29.16

Source: author's edition according to CBS, 2016

Iz Tablice 1 vidljivo je da se urbane destinacije nalaze na različitim stupnju turističkog razvoja. Usprkos najvećem turističkom prometu, gradovi kontinentalne Hrvatske znatno zaostaju za gradovima Jadranske Hrvatske te se nalaze u fazi istraživanja i uključivanja u turističko tržište. Navedeno također potvrđuju pokazatelji turističke gustoće (broj noćenja/površina grada u km²), turističke intenzivnosti (broj noćenja/broj građana) i turističke funkcionalnosti (broj kreveta*100/broj građana) čije su vrijednosti znatno veće u jadranskim destinacijama. Prema Buhali-sovoj (2000) metodologiji, ovu činjenicu dodatno potvrđuju određeni podaci prikupljeni empirijskim istraživanjem.

Pretpostavke uspješne implementacije održivog razvoja turizma utvrđene u pregledu literature predmet su istraživanja provedenog u navedenih osam urbanih destinacija Republike Hrvatske. Temeljem dosadašnjih istraživanja utvrđeno je djelovanje četiriju osnovnih skupina dionika u destinaciji: javni i privatni sektor te lokalno stanovništvo kao dionici unutarnje okoline destinacije i turisti kao dionici vanjske okoline destinacije (Liu, 2003; Byrd; 2007; Byrd, *et al.*, 2009ab; Waligo *et al.*, 2013, 2014). Sukladno tome, na dionicima unutarnje okoline destinacije u svim je gradovima provedeno kvalitativno istraživanje putem vođenih fokus-grupa. Pokusno istraživanje provedeno je 2015. godine u Zadru u okviru kojega su provedene tri fokus-grupe. Ono je poslužilo kao temelj za fokus-grupe u ostalim urbanim destinacijama koje su održane 2016. godine. Uz pomoć turističkih zajednica gradova, pozivi su poslani relevantnim dionicima destinacije. Ukupno je provedeno 11 fokus-grupa na kojima je sudjelovalo 121 predstavnik turističke ponude, lokalne samouprave, kulturnih institucija i ostalih dionika javnog i privatnog sektora te civilnog društva. U šest je gradova održana samo jedna fokus-grupa, što pokazuje nedostatak interesa za istraživanu problematiku, ali i nedostatak komunikacije i suradnje među dionicima. Na fokus-grupama je

Table 1 shows that urban destinations are at different levels of tourism development. In spite of the largest tourist traffic, the cities of Continental Croatia are significantly lagging behind the cities of Adriatic Croatia and are in the phase of research and inclusion in the tourism market. This state is confirmed by the indicators of tourism density (number of overnight stays/city (km²) area), tourism intensity (number of overnight stays/number of citizens) and tourism functionality (number of beds*100/number of citizens), whose values are considerably higher in the Adriatic destinations. The methodology developed by Buhalis (2000) additionally confirmed this fact is by certain data gathered in an empirical research.

Assumptions for a successful implementation of the sustainable tourism development determined in the literature review were subject of the research conducted in eight urban destination of the Republic of Croatia. Based on the current research, the four main groups of stakeholders in the destination are identified: the public and private sector, as well as the local population as part of the inner environment of the destination, and the tourists as part of the external environment of the destination (Liu, 2003; Byrd; 2007; Byrd, *et al.*, 2009ab; Waligo *et al.*, 2013, 2014). Consequently, in all cities, qualitative research was carried out on the stakeholders of the destination's inner environment through guided focus groups. A pilot study was conducted in 2015 in Zadar, within which three focus groups were organized. The study served as the basis for the focus groups in other urban destinations that were held in 2016. With the help of the tourist boards of the cities, calls were sent to relevant stakeholders of destinations. A total of 11 focus groups were organized by 121 representatives of the tourist offer, local government, cultural institutions and other stakeholders in the public and private sector and civil society. Only one focus group was held in six cities, showing a lack of interest in the research issue, as well as a lack of commu-

u prosjeku bilo 11 sudionika. Fokus-grupe su snimane zvučnim zapisom i transkribirane. Transkripti su činili osnovu za analizu i sistematizaciju rezultata iz kojih su izvedeni zaključci o ciljevima istraživanja.

5. REZULTATI ISTRAŽIVANJA

Jedna od temeljnih pretpostavki implementacije održivog razvoja turizma je donošenje i provedba strateških dokumenata razvoja. U polovini svih istraživanih gradova strategija razvoja turizma ne postoji. U Kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj zasebni plan razvoja turizma donesen je samo u jednome gradu, dok je za dva grada turizam razmatran u okviru drugih razvojnih planova. U Jadranskoj Hrvatskoj plan razvoja turizma imaju dva grada, dok je u jednom bio u procesu izrade. U kontinentalnim gradovima koji nemaju strategiju, ističu kako bi „cjelovita strategija na razini 10 godina pomogla“ jer se „nitko sustavno ne bavi ovom destinacijom, ne zna se tko je nadležan, sve ide sporo, a pokazatelji su prijeratni kada se nije niti govorilo o turizmu“. Istovremeno, sudionici fokus-grupa jadranskih gradova koji nemaju plan razvoja turizma ističu: „Nama se turizam događa po inerciji“ no „razvoj ne smije biti stihijski, treba neki krovni koncept, što želimo, što je nama važno u ovoj destinaciji“ jer „nedostaje dugoročno promišljanje, promišljanje za opću korist, ne gleda se dovoljno široko, samo vlastita korist“. Sudionici također navode da je strategiju razvoja turizma „potrebno usmjeriti prema turistima i prema lokalnoj zajednici jer je ovo dvoje nepovezano“. Zaključno, sudionici dodaju da se „turizam događa stihijski“, „u gradu vlada kaos“, a „puno toga povoljnog i pozitivnog se događa zahvaljujući pojedincima“, stoga „strategija mora postojati na nacionalnoj, regionalnoj i lokalnoj razini i trebaju biti obosmjerno povezane“. Uspriko postavljenim planovima razvoja, istaknuto je također kako ponekad u strategijama postoje nerealni projekti koji se ne mogu realizirati te nedostaje „bit strategi-

nication and cooperation among stakeholders. On average there were 11 participants at the focus groups. The focus groups were audio recorded and transcribed. The transcripts were used for the analysis and systematization of the results from which the conclusions on the research goals were derived.

5. RESEARCH RESULTS

One of the basic preconditions for the implementation of sustainable tourism development is the adoption and implementation of strategic development documents. In half of all researched cities tourism development strategies did not even exist. In Continental Croatia, a separate tourism development plan was adopted only in one city, while in two other cities tourism was considered as part of broader development plans. In Adriatic Croatia, two cities had tourism development plans, while in one city the plan was still a work in progress. In Continental Croatia the cities lacking tourism strategy pointed out that “a full-fledged 10-year strategy would help” because “nobody systematically deals with this destination, no one knows who is in charge, everything goes slowly, and the indicators are from the pre-war period, when tourism was not even discussed”. At the same time, participants in the focus groups held in the Adriatic cities without a tourism development plan emphasize: “We experience tourism by inertia,” but “development must not be sloppy, there is a need for a roof concept, to define what we want, what is important to us in this destination” because “there is a lack in long-term thinking, thinking for the general benefit, broad horizons are not seen enough, but rather one’s own benefit”. They also state that the tourism development strategy “needs to be directed towards tourists and the local community, because these two are not connected”. In conclusion, the participants add that “tourism is happening in an uncontrolled way”, “there is a chaos in the city”, and “a lot of positive and favourable

je“, odnosno „pravi smjer razvoja“. Ovdje valja istaknuti kako nijedna promatrana urbana destinacija nema operativni marketinški plan turizma destinacije.

Međutim, osim same formulacije strategije, ključna je njena provedba. Za njenu provedu je u gradovima, koji imaju plan razvoja, zadužena gradska uprava, ali u njoj sudjeluju i ostali dionici, posebno turistička zajednica. Kako navode sudionici fokus-grupa, tijekom izrade strategije provedene su javne rasprave, radionice i fokus-grupe s određenim segmentima lokalnih dionika dok turisti i lokalno stanovništvo nisu bili uključeni u izradu strategije. Istovremeno, u Malome Lošinj u sudionici fokus-grupe navode da su u izradi plana razvoja turizma sudjelovali svi dionici, a posebno lokalno stanovništvo dok se u Rovinju plan razvoja turizma znatno oslanja na strategiju razvoja grada i još nekoliko projekata koji zajedno čine okosnicu prostornog planiranja i investicija. Dionici Malog Lošinja dodatno ističu: „da bi se strategija ostvarila, strategijom se treba baviti konstantno“, odnosno „strategiju treba živjeti, ona je način života“. Sudionici fokus-grupa u svim istraživanim gradovima se slažu da provedbu strategije, osim turističke zajednice, gradske i županijske uprave, treba osigurati destinacijska menadžmentska organizacija (DMO) na razini županije i/ili grada.

Postojanje destinacijske menadžmentske organizacije (DMO) i višedioničke mreže u destinaciji pretpostavka je učinkovitog upravljanja održivim razvojem turizma. Fokus-grupama nastojalo se utvrditi struktura mreža i uloga pojedinih dionika te njihova suradnja i komunikacija (s podrškom informacijsko-komunikacijske tehnologije). U skladu s neprovedenim ciljem Strategije razvoja turizma Republike Hrvatske o preustroju sustava turističkih zajednica u svrhu izgradnje učinkovitog sustava upravljanja turističkom destinacijom (Vlada RH, 2013; Državni ured za reviziju RH, 2016), destinacijska menadžmentska organizacija formal-

things happen thanks to individuals”, therefore “strategies must exist at the national, regional and local levels, and should be interdependent”. Despite the set development plans, focus groups also pointed out that sometimes strategies include unrealistic projects that cannot be implemented and lack “the core of the strategy” or “real development direction”. It should be noted here that none of the observed urban destinations has an operational marketing tourism plan in place.

However, apart from setting the strategy, implementing it is the key factor. City government is in charge in cities that do have a development plan, but other stakeholders, especially tourist boards, are engaged in it as well. According to the focus groups, public discussions, workshops and focus groups with certain segments of local stakeholders were conducted while the strategy was being developed. Yet, the tourists and the local population were not involved in the development of the strategy. At the same time, in Mali Lošinj, a focus group stated that all stakeholders, especially the local population, were engaged in the creation of the tourism development plan, while in Rovinj the tourism development plan relies heavily on the city development strategy and several other projects that jointly form the basis of spatial planning and investment. The participants in Mali Lošinj further emphasized that “in order for a strategy to be realized, it must be tackled constantly”, that is, “it should be lived and it is a way of life”. Focus groups in all researched cities agreed that the implementation of the strategy, apart from the tourist board, city and county governments, should be provided by the Destination Management Organization (DMO) at county and/or city levels.

A destination management organization (DMO) and a multi-stakeholder network in the destination are prerequisites for effective management of sustainable tourism development. The aim of the focus groups was to identify the structure of the networks, the role of individual stakeholders and their coopera-

no ne postoji ni u jednom od promatranih gradova. Upravo navedeno očekuju dionici urbanih destinacija jer postojeći sustav upravljanja očito nije učinkovit, a promjene vide u stvaranju destinacijske menadžmentske organizacije koju će voditi gradska uprava ili turistička zajednica. Grad Mali Lošinj prilagodio se tržišnim uvjetima i stvorio neformalnu destinacijsku menadžmentsku organizaciju s turističkom zajednicom u središtu (necentralizirana) koja usko surađuje s gradskom upravom i svim ostalim relevantnim dionicima destinacije. Sukladno tome, višedionička mreža postoji, nije potpuno formalizirana, a odnosi su uređeni zajedničkim programima i projektima usmjerenim održivom razvoju turizma. Dionici mreže imaju gotovo jednaku ulogu, učinkovito surađuju i komuniciraju dnevno, jer upravo ističu da „bez komunikacije i suradnje ne može funkcionirati destinacija“.

U drugim gradovima turistička zajednica grada u središtu je neformalne mreže dionika koja koordinira rad svih dionika. Ovakvim ustrojem u Rovinju dionici dobro komuniciraju i surađuju, posebno s ključnim dionicima destinacije dok u Splitu i Zadru sudionici fokus-grupa navode kako prema aktualnom ustroju turistička zajednica ne upravlja razvojem turizma grada i ne može sve kontrolirati, a DMO „zahtjeva određenu razinu političke i društvene kulture koju mi nemamo“. Nadalje, na fokus-grupama se navodi da za DMO „treba visoka razina osviještenosti lokalnog stanovništva i razvijen volonterski duh za sudjelovanje u izvršnom tijelu“. Što se tiče mreže dionika, nekakva mreža postoji, ali komunikacija i suradnja je slaba, sve se „rješava na mikrorazini, na temelju osobnih odnosa“. Sudionici jedne fokus-grupe dodatno ističu kako ih „nitko ne doživljava“ i „surađuju jedino kad je neki konkretan problem“. Dakle, „nedostaje suradnje, svaka institucija radi sama za sebe, a trebali bi raditi zajedno“ te „nedostaje međusobne komunikacije da se nešto pokrene“. Istovremeno „postoji problem nesuradnje

tion and communication (with the support of information and communication technology). In accordance with the unrealized objective of the Tourism development strategy of the Republic of Croatia on the restructuring of the tourist board system for the purpose of building an effective tourism destination management system (Government of the Republic of Croatia, 2013; State Audit Office of the Republic of Croatia, 2016), a destination management organization does not formally exist in any of the researched cities. The aforementioned is expected by the stakeholders of urban destinations, since the existing management system is clearly ineffective, and they see potential changes in setting up a destination management organization that is run by a city government or a tourist board. The town of Mali Lošinj adapted to the market conditions and created an informal destination management organization with a non-centralized tourist board that closely cooperates with city government and all other relevant stakeholders. Consequently, the multi-stakeholder network is there, it is not fully formalized, and the relations are governed by joint programs and projects geared to sustainable tourism development. Stakeholders in the network have almost the same role, effectively cooperating and communicating on a daily basis, as they pointed out that “without communication and collaboration the destination cannot operate”.

In other cities, the tourist city board is in the centre of an informal network of stakeholders and coordinates the actions of all stakeholders. Such an organization in Rovinj allowed the stakeholders to develop quality communication and cooperation, especially among the key stakeholders, while in Split and Zadar the focus groups stated that, within the current organization, the tourist board does not manage the development of city tourism and cannot control everything. A DMO primarily “requires a certain level of political and social culture that we do not have,” they claimed. Furthermore, the focus groups stated that the DMO “requires a high

turističke zajednice s ostalim ustanovama“ i „problem kapaciteta uprave jer su koordinacijski poslovi i poslovi strateškog planiranja svedeni na minimum“. Što se tiče višedioničke mreže u gradovima kontinentalne Hrvatske, ona strogo formalno ne postoji. Umrežavanje još traje dok u određenim gradovima postoji jako slaba suradnja i komunikacija. Usprkos tehnološkim dostignućima, podrška informacijsko-komunikacijske tehnologije u svim promatranim urbanim destinacijama ne postoji, iako su vidljivi određeni pomaci i promišljanja o njihovim mogućnostima u složenim upravljačkim procesima. Neke destinacije imaju zajedničku bazu podataka i sustav reklamacija koji služe kao podrška u komunikaciji i suradnji. Također, u svim promatranim gradovima dionici ističu privatna poznanstva potrebna za komunikaciju i suradnju.

U upravljanju destinacijom važnu ulogu ima lokalna vlast. Temeljem rezultata fokus-grupa vidljiv je različit stupanj uključenosti gradske uprave u upravljanje turizmom pojedinih urbanih destinacija. Pri tome se moglo zaključiti kako većinu aktivnosti obavlja turistička zajednica. U kontinentalnim gradovima turizam je dio odjela za gospodarstvo i poduzetništvo ili uopće nije uključen u neki od upravnih odjela gradske uprave. Ipak, na fokus-grupama ističu kako lokalna uprava ne predstavlja ograničenje, no turizam u gradu nema značajnu ulogu. Gradska uprava općenito nije dovoljno uključena u upravljanje destinacijom, što je u skladu s državnim razinom koja je općenito premalo usmjerena na kontinentalni turizam. U gradovima Jadranske Hrvatske niti u jednoj od gradskih uprava turizam nema zasebni samostalni upravni odjel, već je sastavni dio odjela za gospodarstvo, poduzetništvo i obrtništvo. U Malome Lošinj u gradskoj upravi sudjeluje u radu turističke menadžmentske organizacije i usko surađuje sa svim dionicima destinacije, što potvrđuje i činjenica da je gradsko vijeće usvojilo Program razvoja održivog turizma

level of awareness of the local population and a developed spirit of volunteering for participation in the executive body”. As far as the network of stakeholders is concerned, there is a certain type of network in these cities, but communication and cooperation is weak, everything is “resolved on a micro-plane, based on personal relationships”. The interviewees in one focus group further pointed out that “no one minds” them and they “co-operate only when there is a specific problem”. In addition, “there is a lack of cooperation, every institution operates for itself, and they should work together”, and “there is a lack of mutual communication to start something up”. At the same time, “there is a problem of the lack of cooperation between tourist board and other institutions” and “the problem of management capacity, because coordination activities and strategic planning activities are minimized”. In the cities of Continental Croatia the multi-stakeholder network does not exist, in a strictly formal sense. Networking is still ongoing, while in certain cities there is very poor cooperation and communication. Despite the technological achievements, there is no IT support in all the observed urban destinations, although there are some visible shifts and reflections on IT possibilities in complex management processes. Certain destinations have joint databases and complaint systems that to support communication and collaboration. Similarly, in all observed cities, the participants stress the importance of private contacts needed for communication and cooperation.

The local governments have an important role in managing the destinations. Based on the focus groups results, there are different degrees of involvement of the city administration in managing tourism in individual urban destinations. It could be concluded that most activities are carried out by the tourist boards. In continental cities, the responsibility for tourism is left to the departments of economy and entrepreneurship, or tourism does not belong to any of the local administration departments. Still, focus groups

s pripadajućim elementima i pokazateljima razvoja. U Rovinju također smatraju da je gradska uprava usmjerila investicije i infrastrukturne projekte, čime je ostvaren razvoj grada i turizma te postavljen budući smjer razvoja. Međutim, u Splitu i Zadru sudionici fokus-grupa ne dijele ovo mišljenje i smatraju da je grad „zakazao i loše upravlja turističkom ponudom i destinacijom“. Zbog sve većeg priliva turista „Grad malo mari za probleme infrastrukture za prihvata turista“, a „infrastruktura ne prati razvoj turizma“, pri čemu „određeni projekti stoje, u gradu vlada kaos, posebno u prometu“. Osim toga, problem je sustava i zakona (administracija, složenost i sporost sustava) te „se sve na kraju ispolitizira“. U Zadru ističu slične probleme te pridodaju kako se upravni odjel u čijem je djelokrugu turizam treba dodatno ekipirati jer trenutni kapacitet ne pokriva aktualne potrebe turizma u gradu. Istaknuta je i nedovoljna suradnja s ostalim dionicima kao i problem politike. Osim toga, ističe se nedostatak kvalitetnih plaža, pomanjkanje određenih komunalnih usluga (kanalizacija) i infrastrukture te neučinkovita regulacija prometa. Međutim, najviše kritika upućeno je regulaciji otvaranja smještajnih i ugostiteljskih objekata te regulaciji ostalih turističkih aktivnosti i sadržaja koji utječu na kvalitetu turističke ponude grada, a koje su u djelokrugu gradske uprave.

Osim vlasti, za provedbu održivog razvoja turizma važna je uključenost lokalnog stanovništva. Rezultati fokus-grupa ukazuju da u gradovima kontinentalne Hrvatske lokalno stanovništvo nije znatno uključeno u turizam jer turizam nije od općeg interesa pa lokalno stanovništvo u turizmu ne vidi potencijale i mogućnosti gospodarskog razvoja, već je usmjereno na druge djelatnosti. Da bi se lokalno stanovništvo zainteresiralo za turizam, treba se nešto pokrenuti. Sukladno tome, u pojedinim kontinentalnim gradovima sve se više komunicira s građanima koji se po potrebi sve više uključuju u turističke manifestacije. U gradovima Jadranske Hr-

pointed out that the local government did not limit tourism, rather that tourism did not play a significant role in the city. In general, city administrations are insufficiently involved in destination management, which is in line with the state policy whose focus on tourism is generally inadequate. In the Adriatic Croatia cities, there was not a single administration with an independent administrative department of tourism, and tourism is integrated in the department of economy, entrepreneurship and crafts. In Mali Lošinj, the city administration participates in the activities of the destination management organization and closely cooperating with all stakeholders, which is confirmed by the fact that the City Council adopted the Program of sustainable tourism development with the relevant elements and indicators of the development. In Rovinj, they too believe that the city administration's funneling investments into infrastructure projects brought about the development of the city and tourism, and set the future direction of development. However, in Split and Zadar, the focus group participants do not share this opinion and believe that the city "failed in managing the tourist offer and destination". Due to the increasing inflow of tourists "The city does not care too much for the infrastructure problems" and "infrastructure does not follow the development of tourism", where "certain projects are stopped, there is a chaos in the city, particularly in traffic". In addition, the problem is the system and the law (administration, complexity and inertia of the system) and "in the end, everything is politicized". In Zadar, they highlight similar problems and add that the administrative department covering tourism needs to be further equipped, because the current capacity does not cover current tourism needs in the city. A lack of cooperation with other stakeholders was pointed out too, as well as the problem of politics. In addition, the lack of quality beaches, certain utilities (sewage) and infrastructure, as well as of inefficient traffic regulation are underlined. However, most criticism is directed at the regulation of the opening of

vatske lokalno stanovništvo znatnije sudjeluje u upravljanju destinacijom. Ovo je posebice izraženo u Malome Lošinj i Rovinju u kojima lokalno stanovništvo putem ankete i online aplikacije može izraziti svoje stavove i mišljenje, dati svoje prijedloge, podnijeti pritužbe i sl. U Malome Lošinj ovo argumentiraju činjenicom da lokalno stanovništvo mora biti zadovoljno razvojem turizma jer živi za turizam i od turizma. Sudionici fokus-grupa u Zadru ovo potvrđuju navodom da „turizam treba biti u funkciji lokalne zajednice“. U konačnici, u svim je gradovima izražena namjera da se lokalno stanovništvo uključi u turizam, ali je slab odaziv, no valja uzeti u obzir da se prema stupnju razvoja turizma trebaju provoditi drukčiji programi koji se ciljano i svrhovito usmjeravaju lokalnom stanovništvu.

Na učinkovito upravljanje turizmom destinacije utječe i institucionalno okruženje. Na fokus-grupama u kontinentalnim gradovima (Osijeku i Varaždinu) istaknuto je kako je turizam u Kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj zanemaren, sukladno čemu institucionalni uvjeti na razini države nisu povoljni, zbog usmjerenosti na turizam Jadranske Hrvatske. Takva situacija ograničava poduzetnike, investicije i projekte jer nema prave podrške te utječe na lokalnu upravu koja nije dovoljno uključena u turizam grada. Institucionalno ograničenje se također osjeća u postojećem zakonu i organizacijskoj strukturi turističkih zajednica. Ovo navode i u jadranskim gradovima te nadodaju da „zakonska regulativa ograničava u pojedinim turističkim aktivnostima“, a „institucije koče, kao na primjer, u pripremi i nabavi dokumentacije, nema podrške, a imovinsko-pravni odnosi nisu riješeni“ i „svaki problem na kraju završava u sustavu“. U konačnici, dionici jedne fokus-grupe zaključuju kako je „uvijek prisutan utjecaj politike i tuđih interesa“ te da postoje „neusklađeni propisi na nacionalnoj razini“. Neki od uzroka institucionalnih ograničenja mogu se pronaći u neprovedbi ključnih ciljeva Stra-

accommodation and catering facilities as well as the regulation of other tourist activities and content affecting the quality of the city tourist offer, all of which are within the scope of the city administration.

In addition to the authorities, the implementation of sustainable tourism development depends on the involvement of the local population. The focus groups' results indicate that the local populations of the cities in Continental Croatia are not involved in tourism significantly, because it is outside their scope of general interest and they do not see the potentials and opportunities of economic development in tourism but rather focus on other activities. Raising interest in tourism with the local people requires new initiatives. Consequently, in some continental cities increasing communication with the citizens is resulting in their growing involvement in tourist manifestations when necessary. In the cities of Adriatic Croatia, the local population are getting involved in the destination management. This is particularly the case in Mali Lošinj and Rovinj where the local people can use their survey and online applications to express their views and opinions, make suggestions, submit complaints, etc. The authorities in Mali Lošinj explain this by claiming that the local population needs to be content with the development of tourism because they live for tourism and from tourism. The focus group participants in Zadar confirmed this by saying that “tourism should be developed for the local community”. Ultimately, in all cities, there is a clear intention to engage the local population in tourism, but the response is weak. Still, it should be taken into account that different programs in agreement with the degree of tourism development need to be implemented and targeted purposefully at the local population.

Effective tourism destination management is also influenced by the institutional environment. The focus groups in the continental cities (Osijek and Varaždin) highlighted that tourism is neglected in Continental Croatia and that the institutional conditions

tegije razvoja turizma Republike Hrvatske (Vlada RH, 2013; Državni ured za reviziju RH, 2016).

Nedostatak financijskih sredstava jedno je od temeljnih ograničenja u implementaciji koncepta održivog razvoja. To posebno ističu sudionici fokus-grupa u gradovima kontinentalne Hrvatske. Ovo se osjeća u promociji destinacije i investicijama. Međutim, navedeno je posljedica niskog stupnja razvijenosti turizma i uključenosti lokalnog stanovništva u turizam jer turizam nije prioritet. U nekim jadranskim gradovima navode da financijska sredstva nedostaju, no nisu ključni problem dok u Rovinju ističu kako financijska sredstva ne nedostaju. Financijska sredstva ponajviše nedostaju za veće projekte i manifestacije, promociju i *brendiranje* destinacije. Iz svega se moglo zaključiti da su financijska sredstva u promatranim gradovima općenito više vezana uz razvoj turizma nego uz samu implementaciju održivog razvoja u turizmu. No, vjerojatno bi se s većim financijskim sredstvima moglo utjecati na druge elemente razvoja koji bi postupno vodili implementaciji koncepta održivog razvoja turizma.

Za implementaciju koncepta održivog razvoja turizma potrebno je razumijevanje samog koncepta i potencijalnih koristi koje dionici destinacije imaju od toga. Rezultati s fokus-grupa ukazuju na različito razumijevanje i tumačenje koncepta održivog razvoja turizma – sudionici su općenito upoznati s pojmom održivog razvoja turizma, a samo pojedinci razumiju njegova temeljna načela i ciljeve. Postoje razlike u razumijevanju u gradovima kontinentalne u odnosu na Jadransku Hrvatsku, koje proizlaze prije svega iz stupnja razvoja destinacije, odnosno masovnosti turizma koja u Kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj nije prisutna, zbog čega u tim gradovima i ne razmišljaju o održivom razvoju turizma. U tom kontekstu postoje i pogrešna tumačenja koncepta koji se povezuje s pojmom *samoodrživosti* turizma, odnosno s mogućnošću da turizam svojim djelovanjem sam sebe održava. Istovremeno, u nekim ja-

at the state level are not favourable due to the exclusive focus on tourism in Adriatic Croatia. Such a situation restricts entrepreneurs, investments and projects due to the lack of proper support and affects local governments whose involvement in tourism is insufficient. Institutional restrictions are also felt through the existing law and organizational structures of tourist boards. This is also mentioned in the Adriatic cities where focus groups added that “legal regulations limit certain tourist activities” and “institutions hinder, for example, preparing and obtaining documentation, do not provide support, or do not resolve estate planning issues” and that “every problem ends up in the system”. Finally, the participants of one focus group conclude that “influence of politics and other interest groups can always be felt” and that “non-harmonized national regulations” present difficulties. Some of the causes of institutional constraints can be found in the unrealized key objectives of the Croatian tourism development strategy (Government of the Republic of Croatia; 2013, State Audit Office of the Republic of Croatia, 2016).

Lack of financial resources is one of the fundamental constraints in implementing the concept of sustainable development. This fact is particularly emphasized by the focus groups in the cities of Continental Croatia. This is felt in the promotion of destinations and investments. However, the mentioned is the result of the low degree of tourism development and involvement of the local population in tourism, because tourism is not a priority there. In some Adriatic towns the funds seem to be scarce, although that is not the key problem, while in Rovinj they claim that financial resources are not missing. The lack of financial resources is apparent mostly for larger projects and events, promotion, and branding of destinations. All the above-mentioned shows that the financial resources in the observed cities are generally more related to the development of tourism than to the implementation of sustainable tourism development. Howev-

dranskim destinacijama vidljivo je drukčije razumijevanje koncepta, kao nečega što će prije svega doprinijeti kvaliteti života lokalne zajednice, a manje turistima. U Malome Lošinj u potpunosti razumiju i uviđaju koristi implementacije koncepta održivog razvoja turizma jer su ga implementirali temeljem Programa razvoja održivog turizma i trenutno ga provode primjenom 130 različitih pokazatelja.

Osim razumijevanja samog koncepta održivog razvoja turizma, za transformiranje teorijskih postavki koncepta u njegovu praktičnu primjenu i učinkovito upravljanje destinacijom nužna su određena znanja privatnog i javnog sektora. Pri tome je potrebno educirati lokalno stanovništvo o mogućnostima i ograničenjima razvoja turizma, odnosno o utjecaju i mogućim učincima turizma. S toga aspekta sudionici fokus-grupa općenito su ocijenili da određena znanja nedostaju na svim razinama i u različitim područjima, a posebno u strateškom planiranju i provođenju tih planova. Dugoročno gledajući, smatraju da je obrazovanje ključno, posebice po pitanju razvoja i promjena. Istovremeno, postoji problem nedostatka obrazovanog i kvalitetnog kadra, posebice u destinacijama koje teže kvaliteti, a ovaj problem će biti još izraženiji u budućnosti. Sukladno s obrazovnim potrebama provode se različiti programi namijenjeni svim dionicima destinacije, osobito lokalnom stanovništvu i privatnim iznajmljivačima, no odaziv je slab. U fokus-grupama nije se uspjelo utvrditi o kakvim se točno obrazovnim programima radi i koliko se često provode za pojedine skupine dionika.

Pokazatelji održivog razvoja turizma ključni su za upravljanje održivim razvojem destinacije. Međutim, zbog pomanjkanja znanja i praktične primjene koncepta održivog razvoja turizma, ova tema nije pružila potrebne informacije osim u Malom Lošinj. Ipak, kao temeljni pokazatelj održivosti na fokus-grupama se razmatrao kapacitet nosivosti pojedine urbane destinacije. Sukladno

er, probably it would be possible to use more ample financial resources to influence other developmental elements that would gradually lead to the implementation of the concept of sustainable tourism development.

To implement the concept of sustainable tourism development, it is necessary to understand the concept itself as well as its potential benefits for destination stakeholders. Focus groups' results point to a different understanding and interpretation of the concept of sustainable tourism development. Namely, the participants are generally familiar with the notion of sustainable tourism development, but only individuals understand its basic principles and goals. There are also differences in the interpretations between the Continental and Adriatic Croatia, which is primarily due to the degree of development of the destinations, i. e. mass of tourism which lacks in Continental Croatia. Therefore, these cities do not think about the sustainable development of tourism. In this context, there are also misinterpretations of the concept that is related to the term *self-sustainability* of tourism, i. e. the ability to maintain tourism by its own action. At the same time, in some Adriatic destinations, there is a different understanding of the concept, seen as something that will primarily contribute to the quality of life of the local community and less to the tourists. In Mali Lošinj, they fully understand and recognize the benefits of implementing the concept of sustainable tourism development since they implemented it on the basis of the Sustainable Tourism Development Programme and are currently implementing it by using 130 different indicators.

Apart from understanding the very concept of sustainable tourism development, the knowledge of the private and public sectors is necessary for transforming the theoretical concepts of the concept into their practical application and efficient destination management. It is therefore necessary to educate the local population about the possibilities and constraints of tourism development, i. e. the

s nižim stupnjem razvoja turizma, sudionici fokus-grupa u promatranim urbanim destinacijama kontinentalne Hrvatske ne vide opasnost od skorog dosezanja kapaciteta nosivosti destinacije, no postoji ograničenje trenutnim turističkim kapacitetima koji onemogućuju veći intenzitet turizma. Ovakva situacija rezultat je uzročno-posljedične veze – više kapaciteta i sadržaja privuklo bi više turista, odnosno veći broj turista omogućio bi razvoj kapaciteta i ostalih sadržaja. U gradovima Jadranske Hrvatske problem kapaciteta nosivosti destinacije je izraženiji, posebice u Splitu i Zadru koji se nalaze u razvojnoj fazi bez strateškog plana i regulacije razvoja destinacije. U tim je destinacijama broj kreveta i turističkih dolazaka posljednjih godina porastao nekoliko puta približivši se točki zasićenosti. Sudionici fokus-grupa uočavaju sve prisutnije negativne učinke turizma koji se očituju kao devastacija okoliša, infrastruktura neprimjerena razvoju, prometne gužve, porast cijena, gubitak kulturnog identiteta i općenito pad kvalitete života u gradu. Usprkos posjedovanju strategije, u Rovinju su svjesni nedovoljne regulacije povećanja kapaciteta smještaja, ali i nužnosti jer se želi održati trenutačni intenzitet turizma uz povećanje kvalitete. U Malome Lošinjtu također teže podizanju kvalitete, a kapacitet nosivosti destinacije, kao i ostale elemente održivosti destinacije, reguliraju mjere i pokazatelji Programa razvoja održivog turizma destinacije.

Ispitanici na fokus-grupama općenito vide pozitivan utjecaj turizma na njihov grad. Slabiji pozitivan utjecaj vidljiv je u gradovima kontinentalne Hrvatske pa sudionici fokus-grupa kažu kako koristi od turizma ponajviše imaju hotelijeri i restorani, iako vide potencijalni pozitivni utjecaj turizma u povećanju zaposlenosti, razvoju poljoprivrede, većoj potrošnji, plaćanju poreza, promociji grada i njegovoj prepoznatljivosti, više-kulturalnosti i očuvanju kulture. S obzirom na turističku razvijenost i koristi od turizma, u promatranim gradovima Jadranske Hrvat-

impacts and the potential effects of tourism. From this perspective, focus group participants generally assessed that certain awareness is lacking at all levels and in different areas, especially in the strategic planning and implementation of these plans. In the long run they think that education is crucial, especially in terms of development and change. At the same time, there is a lack of qualified quality staff, especially in quality-oriented destinations, which will be even more pronounced in the future. In accordance with the educational needs, various programs are implemented for all stakeholders, especially the local population and private renters, but the response is poor. Focus groups have failed to identify what the educational programs are about and how often they are run for particular groups of stakeholders.

Indicators of sustainable tourism development are the key factors in managing sustainable development of a destination. However, due to the lack of knowledge and practical application of the concept of sustainable tourism development, this topic did not provide the necessary information, with the exception of Mali Lošinj. Nevertheless, as a fundamental indicator of a destination's sustainability, the focus groups analysed the carrying capacity of a particular urban destination. In accordance with the lower degree of tourism development, the focus groups in the observed urban destinations of Continental Croatia do not see the danger of soon reaching their capacity. However, they see in the restrictions on the current tourism capacities an obstacle to intensifying tourism. Such a situation is the result of a causal relationship – larger capacities and more facilities would attract more tourists, i. e. a greater number of tourists would ensure the development of capacities and other facilities. In the Adriatic Croatia cities the capacity problem of the destinations is more pronounced, especially in Split and Zadar, both of which have reached the developmental stage without the strategic plans and the regulation of

ske stavovi o pozitivnom utjecaju turizma su izraženiji. To najbolje ocrtavaju stajališta sudionika fokus-grupa u Malome Lošinj koji kažu: „Turizam je glavni izvor prihoda i omogućuje standard. Standard je ovdje dobar jer su svi na neki način uključeni u turizam. Sve je vezano uz turizam. Da nema turizma, otok ne bi bio uređen.“ U Malome Lošinj također ističu kako turizam omogućuje zaposlenost, a mladi se vraćaju ili ostaju na otoku.

U jadranskim gradovima su zbog razvijenosti turizma negativni učinci turizma izraženiji. Problemi koji se javljaju su sljedeći: rast smještajnih kapaciteta, infrastruktura neprimjerena razvoju turizma, problemi u prometu, nedostatak parkirališta, gužva i buka, zbrinjavanje otpada, različiti socijalni problemi i depopulacija gradskih jezgri, pad kvalitete turističkih i gradskih usluga, porast cijena, devastacija kulturne baštine, nestajanje autentične kulture i kuhinje te određeni problemi s drogom, alkoholom i prostitucijom. Negativne učinke turizma najbolje ocrta kritika izrečena na fokus-grupi u Zadru: „Turizam je jedna od najvećih nesreća koja nam se dogodila. Gdje se pojavljuje turizam, prestaje svaka prava vrijednost.“ U kontinentalnim gradovima negativni učinci turizma nisu uočeni zbog nižeg stupnja razvoja turizma, međutim sudionici uviđaju potrebu očuvanosti i kvalitete prirodnog okoliša kao ključnog resursa razvoja turizma u promatranim gradovima.

Na kraju fokus-grupa sudionici su iskazali viđenje svoje urbane destinacije u budućnosti. Ovaj je aspekt važan jer se veže uz strateško planiranje razvoja, pozicioniranje na turističkom tržištu i razvoj destinacije u okviru toga tržišta. Vizija temeljena na postojećim resursima i potencijalima u svim je destinacijama usmjerena razvoju određenih specifičnih oblika turizma. U gradovima kontinentalne Hrvatske razvoj turizma trebao bi počivati na očuvanom okolišu, uz dominaciju zdravstvenog, sportsko-rekreacijskog, kulturnog i MICE turizma. Sukladno s

the destination development. In these destinations, the number of rented beds and tourist arrivals has increased by several times in the recent years, thus approaching the saturation points. The focus group participants see increasingly negative effects of tourism manifested as environmental devastation, inadequate infrastructure development, traffic jams, higher prices, loss of cultural identity and the overall decline in the quality of city life. Despite the strategy, Rovinj is aware of its insufficient regulation of the increasing accommodation capacity as well as the necessity thereof, since they want to maintain the current intensity of tourism while raising quality. Mali Lošinj also streams to enhancing quality, while the destination carrying capacity and the other elements of the destination sustainability are regulated by the measures and indicators of the Sustainable tourism development program.

Focus group participants generally see positive impacts of tourism on their city. A weaker positive impact is visible in the cities of Continental Croatia, where the focus groups say that the benefits of tourism are mostly felt by hoteliers and restaurants, although they see the potential positive impact of tourism in terms of higher employment rate, agricultural development, higher spending, taxation, city promotion and recognisability, multiculturalism and cultural preservation. With regard to tourism development and tourism benefits, in the observed cities of the Adriatic Croatia the attitudes towards the positive influence of tourism are more pronounced. This is best shown by the viewpoints expressed in the Mali Lošinj focus group: “Tourism is the main source of income and ensures the standard. The standard is good here because everyone is in some way involved in tourism. Everything is related to tourism. If there was no tourism, the island would not be that well ordered”. Mali Lošinj also points out that tourism provides employment, whereupon the young return or stay on the island.

tim razvojem očekuje se povećanje smještajnih kapaciteta i drugih sadržaja te povećanje broja turističkih dolazaka i noćenja. Gradovi Jadranske Hrvatske također žele razvijati određene specifične oblike turizma s ciljem rasterećenja glavne i produljenja ukupne sezone. I u ovim gradovima ističu razvoj zdravstvenog, sportsko-rekreacijskog, kulturnog i MICE turizma. Mali Lošinj i Rovinj već su usmjerili svoj razvoj i uz tendenciju podizanja kvalitete tim smjerom žele nastaviti. Split i Zadar još se uvijek pronalaze u procesu razvoja, iako znaju da im je za podizanje kvalitete i razvoj specifičnih oblika turizma potreban kvalitetan hotelski smještaj. Ovo je posebno vidljivo s obzirom na priželjkivanu promjenu strukture smještajnih kapaciteta s naglaskom na hotele više kategorije te stvaranje imidža i marke čime bi bili prepoznatljivi i drukčiji na turističkom tržištu. Ovdje valja spomenuti da sudionicima fokus-grupa sam grad ne predstavlja destinaciju, već je destinacija grad sa širom okolicom, grad i županija te grad i regija. Ovakva percepcija je pozitivna, ne samo zbog trendova u turizmu, mogućnosti produljenja sezone i ostvarenja svih funkcija turizma povezivanjem grada sa širom okolicom ili regijom, već je ovakvim promišljanjem, a posebice u smjeru razvoja specifičnih oblika turizma moguće rasteretiti zagušene gradske jezgre većine promatranih gradova i smanjiti negativne učine turizma u gradovima.

6. ZAKLJUČAK

Rezultati istraživanja ukazuju na složenost turizma i učinaka koje ostvaruje, ali i na prisutnost problema implementacije koncepta održivog razvoja turizma u turističkim destinacijama. Može se zaključiti da na implementaciju koncepta utječu različiti čimbenici, a temeljna ograničenja proizlaze prije svega iz nepovoljnog institucionalnog okruženja te nepostojanja i neprovedbe strateškog plana razvoja turizma na nacionalnoj, regionalnoj i lokalnoj razini. Učinkovitost proved-

On the other hand, the negative effects of tourism due to its development are more pronounced in the Adriatic cities. The problems are following: increase in the number of accommodation capacities, inadequate tourism development infrastructure, traffic problems, lack of parking facilities, noise and crowd, waste disposal, various social problems and urban cores depopulation, poor quality of tourism and city services, higher prices, devastation of cultural heritage, the disappearance of the authentic culture and cuisine, and certain issues related to drugs, alcohol and prostitution. The negative effects of tourism are best identified in the critique expressed at the Zadar focus group: "Tourism is one of the greatest misfortunes that happened to us. Where tourism occurs, every true value ceases". In the continental cities, the negative effects of tourism have not been observed due to the lower degree of tourism development, but the participants do recognize the need for preserving the quality of the natural environment as a key resource for the tourism development of the observed cities.

At the end, the focus group participants expressed their visions of their urban destinations in the future. This aspect is important because it is linked to the strategic planning of development, the positioning in the tourism market and the destination development within the framework of that market. The vision based on the existing resources and potentials in all destinations is geared towards the development of certain specific forms of tourism. In the cities of Continental Croatia, tourism development should be based on the preservation of the environment, along with medical, sport and recreational, cultural and MICE tourism. In line with this development, an increase in accommodation capacities and other facilities is expected, as well as an increase in the number of tourist arrivals and overnight stays. The cities of the Adriatic Croatia also aspire to develop certain specific forms of tourism with the aim of relieving the top season and extending

be strategije, ali i razvoja turizma općenito ovisi o uključenosti svih dionika destinacije, a posebice vlasti kao nositelja društveno-gospodarskog razvoja i lokalne zajednice kao krajnjeg korisnika. U tom procesu nije poželjno uplitanje politike. Neučinkovitost turističkog sustava dodatno je ograničenje uz koje se veže nepostojanje učinkovite višedioničke mreže te nedostatak komunikacije, suradnje i razumijevanja među dionicima destinacije nužnih u složenom i heterogenom turističkom okruženju. Za implementaciju koncepta održivog razvoja turizma potrebno je razumijevanje samog koncepta i potencijalnih koristi koje dionici destinacije imaju od toga. Uz to su potrebna različita znanja na svim razinama, a posebice ona vezana uz formulaciju i provedbu razvojnih planova. Neizostavan dio razvojnih planova turizma svakako su pokazatelji njegovog održivog razvoja, stoga razumijevanje i primjena pokazatelja predstavlja ključan aspekt praćenja, mjerenja i usmjeravanja razvoja. Međutim, usprkos različitim metodologijama i sustavima pokazatelja održivog razvoja turizma, još uvijek izostaju kontinuirani i cjeloviti podaci za njihov izračun.

Navedeni problemi implementacije prisutni su u Hrvatskoj te ukazuju na mogućnosti i ograničenja turizma promatranih urbanih destinacija i hrvatskoga turizma općenito. U Hrvatskoj je vidljiva razlika u turističkoj razvijenosti gradova kontinentalne i Jadranske Hrvatske, prema kojoj kontinentalni gradovi znatno zaostaju i nalaze se u fazi uključivanja u turističko tržište. Sukladno s time, u tim gradovima ne postoje negativni učinci turizma, ali ni promišljanje o održivom razvoju turizma, već samo o razvoju turizma. Jadranski gradovi Split i Zadar nalaze se u fazi razvoja te su u njima prisutni ozbiljni negativni učinci turizma. Gradovi Mali Lošinj i Rovinj se nalaze u području kretanja između kritičnih točki kapaciteta nosivosti destinacije, a u tim destinacijama prisutan je proces planiranja i regulacije turističkih aktivnosti, pri čemu je Mali Lošinj implementacijom koncepta održivog razvoja

the overall season. Furthermore, these cities highlight the opportunities for developing medical, sports and recreational, cultural and MICE tourism. Mali Lošinj and Rovinj have already streamlined their development and they want to continue in this direction with tendency towards quality building. Split and Zadar are still in the process of development, although they know that quality hotel accommodations are needed to raise quality and develop specific forms of tourism. This is particularly noticeable with regard to the desired change in the structure of accommodation capacities, with the emphasis on hotels of higher categories, and the creation of images and brands that would make them recognizable and different on the tourism market. It should be noted here that for the focus groups the city itself does not present a destination, rather the destination is the city with the surrounding area, city and county, city and region. This perception is positive not only because of tourism trends, the possibility of extending the season and realising all roles of tourism by linking the city with the surrounding area or region, but rather it can relieve the congested city nuclei and thus reduce the negative effects of tourism – especially in terms of developing specific forms of tourism.

6. CONCLUSION

The results of the research indicate the complexity of tourism and its effects, as well as the presence of the problem of implementing the concept of sustainable tourism development in tourism destinations. It can be concluded that the implementation of the concept is influenced by various factors, and the fundamental constraints stem primarily from the unfavourable institutional environment as well as the absence and/or failure of a strategic plan for tourism development at the national, regional and local levels. The effectiveness of implementing the strategy and developing tourism generally depends on the involvement of all stakeholders, and in particular on the authorities as the bearers

ušao u fazu pomlađivanja destinacije. Može se zaključiti kako, osim u Malome Lošinj, promatrani gradovi još uvijek nisu dosegнули stupanj svijesti i turističkog razvoja potreban za implementaciju načela i ciljeva održivog razvoja. Zbog razvijenosti i masovnosti turizma u pojedinim gradovima, Mali Lošinj može poslužiti drugim urbanim destinacijama kao dobar primjer upravljanja turizmom, posebice što sve promatrane urbane destinacije svoju viziju razvoja temelje na očuvanom i kvalitetnom okolišu te kulturno-povijesnoj i prirodnoj baštini. Međutim, iako Mali Lošinj predstavlja iznimku, u Hrvatskoj je nužno urediti turistički i društveno-gospodarski sustav s jedinstvenim kriterijima za mjerenje i praćenje razvoja turizma koji će omogućiti njegov održivi razvoj.

of socio-economic development, as well as on the local communities as the end users. In this process the interference of politics is not desired. The inefficiency of the tourist system is an additional constraint linked to the absence of an effective multi-stakeholder network and the lack of communication, cooperation and understanding among the stakeholders of the complex and heterogeneous tourist environment. To implement the concept of sustainable tourism development, it is necessary to understand the concept itself and its potential benefits for the destination stakeholders. In addition, various knowledge at all levels is needed, especially the knowledge related to the formulation and implementation of development plans. An indispensable part of the development plans of tourism are certainly indicators of its sustainable development, thus the understanding and application of the indicators present a key aspect in monitoring, measuring and directing the development. However, in spite of the various methodologies and systems of indicators of sustainable tourism development, there is still a lack of continuous and complete data for their calculation.

The mentioned implementation issues are present in Croatia and point to the possibilities and constraints of tourism in the observed urban destinations and Croatia's tourism in general. There is a distinct difference in the tourism development of the cities of Continental and Adriatic Croatia, which points to significantly lagging behind by the continental cities whose stage is described as the inclusion in the tourism market. Consequently, there are no comments on the negative effects of tourism in these cities, nor are there any reflections on the sustainable development of tourism. There is only the development of tourism. Adriatic cities of Zadar and Split, the cities that are in the development phase and experience serious negative effects of tourism. The cities of Mali Lošinj and Rovinj move between the critical points of their carrying capacities, and in these destinations there is a process of planning and

LITERATURA - REFERENCES

- Andereck, K. L. (2009). Tourists' perceptions of environmentally responsible innovations at tourism businesses. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 17. No. 4. pp. 489-499. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580802495790>
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., Vogt, C. A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 32. No. 4. pp. 1056-1076. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2005.03.001>
- Ashworth, G. J. (1989). Urban tourism: an imbalance in attention. In Cooper, C. (Eds.). *Progress in tourism, recreation and hospitality management*. Vol. 1. pp. 33-54. London: Belhaven.
- Ashworth, G. J. (2003). Urban tourism: still an imbalance in attention?. In Cooper, C. (Eds.). *Classic reviews in tourism*. pp. 143-163. Clevedon: Channel View.
- Ashworth, G., Page, S. J. (2011). Urban tourism research: Recent progress and current paradoxes. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 32. pp. 1-15. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.02.002>
- Barrutia, J. M., Echebarria, C. (2015). Factors affecting the attitude of tourism-destination local authorities towards sustainable planning tools in a networking context: the Balearic Sustainability Network. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 23. No. 2. pp. 207-233. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2014.934375>
- Begum, H., Alamb, F., Sahazalia, N. (2014). Tourist's perceptions towards the role of stakeholders in sustainable tourism. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Vol. 144. pp. 313-321. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.301>
- Ben-Dalia, S., Collins-Kreiner, N., Churchman, A. (2013). Evaluation of an Urban Tourism Destination. *Tourism Geographies*. Vol. 15. No. 2. pp. 233-249. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2011.647329>
- Blank, U., Petkovich, M. (1987). Research on urban tourism destinations. In Ritchie, J. R. B., Goeldner, C. R. (Eds.). *Travel, Tourism and Hospitality research: A Handbook for Managers*. pp. 165-177. New York: Wiley.
- Blažević, B., Peršić, M. (Eds.) (2009). *Turistička regionalizacija u globalnim procesima*. Opatija: Fakultet za turistički i hotelski menadžment Opatija, Sveučilište u Rijeci.
- Bornhorst, T., Brent Ritchie, J. R., Sheehan, L. (2010). Determinants of tourism success for DMOs & destinations: An empirical examination of stakeholders' perspectives. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 31. pp. 572-589. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.06.008>
- Bramwell, B. (2011). Governance, the state and sustainable tourism: a political economy approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 19. No. 4-5. pp. 459-477.

regulation of tourist activities, while Mali Lošinj implemented the concept of sustainable development to enter the rejuvenation phase. It can be concluded that, apart from Mali Lošinj, the observed cities have not yet reached the levels of awareness of the tourism development needed to implement the principles and objectives of sustainable development. Due to the development and mass tourism in certain cities, Mali Lošinj can serve as an example of good tourism management for other urban destinations, especially since all observed urban destinations have their visions of development based on the preserved and high quality environment and cultural, historical and natural heritage. However, although Mali Lošinj is an exception, it is necessary to regulate the tourism and socio-economic system in Croatia by adopting unique criteria for measuring and monitoring the development of tourism that will enable its sustainable development.

- DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.576765>
- Bramwell, B., Lane, B. (1993). Sustainable tourism: An evolving global approach?. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 1. No.1. pp. 1-5. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669589309450696>
- Bramwell, B., Lane, B. (2010). Sustainable tourism and the evolving roles of government planning. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 18. No. 1. pp. 1-5. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580903338790>
- Bramwell, B., Lane, B. (2011). Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 19. No. 4-5. pp. 411-421. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.580586>
- Buhalis, D. (2000). Marketing the competitive destination of the future. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 21. pp. 97-116. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(99\)00095-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(99)00095-3)
- Burns, P. (2008). Tourism, political discourse and post-colonialism. *Tourism and Hospitality: Planning & Development*. Vol. 6. No. 1. pp. 61-73. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790530801936502>
- Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer*. Vol. 24. No. 1. pp. 5-12. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0064.1980.tb00970.x>
- Butler, R. W. (1999). Sustainable tourism: A state-of-the-art review. *Tourism Geographies*. Vol. 1. No. 1. pp. 7-25. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616689908721291>
- Byrd, E. T. (2007). Stakeholders in sustainable tourism development and their roles: applying stakeholder theory to sustainable tourism development. *Tourism Review*. Vol. 62. No. 2. pp. 6-13. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/16605370780000309>
- Byrd, E. T., Cárdenas, D. A., Greenwood, J. B. (2008). Factors of stakeholder understanding of tourism: The case of Eastern North Carolina. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*. Vol. 8. No. 3. pp. 192-204. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/thr.2008.21>
- Byrd, E. T., Bosley, H. E., Dronberger, M. G. (2009a). Comparison of stakeholder perceptions of tourism impact in rural eastern North Carolina. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 30. No. 5. pp. 693-703. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.10.021>
- Byrd, E. T., Cardenas, D. A., Dregalla, S. E. (2009b). Differences in Stakeholder Attitudes of Tourism development and the natural Environment. *The University of North Carolina e-Review of Tourism Research (eRTR)*. Vol. 7. No. 2. pp. 39-51.
- Choi, H. C., Sirakaya, E. (2006). Sustainability indicators for managing community tourism. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 27. No. 6. pp. 1274-1289. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.05.018>
- Choi, H. C., Murray, I. (2010). Resident attitudes toward sustainable community tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 18. No. 4. pp. 575-594. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580903524852>
- Cooper, C., Scott, N., Baggio, R. (2009). Network Position and Perceptions of Destination Stakeholder Importance. *Anatolia*. Vol. 20. No. 1. pp. 33-45. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2009.10518893>
- d'Angella, F. (2007). Destination management and stakeholders' collaboration in urban destinations. In *XVI Simposio Internacional de Turismo y Ocio*. <http://www.esade.edu/cedit2007/pdfs/papers/pdf18.pdf> [pristupljeno 15/06/2016]
- Dredge, D., Jamal, T. (2015). Progress in tourism planning and policy: A post-structural perspective on knowledge production. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 51. pp. 285-297. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.06.002>
- Drexhage, J., Murphy, D. (prepared) (2010). *Sustainable development: from Brundt-*

- land to Rio 2012*. International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) za UN, New York: UN.
- Državni ured za reviziju Republike Hrvatske (2016). *Izvjешće o obavljenoj reviziji učinkovitosti: Provedba mjera utvrđenih strategijom razvoja turizma Republike Hrvatske do 2020*. http://www.revizija.hr/datastore/filestore/81/provedba_mjera_utvrđenih_strategijom_razvoja_turizma_rh_do_2020.pdf [pristupljeno 26/09/2016]
- Dwyer, L., Edwards, D., Mistilis, N., Roman, C., Scott, N. (2009). Destination and enterprise management for a tourism future. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 30. pp. 63-74. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.04.002>
- DZS, Državni zavod za statistiku (2015a). *Statistički ljetopis Republike Hrvatske 2015., god. 47*. http://www.dzs.hr/Hrv_Eng/ljetopis/2015/sljh2015.pdf [pristupljeno 01/07/2016]
- DZS, Državni zavod za statistiku (2015b). *Statistička izvješća – Turizam u 2014, broj 1539*. http://www.dzs.hr/Hrv_Eng/publication/2015/SI-1539.pdf [pristupljeno 15/12/2016]
- DZS, Državni zavod za statistiku (2016). *Dolasci i noćenja turista u 2015*. Priopćenje, godina LII, br. 4.3.2.. http://www.mint.hr/UserDocsImages/160209_Dolasci_nocenja_2015.pdf [pristupljeno 01/07/2016]
- Edwards, D., Griffin, T., Hayllar, B. (2008). Urban tourism research: developing an agenda. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 25. No. 4. pp. 1032-1052. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2008.09.002>
- European Commission (2000). *Towards quality urban tourism. Integrated quality management (IQM) of urban tourist destinations*. Brussels: European Commission.
- European Commission (2013a). *European Tourism Indicator System toolkit for Sustainable Destinations*. DG Enterprise and Industry. <https://www.surrey.ac.uk/shtm/Files/ETIS%20TOOLKIT.pdf> [pristupljeno 22/01/2016]
- European Commission (2013b). *European Tourism Indicator System Detailed Indicator Reference Sheets for Sustainable Destinations*. DG Enterprise and Industry. <https://www.surrey.ac.uk/shtm/Files/ETIS%20Toolkit%20Detailed%20Indicator%20Reference%20Sheets.pdf> [pristupljeno 22/01/2016]
- Eurostat (2006a). *Methodological work on measuring the sustainable development of tourism, Part 1: Technical Report*. Working papers and studies. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3888793/5834113/KS-DE-06-001-EN.PDF/d1c8aa01-74c0-4741-8c0e-59de-5974fa57> [pristupljeno 22/01/2016]
- Eurostat (2006b). *Methodological work on measuring the sustainable development of tourism, Part 2: Manual on sustainable development indicators of tourism*. Working papers and studies. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3888793/5834249/KS-DE-06-002-EN.PDF/178f8c9a-4a03-409c-b020-70ff7ef6803a> [pristupljeno 22/01/2016]
- Gössling, S., Scott, D. (2012). Scenario planning for sustainable tourism: an introduction. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 20. No. 6. pp. 773-778. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2012.699064>
- GSTC, Global Sustainable Tourism Council (2013). *Global Sustainable Tourism Council Criteria for Destinations: Suggested Performance Indicators*. GSTC.
- Hall, C. M. (2009). Degrowing Tourism: Décroissance, Sustainable Consumption and Steady-State Tourism. *Anatolia*. Vol. 20. No. 1. pp. 46-61. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2009.10518894>

- Hall, C. M. (2010). Changing Paradigms and Global Change: From Sustainable to Steady-state Tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*. Vol. 35. No. 2. pp. 131-143. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2010.11081629>
- Hall, C. M. (2011). Policy learning and policy failure in sustainable tourism governance: from first-and second-order to third-order change?. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 19. No. 4-5. pp. 649-671. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.555555>
- Hall, C. M., Jenkins, J. M. (1995). *Tourism and public policy*. London: Routledge.
- Hardy, A. L., Beeton, R. J. S. (2001). Sustainable tourism or maintainable tourism: Managing resources for more than average outcomes. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 9. No. 3. pp. 168-192. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580108667397>
- Hardy, A. L., Beeton, R. J. S., Pearson, L. (2002). Sustainable Tourism: An Overview of the Concept and its Position in Relation to Conceptualisations of Tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 10. No. 6. pp. 475-496. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580108667397>
- HGK, Hrvatska gospodarska komora (2015). *Kohezijska politika Europske unije i Hrvatska 2014.-2020. Vodič kroz strateški okvir i pregled mogućnosti financiranja*. <https://izvoz.gov.hr/UserDocsImages/dokumenti/Kohezijska%20politika%20EU%20i%20Hrvatska%202014.-2020..pdf> [pristupljeno 01/07/2016]
- Ismail, H., Baum, T. (2006). Urban Tourism in Developing Countries: in the Case of Melaka (Malacca) City, Malaysia. *Anatolia*. Vol. 17. No. 2. pp. 211-233. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2006.9687187>
- ITB (2014). *ITB World Travel Trends Report 2014/2015*. Berlin: Messe Berlin. http://www.itb-berlin.de/media/itb/itb_dl_de/itb_itb_berlin/itb_itb_academy/ITB_2015_WTTR_Report_A4_4.pdf [pristupljeno 12/12/2015]
- Ko, T. G. (2005). Development of a tourism sustainability assessment procedure: A conceptual approach. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 26. No. 3. pp. 431-445. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2003.12.003>
- Koutsouris, A. (2009). Social learning and sustainability tourism development; local quality conventions in tourism: A Greek case study. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 17. No. 5. pp. 567-581. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580902855810>
- Krajinović, V. (2015). Challenging the key issues in measuring sustainable tourism development. *Acta Turistica*. Vol 27. No 1. pp. 63-91.
- Kumar, S., Kusakabe, K., Shrestha, P. et al. (2016). *Sustainable urban tourism through low-carbon initiatives: Experiences from Hue and Chiang Mai*. Asian Institute of Technology.
- Law, M. C. (2002). *Urban Tourism – The Visitor Economy and the Growth of Large Cities*. Second Edition. London-New York: Continuum.
- Liu, Z. (2003). Sustainable Tourism Development: A Critique. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 11. No. 6. pp. 459-475. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580308667216>
- Liu, A., Wall, G. (2006). Planning tourism employment: a developing country perspective. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 27. pp. 159-170. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.08.004>
- Manning, E. W., Dougherty, D. T. (2000). Planning Sustainable Tourism Destinations. *Tourism Recreation Research*. Vol. 25. No. 2. pp. 3-14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2000.11014907>
- Maxim, C. (2015). Drivers of Success in Implementing Sustainable Tourism Policies in Urban Areas. *Tourism Planning & Development*. Vol. 12. No. 1. pp. 37-47.

- DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2014.960599>
- Maxim, C. (2016). Sustainable tourism implementation in urban areas: a case study of London. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 24. No. 7. pp. 971-989. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2015.1115511>
- McCool, S. F., Butler, R., Buckley, R., Weaver, D., Wheeler, B. (2013). Is Concept of Sustainability Utopian: Ideally Perfect but Impracticable?. *Tourism Recreation Research*. Vol. 38. No. 2. pp. 213-242. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2013.11081746>
- McDonald, J. R. (2009). Complexity science: An alternative worldview for understanding sustainable tourism development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 17. No. 4. pp. 455-471. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580802495709>
- McKercher, B. (2003). *Sustainable tourism development: Guiding principles for planning and management*. Presentation to the National Seminar on Sustainable tourism Development, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, November 5-9, 2003. <http://www.estig.ipbeja.pt/~aibpr/Ensino/EngDesenvTur/MaterialdeApoio/Grupo2/Guiding-Principles.pdf> [pristupljeno 25/04/2014]
- Miller, G., Rathouse, K., Scarles, C., Holmes, K., Tribe, J. (2010). Public understanding of sustainable tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 37. No. 3. pp. 627-645. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2009.12.002>
- Miller, D., Merrilees, B., Coghlan, A. (2015). Sustainable urban tourism: understanding and developing visitor pro-environmental behaviours. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 23. No. 1. pp. 26-46. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2014.912219>
- Ming, J. L., Qiu, H., Goh, C., Wang, D. (2016). An Analysis of Tourism Development in China from Urbanization Perspective. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*. Vol. 17. No. 1. pp. 24-44. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1528008X.2015.1016594>
- Ministarstvo turizma RH (2014). *Turizam u brojkama 2013*. Zagreb: Ministarstvo turizma RH.
- Ministarstvo turizma RH (2015). *Turizam u brojkama 2014*. Zagreb: Ministarstvo turizma RH.
- Ministarstvo turizma RH (2016). *Turizam u brojkama 2015*. Zagreb: Ministarstvo turizma RH.
- Ministarstvo uprave RH (2016). <https://uprava.gov.hr/o-ministarstvu/ustrojstvo/uprava-za-politicki-sustav-drzavnu-upravu-te-lokalnu-i-podrucnu-regionalnu-samoupravu/lokalna-i-podrucna-regionalna-samouprava/popis-zupanija-gradova-i-opcina/846> [pristupljeno 01/06/2016]
- Mullins, P. (1991). Tourism urbanization. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. Vol. 15. No. 3. pp. 326-42. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.1991.tb00642.x>
- Nunkoo, R., Ramkissoon, H. (2010). Small island urban tourism: a residents' perspective. *Current Issues in Tourism*. Vol. 13. No. 1. pp. 37-60. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500802499414>
- Page, S. J. (1995). *Urban tourism*. London: Routledge.
- Page, S. J., Hall, C. M. (2003). *Managing urban tourism*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.
- Page, S. J., Thorn, K. J. (1997). Towards Sustainable Tourism Planning in New Zealand: Public Sector Planning Responses. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 5. No. 1. pp. 59-77. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669589708667276>
- Pakdeepinit, P. (2007). *A model of sustainable tourism development in Kwan Phayao Lake Rim Communities, Phayao Province, Upper Northern Thailand*. Doctoral thesis. Silpakorn University.

- PAP/RAC, Priority Actions Programme, in framework of Regional Activity Centre Mediterranean Action Plan (2004). *Guidelines for Urban Regeneration in the Mediterranean Region*. <http://www.pap-the-coastcentre.org/pdfs/Urban%20Regeneration.pdf> [pristupljeno 25/01/2017]
- Phillips, P., Moutinho, L. (2014). Critical review of strategic planning research in hospitality and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 48. pp. 96-120. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.05.013>
- Ruhanen, L. (2008). Progressing the Sustainability Debate: A Knowledge Management Approach to Sustainable Tourism Planning. *Current Issues in Tourism*. Vol. 11. No. 5. pp. 429-455. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500802316030>
- Ruhanen, L. (2009). Stakeholder Participation in Tourism Destination Planning Another Case of Missing the Point?. *Tourism Recreation Research*. Vol. 34. No. 3. pp. 283-294. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2009.11081603>
- Ruhanen, L. (2012). Strategic visioning: Integrating sustainable development principles in tourism destination planning. *Acta Turistica*. Vol. 24. No 2. pp. 149-176.
- Ruhanen, L. (2013). Local government: facilitator or inhibitor of sustainable tourism development?. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 21. No.1. pp. 80-98. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2012.680463>
- Ruhanen, L., Weiler, B., Moyle B. D., McLennan, C. J. (2015). Trends and patterns in sustainable tourism research: a 25-year bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 23. No. 4. pp. 517-535. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2014.978790>
- Scott, N., Cooper, C. (2010). Innovation for sustainable urban tourism: some thoughts on best practice. *Revista de Administração Pública – RAP*. Vol. 44. No. 5. pp. 1171-1190. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-76122010000500008>
- Sharpley, R. (2000). Tourism and Sustainable Development: Exploring the Theoretical Divide. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 8. No. 1. pp. 1-19. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580008667346>
- Sharpley, R. (2009). *Tourism Development and the Environment: Beyond Sustainability?*. London, New York: Earthscan.
- Spirou, C. (2011). *Urban Tourism and Urban Change: Cities in a Global Economy*. New York: Routledge.
- Timur, S., Getz, D. (2008). A network perspective on managing stakeholders for sustainable urban tourism. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. Vol. 20. No. 4. pp. 445-461. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110810873543>
- TSG, Tourism Sustainability Group (2007). *Action for More Sustainable European Tourism*. Bruxelles, Luxembourg: Tourism Sustainability Group. http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/_getdocument.cfm?doc_id=237 [pristupljeno 22/01/2016]
- UN, United Nations (2002). *Report of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg; Rio +10*. http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/documents/131302_wssd_report_reissued.pdf [pristupljeno 04/11/2015]
- UNDESA, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (1999). *Tourism and Sustainable Development – Sustainable Tourism: A Local Authority Perspective. Background Paper 3, Commission on Sustainable Development Seventh Session*. <http://www.gdrc.org/uem/eco-tour/tourism-sustdev.pdf> [pristupljeno 26/11/2015]
- UNSD, United Nations Division for Sustainable Development (1992). *Agenda 21*. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/>

- content/documents/Agenda21.pdf [pristupljeno 03/01/2015]
- UNEP, ICLEI, United Nations Environmental Programme, International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (2003). *Tourism and Local Agenda 21: The Role of Local Authorities in Sustainable Tourism*. <http://www.unep.fr/shared/publications/pdf/3207-TourismAgenda.pdf> [pristupljeno 26/11/2015]
- UNEP, UNWTO, United Nations Environmental Programme, World Tourism Organization (2005). *Making tourism more sustainable: A Guide for Policy Makers*. Paris: United Nations Environmental Programme.
- UNWTO, United Nations World Tourism Organization (1994). *National and Regional Tourism Planning: Methodologies and Case Studies*. Madrid: UNWTO.
- UNWTO, United Nations World Tourism Organization (1996). *What Tourism Managers Need to Know: A Practical Guide to the Development and Use of Indicators of Sustainable Tourism*. Madrid: UNWTO.
- UNWTO, United Nations World Tourism Organization (1998). *Guide for Local Authorities on Developing Sustainable Tourism*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
- UNWTO, United Nations World Tourism Organization (2000). *Sustainable Development of Tourism: A Compilation of Good Practices*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
- UNWTO, United Nations World Tourism Organization (2004). *Indicators of Sustainable Development for Tourism Destinations: A Guidebook*. Madrid: UNWTO.
- UNWTO, United Nations World Tourism Organization (2007). *A Practical Guide to Tourism Destination Management*. https://pub.unwto.org/WebRoot/Store/Shops/Info-shop/4745/8BCE/AD9A/ECA8/048B/C0A8/0164/0B7A/071115_practical_guide_destination_management_excerpt.pdf [pristupljeno 26/11/2015]
- UNWTO, United Nations World Tourism Organization (2011). *Policy and practice for global tourism*. http://pub.unwto.org/WebRoot/Store/Shops/Info-shop/4D93/3C61/DDD2/4F6C/8E4C/C0A8/0164/5C4F/110330_policy_practice_global_tourism_excerpt.pdf [pristupljeno 15/11/2015]
- UNWTO, United Nations World Tourism Organization (2013). *Sustainable Tourism for Development Guidebook: Enhancing capacities for Sustainable Tourism for development in developing countries*. <http://dtxqtq4w60xqpw.cloudfront.net/sites/all/files/docpdf/devcoengfinal.pdf> [pristupljeno 26/11/2015]
- UNWTOSTD, United Nations World Tourism Organization, Sustainable development of Tourism (2015). <http://sdt.unwto.org/content/about-us-5> [pristupljeno 25/11/2015]
- Vujić, V. (Eds.) (2003). *Održivi razvoj turizma – problemi i perspektive*. Opatija: Fakultet za turistički i hotelski menadžment Opatija, Sveučilište u Rijeci.
- Vukonić, R. (2001). *Turizam i razvoj*. Zagreb: Mikrorad.
- Waligo, V. M., Clarke, J., Hawkins, R. (2013). Implementing sustainable tourism: A multi-stakeholder involvement management framework. *Tourism management*. Vol. 36. pp. 342-353. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.10.008>
- Waligo, V. M., Clarke, J., Hawkins, R. (2014). The 'Leadership–Stakeholder Involvement Capacity' nexus in stakeholder management. *Journal of Business Research*. Vol. 67. No. 7. pp. 1342-1352. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.08.019>
- WCED, United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development (1987). *Our Common Future*. <http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf> [pristupljeno 21/11/2015]

- Weaver, D. B. (2006). *Sustainable tourism: theory and practice*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Weaver, D. B., Lawton, L. J. (1999). *Sustainable tourism: A critical analysis*. Cooperative Research Centre for Sustainable Tourism Research report series.
- Weaver, D. B., Lawton, L. J. (2001). Resident perceptions in the urban-rural fringe. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 28. No. 2. pp. 439-458. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(00\)00052-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(00)00052-9)
- Wesley, A., Pforr, C. (2010). The governance of coastal tourism: unravelling the layers of complexity at Smiths Beach, Western Australia. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 18. No. 6. pp. 773-792. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669581003721273>
- Wheeller, B. (1993). Sustaining the ego. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 1. pp. 121-129. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669589309450710>
- Vlada RH (2013). *Strategija razvoja turizma Republike Hrvatske do 2020. godine*. Zagreb: Vlada RH. <http://www.mint.hr/UserDocsImages/Strategija-turizam-2020-editfinal.pdf> [pristupljeno 25/09/2016]
- World Charter for Sustainable Tourism +20, (2015). *Charter for Sustainable Tourism 1995*. <http://sustainabletourismcharter2015.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/CharterForSustainable-Tourism.pdf> [pristupljeno 30/11/2015]
- Wray, M. (2011). Adopting and implementing a transactive approach to sustainable tourism planning: translating theory into practice. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 19. No. 4-5. pp. 605-627. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.566928>
- WTTC, UNWTO, EC, 1996. World Travel and Tourism Council, United Nations World Tourism Organization, Earth Council (1996). *Agenda 21 for the Travel and Tourism Industry: Towards Environmentally Sustainable Development*. London: WTTC, UNWTO and EC.
- Yüzbaşıoğlu, N., Topsakalb, Y., Çelikk, P. (2014). Roles of tourism enterprises on destination sustainability: case of Antalya, Turkey. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Vol. 150. pp. 968-976. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.109>
- Zhang, C., Xiao, H., Gursoy, D., Rao, Y. (2015). Tacit knowledge spillover and sustainability in destination development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 23. No. 7. pp. 1029-1048. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2015.1032299>

Primljeno: 14. ožujka 2018. /

Submitted: 14 March 2018

Prihvaćeno: 28. svibnja 2018. /

Accepted: 28 May 2018

