

Vanja KRAJINOVIĆ\*

**MJERENJE ODRŽIVOSTI TURIZMA:  
JESMO LI NA PRAVOM PUTU?****MEASURING TOURISM SUSTAINABILITY:  
ARE WE ON THE RIGHT TRACK?**

---

**SAŽETAK:** Prilikom implementacije koncepta održivog razvoja turizma u razvojne politike i planove destinacija javljaju se brojni izazovi. Takva situacija dijelom je rezultat nedovoljnog razumijevanja potencijala i ograničenja koncepta, čime postaje još teže mjeriti dostignutu razinu održivosti u destinacijama. Cilj je ovog rada provesti sveobuhvatnu analizu potencijalnih modela za mjerenje održivog razvoja turizma. Rezultati istraživanja ukazuju na snažnu potrebu definiranja razina održivosti u destinacijama. Dodatno, od ključne je važnosti uključiti sve relevantne dionike u proces mjerenja kako bi se osigurali potpuni rezultati. U ovom se radu snažni model integracije indikatora održivosti naglašava kao izrazito prikladan i pouzdan odabir u procesu mjerenja održivosti destinacija. Proces mjerenja uvelike ovisi o razini uključenosti dionika i razini njihove svijesti o važnosti procesa mjerenja.

**KLJUČNE RIJEČI:** održivi razvoj turizma, model za mjerenje, indikatori održivosti, održavanje rasta

**ABSTRACT:** Numerous challenges occur when implementing the concept of sustainable tourism development into destinations' policies and development plans. This is partly the result of insufficient understanding of its potentials and limits, which makes it even more difficult to measure the reached stage of sustainability in destinations. The aim of this paper is to provide a thorough analysis of the potential models for measuring sustainable tourism development. The research results indicate a strong need to define the levels of sustainability in destinations. In addition, it is crucial to involve all relevant stakeholders in the measuring process to gain complete measurement results. This study emphasizes the strong model of integrating sustainability indicators as highly appropriate and reliable in the process of measuring sustainability in destinations. This process highly depends on the levels of stakeholder involvement and of awareness about the importance of the measurement process.

**KEY WORDS:** sustainable tourism development, measuring model, sustainability indicators, sustaining growth

---

\* Associate Professor Vanja Krajnović, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Economics & Business, Zagreb, Croatia, e-mail: [vkrajnovic@efzg.hr](mailto:vkrajnovic@efzg.hr), ORCID: 0000-0002-8369-3599

## 1. UVOD

Teoriji održivog razvoja turizma dano je puno pažnje iz različitih perspektiva od 1990-ih, a od tog se razdoblja uočava i značajan porast broja objavljenih znanstvenih radova u tom području (Pigram, 1990; Atkinson *et al.*, 1997; Berry i Ladkin, 1997; Hunter, 1997; Garrod i Fyall, 1998; Bulter, 1999; Sharpley, 2000; Tosun, 2001; Liu, 2003; Ko, 2005; Dodds i Butler, 2010; Weaver, 2011; Buckley, 2012; Ruhanen *et al.*, 2015; Dwyer, 2018; Gössling, 2018; Ziyadin *et al.*, 2019; Sharpley, 2020; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2021; Streimikiene *et al.*, 2021). Geneza koncepta nije promijenjena, ali održivi razvoj turizma je prije svega prilagodljiva paradigma te je stoga pod utjecajem brojnih promjena u okruženju. Posljedično se čini da interpretacija koncepta neće rezultirati opće prihvaćenim rješenjem (Sharpley, 2000:3). Štoviše, prema Garrodu i Fyallu (1998:199) moguće je naglasiti kako je „definiranje održivog razvoja u kontekstu turizma postalo u zadnje vrijeme u znanstvenoj literaturi nešto poput kućne radinosti“. Teorija održivog razvoja primjenjiva je u različitim disciplinama i kao takva rezultira brojnim izazovima kada je u pitanju interpretacija njenih specifičnosti u okviru različitih područja.

Ako se fokus istraživanja premjesti s definiranja koncepta održivog razvoja turizma prema kvantificiranju postignute razine održivosti u određenoj destinaciji, javlja se potpuno nova skupina prepreka istraživanju. Upravo je to danas ključni problem i destinacije bi imale koristi od mogućnosti prevladavanja poteškoća prilikom implementacije različitih održivih strategija i u konačnici kvantificiranja uspjeha u postizanju održivosti njihovih resursa i društva u cjelini. No, jedna se nepobitna tvrdnja povezuje s održivim društvom – „mora biti dizajnirano na takav način da se njegovi načini života, poslovanja, gospodarenja, fizičke strukture i tehnologije ne miješaju s inherentnom

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Since the 1990s sustainable tourism development theory has received much attention from numerous perspectives and hence a significant increase in the amount of published research papers can be noticed (Pigram, 1990; Atkinson *et al.*, 1997; Berry and Ladkin, 1997; Hunter, 1997; Garrod and Fyall, 1998; Bulter, 1999; Sharpley, 2000; Tosun, 2001; Liu, 2003; Ko, 2005; Dodds and Butler, 2010; Weaver, 2011; Buckley, 2012; Ruhanen *et al.*, 2015; Dwyer, 2018; Gössling, 2018; Ziyadin *et al.*, 2019; Sharpley, 2020; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2021; Streimikiene *et al.*, 2021). Although the genesis of the concept has not changed, sustainable tourism development is above all an adaptable paradigm and hence highly influenced by numerous changes in the environment. Consequently, it seems that the interpretation of the concept is not likely to result in a universally acceptable solution (Sharpley, 2000:3). Moreover, according to Garrod and Fyall (1998:199) it can be maintained that “defining sustainable development in the context of tourism has become something of a cottage industry in the academic literature of late”. Sustainable development theory is applicable to different disciplines and thus results in numerous challenges in regard to interpreting its specifics within various fields.

If the research focus is shifted from defining the concept of sustainable tourism development towards quantifying the reached level of sustainability in a given destination, a completely new set of research obstacles occurs. That is the key issue nowadays and destinations would benefit from having the possibility to overcome difficulties by implementing different sustainable strategies and eventually quantifying achieved sustainability of their resources and society in general. However, one indisputable assertion correlated with sustainable society – “it must be designed in such a way that its ways of life, businesses, economy,

sposobnošću prirode da održi život“ (Capra i Luisi, 2014:n.p.). Iz te se perspektive čini da je održivost gotovo utopijski koncept u kontekstu upravljanja, a kamoli u kontekstu njegovog mjerenja. Brojna su ograničenja i prepreke procesa mjerenja i njegov se uspjeh obično oslanja na razinu svijesti dionika koji su uključeni u proces. Bilo kakav otpor na bilo kojoj razini ima izravne implikacije na uspjeh ne samo mjerenja održivosti, već i na implementaciju održivih politika.

„Definicija održivog razvoja je neopadajuća ljudskog blagostanja tijekom vremena“ (Atkinson *et al.*, 1997:16). Ako je cilj postizanje održivog razvoja, tada je ključno da dionici ostanu uključeni i da su u tijeku s promjenama u teorijskom napretku kako bi se i sami mogli razvijati. Suvremeno se društvo brzo mijenja i nužno je razviti svijest o promjenama kako bi ih se moglo prihvatiti. „Jedan očit način istraživanja tih kompleksnih i dugoročnih promjena je konstruiranje kvantitativnih modela održivog razvoja“ (Moffatt i Hanley, 2001:545). Dakle, promjena je jedina konstanta i sukladno tome, aktivnosti, ljudi, mjesta i vrijeme, svi oni su u konstantnom stanju promjene (Nelson, Butler i Wall, 1993:31). Važno je imati na umu kako je turizam prije svega društveni fenomen (Cohen, 1984; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006) i, kao takav, orijentiran je prema proširenju razumijevanja među kulturama, obogaćivanju osobnog znanja, prihvaćanju novih ideja, toleriranju različitosti, itd. Ekonomski je aspekt turizma došao u fokus zbog njegovog rapidnog rasta te često zasjenjuje ekološke i kulturne aspekte rasta (Zhou *et al.*, 1997; Wagner, 1997; Fossati i Pannela, 2000; Brau, Lanza i Usai, 2008).

Moguće je tvrditi kako je teorija dostigla točku u kojoj bi trebala pružiti alate za mjerenje razine održivosti u bilo kojem trenutku. „Učiniti turizam održivim nije lako, uglavnom zbog toga što neprecizna narav turizma otežava njegovu primjenjivost“ (Torres-Delgado i López Palomeque, 2014:122). Kvalitativno je moguće odrediti dosegnutu razinu

physical structures, and technologies do not interfere with nature’s inherent ability to sustain life” (Capra and Luisi, 2014:n.p.). From this perspective, sustainability seems to be almost a utopian concept in terms of managing it, much less measuring it. Due to numerous limitations and obstacles to the measuring process, its success usually relies on the level of awareness of the stakeholders included in the process. Any form of resistance at any level has direct implications on the success of both measuring sustainability and implementing sustainable policies.

“A definition of sustainable development is non-declining human wellbeing over time” (Atkinson *et al.*, 1997:16). If sustainable development is the aim, it is crucial that the stakeholders remain involved and abreast with the changes in theoretical advances to be able to develop independently. As the contemporary society changes rapidly, rising awareness of the changes is essential to accept them. “One obvious way to explore these complex and long-term changes is to construct quantitative models of sustainable development” (Moffatt and Hanley, 2001:545). Hence, change is the only constant and thus it is the state of all activities, people, places and times (Nelson, Butler and Wall, 1993:31). It is vital to remember that tourism is principally a social phenomenon (Cohen, 1984; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006), focused on broadening understanding among cultures, increasing personal knowledge, embracing new ideas, tolerating differences, etc. The economic aspect of tourism development emerged with its rapid growth and tends to overshadow the environmental and cultural aspects of growth (Zhou *et al.*, 1997; Wagner, 1997; Fossati and Pannela, 2000; Brau, Lanza and Usai, 2008).

It is possible to claim that the theory has reached a point where it should deliver the means for measuring the level of sustainability at any moment. “Making tourism sustainable is not easy, mainly because the imprecise nature of the concept of sustainability

održivosti, ali u današnje vrijeme dionicima bi trebala biti pružena mogućnost preciznog mjerenja njihovog uspjeha u postizanju održivosti destinacija (Twining-Ward i Butler, 2002; Choi i Sirakaya, 2005; Yu, Chancellor i Cole, 2011). Stoga je cilj ovog rada analizirati proces mjerenja održivog razvoja turizma u destinacijama i eliminirati mističan karakter koji mu se ponekad pripisuje.

Održivost se često definira kao željeno stanje, ali ona zahtijeva određeno napuštanje uobičajenog načina poslovanja, kao i investicije u nove sustave te stoga ona nije uvijek pravilno niti optimalno implementirana u razvojne strategije. Znanstvenici diljem svijeta ulažu mnogo truda u razvoj takvih modela te je moguće izdvojiti brojne pokušaje, poput Moffatta i Hanleyja, 2001; Hannoura, Cothren i Khairyja, 2006; Morana *et al.*, 2008; Torres-Delgado i López Palomeque, 2014; Espinera, Orchiston i Highama, 2017; Cotterell *et al.*, 2019; te Alfaro Navarra, Andrés Martínez i Mondéjar Jiménez, 2020. Ideja je ovog istraživanja predložiti dodatno potencijalno rješenje za dilemu s kojom se sve destinacije diljem svijeta suočavaju u nekom trenutku.

Iako je održivi razvoj bio u središtu znanstvenih istraživanja još od Brundtlandskog izvještaja, o njegovoj genezi i ključnim idejama još se uvijek raspravlja (Butler, 1999; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2018; Lane, 2018). Međutim, koncept je dosegnoo onu razinu u kojoj bi trebalo definirati specifične politike, a dionicima bi trebalo omogućiti pristup alatima za mjerenje njihovog uspjeha u implementaciji tih politika. Između ostalih, neka od pitanja koje koncept postavlja su: Tko bi trebao biti zadužen za implementaciju ovog koncepta u razvojne strategije? Koji bi dionici trebali biti uključeni u provođenje ovog koncepta? Tko bi trebao snositi troškove? Tko bi se trebao okoristiti njegovim prednostima? Koja je uloga turista u ovom procesu? Konačno, možemo li nekako provesti precizno mjerenje uspjeha ovog koncepta u destinacijama? Glavni fokus ovog rada stavljen je na odgovaranje na ovo zadnje postavljeno pitanje.

makes it difficult to apply” (Torres-Delgado and López Palomeque, 2014:122). Qualitatively, the reached level of sustainability can be determined, but the stakeholders should be able to precisely measure their destination’s achieved sustainability (Twining-Ward and Butler, 2002; Choi and Sirakaya, 2005; Yu, Chancellor and Cole, 2011). Therefore, this paper aims to analyse the process of measuring sustainable tourism development in destinations and to dispel the myth it is sometimes attributed.

Sustainability is often defined as the desired state, but it requires certain abandonment of the ways of doing business as well as investing into new systems and, therefore, it is not always implemented properly nor optimally into development strategies. Scientists worldwide endeavour to develop such models and numerous attempts can be highlighted (Moffatt and Hanley, 2001; Hannoura, Cothren and Khairy, 2006; Moran *et al.*, 2008; Torres-Delgado and López Palomeque, 2014; Espinera, Orchiston and Higham, 2017; Cotterell *et al.*, 2019; Alfaro Navarra, Andrés Martínez and Mondéjar Jiménez, 2020). The idea of this research is to propose additional potential solution to the sustainable development dilemma which all tourism destinations worldwide will face at some point.

Even though sustainable development has been in the focus of academic research since the Brundtland Report, its genesis and core ideas are still being debated (Butler, 1999; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2018; Lane, 2018). However, the concept has reached its next stage where specific policies should be defined and stakeholders involved in the process must be provided with tools for measuring their success in implementation of those policies. Among others, some of the questions that the concept raises are: Who should be in charge of implementing this concept into development strategies? Which stakeholders should take part in pursuing this concept? Who should settle the costs? Who should take advantage of the benefits? What is the role of tourists in

U pregledu literature naglasak je stavljen na istraživanje glavnih izazova u mjerenju održivog razvoja turizma. Na temelju tih rezultata, temeljito je analiziran jedan potencijalni model za mjerenje održivosti na destinacijskoj razini, a raspravljaju se i njegove praktične implikacije te ograničenja. Na kraju rada dana su zaključna razmatranja.

## 2. PREGLED LITERATURE

Malo je sumnje u to da su izazovi održivosti imali značajan utjecaj na suvremeni razvoj turizma, posebice zbog toga što većina turista danas ima visoko razvijenu svijest o važnosti održivog življenja (Budeanu, 2007; Juvan i Dolnicar, 2016). Međutim, interpretacija održivih politika je često prepuštena samim destinacijama, a takve situacije mogu uzrokovati određene značajne razlike u njihovoj implementaciji. „Raste percepcija o tome da je opća rasprava o održivom razvoju nekako eksternalizirana od procesa interpretiranja održivog turizma“ (Hunter, 1997:856). Postoji općenito slaganje o potrebi pružanja teorijskog znanja na lokalnim razinama kako bi se omogućilo kreiranje održivijih turističkih proizvoda. Iako su zabilježeni značajni pomaci u kontekstu definiranja indikatora održivog razvoja turizma globalno (npr. UNWTO, Europska komisija, Svjetski ekonomski forum, WWF, OECD, Svjetska banka), mjerenju održivosti kao balansiranog fenomena nije dana dovoljna pažnja te su potencijalna rješenja ovog pitanja prilično zamagljena. Mansfeld i Jonas (2006:585) su naglasiti da je poprilično izazovno odrediti što to čini turizam održivim, ali da je također važno odrediti kako ga mjeriti te kako razlikovati održivi i neodrživi turizam. Ti izazovi su ostali u fokusu brojnih istraživača do današnjeg doba.

Prema Milleru (2001:352), kvantitativna mjera mora pružiti puno više informacija od kvalitativne, jer inače ne postoji potreba za ulaganjem dodatnih resursa u razvoj kvantitativnih mjerenja. Znanost teži kvantifici-

the process? Finally, can we somehow make precise measurement of this concept's success within destination? The main focus of this paper is put on answering the last question.

The literature review emphasises the investigations into the main challenges of measuring sustainable tourism development. On the basis of those findings, a potential model for measuring sustainability at the destination level is thoroughly analysed and its practical implications and limitations are discussed. Finally, the paper offers the concluding remarks.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

There is little doubt that sustainability challenges have impacted significantly contemporary tourism development as tourists are highly aware of the importance of sustainable living (Budeanu, 2007; Juvan and Dolnicar, 2016). However, the interpretation of sustainable policies is often left to destinations alone, which might cause certain substantial differences in their implementation. “The perception grows that the general sustainable development debate is somehow external to the process of interpreting sustainable tourism” (Hunter, 1997:856). There is a common agreement on the need to deliver theoretical knowledge at the municipal level in order to enable creation of more sustainable tourism products. In spite of the significant advances in defining the indicators of sustainable tourism development globally (e.g. UNWTO, European Commission, World Economic Forum, WWF, OECD, World Bank), measuring sustainability as a balanced phenomenon has not received enough attention and potential solutions to this issue are rather blurred. Mansfeld and Jonas (2006:585) have emphasized that it is quite challenging to determine what makes tourism sustainable, but it is also important to determine how to measure it and how to distinguish sustainable from non-sustainable tourism. These challenges have remained in the focus of numerous researchers until today.

ranju različitih fenomena u okruženju jer u određenoj mjeri to olakšava naše razumijevanje odnosa i pripadnosti koje nas okružuju. Štoviše, „temeljna međupovezanost svih fenomena je dominantna tema u modernoj znanosti, a mnogi od naših velikih znanstvenika izrazili su svoj osjećaj divljenja i čuđenja kada su suočeni s misterijem koji se proteže izvan granica njihovih teorija“ (Capra i Luisi, 2014:n.p.). Ako je fenomenu dana numerička vrijednost, lakše je razumjeti njegov položaj u odnosu na druge slične pojave ili mjeriti njegov uspjeh tijekom vremena. Ako nam je dana mogućnost kvantitativnog mjerenja bilo kojeg kompleksnog i sveobuhvatnog fenomena, imali bismo moć ocijeniti njegov uspjeh.

## 2.1. Uloga dionika

Razvoj turizma stavlja težak zadatak pred dionike destinacije. Oni nisu samo dužni konstantno tražiti nove načine kojima će osigurati postizanje najboljih mogućih rezultata održivih politika u dugom roku, već moraju osigurati i mjerljivost tog razvoja te, u konačnici, održivosti. Uzimajući u obzir sve te faktore, postaje neizbježno i ključno osigurati kreiranje metodologije koja bi omogućila mjerenje trenutnog stanja održivosti bilo koje destinacije u bilo kojem trenutku. Čini se razumnim tvrditi da nam je potrebna promjena paradigme turizma kako bismo se simultano prilagođavali konstantnim promjenama u okruženju, ali još važnije, kako bismo osigurali održive politike (npr. Dwyer, 2018). No uz pomak paradigme, nužno je shvatiti važnost i ulogu svakog dionika uključenog u proces. Jedan od najvećih izazova u mjerenju održivog razvoja turizma proizlazi iz nedostatka suradnje između dionika, kao i pogrešnog shvaćanja njihove važnosti u procesu.

„Destinacije budućnosti moraju odrediti ciljeve kojima će osigurati mjerenje razvoja njihovog mjesta te ih njegova degradacija ne smije uhvatiti nespremne“ (Epler Wood, 2017:274). Kako tvrdi ista autorica, to treba

According to Miller (2001:352), quantitative measure must provide much more information than qualitative one, otherwise there is no need to invest additional resources in developing it. Science tends to quantify different phenomena in the environment as it rather simplifies understanding the relationships and affiliations that surround us. Moreover, “the fundamental interconnectedness of all phenomena is a dominant theme in modern science, and many of our great scientists have expressed their sense of awe and wonder when faced with the mystery that lies beyond the limits of their theories” (Capra and Luisi, 2014:n.p.). If a phenomenon is given numerical value, it is easier to comprehend its position in relation to other similar appearances, or to measure its success over time. Given the opportunity to measure quantitatively any complex and encompassing phenomenon, we could rate its success.

## 2.1. The role of stakeholders

Tourism development places a difficult task onto the stakeholders of a destination. Not only are they obliged to constantly pursue new ways of ensuring that sustainability achieves the best possible long-term results, but they also need to ensure measurability of the development and ultimately its sustainability. Considering all these factors, creating a methodology which would enable measuring the current state of sustainability of any destination at any time becomes inevitable and crucial. It seems reasonable to claim that a tourism paradigm change requires simultaneous adapting to constant changes in the environment, but more importantly, ensuring sustainable policies (e.g. Dwyer, 2018). Alongside the paradigm shift, it is necessary to comprehend the importance and role of each stakeholder involved in the process. One of the biggest issues in measuring sustainable tourism development arises from the lack of cooperation between stakeholders and their misunderstood importance in the process.



provesti lokalna vlast u dogovoru s privatnim sektorom i civilnim društvom. Naglasak održivog razvoja mora biti stavljen na važnost suradnje na destinacijskoj razini, jer pitanja održivosti najintenzivnije utječu na dionike u bilo kojoj destinaciji. Stoga, iako turisti jesu finalni konzumenti turističkih proizvoda i usluga, njihova uključenost u kreiranje održivog razvoja ograničena je količinom vremena koju provode u destinaciji, kao i rasponom aktivnosti u koje su se voljni uključiti. Važnost uključenosti dionika osobito je vidljiva u ruralnim područjima gdje je pitanje dijeljenja koristi od turizma vrlo često postavljeno (npr. Heslinga, Groote i Vanclay, 2019).

Ako se održivi razvoj turizma analizira iz perspektive tržišta ponude, može se generalno tvrditi da su dionici grupirani kao predstavnici javnog sektora, privatnog sektora i lokalne zajednice. Svakom članu tih skupina mora biti dana prilika za preuzimanje aktivne uloge u procesu. Međutim, ključno je shvatiti kako planiranje i politike uključuju političku raspravu o svim izazovima koje proces pretpostavlja (Bramwell i Lane, 2011:411). Naposljetku, umiješanost politike ima prevagu u procesu implementacije održivih politika. „Održivi razvoj je prije politički slogan nego analitički alat... Stoga, mogao bi biti katalizator za raspravu, kompromise i identifikaciju prikladnih trgovanja između interesa koji se natječu“ (Wall, 1997:33). Održivost obično preuzima politički značaj na kojoj god da se razini o njoj raspravlja. To je rezultat kompleksnosti sustava turizma i brojnih ekonomskih i društvenih aktivnosti koje imaju udio u procesu razvoja turističkih destinacija. Ako bi svi ti dionici trebali međusobno surađivati, moralo bi ih se potaknuti na to, a sam bi proces trebao biti pojednostavljen. To se obično postiže uključenošću politike bilo na nacionalnoj, bilo na destinacijskoj razini.

Potreba da se održivom razvoju turizma dodijeli numerička vrijednost dugo je već u središtu istraživanja na neizravan način i to kroz koncept kapaciteta nosivosti. Iako je

“Destinations of the future must set goals to ensure that they can measure the evolution of their place and not be caught by surprise with its degradation” (Epler Wood, 2017:274). This author assigns the local authorities in consultation with the private sector and civil society with this task. For sustainable development the importance of cooperation at the destination level is emphasised, as sustainability issues most intensively affect stakeholders in any destination. Hence, even though tourists are the final consumers of tourism products and services, their involvement in the creation of sustainable environment is limited by the amount of time spent in a destination and the scope of sustainable activities they are willing to get engaged in. The importance of stakeholder’s involvement is especially evident in rural areas, where the issue of sharing the benefits from tourism is often raised (e.g. Heslinga, Groote and Vanclay, 2019).

If sustainable tourism development is analysed from the supply-side perspective, it can be generally stated that stakeholders are grouped as representatives of the public sector, private sector and local community. Each member of those groups must be given an opportunity to take an active role in the process. However, it is crucial to comprehend that planning and policy include political debate on all issues in the process (Bramwell and Lane, 2011:411). Eventually, political inclusion prevails in the process of implementing sustainable policies. “Sustainable development is a political slogan rather than an analytical tool... Thus, it may be a catalyst for discussion, compromise and the identification of appropriate trade-offs between competing interests” (Wall, 1997:33). Usually, sustainability usually becomes political at whatever level it is analysed. This arises from the complexity of tourism system and numerous economic and social activities that involved in the process of tourism destination development. If all stakeholders had to cooperate, they should be encouraged and

taj pristup doživio brojne promjene tijekom vremena, još uvijek se on barem djelomično preklapa s osnovnim pretpostavkama održivog razvoja (npr. Wall, 2020). Stoga održivost pretpostavlja „holistički, orijentiran na budućnost te društveno izjednačavajući globalni proces“ (Saarinen, 2006:1125). Takav holistički pristup glavni je preduvjet mjerenja održivog razvoja turizma. Brojni su bili pokušaji razvoja popisa indikatora koji bi se mogli koristiti u mjerenju održivosti u bilo kojoj destinaciji. Ti popisi, međutim, ne pružaju sveobuhvatne alate za mjerenje temeljitog procesa koji bi omogućio ponderiranje vrijednosti indikatora u jedinstvenoj jednadžbi.

## 2.2. Važnost indikatora

Brojni se pristupi mogu koristiti s ciljem razvoja globalno primjenjivog popisa indikatora, ali glavna ideja budućih istraživanja mora biti izmještena iznad puke analize vrijednosti indikatora jer ona neće omogućiti sveobuhvatan uvid u točnu razinu održivosti destinacije. „U okviru turizma, promjena smjera zahtijevat će predanost pomaku izvan ustaljenog stanja turizma, redefiniranje granica prostorno-vremenskog sustava, razumijevanje kompleksnih socioekonomskih sustava i prilagodbu globalnim okolišnim silama“ (Higham i Miller, 2018:4). Iako je razvoj samog modela pitanje kvantitativnih mjera i preciznih procedura, važno je osigurati sve nužne preduvjete prije predstavljanja modela dionicima destinacija.

I dok je održivi turizam široko prihvaćen u akademskoj i znanstvenoj zajednici, brojne debate, diskursi i kritike konzistentni su sadržaj u literaturi (Ruhanen *et al.*, 2015:518). Iako su u različitim destinacijama diljem svijeta implementirane određene održive politike, naponi u mjerenju aktualne razine održivosti limitirani su na mjerenje učinka odabranih indikatora tijekom definiranog vremenskog razdoblja. „Glavna uloga indikatora je da nagovijeste napredak prema ili

the process should be simplified. That is usually achieved through political engagement at either national or destination's level.

The need to assign numerical values to sustainability of tourism development has been in the researchers' focus indirectly for long through the concept of carrying capacity. Although the approach underwent significant changes over time, it still only partially meets the basic presumptions of sustainable development (e.g. Wall, 2020). Hence, sustainability assumes “holistic, future-oriented, and socially equal global-scale process” (Saarinen, 2006:1125). Such holistic approach is the main prerequisite of measuring sustainable tourism development. Numerous attempts have been carried out to develop lists of indicators for measuring destinations' sustainability. However, they do not provide holistic measuring tools for a thorough process that would enable weighting the value of indicators in the overall equation.

## 2.2. The importance of indicators

Numerous approaches can be used for developing a universally applicable list of indicators, but future research must aim beyond a mere analysis as it will not provide a holistic insight into the precise stage of a destination's sustainability. “In terms of tourism, this shift in direction will require a commitment to move beyond steady-state tourism, the redefinition of spatio-temporal system boundaries, an appreciation of complex socio-ecological systems and the accommodation of global environmental forces” (Higham and Miller, 2018:4). Although the model's development alone regards quantitative measures and precise procedures, securing all essential preconditions is key prior to introducing the model to destinations' stakeholders.

While sustainable tourism has been widely embraced by the academic and scientific community, numerous debates, discourses, and criticisms have been a consistent feature of the literature (Ruhanen *et al.*, 2015:518).



odmak od zajedničkih ciljeva održivog razvoja s ciljem informiranja javnosti, donositelja odluka i menadžera“ (Parris i Kates, 2003:13). Mjerenjem djelovanja indikatora tijekom vremena dobili smo prijeko potrebno znanje o pojedinim aspektima održivog razvoja u destinacijama. To znanje, pak, mora biti stavljeno u holističku perspektivu kako bi dalo cjelovit uvid u cjelokupnu ravnotežu kriterija održivosti u danj destinaciji. Neusklađenost trenutnog napretka u području, koja proizlazi iz nedosljednosti u razini svijesti praktičara i znanstvene zajednice, rezultirala je nedovoljnom razinom razumijevanja njihovih uloga u procesu. Stoga, iako akademska zajednica pruža dragocjeno znanje o potencijalnim rješenjima u sferi održivog razvoja, napredak se teško može postići bez podrške lokalnih dionika.

Cernat i Gourdon (2012:1044-1045) tvrde da globalna lista indikatora, ona koja bi se koristila za usporedbu razine održivosti u različitim destinacijama, još uvijek nije kreirana zbog brojnih razloga, ali prije svega zbog multivarijantnog karaktera održivosti i poteškoća u agregiranju značajne razine potrebnih informacija. Zbog različitosti u geografskom položaju, veličini destinacija, fazi životnog ciklusa destinacija i drugih specifičnih karakteristika, nužno je spomenuti da neće svaka destinacija uključiti jednake indikatore u modele za mjerenje, niti će svaki indikator imati jednaki ponder u jednadžbi. Ovo je najvažniji razlog zbog kojih dionici moraju postati svjesni svojih odgovornosti, ali i svoje uloge u procesu kreiranja održivih okruženja. Pokazalo se da je proces odabira najprimjerenijih, snažnih indikatora, koji bi omogućili mjerenje trenutnog stanja održivosti u bilo kojoj destinaciji, najkompleksniji korak u ovom procesu. Općenito, ako poduzeću ili destinaciji nisu omogućeni točni i pouzdani indikatori i modeli za nadgledanje, nije moguće donijeti nikakve zaključke o održivosti sve do protoka mnogo godina od određenog događaja (Bulter, 1999:20). Diéguez-Castriellón, Gueimonde-Canto i Rodríguez-López

Although sustainable policies have been implemented into different destinations worldwide, their efforts to measure the actual sustainability levels have remained limited to measuring the performance of the chosen indicators during a defined period of time. “The major role of indicators is to indicate progress toward or away from some common goals of sustainable development in order to advise the public, decision makers and managers” (Parris and Kates, 2003:13). By measuring indicators’ performance over time, much needed knowledge about particular aspects of sustainable development in destinations was gained. However, that knowledge must be embedded in a holistic perspective to provide a thorough insight into the overall balance of sustainability pillars in any destination. The discrepancy in temporal progress in the field arising from inconsistencies in the levels of awareness of practitioners and academia has resulted in insufficient comprehension of their roles in the process. Hence, even though academia provides the valuable knowledge about possible solutions in the sphere of sustainable development, progress can hardly be achieved without the support of the local stakeholders.

Cernat and Gourdon (2012:1044-1045) argue that a universal list of indicators which would be used to compare sustainability levels in different destinations is still not developed due to numerous reasons, but above all due to the multivariate character of sustainability and difficulty in aggregating the considerable amount of the needed information. Due to differences in geographical position, size of destinations, stage of destination lifecycle and other specific features, it has to be stated that not each destination will include the same indicators in measuring models, nor will each indicator have the same weight in the equation. This is the most important reason why stakeholders need to become aware of both their responsibilities and their role in the process of creating sustainable environments. The process of choosing the most appropriate,

(2021:18-21) izdvajaju nekoliko područja za koje se očekuje da će biti u središtu budućih istraživanja: pojava novih destinacija koje treba analizirati, metodologija kreiranja kompozitnih indikatora, ispunjenje ciljeva održivog razvoja koje je definirao UN, okviri koje razvijaju međunarodne organizacije, lokalne zajednice (domaćini), interakcijske perspektive dionika te klimatske promjene.

Pokušaji da se razviju i vrednuju indikatori održivosti konstantno su u središtu interesa kako znanstvenika (npr. Foroni, Modica i Zenga, 2019; Gebreegziabhaer Asmelash i Kumar, 2019), tako i različitih međunarodnih institucija. Između ostalih, važno je izdvojiti ETIS (Europski sustav indikatora turizma) kojeg je razvila Europska komisija. To je „sustav indikatora koji je primjeren za sve turističke destinacije, a potiče ih da prihvate inteligentniji pristup planiranju turizma“ (Europska komisija). ETIS se koristi kao alat za upravljanje, nadzor sustava i alat za informiranje, pružajući dionicima destinacije nužno znanje o tome kako ocijeniti i nadzirati vrijednost i utjecaj različitih indikatora u destinacijama. Mjerenje održivosti turizma u fokusu je i UNWTO-a. Cilj je ove organizacije „razviti međunarodni statistički okvir za mjerenje uloge turizma u mjerenju održivog razvoja, uključujući ekonomsku, ekološku i društvenu dimenziju“ (UNWTO, n.d.). Napori na obje strane imali su pozitivne učinke i implementirani su na destinacijskoj razini, omogućavajući stjecanje znanja o napretku u vrednovanju dostignute razine održivosti u različitim destinacijama. Međutim, sveobuhvatno znanje može se dobiti samo ako su svi indikatori ponderirani i vrednovani unutar jedinstvenog modela za mjerenje.

strong indicators which would enable measuring the current state of sustainability in any destination proved to be the most complex step in the process. In general, if an enterprise or a destination is not provided with accurate and reliable indicators and monitoring models, it is not possible to make any conclusion about sustainability until many years after the fact (Bulter, 1999:20). Diéguez-Castrillón, Gueimonde-Canto and Rodríguez-López (2021:18-21) emphasize several areas in the focus of future research: emergence of new destinations for analysis, composite indicator construction methodologies, fulfilment of the SDGs by the United Nations, frameworks developed by international organizations, host communities, interactional perspectives of stakeholders and climate change.

The attempts to develop and validate sustainability indicators are constant concerns of both scientists (e.g. Foroni, Modica and Zenga, 2019; Gebreegziabhaer Asmelash and Kumar, 2019) and international institutions. Among many, ETIS (European Tourism Indicators System), developed by the European Commission, is a “system of indicators suitable for all tourism destinations, encouraging them to adopt a more intelligent approach to tourism planning” (European Commission). It is used as a management tool, monitoring system and an information tool to provide the stakeholders with much needed knowledge on assessing and monitoring the value and impact of different indicators in destinations. Similarly UNWT aims to “develop an international statistical framework for measuring tourism’s role in sustainable development, including economic, environmental and social dimensions” (UNWTO, n.d.). Their efforts have yielded positive outcomes and have been implemented at the destination level, ensuring the acquisition of much needed knowledge about the progress in evaluating the reached sustainability stage of diverse destinations. However, comprehensive knowledge can be gained if all indicators are weighted and evaluated within the same measuring model.

### 2.3. Ključni izazovi procesa mjerenja

Brojne se poteškoće vežu uz proces mjerenja održivog razvoja turizma. „Iz perspektive poslovne ekonomije, pokretanje poduzeća u turizmu je općenito problematičan proces, posebice tijekom prvih nekoliko godina aktivnosti u kapitalno-intenzivnim poduzećima“ (Aronsson, 2000:136). Naime, pomalo je teško mjeriti održivost destinacija u inicijalnim fazama njihovog razvoja. Međutim, kako su sve one pod utjecajem različitih internih i eksternih događaja, učincima održivih politika ne treba puno vremena da postanu vidljivi i mjerljivi.

Uključenost lokalne zajednice od ključne je važnosti u procesu implementacije i mjerenja održivog razvoja turizma u bilo kojoj destinaciji (Lee, 2013). Njihova podrška ima ključni utjecaj na uspjeh procesa nadzora. Zdravorazumski razlog za uključivanje lokalne zajednice u istraživanje nalazi se u samoj genezi koncepta – ako mu je cilj osigurati održivo društvo, pravo glasa treba dati onima na koje on utječe, ali koji nisu izravno uključeni u raspodjelu koristi.

UNWTO (2021) je aktivno uključen u raspravu i implementaciju potencijalnih rješenja za mjerenje održivosti turizma u različitim destinacijama diljem svijeta. Kako je navedeno u dokumentu, zemlje su sve spremnije na upoznavanje s procesom mjerenja. Naime, to je pitanje nacionalnih interesa i kao takvom bi mu trebalo pristupiti s posebnom pažnjom, usvajanjem uključivih politika. Štoviše, čini se razumnim optimizirati skupinu indikatora koji bi se koristili u procesu mjerenja. Čini se da bi se bolji rezultati mogli postići korištenjem manje, fokusiranije skupine indikatora, koja bi pružila veće razumijevanje održivosti turizma u destinacijama (Agyeiwaah, McKercher i Suntikul, 2017).

Razina svijesti o važnosti mjerenja održivosti je u porastu i pažnja se preusmjerava prema potpunom shvaćanju učinaka turizma na destinacije. To je od posebne važnosti za

### 2.3. Key challenges in the measuring process

Numerous difficulties relate to the process of measuring sustainable tourism development. “Seen from the viewpoint of business economics, starting tourism companies would in general seem to be problematic, particularly during the first few years of activity in capital-intensive companies” (Aronsson, 2000:136). Hence, it is rather difficult to measure sustainability of destinations in initial stages of development. However, due to the influence of different internal and external events, the effects of sustainable policies soon become visible and measurable.

Involvement of the local community is crucial in the process of implementing and measuring sustainable tourism development in any destination (Lee, 2013). Their support is crucial for the success of the monitoring process. Common-sense reason for including local community into research lies in the genesis of the concept – if it aims to ensure a sustainable society, those affected, but not directly involved in the allocation of benefits, should be given voice.

UNWTO (2021) is actively involved in both the discussion and the implementation of potential solutions for measuring sustainability of tourism in different destinations worldwide. As stated in the document, countries are becoming more willing to learn about the measuring process. Namely, this is a matter of national interest and hence should be approached with special attention by adopting inclusive policies. Moreover, it seems rational to optimize the set of indicators used in the measuring process. It seems that a smaller, more focused set of indicators could yield better results and provide more insights into the sustainability of tourism in destinations (Agyeiwaah, McKercher and Suntikul, 2017).

As the level of awareness about the importance of measuring sustainability rises, the attention moves towards complete under-

otočne destinacije koje se uobičajeno izdvajaju kao najosjetljivije lokacije u kontekstu učinaka na sve kriterije održivosti. U središtu je nekoliko istraživanja (npr. Cohen, 2020; Hsu *et al.*, 2020) pitanje ocjene stavova otočnog stanovništva u kontekstu održivog turizma.

U suštini, moguće je tvrditi da glavni izazovi povezani s procesom mjerenja proizlaze iz identificiranja optimalne skupine indikatora koji bi se trebali koristiti, određivanja dionika potrebnih za proces i definiranja optimalnog modela za izračun ravnoteže. Iako je puno toga intenzivno raspravljano vezano uz ove izazove od početka 2000-ih godina, još uvijek nismo dostigli razinu svijesti koja bi uključivala lako mjerljive indikatore, ispravno odabrane dionike niti primjeren model za mjerenje. Ovaj rad predlaže potencijalno rješenje navedenih izazova.

### **3. ANALIZA POTENCIJALNOG MODELA ZA MJERENJE ODRŽIVOG RAZVOJA TURIZMA**

U kontekstu mjerenja održivog razvoja turizma moguće je koristiti i izdvojiti različite modele: vrlo slabi, slabi, snažan i vrlo snažan model. Vrlo slaba pozicija održivosti orijentirana je na rast i iskorištavanje resursa; u slaboj se javlja zabrinutost za raspodjelu troškova i koristi razvoja na temelju intra- i intergeneracijske jednakosti; snažna pozicija održivosti prepoznaje primarnu vrijednost održavanja funkcionalnog integriteta ekosustava povrh sekundarne vrijednosti iskorištavanjem ljudskih resursa; dok je vrlo snažna do te mjere usmjerena na očuvanje resursa da je iskorištavanje prirodnih resursa minimizirano (Fennell i Cooper, 2020).

Čini se kako bi najrazumnije rješenje za mjerenje održivog razvoja turizma moglo uključivati implementaciju snažnog modela mjerenja u kontekstu odnosa indikatora u jednadžbi. Ako bi se održivost analizirala isključivo kao pitanje političke intervencije,

standing of tourism's impact on destinations. This is especially crucial for island destinations which are commonly recognized as most sensible locations in terms of impacts on all sustainability criteria. It is in the focus of several researchers (e.g. Cohen, 2020; Hsu *et al.*, 2020) to assess the attitudes of island residents in terms of sustainable tourism.

It can be argued that the main challenges related to the measuring process arise from identifying the optimal set of indicators to be used, determining the stakeholders needed for the process and defining the optimal model for calculating the balance. Although much on these challenges has been discussed intensively since the beginning of 2000s, a level of awareness which would include easily measured indicators, properly defined stakeholders, or an adequate measuring model still has not been achieved. This study proposes a potential solution to these issues.

### **3. ANALYSIS OF A POTENTIAL MODEL FOR MEASURING SUSTAINABLE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT**

In terms of measuring sustainable tourism development, different models can be used and outlined – very weak, weak, strong and very strong. A very weak model is growth oriented and resource exploitative; a weak one is characterised by concern for distribution of development costs and benefits through intra- and intergenerational equity; a strong one recognizes primary value of maintaining the functional integrity of ecosystems over and above secondary value through human resource utilization; while very strong one is resource preservationist insofar as to minimise the utilization of natural resources (Fennell and Cooper, 2020).

The most rational solution for measuring sustainable tourism development seems to be to implement the strong model in terms of indicators' relation in the equation. If sustainability was examined only as a matter of

ne bi bilo iznenađujuće kada bi bio odabran slab oblik integracije, s obzirom na to da on omogućava prevladavanje ekonomskih koristi te kompenzira slabe rezultate ostalih kriterija održivosti. Snažan model pretpostavlja da je održivost moguće postići ako i samo ako sva tri kriterija postignu rast ili barem ne zabilježe neto gubitak. Kao odgovor na rastuće učinke prekomjernog turizma u različitim destinacijama diljem svijeta, neki istraživači tvrde da je rješenje moguće naći u prihvaćanju pretpostavki vrlo snažne održivosti (Cotterell *et al.*, 2019). Koliko god bi takva situacija omogućila razvoj kompleksnog sustava prilagodljivog menadžmenta i sustavnog razmišljanja, ovaj bi pristup vlade vrlo teško prihvatile i kao takav ne bi bio lako uključiv u održive politike. Općenito se može tvrditi da ne postoji značajna razlika između slabe i snažne održivosti u kontekstu prihvaćanja definicije održivog razvoja; pristupi se razlikuju u odnosu na uvjete koji su potrebni da bi se zadovoljila postignuća održivog razvoja (Pearce, Hamilton i Atkinson, 1996:87). Izbor oblika integracije izravna je posljedica manjka svijesti o neravnotežama i neregularnostima u društvu i okruženju općenito. Iako bi slabi oblik integracije predstavljao pojednostavljeni izlaz iz krajnje neodrživog sustava, snažan oblik je jedini ispravan odgovor na neravnoteže u okruženju i u lokalnom društvenom sustavu.

„Osnovna ideja koja je u podlozi snažne održivosti jest da određena količina resursa mora biti sačuvana netaknuta kako bi mogla nastaviti pružati nužne usluge“ (Fennell i Cooper, 2020:88). Održivost je dosegнула točku u kojoj je nužno donijeti odlučne odluke o namjenskim naporima kako bi se osigurale dugoročne koristi za destinaciju i njene dionike. Jedno od mogućih, najneposrednijih rješenja, čini se, leži u procesu mjerenja, koliko god se ono povremeno činilo kompleksnim i nejasnim. U konačnici, u okviru održivog razvoja, ono što treba biti očuvano su priroda, sustavi za održavanje života i zajednice, dok se ljudi, ekonomija

political intervention, the choice of the weak model would not be surprising as it allows the economic benefits to prevail and compensate for poor performance of other sustainability pillars. The strong model assumes that sustainability can be reached if and only if all three criteria achieve growth or at least no net loss. As a response to the increasing impacts of overtourism in different destinations worldwide some researchers claim that a solution can be found in embracing the presumption of very strong sustainability (Cotterell *et al.*, 2019). As much as this would allow development of a complex system of adaptive management and systems thinking, this approach would hardly be favoured by governments and as such it would not be easily included in sustainable policies. It seems that there is no significant difference between weak and strong sustainability models in terms of accepting the definition of sustainable development; the approaches differentiate with regard to the conditions required to satisfy the achievement of sustainable development (Pearce, Hamilton and Atkinson, 1996:87). The choice of the form of integration is a direct consequence of the lack of awareness about imbalances and irregularities in the society and environment. Although a weak model would seem a simple solution for the utterly unsustainable system, a strong one is the only fair response to the environmental imbalances and local social system.

“The essential idea underlying strong sustainability is that a given amount of a resource must be preserved intact, in order that it may continue to provide critical service” (Fennell and Cooper, 2020:88). Sustainability has reached a point where it is necessary to make determined decisions about dedicated effort to ensure long-term benefits for a destination and its stakeholders. One of the possible, most straightforward solutions seems to lie in the process of measurement, as much complex and ambiguous it occasionally may seem. Sustainable development requires the preservation of nature, life support and community systems, while people, econ-



i društvo moraju razvijati (Paris i Kates, 2003:3). Ako želimo omogućiti takav razvoj, moramo postati svjesni nedostataka sustava i posljedično, moramo se osposobiti za to da ga unaprijedimo. „Održivi razvoj turizma može se shvatiti kao jedan od brojnih sektora procesa koji doprinose održivom razvoju, a on je sam proces koji vodi prema održivosti ili skladu između ljudskog roda i prirodnog svijeta“ (Sharpley, 2009:61).

Jedan od razloga zbog kojih je turizam pod određenim pritiskom u kontekstu definiranja njegovih učinaka na ukupno okruženje jest činjenica da je posvećenost postizanju uravnoteženog razvoja zapravo samo deklarativna. Kada je rast temeljna pretpostavka razvoja u brojnim destinacijama, taj razvoj teško može biti uravnotežen, a još teže može biti održiv. „Primjetno je da se naglasak na održivi razvoj, uz širi naglasak na ekološke faktore, podudara s razdobljem nedostatka sustavnog razvoja u ekonomiji kao cjelini“ (Butcher, 1997:31). Ono što nas razdvaja od mogućnosti da dostignemo željeno održivo društvo sadržano je u shvaćanju samog pojma. Dugo je pažnja istraživanja bila usmjerena na definiranje koncepta, a danas se ta pažnja mora preusmjeriti na dva glavna izazova – definiranje preciznog, snažnog modela za mjerenje i, što je još važnije, dijeljenje znanja o održivim politikama s dionicima u destinacijama.

„I dok je snažan oblik integracije usmjeren na pitanja pravde, efekt oporavka i ukupnih granica, slabe oblike karakterizira previd tih pitanja i povjerenje u tehnološka rješenja i marketinške pristupe prilikom osiguravanja održivosti“ (Hinton, 2017:239). Ako je jedini cilj kreiranja modela za mjerenje zadovoljavanje formalnih kriterija koje postavlja bilo koja skupina dionika u destinaciji, slabi oblik integracije bi se mogao smatrati kao primjeren alat. U bilo kojem drugom scenariju snažan oblik je optimalno rješenje jer njegovi rezultati pružaju dubinske informacije, što predstavlja osnovu za prilagodbu određenih aktivnosti koje su zabilježile slabije rezulta-

omy, and society need to be developed (Paris and Kates, 2003:3). To enable such development, we must recognise the deficiencies in the system and consequently train to enhance it. “Sustainable tourism development can be thought of as one of numerous sectors of processes that contribute to sustainable development, itself a process leading toward sustainability or harmony between humankind and the natural world” (Sharpley, 2009:61).

One of the reasons why tourism is under certain pressure in terms of defining its impact on the overall environment is the often-mere declarative devotion to achieving balanced development. With growth being a central postulate of development in numerous destinations, it can hardly be balanced, let alone sustainable. “It is notable that the emphasis on sustainable development, and the broader emphasis on environmental factors, coincides with a period of lack of systematic development in the economy as a whole” (Butcher, 1997:31). What hinders the chances of reaching the desired sustainable society is contained in the understanding of the very term. It has long been in the focus of research to define the concept, while nowadays the attention must shift to two main challenges – defining a precise, strong measuring model and, more importantly, delivering the knowledge about sustainable practices to the stakeholders in destinations.

“Whereas strong forms seek to address issues of justice, the rebound effect and overall limits, weak forms are characterized as overlooking these issues and trusting in technological solutions and market approaches to deliver sustainability” (Hinton, 2017:239). If the only objective of introducing a measuring model to meet the formal criteria imposed by any group of stakeholders in a destination, the weak form of integration could be considered an appropriate tool. In any other scenario the strong form is the optimal solution as its results provide in-depth information, which is the basis for adjusting certain activities that have been performing poorly. Dur-



te. Tijekom procesa planiranja učinaka turizma, mjere planiranja mogu biti osmišljene na način da mogu ublažiti postojeće učinke turizma (Mathieson i Wall, 1982:179).

Društvo se tijekom posljednjih nekoliko desetljeća snažno razvijalo. No ipak, i dalje nam je navika nositi se s poteškoćama tek onda kada one postanu ozbiljni izazovi. Isto se događa s održivošću. Nema sumnje da je u tom području došlo do značajnog napretka i brojne su destinacije dobile priliku umanjiti negativne posljedice razvoja. Napredak u ovom specifičnom području, međutim, mora biti ubrzan i intenzivnije komuniciran ako se želi postići njegova učinkovitost i razumljivost. Mjerenje učinaka u okolišu „mora na sistematičan način odražavati interakcije usmjerene na okoliš kako bi se definirao razmjer u kojem poboljšanje učinaka u okolišu odgovara postavljenim standardima“ (Mathieson i Wall, 1982:73). Mjerenje učinaka u okolišu je danas pod globalnim pritiskom, a turizam nije isključen iz tog procesa. No, bez obzira na to, ta mjera sama za sebe pruža samo djelomičnu (iako puno jasniju) sliku o ukupnim učincima u destinaciji. Koordiniran, simultan i sveobuhvatan proces mjerenja služi kao potencijalno sredstvo u suočavanju sa smanjenom kvalitetom okoliša u pojedinim turističkim destinacijama.

Jedan od glavnih napredaka u procesu razvoja modela za mjerenje održivog razvoja turizma zabilježen je s razvojem modela trostruke bilance (npr. Buckley, 2012; Stoddards, Pollard i Evans, 2012; Tyrrell, Paris i Biaett, 2013; Dwyer, 2015). Model trostruke bilance poslužio je kao nužno potrebna alternativa tradicionalnim pristupima – destinacije su bile osnažene preuzeti kontrolu nad vlastitim razvojnim procesima. Štoviše, globalni izvještaji i strategije prilagođavani su na destinacijskim razinama. Danas je u središtu istraživanja pitanje kako osigurati razmjenu informacija između različitih destinacija diljem svijeta kako bi se potaknuo

ing the process of planning for the impacts of tourism, planning measures can be devised to mitigate its existing impacts (Mathieson and Wall, 1982:179).

Society has developed tremendously during the last few decades. And yet, we tend to deal with difficulties only when they become serious issues. The same is true for sustainability. Undoubtedly, much has been done in this field and numerous destinations were able to mitigate the negative consequences of development. The progress in this specific field, however, must be accelerated and communicated more intensively if it is to become effective and understandable. Measuring environmental performance “must reflect tourism-environment interactions in a systematic way in order to determine the extent to which improvement in environmental performance matches up to the targets of standards set” (Mathieson and Wall, 1982:73), and is under global pressure today, and tourism is no exception to this process. Nevertheless, if considered in isolation, it provides only a partial (although clearer) image of the total impacts in a destination. Coordinated, simultaneous and all-encompassing measuring process serves as a potential means, for dealing with the deteriorating environment in some tourism destination areas.

One of the main advancements in the process of developing a model for measuring sustainable tourism development was noted with the development of the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) approach (e.g. Buckley, 2012; Stoddards, Pollard and Evans, 2012; Tyrrell, Paris and Biaett, 2013). TBL has provided a much-needed alternative for traditional approaches – destinations were empowered to take control of their development processes. Moreover, global reports and strategies were adjusted to destination levels. Today’s research focuses on how to ensure the exchange of information between different destinations worldwide in order to encourage more of them to participate in the global exchange while sharing the newly acquired knowledge.

veći broj njih na to da postanu dio globalne razmjene, dijeleći novostečeno znanje.

Na temelju provedenog sekundarnog istraživanja na razini objavljenih studija, u ovom se radu kao optimalan model mjerenja održivog razvoja turizma izdvaja snažan model integracije indikatora održivog razvoja turizma. Njega je moguće definirati na sljedeći način (prema Turneru, Pearceu i Batemanu, 1993 u Budimski, 2012:135):

$$Y_{(\text{ekonomski})} = \Delta(x_1) + \dots + \Delta(x_n)$$

$$Y_{(\text{ekološki})} = \Delta(y_1) + \dots + \Delta(y_n)$$

$$Y_{(\text{socio-kulturni})} = \Delta(z_1) + \dots + \Delta(z_n)$$

Ovaj model integracije pretpostavlja ukupnu ravnotežu sva tri kriterija, a upravo je ta ravnoteža nužna za postizanje održivog razvoja turizma i u konačnici osigurava postizanje kvalitetnog i održivog okruženja za lokalnu zajednicu. Ovaj je model testiran u tri različite destinacije (dvije u Hrvatskoj i jedna u SAD-u). Predloženi je model testiran na način da se provjeri je li moguće koristiti ga u različitim destinacijama. U svim destinacijama koje su bile uključene u istraživanje proces je uspješno proveden. Održivost je pitanje prilagodbe brojnim promjenama u okruženju; stoga je bilo kakav uspjeh u postizanju održivih rješenja samo trenutno, tj. ne može se bezuvjetno smatrati stalnim stanjem pa zato zahtijeva daljnja poboljšanja. Kontinuirana mjerenja treba provoditi i njihove rezultate analizirati, jasno određujući ciljeve i obaveze svakog dionika uključenog u taj proces.

Rezultati provedenog istraživanja upućuju na sljedeće (Krajinović, 2015:82):

- a) za uspješnost mjerenja nužno je definiranje prikladnog skupa indikatora, koji se tijekom procesa istraživanja mogu prilagoditi specifičnostima destinacije koju se analizira;
- b) odluka o dionicima koji će biti uključeni u istraživanje presudni je dio procesa mjerenja;
- c) provođenje istraživanja specifičan je proces koji je ovisan o kvalitetno odabranom

Based on the secondary research conducted on the published studies, this paper emphasizes a strong model of integrating the indicators of sustainable tourism development as the optimal model for measuring sustainable tourism development. It can be defined in the following manner (after Turner, Pearce and Bateman, 1993 in Budimski, 2012:135):

$$Y_{(\text{economic})} = \Delta(x_1) + \dots + \Delta(x_n)$$

$$Y_{(\text{environmental})} = \Delta(y_1) + \dots + \Delta(y_n)$$

$$Y_{(\text{socio-cultural})} = \Delta(z_1) + \dots + \Delta(z_n)$$

This model of integration assumes total balance of all three criteria, which is required for achieving sustainable tourism development to finally ensure quality and sustainable environment for the local community. This model was tested in three destinations (two in Croatia and one in the USA). The proposed model was tested in such a way to verify if it is possible to use it in diverse destinations. In all destinations included in the research the process was successfully carried out. Sustainability is a matter of adaptation to a number of changes in the environment; hence any achievement in attaining sustainable solutions is only momentary, i.e. it cannot be considered as an unconditionally permanent state, and therefore it requires further upgrades. Continuous measurements ought to be undertaken and analysed with clearly defined objectives and obligations of each stakeholder included in the process.

Research results indicate the following (Krajinović, 2015:82):

- a) for successful measuring it is necessary to define an appropriate set of indicators, which can be adjusted to the specifics of the analysed destination during the research process;
- b) deciding which stakeholders to include in the research seems to be key in the measuring process;
- c) conducting the research is a specific process, dependent on the quality of the chosen model that will, ultimately, ensure compendious results and information on

modelu koji će u konačnici omogućiti sveobuhvatne rezultate i dobivanje informacije o stanju ravnoteže kriterija održivog razvoja; te

- d) ključna je primjena modela za mjerenje održivog razvoja turizma na razini destinacija, na temelju čijih bi rezultata dionicima trebalo biti transparentno i jasno koji su elementi podbacili u procesu postizanja održivosti, a koji su bili uspješni, kako bi mogli prilagoditi svoje razvojne strategije u dugom roku.

Odabrani model pruža važne informacije o dostignutoj razini održivosti na razini destinacije, onemogućavajući interesne skupine da utječu na konačne rezultate i omogućujući uravnotežen uvid u poslovanje destinacije. Održivost se može postići samo premošćivanjem jaza između različitih interesnih skupina dionika na razini destinacija, što bi trebalo u konačnici osigurati održiva okruženja.

#### 4. ZAKLJUČCI

Održivi razvoj turizma kao koncept stavlja brojne izazove pred suvremeno društvo općenito, kao i na turističke destinacije. Iako posjedujemo brojne dokumente i strategije koje su objavile brojne organizacije, a koje pružaju kvalitativne pristupe u suočavanju s izazovima održivosti, nismo daleko odmaknuli s procesom. Zbog brojnih ozbiljnih posljedica neodrživog razvoja u mnogim destinacijama, postalo je nužno prihvatiti nove paradigme, u konkretnom slučaju kvantitativni pristup u rješavanju ovog izazova. Unatoč činjenici da se kvantificiranje postignute razine održivosti čini kao pomalo neprimjerena mjera, ponajviše zbog njene kompleksnosti, ono ipak može biti jedan od najučinkovitijih pristupa u rješavanju brojnih problema povezanih s razumijevanjem i suočavanjem s izazovima održivog razvoja destinacija.

Model koji je predložen u ovom radu temelji se na specifičnostima snažnog oblika

the state of balance among the sustainable development criteria; and

- d) applying the model for measuring sustainable tourism development at the destination level is key as the results should give the stakeholders transparent and clear information on the elements that failed in the process of achieving sustainability as opposed to those that succeeded to facilitate the adjustment of long-term development strategies.

The chosen model provides important information about the reached stage of sustainability at the destination level, disabling interest groups to impact the final results and providing a balanced insight into a destination's performance. Only by bridging the gap between different interest groups of stakeholders at the destination level can sustainability be achieved, which should in the end ensure sustainable environments.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

The concept of sustainable tourism development places numerous challenges on the contemporary society in general and tourism destinations in particular. In spite of a number of documents and strategies published by numerous organizations, providing qualitative approaches to dealing with sustainability issues, the process has not advanced very far. Due to serious consequences of unsustainable development in numerous destinations, it has become necessary to adopt new paradigms – in this case a quantitative approach for solving this challenge. Despite the fact that quantifying the achieved stage of sustainability seems a somewhat inappropriate measure, due to its complexity, it can be one of the most effective approaches to solving the numerous problems associated with understanding and dealing with the destinations' sustainable development issue.

The proposed model is based on the idiosyncrasies of the strong form of integration, which is in this case considered as the

integracije, koji je u ovom slučaju promatran kao sveobuhvatan u kontekstu uključivanja i balansiranja kriterija održivosti. Ako se održivost smatra ključnim elementom suvremenoga razvoja turizma, najodvažnija je odluka koristiti onaj alat za mjerenje koji daje najviše informacija i koji je najprimjereniji. Kako je u ovom istraživanju ključna uloga i važnost dana dionicima na različitim razinama, a oni su u potpunosti opravdali povjerenje koje im je dano, jedan od glavnih zaključaka koji proizlazi iz ovog rada je da bi dionike trebalo poticati i osnaživati u preuzimanju aktivne uloge u planiranju i nadzoru održivog razvoja turizma unutar njihovih zajednica.

Na održivost se ne smije gledati kao na isključivo krilaticu prilikom privlačenja osviještenih, društveno odgovornih turista. Ona bi se trebala povezivati s trajnim naporima turističke destinacije u postizanju održivog okruženja, suradnje između prakse i akademske zajednice te, neizbježno, procesa mjerenja koji bi davali rezultate poduzetih akcija. Sve bi to bila zdravorazumska podloga za društvo da se pokrene prema održavanju i upravljanju razvoja turizma i pružanju jednakih mogućnosti svim dionicima koji su uključeni u taj proces.

Ograničenje ovog istraživanja ogleda se u kompleksnosti procesa modeliranja. Kako je ovo istraživanje imalo jedan osnovni cilj, a on je bio testirati je li moguće primijeniti ovaj model u kontekstu turističke destinacije, pa vrijednosti samih indikatora nisu uključene u model, nego je testirana i procijenjena njihova važnost. Buduća istraživanja će uključiti ponderiranje vrijednosti indikatora i analizu preciznih rezultata održivog razvoja turizma u svakoj destinaciji. Upravo je taj aspekt istraživanja njegovo osnovno ograničenje. Dodatno, s obzirom na to da je održivi razvoj proces i uključuje prilagodbe trajnim promjenama u okruženju, nužno je ponavljati istraživanje u istim destinacijama kako bi se mogao pratiti napredak (ili nedostatak istog) u naporima dionika.

most encompassing in terms of including and balancing sustainability principles. If sustainability is considered a crucial element of contemporary tourism development, the most resolute decision is to use the most informative and appropriate measuring tool. As the prevailing role and importance in this research was given to the stakeholders at different levels, who have entirely justified the trust placed in them, one of the main conclusions arising from this paper is that the stakeholders should be encouraged and empowered to participate actively in planning and monitoring sustainable tourism development within their communities.

Sustainability must not be addressed solely as a catchword for attracting enlightened, socially responsible tourists. It should refer to permanent efforts of a tourism destination to achieve sustainable environment, collaboration between practitioners and the academia and, unavoidably, measurement processes that would reflect the results of undertaken actions. Thus, a sound basis would be created for the society to move towards sustaining and managing tourism growth and providing equal opportunities for all stakeholders in development process.

The limitation of this research lies in the complexity of the modelling process. As its one primary objective was to test whether it is possible to apply this model in a tourism destination context, the values of the indicators themselves were not incorporated into the model, but rather their importance was tested and evaluated. Future research will include weighting the values of indicators and analysing the precise results of sustainable tourism development in each destination. That aspect of the research is its core limitation. Additionally, as sustainable development is a process and includes adjustments to the continuous changes in the environment, it is necessary to repeat the research in the same destinations in order to be able to keep track of the progress (or the lack thereof) in the stakeholders' endeavours.

**LITERATURA - REFERENCES**

- Agyeiwaah, E., McKercher, B., Suntikul, W. (2017). Identifying core indicators of sustainable tourism: A path forward? *Tourism Management Perspectives*, Vol. 24, pp. 26-33. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2017.07.005>
- Alfaro Navarro, J.-L., Andrés Martínez, M.-E., Mondéjar Jiménez, J.-A. (2020). An approach to measuring sustainable tourism at the local level in Europe. *Current Issues in Tourism*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 423-437. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2019.1579174>
- Aronsson, L. (2000). *The development of sustainable tourism*. Continuum: London.
- Atkinson, G., Dubourg, R., Hamilton, K., Munsinghe, M., Pearce, D., Young, C. (1997). *Measuring Sustainable Development*. Edward Elgar: Cheltenham.
- Berry, S., Ladkin, A. (1997). Sustainable tourism: a regional perspective. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 18, No. 7, pp. 433-440. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(97\)00053-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(97)00053-8)
- 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>
- Brau, R., Lanza, A., Usai, S. (2008). *Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.: Cheltenham.
- Buckley, R. (2012). Sustainable Tourism: Research and Reality. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 528-546. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2012.02.003>
- Buckley, R. (2012). Sustainable Tourism: Research and Reality. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 528-546. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2012.02.003>
- Budeanu, A. (2007). Sustainable tourist behaviour – a discussion of opportunities for change. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, Vol. 31, pp. 499-508. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2007.00606.x>
- Budimski, V. (2012). *Measuring sustainable tourism development: variable identification and valuation*. doctoral thesis. Zagreb: Faculty of Economics & Business.
- Butcher, J. (1997). Sustainable Development or Development? In M. J. Stabler (Ed.) *Tourism & Sustainability: Principles to Practice*. CAB International: New York. pp. 27-38
- 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>
- Capra, F., Luisi, P. L. (2014). *The Systems View of Life: A Unifying Vision*. Cambridge University press: Kindle edition. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511895555>
- Cernat, L., Gourdon, J. (2012). Paths to success: Benchmarking cross-country sustainable tourism. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 33, No. 5, pp. 1044-1056. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.12.007>
- Choi, H. C., Sirakaya, E. (2005). Measuring Residents' Attitude toward Sustainable Tourism: Development of Sustainable Tourism Attitude Scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 43, No. 4, pp. 380-394. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287505274651>
- Cohen, E. (1984). The sociology of tourism: Approaches, issues and findings. *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 10, pp. 373-392. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.10.080184.002105>
- Cohen, E. (2020). Small island tourism: a review. *Acta Turistica*, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 169-183. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22598/at/2020.32.2.169>
- Cotterell, D., Hales, R., Arcodia, C., Ferreira, J.-A. (2019). Overcommitted to tourism and under committed to sustainability:



- the urgency of teaching “strong sustainability” in tourism courses. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 27, No. 7, pp. 882-902. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2018.1545777>
- Diéguez-Castrillón, M. I., Gueimonde-Canto, A., Rodríguez-López, N. (2021). Sustainability indicators for tourism destinations: bibliometric analysis and proposed research agenda. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01951-7>
- Dodds, R., Butler, R. (2010). Barriers to implementing sustainable tourism policy in mass tourism destinations. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 35-53.
- Dwyer, L. (2015). Triple bottom line reporting as a basis for sustainable tourism: Opportunities and challenges. *Acta Turistica*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 33-62.
- Dwyer, L. (2018). Saluting while the ship sinks: the necessity for tourism paradigm change. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 29-48. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1308372>
- Epler Wood, M. (2017). *Sustainable Tourism on a Finite Planet*. Routledge: New York. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315439808>
- Espinero, S., Orchiston, C., Higham, J. (2017). Resilience and sustainability: a complementary relationship? Towards a practical conceptual model for the sustainability – resilience nexus in tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 25, No. 10, pp. 1385-1400. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1281929>
- European Commission, n.d. *European Tourism Indicators System for sustainable destination management*. Available at [https://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/tourism/offer/sustainable/indicators\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/tourism/offer/sustainable/indicators_en) (accessed on 15 May 2020)
- Fennell, D. A., Cooper, C. (2020). *Sustainable Tourism: Principles, Contexts and Practices*. Channel View Publications: Bristol.
- Faroni, I., Modica, P., Zenga, M. (2019). Residents’ Satisfaction with Tourism and the European Tourism Indicator System in South Sardinia. *Sustainability*, Vol. 11, No. 8, pp. 2243. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11082243>
- Fossati, A., Pannella, G. (2000). (Eds.). *Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development*. Kluwer Academic Publishers. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-4321-3>
- Garrod, B., Fyall, A. (1998). Beyond the rhetoric of sustainable tourism? *Tourism Management*, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 199-212. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(98\)00013-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(98)00013-2)
- Gebreegziabhaer Asmelash, A., Kumar, S. (2019). Assessing progress of tourism sustainability: Developing and validating sustainability indicators. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 71, pp. 67-92. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.09.020>
- Goodall, B., Stabler, N. (2002). Environmental standards and performance measurement in tourism destination development. In G. Richards and D. Hall (Eds.) *Tourism and Sustainable Community Development*. Routledge: New York, pp. 63-82.
- Gössling, S. (2018). Tourism, tourist learning and sustainability: an exploratory discussion of complexities, problems and opportunities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 292-306. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1349772>
- Hannoura, A. P., Cothren, G. M., Khairy, W. M. (2006). The development of a sustainable development model framework. *Energy*, Vol. 31, No. 13, pp. 2269-2275. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2006.01.022>
- Heslinga, J., Groote, P., Vanclay, F. (2019). Strengthening governance processes to improve benefit-sharing from tourism



- in protected areas by using stakeholder analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 27, No. 6, pp. 773-787. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1408635>
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2006). More than an “industry”: The forgotten power of tourism as a social force. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 27, No. 6, pp. 1192-1208. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.05.020>
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2018). Sustainable tourism: Sustaining tourism or something more?. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, Vol. 25, pp. 157-160. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2017.11.017>
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2021). The „war over tourism“: challenges to sustainable tourism in the tourism academy after COVID-19. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 551-569. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1803334>
- Higham, J., Miller, G. (2018). Transforming societies and transforming tourism: sustainable tourism in times of change. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 1-8. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2018.1407519>
- Hinton, E. (2017). The politics of sustainable consumption. In M. Redclift and D. Springett (Eds.) *Routledge International Handbook on Sustainable Development*. Routledge: New York, pp. 237-249.
- Hsu, C., Chen, M., Nyaupane, G. P., Lin, S. (2020). Measuring sustainable tourism attitude scale (SUS-TAS) in an Eastern Island context. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, Vol. 33, 100617. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2019.100617>
- Hunter, C. (1997). Sustainable Tourism as an adaptive paradigm. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 850-867. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(97\)00036-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(97)00036-4)
- Juvan, E., Dolnicar, S. (2016). Measuring environmentally sustainable tourist behaviour. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 59, pp. 30-44. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2016.03.006>
- 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>
- Krajinović, V. (2015). Challenging the key issues in measuring sustainable tourism development. *Acta Turistica*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 63-91.
- Lane, B. (2018). Will sustainable tourism research be sustainable in the future? An opinion piece. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, Vol. 25, pp. 196-199. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2017.12.005>
- Lee, T. H. (2013). Influence analysis of community resident support for sustainable tourism development. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 34, pp. 37-46. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.03.007>
- 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>
- Mansfeld, Y., Jonas, A. (2006). Evaluating the socio-cultural carrying capacity of rural tourism communities: A “value stretch” approach. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, Vol. 97, No. 5, pp. 583-601. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9663.2006.00365.x>
- Mathieson, A., Wall, G. (1982). *Tourism: economics, physical and social impacts*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.: New York.
- Miller, G. (2001). The development of indicators for sustainable tourism: results of a Delphi survey of tourism researchers. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 351-362. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(00\)00067-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00067-4)
- Moffatt, I., Hanley, N. (2001). Modelling sustainable development: systems dynamic and input-output approaches. *Envi-*

- ronmental Modelling & Software*, Vol. 16, No. 6, pp. 545-557. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-8152\(01\)00024-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-8152(01)00024-X)
- Moran, D. D., Wackernagel, M., Kitzes, J. A., Goldfinger, S. H., Boutaud, A. (2008). Measuring sustainable development – Nation by nation. *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 64, No. 3, pp. 470-474. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.08.017>
- Nelson, J. G., Butler, R., Wall, G. (1993). (Eds.). *Tourism and Sustainable Development: Monitoring, Planning, Managing*. University of Waterloo: Heritage Resources Centre, Ontario.
- Parris, T. M., Kates, R. W. (2003). Characterizing and Measuring Sustainable Development. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, Vol. 28, pp. 559-586. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.28.050302.105551>
- Pearce, D., Hamilton, K., Atkinson, G. (1996) Measuring sustainable development: progress on indicators. *Environment and Development Economics*, Vol. 1, pp. 85-101. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355770X00000395>
- Pigram, J. J. (1990). Sustainable tourism – policy considerations. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, Vol. 1, pp. 2-9.
- 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>
- Saarinen, J. (2006). Traditions of sustainability in tourism studies. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 1121-1140. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2006.06.007>
- 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?* Earthscan: London. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781849770255>
- Sharpley, R. (2020). Tourism, sustainable development and the theoretical divide: 20 years on. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 28, No. 11, pp. 1932-1946. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1779732>
- Stoddards, J. E., Pollard, C. E., Evans, M. R. (2012). The Triple Bottom Line: A Framework for Sustainable Tourism Development. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 233-258. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15256480.2012.698173>
- Streimikiene, D., Svagzdiene, B., Jasinskas, E., Simanavicius, A. (2021). Sustainable tourism development and competitiveness: The systematic literature review. *Sustainable Development*, Vol. 29, pp. 259-271. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd2133>
- Torres-Delgado, A., López Palomeque, F. (2014). Measuring sustainable tourism at the municipal level. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 49, pp. 122-137. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.09.003>
- Tosun, C. (2001). Challenges of sustainable tourism development in the developing world: the case of Turkey. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 289-303. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(00\)00060-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00060-1)
- Twining-Ward, L., Butler, R. (2002). Implementing STD on a Small Island: Development and Use of Sustainable Tourism Development Indicators in Samoa. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp. 363-387. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580208667174>
- Tyrrell, T., Paris, C. M., Biaett, V. (2013). A Quantified Triple Bottom Line for Tourism: Experimental Results. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 52, No. 3, pp. 279-293. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287512465963>

- UNWTO. (n.d.) *Measuring the sustainability of tourism*. Available at <https://www.unwto.org/Measuring-Sustainability-Tourism> (accessed on 15 May 2020)
- UNWTO. (2021). *Measuring the Sustainability of Tourism (MST): progress and way forward*. UNWTO: Madrid.
- Wagner, J. E. (1997). Estimating the economic impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 592-608. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(97\)00008-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(97)00008-X)
- Wall, G. (1997). Sustainable tourism – unsustainable development. In S. Wahab and J. J. Pigram (Eds.) *Tourism, Development and Growth*. Routledge: New York, pp. 33-49.
- Wall, G. (2020). From carrying capacity to overtourism: a perspective article. *Tourism Review*, Vol. 75, No. 1, pp. 212-215. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-08-2019-0356>
- Weaver, D. (2011). Can sustainable tourism survive climate change? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 5-15. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2010.536242>
- Yu, C., Chancellor, H. C., Cole, S. T. (2011). Measuring Residents' Attitudes toward Sustainable Tourism: A Reexamination of the Sustainable Tourism Attitude Scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 50, No. 1, pp. 57-63. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287509353189>
- Zhou, D., Yanagida, J. F., Chakravorty, U., Leung, P. (1997). Estimating economic impacts from tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 76-89. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(96\)00035-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(96)00035-7)
- Ziyadin, S., Borodin, A., Streltsova, E., Sueubayeva, S., Pshembayeva, D. (2019). Fuzzy logic approach in the modeling of sustainable tourism development management. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 492-504. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17512/pjms.2019.19.1.37>
- Primljeno: 25. studenoga 2021. / Submitted: 25 November 2021*
- Prihvaćeno: 27. travnja 2022. / Accepted: 27 April 2022*
- Ovaj je rad izdan pod licencom CC BY-NC (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).
- This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).