INSTITUTIONS AND PRACTICES

Правильная ссылка на статью:

Длужевска А., Родзос Дж. Наднациональная политика устойчивого туризма: проблемы развития с точки зрения принимающих сторон и туристов // Мониторинг общественного мнения : Экономические и социальные перемены. 2018. № 5. С. 250—268. https://doi.org/10.14515/monitoring.2018.5.19.

For citation:

Dluzewska A., Rodzos J. (2018) Sustainable tourism supranational policies and the wellbeing — Gaps and challenges from the hosts' and the guests' perspective. *Monitoring of Public Opinion : Economic and Social Changes.* No. 5. P. 250—268. https://doi.org/10.14515/monitoring.2018.5.19.

A. Dluzewska, J. Rodzos
SUSTAINABLE TOURISM SUPRANATIONAL POLICIES AND THE WELLBEING — GAPS AND CHALLENGES FROM THE HOSTS' AND THE GUESTS' PERSPECTIVE

SUSTAINABLE TOURISM SUPRANATIONAL POLICIES AND THE WELLBEING — GAPS AND CHALLENGES FROM THE HOSTS' AND THE GUESTS' PERSPECTIVE

НАДНАЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ ПОЛИТИКА УСТОЙЧИВОГО ТУРИЗМА: ПРОБЛЕМЫ РАЗВИТИЯ С ТОЧКИ ЗРЕНИЯ ПРИНИМАЮЩИХ СТОРОН И ТУРИСТОВ

Anna DLUZEWSKA[1] *— Professor*
E‑MAIL: dluzewska.a@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0001-5648-2975

[1] Kazimierz Wielki University of Bydgoszcz, Bydgoszcz, Poland

*ДЛУЖЕВСКА Анна — профессор, факультет физической культуры, гигиены и туризма, Университет Казимира Великого в Быдгоще, Быдгощ, Польша.
E‑MAIL: dluzewska.a@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0001-5648-2975*

Jolanta RODZOS[2] — Senior Lecturer
E-MAIL: jolanta.rodzos@poczta.umcs.
lublin.pl

РОДЗОС Джоланта — *старший препо-*
даватель, факультет землеведения
и пространственного управления, Уни-
верситет Марии Кюри-Склодовской,
Люблин, Польша.
E-MAIL: jolanta.rodzos@poczta.umcs.
lublin.pl

---

[2] Maria Curie-Sklodowska University, Lublin, Poland

Abstract. The year 2017 was declared by the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) as the International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Development. Tourism is seen as a "driver of development and peace, promoting the harmonious co-existence of people from all countries" (Beijing Declaration 2016). A principle of sustainable tourism is to "build sustainable cities and communities". From this perspective, tourism should support the wellbeing of all actors involved. Wellbeing of hosts should be achieved when sustainable tourism guidelines are fulfilled. Wellbeing of guests is necessary to make any destination attractive for tourism. The question posed in this paper, however, challenges that view.

The paper presents a theoretical analysis of wellbeing in relation to sustainable tourism and to hosting and guest communities. The first section talks about wellbeing conceptual backgrounds including Social Indicators, index of life quality based on values, subjective wellbeing or responsible wellbeing. The second section focuses on the analysis of wellbeing in sustainable tourism conceptual background, including the differences between the guidelines provided by WTO (2005), and the latest guidelines published by UNWTO (United Nations World Tourism Organization) and UNGA in 2015. The third section juxtaposes wellbeing conceptual background with

Аннотация. 2017 год был объявлен Генеральной ассамблеей Организации Объединенных Наций (ГА ООН) Международным годом устойчивого туризма в интересах развития. Туризм рассматривается как «движущая сила развития и мира, способствующая гармоничному сосуществованию людей всех стран» (Пекинская декларация 2016 г.). Принцип устойчивого туризма заключается в «создании устойчивых городов и сообществ». С этой точки зрения туризм должен поддерживать благосостояние всех вовлеченных сторон. Благополучие принимающей стороны должно достигаться через соблюдение руководящих принципов устойчивого туризма. Благополучие гостей необходимо, чтобы сделать любой пункт назначения привлекательным для туристических поездок. Однако эта статья оспаривает данную точку зрения.

В тексте представлен теоретический анализ связи благосостояния с устойчивым туризмом, а также принимающей и прибывающей сторонами. В первой части рассказывается о концептуальных предпосылках благосостояния, в том числе о социальных показателях, показателях качества жизни на основе ценностей, субъективного благополучия и ответственного благополучия. Во второй части внимание уделяется анализу благосостояния в концептуальных основах устойчивого туризма, в том числе различиям между

tourism, discussing the most prominent gaps and challenges of wellbeing regarding hosting communities and tourists.

руководящими принципами, представленными ВТО (2005 г.), и последними руководящими принципами, опубликованными ЮНВТО (United Nations World Tourism Organization) и ГА ООН в 2015 г. Третья часть соотносит концепцию благосостояния с туризмом, анализирует наиболее серьезные проблемы и вызовы для благополучия принимающих сообществ и туристов.

Keywords: guests, hosts, sustainable tourism, wellbeing

Ключевые слова: мигранты-туристы, принимающая сторона, устойчивый туризм, благополучие

1. Introduction

Over the past six decades, tourism has experienced continued expansion to become one of the largest and fastest-growing economic sectors in the world. International tourist arrivals have increased from 25 million in 1950 to 278 million in 1980, 674 million in 2000, and 1,235 million in 2016. The number of domestic tourists is estimated at 5—6 billion a year [UNWTO Annual report, 2017].

Of course, the increase in the number of tourists affects economic ratios. In 2016 tourism accounted for 10 % of the world's GDP, 30 % of world services export, 7 % of world's export, and 1 out of 10 inhabitants of our globe was employed in that sector [UNWTO Tourism Highlights, 2017]. Many new destinations have emerged in addition to the traditional ones in Europe and North America. The scale of the phenomenon is so great that tourism industry has become a common term used also outside the economic environment. In turn, social sciences compare tourism to neo-colonialism [MacCannell, 1976; Akama, 2004; Hall, Tucker, 2004]. In addition, functions and dysfunctions of tourism are also commonly discussed [Burns, Novelli, 2008; Dluzewska, 2009]. It is obvious that the impact of tourism is reflected not only in the objectively measurable economic values but also in the pressure on natural and cultural environment. Here, we are dealing with a kind of 'export of culture' which without any doubt affects social relations and the widely understood feeling of satisfaction with life, both in the sending and the receiving community. The perception of wellbeing changes even with regard to a change in the point of reference — inhabitants of tourist reception areas compare themselves with one another but also with tourists. Repeating after the Secretary General World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) Taleb Rifai *«With growth comes responsibility».* Thus, the care of supranational organizations for ensuring that tourism complies with the assumptions of sustainable development is not surprising. However, it is not only about 'fulfilling' the guidelines — the significance of tourism is definitely higher. Tourism is seen as a very important medium, a way to ensure sustainable development of many areas. Since about 2015 UNWTO has continued to advocate for tourism as a fundamental component of policies and priorities for

sustainable development sensu largo. As a result of such measures, in December 2015, the United Nations General Assembly declared 2017 as the International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Development.

The application documents concerning sustainable tourism often mention wellbeing. It indicates a clear influence of the guidelines of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA) (2003, 2005), in which wellbeing is strictly correlated with sustainable development and with ecosystem services, both seen as inextricable elements of one global process, necessary to lead properly *«our common future»*. It is normally assumed that tourism increases the wellbeing. The *Beijing Declaration* (2016) defines sustainable tourism as a «driver of development and peace» as well as emphasizes a huge role of tourism *«in promoting the harmonious co-existence of people from all countries»*. In late 2015, world leaders agreed upon 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to guide our development until 2030. Tourism is committed to do its part in this common endeavor. Goal no 11 by World Committee on Tourism Ethics (WCTE) is to *«help build sustainable cities and communities»*.

Wellbeing of hosts, in accordance with UNWTO (2005) or UNGA (2015), should be achieved when sustainable tourism guidelines are fulfilled. The question posed in this article, however, challenges that view. Does it really lead to wellbeing? Or maybe we are missing some important issues on the way? Wellbeing of guests is necessary to make any destination attractive for tourism. For the start, their needs and expectations will not overlap.

The article is divided into three sections. The first section talks about wellbeing conceptual backgrounds including the Social Indicators [Cummins et al., 2003], index of life quality based on values [Diener, 1995] subjective wellbeing [Diener, Suh, 1996; Ryan, Deci, 2000; Cummins, Nistico, 2002] or the responsible wellbeing one [Chambers, 1997]. The second section focuses on the analysis of wellbeing in sustainable tourism conceptual background, including the differences between the guidelines provided by World Tourism Organization (WTO) in 2005, and the latest guidelines published by United World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) and United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in 2015. The third section juxtaposes wellbeing conceptual background with tourism, the most prominent gaps and challenges of wellbeing regarding hosting communities and tourists.

2. Wellbeing — conceptual background

It would be an understatement to claim that the term 'wellbeing' is reaching its peak of popularity nowadays. It is used in numerous supranational and national policies, and found its way even into mass culture, very often derived from original understanding (e. g. spa & wellness). Wellbeing appears in academic papers related to environment, economy, psychology, medical sciences and many others disciplines. It is also frequently used in relation to tourism, stating by assumption that tourism adds to the wellbeing. In consequence tourism is involved into many of social and even charity actions. Still, despite growing popularity, the term «wellbeing» is very ambiguous [Tuula, Tuuli, 2015].

The concept of wellbeing originated as early as in 1930s within the area of economic studies. It was connected with the term GNP (Gross National Product) which soon evolved into GDP (Gross Domestic Product) referring to the value of all goods

and services produced in a specific country. The reasoning was simple — the greater the GDP, the higher the wellbeing of the inhabitants of the respective country [Shea, 1976]. Without any doubt, at present GDP is only a small fragment of what contributes to the wellbeing of individuals, even when talking in economic terms only. This ratio does not provide information about the distribution of income among respective citizens (in many countries with a high GDP considerable social disparities are observed). However, it does not refer to actual costs of maintenance (what is sufficient to provide for an affluent life in one country, in another one will only cover the basic living expenses). It also does not differentiate between positive and negative expenses (from the GDP perspective buying cigarettes will increase the wellbeing).

It is obvious that countries with a high GDP can invest more in health care, education, culture and other spheres having a positive impact on the wellbeing of citizens [Lai, 2000]. However, this is neither automatic nor simple. Numerous surveys also prove that the mechanism 'more money — more happiness' (i. e. higher wellbeing) is not that obvious [Gardner, Oswald, 2007]. It is interesting that, for instance, the level of wellbeing among the inhabitants of the poor Ethiopia or Bangladesh is higher than among the citizens of many affluent developed countries [Blackmore, 2009; Copestake, 2009; Copestake, Campfield, 2009, Cummins et al., 2003; Deneulin, McGregor, 2009; Eckersley, 1998; Shea, 1976; White, 2009].

The first indicator differentiating expenses into positive and negative ones in terms of wellbeing was the Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI) [Halstead, 1998; Hamilton, 1998]. In turn, the Human Development Index (HDI), next to GDP, took into account the average length of life and level of education (UNDP 2003). Sen [Sen, 1985] went even further and created the famous 'concept of capabilities' in which wellbeing, apart from the above-mentioned ones, comprised political and social factors (including values). Wellbeing was to be formed by *functioning, capabilities*, and *agency*.

Many researchers made references to the 'concept of capabilities'. However, it is peculiar that the papers did not make reference to specific values (connected, for example, with a specific culture) and they did not even treat them as separate categories [Deneulin, McGregor, 2009: 1].

More and more often, also in the field of economic sciences, it was perceived that wellbeing was a very complex status affected by cultural, political, social and many other factors. In a straight line it led to the identification of the so-called Social Indicators (SI) [Cummins et al., 2003]. The creators of SI were guided by the idea to create a full set of indices of wellbeing. What is more, they were willing to create a universal set which could be used regardless of the fact whether the surveys were carried out in Argentina, China or the United States. Of course, this is impossible to achieve even within the same cultural, political or economic context. The selection of respective indices and, further, assigning specific weights to such indices will be arguable. How much does the level of wellbeing increase, e. g. when you have kids? Without any doubt, in the same situation some people could feel happy while others would be more or less satisfied. Still other people can feel sad and frustrated about it.

It turned out very fast that wellbeing surveys carried out in the same area provided totally different results due to a change in the indices and weights [Becker et al., 1987].

We should admit that Diener and Suh [Diener, Suh, 1996: 197] correctly indicated that the largest drawback of SI was the somehow inevitable subjectivity.

Perhaps, the most versatile set of indices closely connected with social studies and psychology is the Index of Life Quality Based on Values (QoL) created by E. Diener [Diener, 1995]. The index consists of 45 indicators that are considered universal. They were assigned to one of 7 groups (spheres) such as *Hierarchy, Conservatism, Intellectual Autonomy, Affective Autonomy, Egalitarian Commitment, Mastery* and *Harmony*. However, with regard to large differences in the perception of wellbeing in affluent and developing societies, Diener proposed two versions of QoL — a basic and an extended one.

Wellbeing is also given some coverage in environmental sciences. From their perspective, human wellbeing is closely linked to the good condition of natural environment — water, air etc. The mechanism is simple — the better the quality of natural environment, the higher the human wellbeing [Hall et al., 2013]. This concept more and more often tends to speak about the wellbeing of the entire globe and not only of a selected area. It analyzes, e.g. the harmful impact of fuel emissions during transcontinental flights [Pearch-Nielsen et al., 2010; Scott et al. 2008, 2010).

A. Prescott [Prescott, 2001] even writes about 'ecosystem wellbeing' defined as «a condition in which the ecosystem maintains its diversity and quality — and thus it's capacity to support people and the rest of life — and it's potential to adapt to change and provide a wide range of choices and opportunities for the future».

Prescott emphasized that it is impossible to talk about human wellbeing at the same time neglecting ecosystem wellbeing — as both of them are equally important. What is more, human wellbeing is impossible without ecosystem wellbeing.

«Ecosystem wellbeing is a requirement because the ecosystems supports life and makes possible any standards of living. Although trade-offs between the needs of people and the needs of ecosystems are unavoidable, they must be limited» [Prescott, 2001: 4].

Indeed, numerous surveys in the area of medical studies proved that good status of natural environment clearly had a positive effect on the health of individuals [Pretty *et al.*, 2007; Rodrigues et al., 2010; Völker, Kistemann, 2011]. Studies were also carried out with reference to respective types of landscape and their impact on wellbeing [Velarde *et al.*, 2007]. Landscapes that have the most favourable effect on wellbeing are the so-called *blue spaces* — rivers, seas, lakes [Pretty et al., 2007] and *green spaces* — forests, parks, meadows etc. (e.g. [Maas et al., 2006; Pretty *et al.*, 2007; Völker and Kistemann, 2011]. In addition, the role of green and blue spaces was often analyzed with reference to tourism and leisure, and representatives of social studies, biology or geographical studies were involved in the surveys [Yang, 2013].

Wellbeing is also given some coverage in social studies and psychology. Two fundamental approaches to wellbeing can be distinguished within the area of humanities [Brock, 1993, Diener, Suh, 1996]. According to the first one, the components of wellbeing are determined by the so-called cultural context [Diener, Suh 1996: 189]. Happiness (wellbeing) will be perceived differently by a resident of Poland than by an Egyptian or by a British citizen. It is due to the cultural context that some behaviours seen as negative for an individual by third parties can be perceived as very positive ones by such an individual (they increase wellbeing). Someone can feel better, e.g. sacrificing something for others. In this approach a huge role is ascribed to social, cultural and religious studies.

Research carried out by the University of Bath Research Group focusing on Wellbeing in Developing Countries (WeD) provided interesting information about how wellbeing functions in different cultural contexts. The outcomes indicate that in developing countries religion, family happiness or the so-called social respect [Deneulin, McGregor, 2009, White, 2009] are more important while financial issues that are so crucial in western countries are definitely less significant.

S. White [White, 2009: 4] identified different mechanisms of wellbeing:

1. In affluent western countries — doing well means feeling good
2. In developing countries — doing good means feeling well

The second approach is the domain of psychologists. They put emphasis on the types of personality and on individual perception. In the same situation, context, or culture someone can see a glass as half full while someone else will claim it is half empty. It is important how the situation is evaluated by the analyzed individual and not how things look from a third party perspective. Thus, your wellbeing level can be high when you are «poor», ill, or unemployed — and — on the contrary — you can have good financial standing and live in good health and your wellbeing can still be low. This approach focuses on the so-called subjective wellbeing (SWB).

Researchers wonder what is the condition determining the specific level of wellbeing of an individual — is it the personality (intrinsic factors) or situations we are involved in (extrinsic factors)? Naturally, with reference to (sustainable) tourism, only the second one can be analyzed. You can influence a proper behaviour of a tourist but certainly not one's personality. Talking about *extrinsic factors*, numerous questions also arise. The most important ones refer to whether wellbeing is rather affected by our actions for the sake of other people (active approach) or by the actions of other people undertaken for our sake (passive approach). The response leads to the popular division into *hedonic* and *eudaimonic* indicators created by Waterman [Waterman, 1993]. From the perspective of the *eudaimonic* approach, good interpersonal relations and social involvement have an influence on the high level of SWB [Ryan, Deci, 2001].

Such a division is applied, among other things, in the *Multidimensional Model of Wellbeing* by Ryff and Keyes' [Ryff, Keyes, 1995]. In this model, SWB consists of: *Purpose in Life, Environmental Mastery, Self-Acceptance, Personal Growth, Autonomy, and Positive Relations with Others.* The great positive role of social involvement in the subjective wellbeing of individuals is emphasized here.

An important *eudaimonic* theory is the Self-Determination Theory (SDT) developed by Ryan and Deci [Ryan, Deci, 2000]. According to this theory, wellbeing comprises fulfilment of three most important needs such as *competence, autonomy*, and *relatedness*. If any of these needs is not fulfilled, ill-being appears. And ill-being may, in turn, result in pathologies of different type. Ryan and Deci [Ryan, Deci, 2000: 68] emphasize mutual relationships between extrinsic and intrinsic factors. Extrinsic factors have a strong motivating or discouraging effect on individuals (and then they already become intrinsic ones). In turn, it contributes to a distinct perception of subsequent extrinsic factors.

The Theory of Subjective Wellbeing Homeostasis developed by Cummins and Nistico [Cummins, Nistico, 2002] is also widely applied with reference to tourism. Here, comparison with others plays a very important role in the development of wellbeing of

individuals. As a result of the comparison, a person can feel better, worse, rich — because he/she has a place to live and is not hungry), or poor (because other people have villas and cars [Dłużewska, 2016].

Among all the wellbeing concepts, the concept of 'responsible wellbeing' by Chambers [Chambers, 1997] is the closest to the ideology of sustainable development. According to this concept, environmental activity respecting natural environment and social activity respecting people and their culture, would contribute to increasing the self-esteem of an individual and thus to increasing the level of subjective wellbeing. The better person I am, the better I feel.

Standards applicable to wellbeing with reference to the application policy of states and many national and supranational organizations such as for example the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) or the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) were established in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA) documents from 2003 and 2005. As defined in MEA, wellbeing is a combination of five elements. These include:

1. *basic material for a good life,*
2. *health,*
3. *good social relations,*
4. *security,*
5. *freedom of choice and action.*

Of course we are talking about the wellbeing of individuals. It is clear that wellbeing is understood in very broad terms — as freedom, security, economic and social wellbeing and good health. Thus, the measurements of wellbeing interpreted as above require that many scientific disciplines such as: economy, medicine, sociology or political science and law are involved. It must be also emphasized that wellbeing interpreted as indicated above is based on measurable (objective) and subjective indicators perceived by an individual — what is a better way of measuring e. g. the quality of social relations if not based on individual statements of people participating in such relations?

Nonetheless, the components of wellbeing in the perspective of MEA are rather the scope of wishes, an indication of the direction in which one should be heading to achieve wellbeing. However, it is very difficult (based on the quoted guidelines) to measure wellbeing in practice and compare the level of wellbeing of residents in a specific area with that of residents in another one. Although the constituents of wellbeing are not inclusive of the 'natural environment status', the whole MEA document leaves no doubt that wellbeing is linked to the concept of ecosystem services and it is supposed to form part of sustainable development.

3. Sustainable tourism and wellbeing

In the publication by WTO & UNEP from 2005, out of 12 goals concerning sustainable tourism only one — *visitor fulfilment (provide a safe, satisfying and fulfilling experience for visitors, available to all)* — is dedicated to tourists. This goal is more focused on availability to tourists than on wellbeing. Furthermore, it is known that a tourist product, destination, experience which would be satisfying and fulfilling to everyone does not exist. Such common availability can lead to degradation of the natural environment and is simply a proof that mass tourism does exist.

The latest document published by UNWTO & UNGA in 2015 does not contain a single section concerning tourists, and thus this part of the article will only analyze the perspective of the host community. The wellbeing — tourists relation will be discussed in the next part of the paper.

The term 'wellbeing' is used in both documents only once. In 2005 it occurs with reference to community (the description of *community wellbeing* reads that it is about *social infrastructure, access to resources, quality of life, quality of environment, lack of corruption and human-by-human exploitation)*. In turn, the publication by UNWTO & UNGA from 2015 mentions wellbeing in one section, next to health.

However, the apparently low proportion of the term 'wellbeing' as used among other guidelines does not mean that this topic is not very often brought up in both documents. It is quite the opposite. If we assume an understanding of wellbeing similar to that in scientific disciplines which explore it, one can even claim that all the goals set by WTO & UNEP (2005) and UNWTO & UNGA (2015) refer to wellbeing. However, both documents differ so they put less or more emphasis on certain issues.

The goals from 2005 were mainly underlain by the rhetoric of equilibrium. In line with the assumptions of sustainable development in the broad sense, also with reference to tourism, it was assumed that economic, environmental and social aspects are equally important. The goals were split into 3 pillars (economic, social and environmental) and into more specific categories — four per each pillar. At least in theory — an identical amount of space was devoted to every pillar. In practice equilibrium is not obvious at all. For instance, a component of 'community wellbeing' from the social pillar is *access to resources* and *quality of environment* although these refer to the *environmental* and not the *social* pillar.

The actual focus of the goals from 2005 is the environmental perspective followed by the economic one. The social perspective is the least common [Barkemeyer et al., 2014; Hall, 2009; Hall et al., 2013; Saarinen, 2006]. It is even clearer in the application policy of most supranational organizations such as for example WEF (2009a, b), WTTC (2003, 2009) or UNWTO (2002, 2007) and in scientific research in the area of sustainable tourism. Such a perspective is close to environmental concepts of wellbeing which link the (human) wellbeing with the good status of natural environment. Thus, the ecosystem wellbeing is applicable here according to Prescot (2001) who believed that environmental wellbeing was equally important to human one. It was later supported by a wider academic community (Hall, Scott, & Gössling, 2013; Tuula, & Tuuli 2015) who also advocated a joint perspective on human and environmental wellbeing.

The economic perspective is close to the concept of wellbeing evaluated according to GDP (being one of the fundamental indicators of tourism development). To some extent one could seek here for Sen's 'concept of capabilities' [Sen, 1985] in which wellbeing was composed of *functioning, capabilities*, and *agency*; or Social Indicators as perceived by economic studies [Cummins et al., 2003].

With reference to the social pillar, 'local control' can comprise the 'need of competence' [Ryan, Deci, 2000]. The possibility to make decisions manifested in the control of the situation without any doubt has a positive effect on the 'need of competence' in the host community. On the other hand, 'cultural richness' takes into account the culture and customs of the host community — thus, it refers to wellbeing concepts

which emphasize the importance of specific cultural and religious norms as proposed by Diener and Suh [Diener, Suh, 1996]. Therefore, Social Indicators can be sought here.

The concept of responsible wellbeing [Chambers, 1997] refers to all pillars of sustainable tourism since it is applicable both to the environment and people (host community).

In addition, recommendations from 2005 contained some impossible wishful thinking (e. g. social equity where we can read about the necessity to ensure fair and *equal* distribution of social and economic benefits of tourism).

The document by UNTWO & UNGA (2015) lists 17 goals for sustainable tourism. It does not use the division into the economic, social and environmental pillars. Components of those goals occur together and they are mentioned as if they were one thing e. g. «affordable (economic) and clean (environment) energy».

The document is under a clear influence on MEA (2003, 2005). This is reflected in goals such as «1 — no poverty» and «2 — zero hunger» corresponding to MEA's «basic material for good life», social and political factors (16 — peace, justice and strong institutions, 5 — gender equality) or «good health and wellbeing» (3). Note that *wellbeing* takes upon a new, not very definite meaning here (as if other elements did not contribute to wellbeing).

More space is devoted to economic goals. They are also definitely more specifically oriented and realistic than those formulated in 2005. For instance, equal and fair distribution of profit is no longer mentioned. Rather, it is «decent work and economic growth» (8) or creating adequate options for education (4 — quality education). It was even noticed that increased income does not always contribute to sustainable development understood in a broader sense. Item 12 — responsible consumption and production suggests an influence of GPI with a division into positive and negative expenditure.

Despite an apparent reduction in proportions (4/17), goals regarding the environment play a very important role here. The difference is that they were formulated in a manner ensuring broader coverage. For instance, goal 14 — «life below water» — includes all goals of the environmental pillar from 2005 with reference to water ecosystems. Similarly, goal 15 — «life on land» makes reference to 'land'. A new thing is seeing the environmental impact of tourism on a global scale, not only at the place of tourist reception (13 — climate action).

4. Gaps and challenges

The measurements of tourism impact on the wellbeing are attempted within respective disciplines that study the above-mentioned wellbeing. Surveys undertaken in selected fields maintain their own perspective and many times ignore the point of view of other disciplines. Sometimes they generates mutually excluding results. For instance, things that from the point of view of economy lead to an increase in wellbeing (such as increased GDP), from the point of view of sociology can contribute to reducing the wellbeing (e. g. deteriorated social relations). Of course, many examples of such surveys and applications for the above-mentioned concepts could be listed. However, this part of the paper discusses only those that are highly significant for analyzing the wellbeing of the host community and tourists and were not included in documents regarding sustainable tourism or seem most contentious. It is also

obvious that not all concepts refer to both groups. It is a result of the obvious fact that reasons for undertaking tourism are completely different in this case (for example, the host community will care about economic benefits which are completely insignificant for tourists). However, to start with, we will analyze the points that are common for both groups.

First, it should be emphasized that tourism significantly changes the point of reference both in the host community and among tourists. Although we live in the times of globalization and watching TV and series alone provides us with information about different (better? worse? strange?) world and different models of behaviour, the contact with 'real' people has a definitely stronger impact than what we see on the screen. In particular it refers to situations when cultural / economic/ religious differences between hosts and visitors are significant. People who have felt rich so far because they had a place to live and enough food, when looking at tourists could (and many times did) conclude that their situation is not good at all [Dluzewska, Michniewicz-Ankiersztajn, Gonia, 2017]. As a result they might be willing to leave in order to find a better place in which they would have a status similar to that of tourists, and have their share in the tourists' assets (in a positive sense by working in tourist services and in the negative one through stealing, begging, prostitution) etc.

It is significant that they only observe the behaviour of tourists that is typical of holiday time. Such behaviour is not usual and it differs from how they live every day. Hosts cannot see tourists working long hours every day, driving their kids to school, being exhausted etc. They can only witness their behaviour in spare time: lying on the beach all day, drinking large amounts of alcohol, partying, and simply doing nothing. Or if actually doing anything — sightseeing and taking photos. Also, tourists comparing themselves with the host community can evaluate their situation differently. They could notice that they have not sufficiently appreciated their possibilities, or they could envy the locals (sun, landscape, money). Without any doubt tourism has a significant impact on social behaviour in both groups. Also, it has a certain impact on how people feel (SWB).

Thus, the Theory of Subjective Wellbeing Homeostasis (TSWH) developed by Cummins and Nistico [Cummins, Nistico, 2002], which emphasizes the high significance of the point of reference (who we compare ourselves with) in shaping the wellbeing, is very useful in wellbeing surveys. And Appadurai's Capacity to Aspire [Appadurai, 2004] is also significant here.

Secondly, tourism often takes place in the so-called developing countries. As already told, some authors even refer to neo-colonialism — a kind of 'conquest' of poorer countries by citizens of affluent ones (usually from Western societies) [MacCannell, 1976; Akama 2004, Hall, Tucker, 2004]. According to surveys carried out by WeD Group, developing countries and Western societies present different schemes of wellbeing [White, 2009]. In principle, it leads to many misunderstandings. The locals are not able to understand how it is possible that tourists feel good while behaving 'immorally', having no children, family, travelling alone etc. In turn, tourists find the often 'non-elastic' and 'old-fashioned' attitudes of the hosts weird and consider the locals backward. If we add cultural differences, a conflict is imminent. The lack of understanding leads to many dysfunctions in tourism [Dłużewska, 2009].

Another element having an identical impact on wellbeing in both groups is the status of natural environment. Clean water, air, lack of visual pollution etc. are definitely positive both for hosts and tourists. However, it must be emphasized that subjective evaluations (SWB) can be completely different in those groups. In many developing countries visual pollution is not a problem for locals. Hence, the increase in wealth increases the amount of waste. Many times it also leads to overusing the resources [Dłużewska, 2008] and damaging local cultural landscape for the sake of modernity: natural roofs on houses are replaced with a more practical, impermeable metal sheet, traditional housing estates are abandoned etc. [Dłużewska, Dłużewski, 2017]. Such behaviours were covered by the priorities for sustainable tourism published by UNWTO & UNGA (2015), specifically in priority 12 «responsible consumption and production».

In the environmental concepts of wellbeing the only 'contentious' issue is the above-mentioned «climate action» (priority 13). The global perspective emphasized by this priority, although justified from the point of view of taking care for the condition of our planet, may turn out unfavourable for certain destinations, in particular in the short run [Dluzewska et al., 2017]. This trend comprises numerous publications concerning harmful effects of jet fuel emissions during transcontinental flights. Here, the idea of sustainable transport came into life. The most sustainable (contributing to the wellbeing of our planet and thus of humans) means of transport is railway [Peeters et al., 2009, de Bruijn et al., 2010; Dwyer et al., 2010; Pearch-Nielsen et al., 2010; Scott et al., 2008, 2010). However, it does not take into account an obvious fact that many tourist destinations, e. g. Indonesia, cannot be reached by train — you need to fly to get there. Thus, a reduction in flights, which from the point of view of the environment increases the wellbeing and contributes to sustainable development, will be evaluated as quite the opposite from the economic perspective. Thus, as a result GDP from tourism would be reduced in destinations distant from the markets the tourists come from.

The opinions of individuals are not significant here. It does not matter whether or not they also think that e. g. reduced emissions of jet fuel, and as a consequence, reduction in the number of tourists visiting the specific destination, have an actual impact on their wellbeing or such an impact does not exist at all [Dluzewska, 2016].

Talking about the relation between tourism and wellbeing of tourists, in the first place reference should be made to the common premonition that tourism increases the wellbeing [Tuohino et al., 2014]. Wellbeing is mostly understood as a health. The concepts wellbeing = health have attracted the interest of tourism scholars and the hospitality industry in recent years (e. g. [Bushell, Sheldon, 2009; Smith, Puczkó, 2009; Tuohino et al., 2014].

Many governments use synonymously the term of medical tourism and health one [Smith, 2015]. Smith and Puzckó [Smith, Puczkó, 2009) were among the first to try to bridge the concepts of wellness and health tourism, and discussed diverse aspects related to wellness, e. g. spirituality, happiness, quality of life and the wellbeing.

Although reference literature often mentions negative effects of tourism, tourism dysfunctions etc. [Dłuzewska, 2009, 2017], in many circles (in particular at the level of national policies) the positive role of tourism is assumed to be an axiom [McCabe et al. 2010; McCabe, Johnson, 2013; Minnaert et al. 2009]. Such a pattern of thinking

results in the idea of financing vacation for employees and their children, charities etc [McCabe, 2009; Minnaert et al. 2006]. Some countries are convinced that tourism is a fundamental good to which we are simply entitled [Diekman, McCabe, 2011].

Surveys concerning the wellbeing of tourists are often carried out with reference to ecosystems [Völker, Kistemann, 2011; Pretty et al., 2007]. Therefore, they analyze which has a better impact — mountains, sea, lakes? A large portion of surveys is carried out in the area of medical studies. Many surveys refer to the above-mentioned blue spaces and green spaces (e. g. [Maas et al., 2006; Pretty et al., 2007, Völker, Kistemann, 2011].

Of course, ecosystems have a similar impact on all people within a specific area (i. e. identical for tourists and for the host community). However, literature neglects this issue.

On the other hand, surveys on wellness take a completely different path. Likewise in the case of social tourism, the indisputable fact is that participation in such a type of tourism increases wellbeing. Literature concerning wellness dominated wellbeing surveys, in particular in non-English-speaking countries. It will not be exaggerated to state that the term 'wellness' has departed from the original, holistic meaning of 'wellbeing'. In many cases, it is automatically associated with spas and health tourism [Dłużewska, 2016; Georgiev, Vasileva, 2010].

5. Conclusions

The guidelines for sustainable tourism focus on the broadly understood wellbeing of the host community. This is how the care for natural environment, economic growth or level of education is perceived. However, not all goals that are important and were included in other common policies (such as for example MEA, 2005) have been included here. The largest lack of sustainable tourism indicators with reference to the host community can be the lack of social and economic measures and indices and complete neglect of the evaluation performed by the parties concerned. There is no place for subjective wellbeing here. It seems that the guidelines were created at the level of 'higher awareness' by someone who knows well what is good for others and what conditions must be satisfied to ensure that someone else feels well. To a large extent this view is supported by WeD claiming that irrespective of the political and cultural context, surveys regarding wellbeing are mainly carried out from the Western perspective. It leads to numerous misunderstandings and imposes the Western point of view [White, 2009; Copestake, Campfield, 2009].

Another big gap is not including tourists in the guidelines developed by UNWTO. It is strange because tourism is a kind of compromise. Tourism must take into account the interests of both groups at all times. But for the satisfaction of travellers, tourism — whether or not sustainable — would not exist at all. Tourists would simply avoid certain destinations. The huge significance of the satisfaction of tourists with their stay in a specific destination, hotel, or country is testified by thousands of articles regarding guest satisfaction, product quality, consumer behaviour etc. And obviously, increased satisfaction with their stay contributes to increasing the wellbeing of tourists. However, these issues are not covered by the concept of sustainable tourism. However, it is done completely separately and not in connection with considerations concerning sustainable tourism. What a pity. It would be good to talk about (sustainable) tourism which would have a positive effect on both the host community and the tourists. It

must be remembered that tourism is a kind of compromise between values, cultures, behaviours and benefits — thus, it should increase the wellbeing of both parties.

References

Akama J. S. (2004) Neo-colonialism, dependency and external control of Africa's tourism industry. In Akama J. S. *Tourism and postcolonialism: Contested discourses, identities and representations*. London: Routledge. P. 140—152.

Appadurai A. (2004) The capacity to aspire. Culture and the Term of Recognition, In: V. Rao, ed. *Cultural politics in a Global Age. Uncertainty, Solidarity and Innovation.* Walton M., Oneworld Publications, Oxford, P. 29—35.

Barkemeyer R., Holt D., Preuss L., Tsang S. (2014) What happened to the 'development' in sustainable development? Business guidelines two decades after Brundtland. *Sustainable evelopment.* Vol. 22. No. 1. P. 15—32. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.521.

Becker R. A., Denby L., McGill R., Wilks A. R. (1987) Analysis of data from the Places Rated Almanac. *The American Statistician*. Vol. 41. P. 169—186. https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.1987.10475474.

Blackmore S. (2009) Responsible wellbeing and its Implications for Development Policies. *WeD Working Paper* 09/47.

Brock D. (1993) Quality of life in health care and medical ethics. In: M. Nussbuam, A. Sen, eds. *The Quality of Life*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. P. 95—132.

Bushell R., Sheldon P. J. (2009) Wellness and Tourism: Mind, body, spirit, place. New York: Cognizant.

Burns P., Novelli M. (Eds.) (2008) Tourism Development. Growth, Myths and Inequalities. Wallingford: CAB International.

Chambers R. (1997) Editorial: Responsible Wellbeing — A Personal Agenda for Development. *World Development.* Vol. 25. No. 11. P. 1743—1754. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(97)10001-8.

Copestake J. (2009) Development and Wellbeing in Peru: Comparing Global and Local Views. *WeD Working Paper,* 09/48.

Copestake J., Campfield L. (2009) Measuring subjective wellbeing in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Peru and Thailand using a personal life goal satisfaction approach. *WeD Working Paper* 09/45.

Cummins R. A., Nistico H. (2002) Maintaining life satisfaction: the role of positive cognitive bias, *Journal of Happiness Studies.* No. 3. P. 37—69. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015678915305.

Cummins R. A., Eckersley R., Pallant J., Van Vugt J. Misajon R. (2003) Developing a national index of subjective wellbeing: The Australian Unity Wellbeing Index. *Social indicators research.* Vol. 64. No. 2. P. 159—190. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024704320683.

de Bruijn K., Dirven R., Eijgelaar E., Peeters P. (2010) *Travelling Large in 2008. The Carbon Footprint of Dutch Holidaymakers in 2008 and the Development since 2002*. NHTV Breda University of Applied Sciences, NRIT Research, NBTC–NIPO Research: Breda, The Netherlands.

Deneulin S., McGregor J. S. (2009) The capability approach and the Politics of the Social Conception of wellbeing. *WeD Working Paper* 09/43.

Diekmann A., McCabe S. (2011) Systems of social tourism in the European Union: A critical review. *Current Issues in Tourism*. Vol. 14. No. 5. P. 417—430. https://doi.org /10.1080/13683500.2011.568052.

Diener E. (1995) A value based index for measuring national quality of life. *Social indicators research.* Vol. 36. No. 2. P. 107—127. https://doi.org/10.1007/ BF01079721

Diener E., Suh, E.M. (1996) Measuring quality of life: Economic, social and subjective indicators. *Social indicators research.* Vol. 40. No. 1. P. 189—216. https://doi. org/10.1023/A:100685951.

Dluzewska A. (2008) Direct and indirect impact of tourism industry on drylands: the example of Southern Tunisia. *Management of Environmental Quality.* Vol. 19. No. 6. P. 661—669. https://doi.org/10.1108/14777830810904894.

Dluzewska A. (2009) Socio-cultural Tourism Dysfunctions in Muslim Countries (Spoleczno-kulturowe dysfunkcje turystyczne w krajach islamu.— in Polish). Warsaw: Warsaw University Press.

Dłużewska A. (2016) Wellbeing — Conceptual Background and Research Practices. *Društvena istraživanja*. Vol. 25. No. 4. P. 547—667. https://doi.org/10.5559/di.25.4.06.

Dłużewska A. (2017) Wellbeing versus sustainable development — conceptual Framework and application challenges. *Problemy ekorozwoju/ Problems of sustainable development.* Vol. 12. No. 2. P. 89—97.

Dłużewska A., Dłużewski M. (2017) Tourism versus the transformation of ksours– Southern Morocco case study. *Bulletin of Geography. Socio-economic Series.* Vol. 36. No. 36. P. 77—86. https://doi.org/10.1515/bog-2017-0015.

Dluzewska A., Michniewicz-Ankiersztajn H., Gonia A. (2017) *Sustainable Tourism Versus Wellbeing — the Hosts and Guests Perspective. Proceedings of the International Conference on Hospitality, Tourism, and Sports Management*, Vol. 1. No.1. Global Academic-Industrial Cooperation Society. P. 247—268.

Dwyer L., Forsyth P., Spurr R., Hoque S. (2010). Estimating the carbon footprint of Australian tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism.* No. 18. P. 355—376. DOI: https:// doi.org/10.1080/09669580903513061.

Eckersley R. (1998) Perspectives on progress: economic growth, quality of life and Ecological sustainability. In: R. Eckersley., ed., *Measuring Progress: Is Life Getting Better?* CSIRO Publishing: Melbourne. P. 3—34.

Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: A Framework for Assessment. 2003. In *Millennium Ecosystem Assessment*. Island Press: Washington DC.

Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Synthesis/ Current State and Trends/ Scenarios/ Policy responses/ Multiscale Assessments. 2005. In *Millennium Ecosystem Assessment*. Island Press: Washington DC.

Gardner J., Oswald A. J. (2007) Money and mental wellbeing: a longitudinal study of medium-sized lottery wins. Vol. 6. No. 1. P. 49—60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2006.08.004.

Georgiev G, Vasileva M. (2010) Conceptualization and Classification of Balneo, Spa and Wellness establishments in Bulgaria. *UTMS Journal of Economics*. Vol. 1. No. 2. P. 37—44.

Hall C. M. (2009) Degrowing tourism: Décroissance, sustainable consumption and steady state tourism. *Anatolia*. Vol. 20. No. 1. P. 46—61. https://doi.org/13032917.2009.10518894.

Hall M. C., Tucker H. (Eds.). (2004) *Tourism and postcolonialism: Contested discourses, identities and representations*. London, New York: Routledge.

Hall C. M., Scott D., Gössling S. (2013) The primacy of climate change for sustainable international tourism. *Sustainable Development.* Vol. 21. No. 2. P. 112—121. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.1562.

Halstead T. (1998) The science and politics of new measures of progress: a United States perspective', In: R. Eckersley, ed., *Measuring Progress: Is Life Getting Better?* Melbourne: CSIRO Publishing. P. 53—68.

Hamilton C. (1998) Measuring changes in economic welfare: the genuine progress Indicator for Australia, In: R. Eckersley, ed., In *Measuring Progress: Is Life Getting Better?* Melbourne: CSIRO Publishing. P. 69—92.

Lai D. (2000) Temporal analysis of human development indicators: principal components approach. *Social Indicators Research.* No. 51. P. 331—366.

Maas J., Verheij R. A., Groenewegen P.P, de Vries, s-.and Spreeuwenberg P. (2006) Evidence based public health policy and practice. Green space, urbanity, and health: how strong is the relation? *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health.* No. 60. P. 587—592. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2005.043125.

MacCannell D. (1976) TheTourist: A NewTheory of the Leisure Class. *New York: Schocken Books.*

McCabe S. (2009) Who needs a holiday? Evaluating social tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research.* Vol. 36. No. 4. P. 667—688. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2009.06.005.

McCabe S., Joldersma T., Li C. (2010) Understanding the benefits of social tourism: Linking participation to subjective well-being and quality of life. *International Journal of Tourism Research.* Vol. 12. No. 6. P. 761—773. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.791.

McCabe S., Johnson S. (2013) The happiness factor in tourism: Subjective well-being and social tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research.* No. 41. P. 42—65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2012.12.001.

Minnaert L., Maitland R., Miller G. (2006) Social tourism and its ethical foundations. *Tourism Culture & Communication.* Vol. 7. No. 1. P. 7—17. https://doi.org/10.3727/109830406778493533.

Minnaert L., Maitland R., Miller G. (2009) Tourism and social policy: The value of social tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research.* Vol. 36. No. 2. P. 316—334. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2009.01.002.

Peeters P., Gössling S., Lane B. (2009) Moving towards low-carbon tourism: new opportunities for destinations and tour operators. In: S. Gössling, C. M. Hall and D. Weaver, eds. *Sustainable Tourism Futures: Perspectives on Systems, Restructuring and Innovations.* London: Routledge. P. 240—257.

Perch-Nielsen S., Sesartic A., Stucki M. (2010) The greenhouse gas intensity of the tourism sector: the case of Switzerland. *Environmental Science and Policy.* No. 13. P. 131—140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2009.12.002.

Prescott A. R. (2001) The wellbeing of nations. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Pretty J., Peacock J., Hine R., Sellens M., South N., Griffin M. (2007) Green exercise in the UK countryside: effects on health and psychological wellbeing and implications for policy and planning. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management.* Vol. 50. P. 211—231. https://doi.org/10.1080/09640560601156466.

Rodrigues A., Kastenholz E., Rodrigues A., (2010) Hiking as a wellness activity — an exploratory study of hiking tourists in Portugal. *Journal of Vacation Marketing.* Vol. 16. No. 4. P. 331—343. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766710380886.

Ryan R. M., Deci E. L. (2000) Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American psychologist.* Vol. 55. No. 1. P. 68. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68.

Ryan R. M., Deci E. L. (2001) On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual review of psychology.* Vol. 52. No. 1. P. 141—166. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141.

Ryff C. D., Keyes, C.L.M. (1995) The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of personality and social psychology.* Vol. 69. No. 4. P. 719—727. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719.

Saarinen J. (2006) Traditions of sustainability in tourism studies. *Annals of tourism Research.* Vol. 33. No. 4. P. 1121—1140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2006.06.007

Scott D., Amelung B., Becken S., Ceron J. P., Dubois G., Gössling S., Peeters P., Simpson M. (2008) Technical report. In Climate Change and Tourism: Responding to Global Challenges. UNWTO: Madrid; UNEP: Paris; WMO: Geneva. P. 23—250.

Scott D., Peeters P., Gössling S. (2010) Can tourism deliver its 'aspirational' emission reduction targets? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism.* No. 18. P. 393—408. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669581003653542.

Sen A. (1985) Well-being, agency and freedom: the Dewey lectures 1984. *The journal of philosophy.* Vol. 82. No. 4. P. 169—221. https://doi.org/10.2307/2026184.

Shea W. R. (1976) Introduction: the quest for a high quality of life'. In: W.R. Shea, J. King-Farlow, eds. *Values and the Quality of Life*. New York: Science History Publications. P. 1—5.

Smith M. (2015) Baltic Health Tourism: Uniqueness and Commonalities. *Scandinavian   Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*. Vol. 15. No. 4. P. 357—379. https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2015.1024819.

Smith M., Puczkó L. (2009) *Health and wellness tourism*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann. Smith M., Puczkó L. (2014). *Health tourism and hospitality: Spas, wellness and medical travel.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Tuohino A., Konu H., Hjalager A-M, Huijbens E. (2014). Practical Examples of Service Development and Innovations in the Nordic Well-Being Industry. In: Kandampully, J. (ed). *Service Management in Health & Wellness Services*. Dubuque: Kendall Hunt. P. 325—346.

Tuula H., Tuuli H. (2015) Wellbeing and Sustainability: A Relational Approach. *Sustainable Development.* No. 23. P. 167—175. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.1581.

UNWTO (2002). Tourism and poverty alleviation. Madrid, Spain.

UNWTO (2007). Tourism will Contribute to Solutions for Global Climate Change and Poverty Challenges. Press release, Madrid, Spain.

UNWTO Annual Report 2016. (2017) URL: http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/annual_report_2016_web_0.pdf.

UNWTO Tourism Highlights 2017. (2017) URL: http://www2.unwto.org/publication/unwto-tourism-highlights-2017-edition-0.

Velarde M. D., Fry G., Tveit M. (2007) Health effects of viewing landscapes — Landscape types in environmental psychology. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening.* No 6. P. 199—212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2007.07.001.

Völker S., Kistemann T. (2011) The impact of blue space on human health and well-being — Salutogenetic health effects of inland surface waters: A review. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health. Vol.* 214. No. 6. P. 449—460. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2011.05.001.

Waterman A. S. (1993) Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal Expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of personality and social psychology.* Vol. 64. No. 4. P. 678. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022—3514.64.4.678.

White S. (2009) Analysing wellbeing: A framework for development Practice. *WeD Working Paper* 09/44.

World Commission on Environment and Development (1987). *Our Common Future.* Oxford University Press: New York: UNEP and WTO (2005). *Making tourism more sustainable — A guide for Policy Makers.* Paris, Madrid.

WTTC (2003). *Blueprint for New Tourism*. London.

WTTC (2009). *Leading the Challenge on Climate Change*. London.

Yang L. (2013). Ethnic tourism and minority identity: Lugu Lake, Yunnan, China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Researc*h. Vol. 18. No. 7. P. 712—730. https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2012.695289.