

# **Social Sustainability on Competitiveness in the Tourism Industry: Toward New Approach?**

*José Manuel Guaita Martínez*

*José María Martín Martín*

*Domingo Enrique Ribeiro Soriano,*

*José Antonio Salinas Fernández*

## **1. Introduction**

The activities included within the so-called tourism sector have played an important role in economic and social development around the world (Martín, Salinas, & Rodríguez, 2019). Many regions in developed as well as in developing countries have made this industry the main pillar of their development strategy, thus being responsible for a large part of the creation of employment and wealth (Guaita, Martín, Salinas, & Mogorrón-Guerrero, 2019). In fact, in some countries, tourism has reached an important level similar to that of other sectors that had traditionally been the driving force behind their development model (Mendola & Volo, 2017; UNWTO, 2018). Forecasts only confirm this reality: tourism will be one of the fastest growing activities at the international level (Gómez-Vega & Picazo-Tadeo, 2019), and it will play an increasingly important role in the economic growth and social development of a large group of developing countries (Joshi, Poudyal, & Larson, 2017). In developed countries, the growing tourist activity continues to provide wealth and employment in a situation where jobs are being lost as a result of deindustrialization, the relocation of activities, and the decrease in competitiveness of the agricultural sector (Martín, Salinas, Rodríguez, & Jiménez, 2017). Therefore, the benefits of this activity extend to

countries and regions of diverse profiles in the process of development or in productive reconversion. This sector is one whose capacity to promote growth and generate employment is beyond any doubt (Gómez & Barrón, 2019).

Notwithstanding the above and bearing in mind the prominent role of the tourism industry in the process of economic recovery after the crisis that began in 2007, a growing feeling of rejection toward tourism has emerged in many countries, the so-called “tourism-phobia” (Martín, Guaita, & Salinas, 2018). This is accounted for by the fact that, in addition to the positive benefits mentioned above associated with the generation of employment and wealth, tourism generates other less positive interactions. The development of the tourist activity and, above all, the continuous growth of the flows of visitors, derives in environmental, socio-cultural, and economic changes in the environment in which the activity takes place (Lee, 2013). These changes, some of which are beneficial and others not so much, undoubtedly affect the lives of the citizens of the destination. The support of the host community will be conditioned by the type of changes that are generated, the way in which they evolve, and the perception that the local population has of them. It is precisely the support of the local population and its participation in the process of tourism development that are key factors in ensuring the success and sustainability of the tourism industry in any destination (Gursoy, Chi, & Dyer, 2010).

If the above is assumed to be true, it is taken for granted that the success of a destination, its long-term sustainability, and, therefore, its competitiveness are conditioned by the social support of the activity, which, in turn, derives from the impacts it causes on local communities. The conceptualization and measurement of competitiveness in the tourism sector has generated controversy and lack of agreement as a consequence of the complexity of the concept and the heterogeneous

dimensions that integrate it (Abreu-Novais, Ruhanen, & Arcodia, 2018; Salinas, Serdeira, Martín, & Rodríguez, 2020). In this chapter, we reflect on the importance of considering social sustainability as part of the concept of tourism competitiveness, something that has often been overlooked. What is more, social sustainability is not recognized explicitly and with sufficient emphasis as a determining factor for the long-term sustainability of destinations. The World Tourism Organization encapsulates tourism sustainability in seven dimensions: tourism seasonality, leakages, employment, tourism as a contributor to nature conservation, community and destination economic benefits, tourism and poverty alleviation, and competitiveness of tourism businesses (Qiu, Fan, Lyu, Lin, & Jenkins, 2018). In this classification, the social perspective is associated only with factors related to the generation of wealth and employment for local communities. This results in an incomplete picture that leaves out the real complexity of the social interactions between tourism and the local communities. The analysis and discussion of the social perspective of tourism competitiveness is limited in academic literature as well.

Specifically, through a review of the academic literature, this chapter tries to answer the following two research questions:

- RQ1: Is social sustainability part of the analysis of tourism competitiveness?
- RQ2: What is the importance of social sustainability for tourist destinations?

The following sections will detail the effects that tourism activity generates on local communities. We will reflect on how these effects influence citizen support for tourism development, and how this lack of support can condition the success of the destination. In addition, the way in which different approaches to measuring competitiveness have

addressed the social perspective will be presented. Doing so will provide a comprehensive overview of the problem of social sustainability, which can undermine the competitiveness of certain tourist destinations and limit their success if ignored from the public agenda.

## 2. Challenges Arising from the Growth of Tourist Activity

The above-mentioned feeling of rejection toward the tourist activity has not been fully explained. This type of rejection may result from a large increase in the number of tourists arriving at certain destinations, the development of new models of tourism organization, and the lack of public planning and regulation (Martín, Ostos, & Salinas, 2019). The situation in some European cities is complicated and the outlook is not positive at all. Such is the case of Barcelona, Berlin, London, Amsterdam, Venice, Rome, or Florence. In Barcelona, which ranks third in Europe in terms of tourist attraction, 59.9% of citizens believe that the city has reached its limit in terms of carrying capacity (Ayuntamiento de Barcelona, 2018), a percentage that five years earlier stood at 25%. In Venice, the pressure exerted by tourism is so intense that the term “Venice Syndrome” had to be coined. This term refers to the depopulation of the center of tourist destinations and an increase in the price of housing, phenomena developed in parallel with overtourism (Milano, 2017). The previous cases represent two examples out of many that could be discussed. This is the outcome of decades of pro-growth strategies being pushed by the public sector, which have been reinforced by the consolidation of low-cost airlines and the expansion of new collaborative economy models (Dredge, Gyimóthy, Birkbak, Jensen, & Madsen, 2016; Martín, 2019; Martín, Rodríguez, Zermeño, & Salinas, 2018).

It is difficult to determine accurately the volume of tourists arriving at the main tourist destinations, as official

statistics tend to collect only data on tourists staying in hotels. This complicates the monitoring of the problem and its diagnosis since tourists staying in unregulated establishments, tourist apartments, or the homes of friends or relatives are not accounted for (Martín, Rodríguez, et al., 2018). This unaccounted number of visitors, besides being large, is growing faster than that associated with the traditional supply of accommodation. For example, in the city of Madrid, there are 85,000 available hotel bed places for use (Instituto Nacional de Estadística, 2018), while the estimation referring to tourist housing reaches 25,000 bed places just by including the Airbnb database (Datahippo, 2019). These new types of accommodation have introduced tourist activity in residential buildings, bringing social impacts to the homes of local residents. This is the reason that the social impacts associated with tourist apartments require special attention.

Even though there are reported benefits for residents associated with the new means of tourist housing intermediation, there is great concern on the part of academics, policymakers, residents, and entrepreneurs (Dredge & Gyimóthy, 2015). It is relatively easy to take up entrepreneurial initiatives within the framework of collaborative economy (Nadler, 2014). In addition, these activities can raise residents' incomes, but they can also deteriorate the working conditions of the residents when they are solely dependent on said activities (Lyons & Wearing, 2015; Schor & Fitzmaurice, 2015). Other negative impacts associated with these platforms refer to issues such as the increase of residential housing prices, evictions of long-stay tenants, and even shortages of residential housing in tourist areas (Edelman & Geradin, 2015), disturbances and noise in residential buildings, loss of local cohesion (Dredge et al., 2016), increased traffic, appropriation of public spaces or overcrowding. In addition to the effects on local communities, other impacts on society as a whole have been

described, such as tax evasion or unfair competition (Lyons & Wearing, 2015). This creates a challenge for the public sector, whose response is still at a very early stage, since the legislation has yet to match the severity of the problem and is also very heterogeneous between cities (Martín et al., 2019).

The growth of tourism and the development of new forms of interaction with the locals have altered their perception of the impacts. This perception is of great importance, as it conditions social support for the tourist activity, which is a key factor for the tourism industry (Deery, Jago, & Fredline, 2012). Locals' negative attitude toward tourism can condition the sustainability of tourist destinations and, thus, their competitiveness (Diedrich & García, 2009). This derives from the fact that this industry depends on the hospitality of the residents and the involvement of tourists in the activities carried out in the destination (Gursoy, Jurowski, & Uysal, 2002). Therefore, a social conception leading to hostile behavior toward tourists can become a limiting factor in the competitiveness of the destination, just as the opposite attitude would reinforce it, as tourists tend to visit places where they feel welcome (Yoon, Gursoy, & Chen, 1999). For tourists, it is really important the way in which they are treated by the locals and if they do not feel accepted, they will look for other destinations to visit (Diedrich & García, 2009).

Both researchers and policymakers have acknowledged the need to integrate the local perspective into the planning of tourist destinations (Liu, Sheldon, & Var, 1987). The sustainable development of tourist destinations could be more successful if the local community was given access to decision-making processes so that they could express their needs, desires, fears, and objectives (Marien & Pizan, 2005). It is essential to monitor the opinions of the residents and incorporate them into the development process of the tourism project. In addition to having a clear positive impact on the communities, this will help public or private planners to manage the negative factors associated with the project and

the way in which they are perceived by the residents (Dyer, Gursoy, Sharma, & Carter, 2007). Gathering the opinions of the local residents will allow the most positive aspects of the project to be reinforced, and together with it, positive attitudes, which will give the tourist destination greater viability in the long term (Vargas, Oom, Da Costa, & Albino, 2015).

### 3. Social Sustainability as a Necessary Condition for Tourism Growth

The development of tourism does not take place in isolation but is included in an environmental, economic, and social context. Each destination has a particular set of characteristics and needs that differentiate it from others. Interactions between tourists and locals have always taken place. At present, as a consequence of the new models of tourist organization, interaction with residential areas is becoming more intense, which makes it necessary to pay more attention to models of tourism development. Social sustainability should not be taken as an excuse to hinder a potentially beneficial activity for its development. Instead of sacrificing this potential source of development, imaginative and ambitious solutions capable of preserving the social sustainability of tourism should be promoted (Seraphin, Sheeran, & Pilato, 2018).

The relationship established between tourists and the social context in which the activity takes place is not always desirable. This relationship will depend on the type of interactions generated, their nature, and intensity. Such interactions are complex, and the materialization in concrete effects on the environment is carried out by means of the so-called “tourism impacts” (Huei-Wen & Huei-Fu, 2016), which can be either negative or positive. The initial studies on the effects of tourist activity on the environments in which it takes place focused on the analysis of economic impacts,

particularly studying the positive ones and, thus, ignoring all the negative interactions generated. Among the positive impacts are the creation of companies, the generation of employment, the improvement of the quality of life of residents, the preservation of local identity, the creation of new infrastructures, interaction with other cultures, or the promotion of historical or natural resources (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011; Andereck, Valentine, Knopf, & Vogt, 2005; Keogh, 1989; Martín, Guaita, et al., 2018; Milano, 2017). On the other hand, negative impacts are classified into the following categories: economic, socio-cultural, and ecological. The impacts that are ultimately brought about on a territory and the degree of intensity of these will depend on the destination itself, its context, the model of organization, the type of visitor, and the activities carried out (Martín, Guaita, et al., 2018). The main negative impacts that have been described in the scholarly literature are the following: an increase in prices, overcrowding of infrastructures and public spaces, noise and insecurity, substitution of local businesses for others more tourist-oriented, more waste production, alteration of traditional lifestyles, overuse of resources, greater consumption of alcohol and drugs, and environmental deterioration, among others (Almeida, Peláez, Balbuena, & Cortés, 2016).

Some authors focus especially on social impacts, as they directly affect the lives of citizens and, therefore, influence their attitude toward tourism to a greater extent (Cohen, 1984). Planning efforts, both public and private, should therefore prioritize limiting negative impacts and maximizing noneconomic social benefits in order to increase the residents' commitment to tourism development (Lin, Chen, & Filieri, 2017; Martín, Jiménez, & Molina, 2014; Sharpley, 1994). Social impacts can in turn be divided into two groups, socio-cultural impacts and socio-economic impacts. The first category includes impacts such as the disappearance of traditional lifestyles, disturbances and nuisances, cultural



degradation, and the development of undesirable activities, among others.

The second category includes impacts related to the increase in the standard of living, changes in the economic system, the decrease in the quality of employment and low salaries, the increase in the value of properties, and the rise in rental prices, among others. The assessment of social impacts is more complex than that of economic impacts since it involves subjective variables associated with the quantification of costs and benefits (Butler, 1980). Such an evaluation is personal and its result will depend on the interaction that each citizen has with the tourist activity itself. In other words, the result will be based on a comparison of the benefits and costs associated with the development of tourism and the effect these have on their lives.

Taking the above into account, the type of impacts generated is just as important in shaping the opinion of residents as the process by which their attitude is shaped. Several theories have been expressed in the academic literature that try to explain the process by which residents' attitudes are shaped. For instance, Doxey (1975) put forward an index describing the intensity of local discontent at the increase of tourist activity. This index goes through the following stages as the tourist activity grows: euphoria, apathy, annoyance, and antagonism. Upchurch and Teivane (2000) also link the degree of support of citizens to the level of development of the activity, which translates into an increase in the pressure exerted on the destination. This model is related to the theory of the destination life cycle proposed by Butler (Butler, 1980), under whose model the following phases or types of attitude are defined: exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation, and decline or renewal (Gjerald, 2005). Ap and Crompton (1993) have, too, proposed a scale that shows the types of attitude toward tourism linked as well to the degree of development of the destination: embracement, tolerance, adjustment, and

withdrawal.

As stated earlier, the connection between the increase in activity and the rejection of the locals is a recurring idea. That is, as tourist activity increases, the impacts become more evident (Gjerald, 2005). For this reason, it is a great challenge to promote the growth of a destination while at the same time guaranteeing its social sustainability. This will be possible as long as the types of impacts generated on each stakeholder are known so that they can be minimized (Gogonea, Baltunga, Nedelcu, & Dumitrescu, 2017). Positive impacts will increase citizens' commitment to tourist development, while negative impacts will reduce its support (Sharpley, 2014).

Some factors may condition the attitude of residents toward certain impacts. These factors include the socio-economic and ethnic characteristics of the visitor, the type of activities carried out, the average length of stay, the potential damage to the local culture, the characteristics of the local community (political ideology, religion, etc.), the importance of tourism within the local economic system, the dependence on this activity, the economic situation of the region, the way in which the space is used, and, of course, the number of visitors (Butler, 1974). Examples of theories that try to explain the way in which citizens construct their opinion include: the Theory of Reasoned Action (Dyer et al., 2007), the Social Representation Theory (Andriotis & Vaughan, 2003), Fishbein and Ajzen's theory (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975), Butler's model of Intercultural Perception (Colantonio & Potter, 2006), the Social Carrying Capacity Theory (Saveriades, 2000), or Doxey's Irridex (Holden, 2006).

Among the proposed alternatives, the Social Exchange Theory (SET) is the most widespread at present. It claims that in order to determine the degree of support for tourist activity, citizens make a comparison of the costs and benefits that said activity has for their lives, whose result is a specific mindset (Ap, 1992).

The above includes the description of factors that interfere with the assessment of the impacts and how the increase in the number of arrivals triggers different stages in the attitude-shaping process of the local population. There remains the need to reflect on the processes according to which citizens shape their opinion. Understanding how citizens shape their opinions on the effect of tourism on their lives is of paramount importance. The way in which citizens perceive impacts and form an opinion will condition their attitude toward this activity and, thus, their commitment to support it (Nicholas, Thapa, & Ko, 2009; Park, Lee, Choi, & Yoon, 2012; Peric, Durkin, & Wise, 2016; Telfer & Sharpley, 2008). The process by which citizens shape their attitude has been approached through various theoretical frameworks. An example of these frameworks would be the stakeholder theory (Peric et al., 2016), although there are more advanced and precise alternatives. Cost-benefit analysis has usually been used to explain the way in which citizens form their opinion of tourism. Presumably, such an opinion arises from a comparison between the benefits associated with tourism and the costs that it generates (Lee, 2013).

This methodology, however, poses a basic problem, namely that it labels each type of impact in advance as a benefit or as a cost, which may lead to a bias in the evaluations (Gursoy et al., 2010). This methodology has evolved and become known as “domain related costs-benefits.” It also begins with the pre-categorization of impacts as benefit or cost, but it also classifies them into three areas (economic, socio-cultural, and environmental). These two methodologies suggest an association between the benefits of tourism and the degree of support, and between the costs and the degree of rejection (Dyer et al., 2007; Jurowski, Uysal, & Williams, 1997). In no case is the citizen offered the possibility of classifying each impact as cost or benefit according to their own criteria (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011). The methodologies described have been

overtaken by the application of non-forced approaches. Under these frameworks, citizens are offered the possibility of deciding whether an impact is positive or negative according to their criteria, as well as the level of intensity associated with them (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011; Cohen, 1984). To this end, the impacts must be presented in a neutral manner.

#### 4. Approaches to the Extended Concept of Tourism Competitiveness

Analyses focused on the sustainable development of the tourism sector often overlook the social perspective, even when its importance is evident. On a positive note, this social perspective is becoming more and more accredited (Rodríguez, Martín, & Salinas, 2017; Rodríguez, Aguilera, Martín, & Salinas, 2018). The World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) defines Sustainable Development (SD) as follows “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED, 1987, p. 43). This approach was taken into account in the development of policies issued in the United Nations (UN) conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, as well as in the subsequent conferences on sustainability organized within the framework of the United Nations (2004).

In the tourism industry, when talking about sustainable development and competitiveness, improving the quality of life of the residents should be a primary goal, since sustainability itself depends on them. To this end, it is necessary to maximize the economic benefits of the locals while respecting both the environment and the hosting community (Bramwell & Lane, 1993; Hall & Lew, 1998; McIntyre, 1993; Park & Yoon, 2009; Park, Yoon, Lee, 2008; Stabler, 1997). In tourism, as in many other sectors, economic growth has been given priority over social issues. The extended vision discussed in this chapter suggests that tourism

development must be economically competitive but at the same time environmentally and socially viable (Puczko & Rátz, 2000). As stated above, the locals' support for tourism and their involvement in it are essential to ensure the sustainability of this industry and its competitiveness (Gursoy et al., 2010). This support depends on how the activity is perceived, which makes it essential to know and understand the point of view of the locals in relation to the type of impacts generated. This will allow for effective strategies capable of guaranteeing local support (Prayag, Hosany, Nunkoo, & Alders, 2013), which will undoubtedly increase the competitiveness of the destination.

Including the social perspective in the analysis of the competitiveness of a destination is not frequent, something that should be corrected. Below is a review of the elements that are usually taken into account in competitiveness analysis. It highlights how an important aspect such as social sustainability is left out of most analyses. The analysis of the literature set out below can be synthesized through a conceptual model that considers the following pillars of tourism competitiveness: primary and secondary resources, management and planning systems, economic sustainability, environmental sustainability, social sustainability, and demand-related factors.

The very concept of tourism competitiveness leads to a great deal of confusion and controversy, since in addition to the complexity of this concept, its measurement includes dimensions of a different nature (Abreu-Novais et al., 2018). In fact, although the concept of competitiveness has been widely studied, there are no generally accepted definitions (Mazanec, Wöber, & Zins, 2007). According to Crouch and Ritchie (1999), two problems arise in the definition of competitiveness: how to approach the comparative advantages and which concepts should be taken into account. Difficulties in defining competitiveness derive from its own complexity and the lack of consensus to identify, measure,

and aggregate the different dimensions that should be considered part of it (Abreu-Novais, Ruhanen, & Arcodia, 2015). In addition, the dimensions used in the estimation of competitiveness are not fixed and the way in which they are measured and analyzed is very heterogeneous, which leads to a major problem (Dwyer & Kim, 2003). In the scholarly literature it is possible to find numerous studies pointing out various factors involved in the competitiveness of tourist destinations, but there is little work focused on pointing out those that are most important (Crouch, 2011).

Numerous studies (Crouch & Ritchie, 1994, 1995, 1999, 2005; Ritchie & Crouch, 1993, 2000, 2003, 2010) have proposed the creation of competitiveness models based on “the national diamond model” developed by Porter (1990). This is based on a set of variables determined by CEOs of organizations located in tourist destinations. These models compare the advantages of resource allocation available at each tourist destination to the competitive advantages, defined as the resources made available by each destination to contribute to growth and development of tourism (Guaita, Martín, & Salinas, 2020). Ritchie and Crouch (2003, 2010) identify four groups of factors: “core resources and attractors” that correspond to the key elements that visitors consider when selecting a destination; “supporting factors and resources,” which are the factors on which the tourist activity is based (services, infrastructures, lodging, accessibility, among others); “destination policy, planning and development” which govern the type of tourism development that drives a destination, and a fourth group; “destination management” which depends on the individual and collective actions that drive a destination. Finally, there are “qualifying and amplifying determinants,” which increase or limit the competitiveness of the destination. Other relevant works, such as those developed by Dwyer and Kim (2003) and Dwyer, Mellor, Livaic, Edwards, and Kim (2004) have defined large groups of indicators (Created Resources, Endowed Resources, Demand Factors, Market Performance Indicators, Supporting

Factors, Destination Management, and Situational Conditions). These groups of factors contain most of the dimensions and variables identified by Crouch and Ritchie's development model, as well as the main elements identified by Buhalis (2000), Hassan (2000), and Mihalic (2000).

Usually, this type of study has been developed by means of the construction of synthetic indicators based on the aggregation of simple indicators, which in many cases have little to say about the competitiveness of a destination (Croes & Kubickova, 2013). Such indicators are somewhat convenient in the interpretation of the data, as they yield only one value (Croes, 2011), which may, however, lead to public policy decisions based on overly simplistic criteria. The OECD reports claim that there is no perfect indicator and consider the improvement of measurement systems to be a major challenge. One of the most widespread indicators of tourism competitiveness is the one proposed by the World Economic Forum (2007, 2008, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017). This indicator, known as The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report (TTCR), produces a ranking based on the information provided by 90 variables structured in 4 sub-indexes (T&T policy and enabling conditions, enabling environment, natural and cultural resources, and infrastructure).

The aforementioned models do not explicitly consider the social perspective and, therefore, do not include social sustainability as a key element, even though they enjoy great importance and are widely accepted in the measurement of tourism competitiveness. The methodology employed in this type of indicator encompasses entire nations, and therefore, it is only obvious that this particular indicator pays little attention to the social perspective considering how complex it would be to take into account the opinion of every citizen in a given tourist destination. The 2017 edition (WEF, 2017), specifically points out the importance of promoting a more inclusive and sustainable development, capable of respecting the environment and at the same time preserving the local communities that depend on tourism. However, this

preservation places more emphasis on the economic aspect than on the social or cultural one.

A variant of the type of analysis described above would be the one that incorporates the results of opinion studies. Dwyer, Livaic, and Mellor (2003) and Dwyer et al. (2004) pointed out the significance of having the opinions of tourists and entrepreneurs of the tourism sector to determine the relative importance of the indicators used to assess competitiveness. But nothing is said about the relevance of taking the locals' opinions into account. The model of competitiveness proposed by Heath (2003) points out that one of the components that conditions competitiveness is the relations established between stakeholders and the creation of partnerships between them. Nevertheless, this model does not address the importance of social sustainability from the perspective of the local people. Fortunately, the social perspective is increasingly being taken into account in the conceptualization of tourism competitiveness. For example, Ritchie and Crouch (2003) point out that the competitiveness of a destination is the "ability to increase tourism expenditure, to increasingly attract visitors while providing them with satisfying, memorable experiences and to do so in a profitable way, while enhancing the well-being of destination residents and preserving the natural capital of the destination for future generations."

The definition of tourism competitiveness provided by Dupeyras and MacCallum (2013) is a very close one "the ability of the place to optimize its attractiveness for residents and non-residents, to deliver quality, innovative, and attractive tourism services to consumers and to gain market shares on the domestic and global market places, while ensuring that the available resources supporting tourism are used efficiently and in a sustainable way." According to Abreu-Novais et al. (2018), competitiveness is concerned with three main aims: improving the attractiveness of a destination and the satisfaction it brings, the wellbeing of the local population,



and sustainability. In this case, social and environmental sustainability are set apart. Some authors relate economic and social sustainability, as they argue that competitiveness must help to achieve economic goals that increase the income of citizens while improving their well-being, yet they are not mutually exclusive (Bahar & Kozak, 2007; Bordas, 2001; Buhalis, 2000; Crouch & Ritchie, 1999; Dwyer & Kim, 2003; Dwyer et al., 2004; Ritchie & Crouch, 2003). The examples here described point to a growing awareness of the importance of social sustainability in the analysis of a destination's competitiveness, although it does not seem to be enough.

The following table summarizes the main competitiveness factors highlighted in the academic literature. Other factors related to social sustainability that should be incorporated have also been presented, taking into account the literature on social sustainability in tourist destinations (Table 7.1).

Considering the above, it is recommended to include in the analyses on tourism competitiveness and in the planning of destinations, the social perspective and the opinions and concerns of the residents. This will help strengthen the competitiveness of the destination and allow longterm business growth. It is also recommended to expand research on how to incorporate this social perspective in the models of analysis of competitiveness and social viability of business projects within the tourism sector.

**Table 7.1** Factors related to tourism competitiveness

<i>Factors identified in the academic literature</i>	<i>Authors who have pointed out these factors</i>
Core resources and attractors Services, infrastructures, lodging, accessibility Destination policy, planning, and development	Ritchie and Crouch (2003, 2010)
Destination management	Ritchie and Crouch (2003, 2010), Dwyer and Kim (2003), and Dwyer et al. (2004)
Created resources Endowed resources Demand factors Market performance indicators Supporting factors Situational conditions	Dwyer and Kim (2003), and Dwyer et al. (2004)
Natural and cultural resources	World Economic Forum (2007, 2008, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017)
Opinions of tourists and entrepreneurs	Dwyer et al. (2003, 2004)
Tourism expenditure	Ritchie and Crouch (2003)
<i>Scarcely developed factors in academic literature</i>	
Citizen support	Abreu-Novais et al. (2018), and Martín (2019)
Life cost increase	Crouch and Ritchie (1999)
Social and cultural impacts	Guaita et al. (2020), Abreu-Novais et al. (2018), and Salinas et al. (2020)
Increase congestion public spaces	Ritchie and Crouch (2003), Dwyer et al. (2004), and Martín (2019)
Population decline	Martín (2019), and Bahar and Kozak (2007)

## 5. Conclusions

Tourist activity has usually been referred to as a “smoke-free” industry, meaning that the negative effects derived from it become less evident. Moreover, these effects have been expressed or highlighted in a more comprehensive way with regard to environmental sustainability. In environmentally sensitive destinations, it is gradually being assimilated that current tourism development should not jeopardize the use of resources in the future. However, there has not been the same level of awareness regarding the social degradation of tourist environments and the impact on the lives of residents. The problem has become evident when after decades of pro-growth policies serious problems have appeared in tourist cities. There has been a growing feeling of rejection toward tourism on the part of the locals, even though when this activity is a cornerstone of the development of these communities.

Tourism competitiveness has traditionally been associated with an increase in the number of visitors. Therefore, the most successful competitiveness policies have resulted in the saturation of some destinations, which from a social point of view has generated numerous interferences in the life of the locals that in many cases have not made up for the economic gains. This has generated the aforementioned feeling of rejection toward tourism, which endangers the support of citizens for this activity, and with it, the very viability of the destination in the future.

Therefore, policies aimed at improving competitiveness and, in general, the development plans of tourist destinations should assume a joint understanding of economic, social, and environmental sustainability. This understanding is not widely represented in the most widespread tourism competitiveness assessment systems. Although the importance of the social perspective is recognized in many cases, it is not correctly integrated into the measurements. This is due partly to the complexity of constructing synthetic indicators which, in

addition to incorporating information referring to quantitative variables, also include information representative of the local perspective.

The definition of sustainability proposed by the United Nations (1987) indicates that this concept stands for the ability of productive activities to meet current needs without compromising future possibilities. This expression, understood in a broad sense, should also consider the social perspective, since it jeopardizes the future development of the tourist activity as much as the environmental one. More specifically, The World Tourism Organization points out that sustainable tourism models must meet the needs of both the current tourists and the host destination while protecting the resources on which these activities are based, so as to ensure future opportunities (World Tourism Organization, 1993). In this definition, issued decades ago, the social perspective appears more clearly, although it has not been adequately reflected in public policies or private development projects.

Taking up the research questions presented in the introduction section, it is possible to point out that social sustainability is not part of the vast majority of models of tourism competitiveness analysis. With regard to the second question, the importance of social sustainability for the development and consolidation of tourist destinations is beyond doubt. Both statements, based on the bibliographic analysis carried out, make up the main contribution of this work, and allow two clear recommendations to be issued. In order to guarantee the sustainability of tourist destinations and their business growth, greater attention must be paid to social sustainability from the public and business spheres. The models of tourism competitiveness analysis should be expanded to include the social perspective, something that is not straightforward. Specifically, research should deepen the statistical systems for measuring tourism competitiveness. New methodologies should be proposed capable of incorporating information on the social impacts associated with an

uncontrolled tourism activity. This represents a great challenge, as it is not a simple task to incorporate the opinion of the residents in the competitiveness measurement systems.

## References

- Abreu-Novais, M., Ruhanen, L., & Arcodia, C. (2015). Destination competitiveness: What we know, what we know but shouldn't and what we don't know but should. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 19(6), 1–21.
- Abreu-Novais, M., Ruhanen, L., & Arcodia, C. (2018). Destination competitiveness: A phenomenographic study. *Tourism Management*, 64, 324–334.
- Almeida, F., Peláez, M. A., Balbuena, A., & Cortés, R. (2016). Residents' perceptions of tourism development in Benalmadena (Spain). *Tourism Management*, 54, 259–274.
- Andereck, K. L., & Nyaupane, G. P. (2011). Exploring the nature of tourism and quality of life perceptions among residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50, 248–260.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., & Vogt, C. A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32, 1056–1076.
- Andriotis, K., & Vaughan, R. D. (2003). Urban residents' attitudes toward tourism development: The case of Crete. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42, 172–185.
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19, 665–690.
- Ap, J., & Crompton, J. L. (1993). Residents' strategies for responding to tourism impacts. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32, 47–50.
- Ayuntamiento de Barcelona. (2018). *Tourism activity report of Barcelona*. Barcelona, Spain: Ayuntamiento de Barcelona.
- Bahar, O., & Kozak, M. (2007). Advancing destination competitiveness research: Comparison between tourists and service providers. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 22(2), 61–71.

- Bordas, E. (2001). Improving public–private sectors cooperation in tourism: A new paradigm for destinations. *Tourism Review*, 56(3/4), 38–41.
- Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (1993). Sustainable tourism: An evolving global approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1(1), 1–5.
- Buhalis, D. (2000). Marketing the competitive destination in the future. *Tourism Management*, 21(1), 97–116.
- Butler, R. W. (1974). Social implications of tourism development. *Annals Tourism Research*, 2, 100–111.
- Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: Implications for management and resources. *Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe Canadien*, 25, 5–12.
- Cohen, E. (1984). The sociology of tourism: Approaches, issues, and findings. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 10, 373–392.
- Colantonio, A., & Potter, R. B. (2006). *Urban tourism and development in the socialist state: Havana during the 'special period'*. La Habana, Cuba: Ashgate.
- Croes, R. (2011). Measuring and explaining competitiveness in the context of small island destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(4), 431–442.
- Croes, R., & Kubickova, M. (2013). From potential to ability to compete: Towards a performance based tourism competitiveness index. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 2(3), 146–154.
- Crouch, G. I. (2011). Destination competitiveness: An analysis of determinant attributes. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(1), 27–45.
- Crouch, G. I., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1994). Destination competitive—Exploring foundations for a long-term research programme. In *Proceedings of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada 1994 Annual Conference* (pp. 79–88). Halifax, Nova Scotia.
- Crouch, G. I., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1995, July 13–16). Destination competitiveness and the role of the tourism

- enterprise. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Business Congress* (pp. 43–48). Istanbul, Turkey.
- Crouch, G. I., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1999). Tourism, competitiveness, and societal prosperity. *Journal of Business Research, 44*, 137–152.
- Crouch, G. I., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2005). Application of the analytic hierarchy process to tourism choice and decision making: A review and illustration applied to destination competitiveness. *Tourism Analysis, 10*(1), 17–25.
- Datahippo. (2019). <https://datahippo.org/es/>. Accessed 30 Sept 2018.
- Deery, M., Jago, L., & Fredline, L. (2012). Rethinking social impacts of tourism research: A new research agenda. *Tourism Management, 33*, 64–73.
- Diedrich, A., & García, E. (2009). Local perceptions of tourism as indicators of destination decline. *Tourism Management, 30*, 512–521.
- Doxey, G. V. (1975). Leisure, tourism and Canada's aging population tourism in Canada: Selected issues and options. *Western Geographical Series, 21*, 57–72.
- Dredge, D., & Gyimóthy, S. (2015). The collaborative economy and tourism: Critical perspectives, questionable claims and silenced voices. *Tourism Recreation Research, 40*, 286–302.
- Dredge, D., Gyimóthy, S., Birckbak, A., Jensen T. E., Madsen, A. K. (2016). *The impact of regulatory approaches targeting collaborative economy in the tourism accommodation sector: Barcelona, Berlin, Amsterdam and Paris*. Impulse Paper N. 9 Prepared for the European Commission DG GROWTH. Copenhagen, Denmark: Aalborg University.
- Dupeyras, A., & MacCallum, N. (2013). *Indicators for measuring competitiveness in tourism: A guidance document* (OECD Tourism Papers, 2013/02). Paris, France: OECD Publishing.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5k47t9q2t923-en>.
- Dwyer, L., & Kim, C. (2003). Destination competitiveness:

- Determinants and indicators. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 6(5), 369–414.
- Dwyer, L., Livaic, Z., & Mellor, R. (2003). Competitiveness of Australia as a tourist destination. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 10(1), 60–78.
- Dwyer, L., Mellor, R., Livaic, Z., Edwards, D., & Kim, C. (2004). Attributes of destination competitiveness: A factor analysis. *Tourism Analysis*, 9(1), 91–101.
- Dyer, P., Gursoy, D., Sharma, B., & Carter, J. (2007). Structural modeling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Tourism Management*, 28, 409–422.
- Edelman, B. G., & Geradin, D. (2015). *Efficiencies and regulatory shortcuts: How should we regulate companies like Airbnb and Uber?* (Harvard Business School Working Paper, 16-026).
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior*. Reading, PA, USA: Addison-Wesley.
- Gjerald, O. (2005). Sociocultural impacts of tourism: A case study from Norway. *Journal of Tourism Cultural Change*, 3, 36–58.
- Gogonea, R. M., Baltalunga, A. A., Nedelcu, A., & Dumitrescu, D. (2017). Sustainable tourism aims to channel tourism to the advantage of all stakeholders—Destination places and communities, tourists and all the associated activities and services. Tourism pressure at the regional level in the context of sustainable development in Romania. *Sustainability*, 9, 698.
- Gómez, C. S., & Barrón, K. S. (2019). Impacts of tourism and the generation of employment in Mexico. *Journal of Tourism Analysis: Revista de Análisis Turístico*, 26(2), 94–114.
- Gómez-Vega, M., & Picazo-Tadeo, A. (2019). Ranking world tourist destinations with a composite indicator of competitiveness: To weigh or not to weigh? *Tourism*



- Management*, 72, 281–291.
- Guaita, J. M., Martín, J. M., Salinas, J. A. (2020). Innovation in the measurement of tourism competitiveness. In M. A. Galindo-Martín, M. T. Mendez Picazo, M. S. Castaño-Martínez (Eds.), *Analyzing the relationship between innovation, value creation, and entrepreneurship* (pp. 268–288). Hershey, USA: IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-1169-5.ch013>.
- Guaita, J. M., Martín, J. M., Salinas, J. A., Mogorrón-Guerrero, H. (2019). An analysis of the stability of rural tourism as a desired condition for sustainable tourism. *Journal of Business Research*, 100, 165–174.
- Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G., & Dyer, P. (2010). Locals' attitudes toward mass and alternative tourism: The case of Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49 (3), 381–394.
- Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C., & Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes: A structural modeling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29, 79–105.
- Hall, C. M., & Lew, A. A. (1998). The geography of sustainable tourism development: introduction. In C. M. Hall & A. A. Lew (Eds.), *Sustainable tourism: Geographical perspectives* (pp. 1–24). New York, USA: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Hassan, S. (2000). Determinants of market competitiveness in an environmentally sustainable tourism industry. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(3), 239–245.
- Heath, E. (2003). Towards a model to enhance destination competitiveness: A southern african perspective. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 10(2), 124–141.
- Holden, A. (2006). *Tourism studies and the social sciences*. New York, USA: Routledge.
- Huei-Wen, L., & Huei-Fu, L. (2016). Valuing residents' perceptions of sport tourism development in Taiwan's North Coast and Guanyinshan National Scenic Area, Asia. *Pacific Journal Tourism Research*, 21, 398–424.

- Instituto Nacional de Estadística. (2018). *Encuesta de ocupación en Alojamientos Turísticos*. Madrid, Spain: INE.
- Joshi, O., Poudyal, N. C., & Larson, L. C. (2017). The influence of sociopolitical, natural, and cultural factors on international tourism growth: A cross-country panel analysis. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 19(3), 825–838.
- Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., & Williams, D. R. (1997). A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 36, 3–11.
- Keogh, B. (1989). Social impact. In G. Wall (Ed.), *Outdoor recreation in Canada* (pp. 233–275). Toronto, Canada: Wiley.
- Lee, T. H. (2013). Influence analysis of community resident support for sustainable tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 34, 37–46.
- Lin, Z., Chen, Y., & Filieri, R. (2017). Resident-tourist value co-creation: The role of residents' perceived tourism impacts and life satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 61, 436–442.
- Liu, J., Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1987). Resident perception of the environmental impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14, 17–37.
- Lyons, K., & Wearing, S. (2015). *The sharing economy issues, impacts, and regulatory responses in the context of the NSW visitor economy*. Sydney, Australia: NSW Business Chamber.
- Marien, C., & Pizan, A. (2005). Implementing sustainable tourism development through citizen participation in the planning process. In S. Wahab & J. J. Pigram (Eds.), *Tourism, development and growth: The challenge of sustainability*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Martín, J. M. (2019). Impacts of the tourist activity and citizens' evaluation about the necessity for resting periods. In M. A. Camilleri (Ed.), *Strategic perspectives in destination marketing* (pp. 81–112). Hershey, USA: IGI Global.

- Martín, J. M., Guaita, J. A., & Salinas, J. A. (2018). An analysis of the factors behind the citizen's attitude of rejection towards tourism in a context of overtourism and economic dependence on this activity. *Sustainability*, *10*(8), 2851.
- Martín, J. M., Jiménez, J. D., & Molina, V. (2014). Impacts of seasonality on environmental sustainability in the tourism sector based on destination type: An application to Spain's Andalusia region. *Tourism Economics*, *20*(1), 123–142.
- Martín, J. M., Ostos, M. S., & Salinas, J. A. (2019). Why regulation is needed in emerging markets in the tourism sector. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, *78*(1), 225–254.
- Martín, J. M., Rodríguez, J. A., Zermeño, K., & Salinas, J. A. (2018). Effects of vacation rental websites on the concentration of tourists—Potential environmental impacts: An application to the Balearic Islands in Spain. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *15*(2), 347.
- Martín, J. M., Salinas, J. A., & Rodríguez, J. A. (2019). Comprehensive evaluation of the tourism seasonality using a synthetic DP2 indicator. *Tourism Geographies*, *21*(2), 284–305.
- Martín, J. M., Salinas, J. A., Rodríguez, J. A., & Jiménez, J. D. (2017). Assessment of the tourism's potential as a sustainable development instrument in terms of annual stability: Application to Spanish rural destinations in process of consolidation. *Sustainability*, *9*(10), 1692.
- Mazanec, J. A., Wöber, K., & Zins, A. H. (2007). Tourism destination competitiveness: From definition to explanation? *Journal of Travel Research*, *46*, 86–95.
- McIntyre, G. (1993). *Sustainable tourism development: Guide for local planners*. Madrid, Spain: World Tourism Organization.
- Mendola, D., & Volo, S. (2017). Building composite

- indicators in tourism studies: Measurements and applications in tourism destination competitiveness. *Tourism Management*, 59, 541–553.
- Mihalic, T. (2000). Environmental management of a tourist destination: A factor of tourism competitiveness. *Tourism Management*, 21(1), 65–78.
- Milano, C. (2017). *Overtourism and Tourismphobia: Global trends and local contexts*. Ostelea School of Tourism & Hospitality. Available online: [http://www.aept.org/archivos/files/ostelea\\_informe\\_overtourism\\_y\\_turismofobia.pdf](http://www.aept.org/archivos/files/ostelea_informe_overtourism_y_turismofobia.pdf). Accessed 18 May 2018.
- Nadler, S. N. (2014). *The sharing economy: What is it and where is it going?*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Nicholas, L. N., Thapa, B., & Ko, Y. J. (2009). Residents' perspectives of a World Heritage Site: The Pitons Management Area, St. Lucia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36, 390–412.
- Park, D. B., Lee, K. W., Choi, H. S., & Yoon, Y. (2012). Factors influencing social capital in rural tourism communities in South Korea. *Tourism Management*, 33, 1511–1520.
- Park, D., & Yoon, Y. (2009). Segmentation by motivation in rural tourism: A Korean case study. *Tourism Management*, 30, 99–108.
- Park, D., Yoon, Y., & Lee, M. (2008). Rural community development and policy challenges in South Korea. *Journal of the Economic Geographical Society of Korea*, 11(4), 600–617.
- Peric, M., Durkin, J., & Wise, N. (2016). Leveraging small-scale sport events: Challenges of organising, delivering and managing sustainable outcomes in rural communities, the case of Gorski Kotar, Croatia. *Sustainability*, 8, 1337.
- Porter, M. E. (1990). *The competitive advantage of nations*. New York, USA: The Free Press.
- Prayag, G., Hosany, S., Nunkoo, R., & Alders, T. (2013).

- London residents' support for the 2012 Olympic Games: the mediating effect of overall attitude. *Tourism Management*, 36, 629–640.
- Puczko, L., & Rätz, T. (2000). Tourist and resident perceptions of the physical impacts of tourism at Lake Balaton, Hungary: Issues for sustainable tourism management. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8, 458–478.
- Qiu, H., Fan, D. X. F., Lyu, J., Lin, P. M. C., & Jenkins, C. L. (2018). Analyzing the economic sustainability of tourism development: Evidence from Hong Kong. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 43(2), 226–248.
- Ritchie, J. R. B., & Crouch, G. (1993, October 17–23). Competitiveness in international tourism: A framework for understanding and analysis. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Congress of Association Internationale d'Experts Scientifique de Tourisme*. San Carlos de Bariloche, Argentina.
- Ritchie, J. R. B., & Crouch, G. (2000). The competitive destination: A sustainability perspective. *Tourism Management*, 21(1), 1–7.
- Ritchie, J. R. B., & Crouch, G. (2003). *The competitive destination: A sustainable tourism perspective*. Wallingford, UK: CABI Publishing.
- Ritchie, J. R. B., & Crouch, G. (2010). A model of destination competitiveness/sustainability: Brazilian perspectives. *Revista de Administración Pública*, 44 (5), 1049–1066.
- Rodríguez, J. A., Aguilera, J. D., Martín, J. M., & Salinas, J. A. (2018). Crisis in the Horn of Africa: Measurement of progress towards millennium development goals. *Social Indicators Research*, 135(2), 499–514.
- Rodríguez, J. A., Martín, J. M., & Salinas, J. A. (2017). Assessing MDG 6 in Sub-Saharan Africa: A territorial analysis using a synthetic indicator. *Revista de Economía Mundial*, 47, 203–221.
- Salinas, J. A., Serdeira, P., Martín, J. M., & Rodríguez, J. A. (2020). Determinants of tourism destination

- competitiveness in the countries most visited by international tourists: Proposal of a synthetic index. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 33, 100582.
- Saveriades, S. (2000). Establishing the social tourism carrying capacity for the tourist resorts of the east coast of the Republic of Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, 21, 147–156.
- Schor, J. B., & Fitzmaurice, C. (2015). Collaborating and connecting: The emergence of the sharing economy. In L. Reisch & J. Thøgersen (Eds.), *Handbook of research on sustainable consumption* (pp. 410–425). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Seraphin, H. S., Sheeran, P., & Pilato, M. (2018). Over-tourism and the fall of Venice as a destination. *Journal Destination Marketing Management*, 9, 374–376.
- Sharpley, R. (1994). *Tourism, tourists and society*. Huntingdon, UK: ELM Publishers.
- Sharpley, R. (2014). Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research. *Tourism Management*, 42, 37–49.
- Stabler, M. J. (Ed.). (1997). *Tourism and sustainability: Principles to practice*. New York, USA: Cab International.
- Telfer, D. J., & Sharpley, R. (2008). *Tourism and development in the developing world*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- United Nations. (1987). *Informe de la Comisión Mundial sobre el Medio Ambiente y el Desarrollo*. New York, USA: United Nations.
- United Nations. (2004). *Indicators of sustainable development for tourism destinations*. Madrid, Spain: United Nations.
- UNWTO. (2018). *UNWTO annual report 2017*. Madrid, Spain: UNWTO.
- Upchurch, R. S., & Teivane, U. (2000). Resident perceptions of tourism development in Riga, Latvia. *Tourism Management*, 21, 499–507.
- Vargas, A., Oom, P., Da Costa, J., & Albino, S. (2015). Residents' attitude and level of destination development: An international comparison. *Tourism Management*, 48(3), 199–210.

- WCED. (1987). *Our common future (Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development)*. Oxford and New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
- WEF. (2007). *The travel & tourism competitiveness report 2007: Furthering the process of economic development*. Geneva. Dataset extracted from: <http://reports.weforum.org/travel-and-tourism-competitiveness-report-2017/downloads/>.
- WEF. (2008). *The travel & tourism competitiveness report 2008: Balancing economic development and environmental sustainability*. Geneva. Dataset extracted from: <http://reports.weforum.org/travel-and-tourism-competitiveness-report-2017/downloads/>.
- WEF. (2009). *The travel & tourism competitiveness report 2009: Managing in a time of turbulence*. Geneva. Dataset extracted from: <http://reports.weforum.org/travel-and-tourism-competitiveness-report-2017/downloads/>.
- WEF. (2011). *The travel & tourism competitiveness report 2011: Beyond the downturn*. Geneva. Dataset extracted from: <http://reports.weforum.org/travel-and-tourism-competitiveness-report-2017/downloads/>.
- WEF. (2013). *The travel & tourism competitiveness report 2013: Reducing barriers to economic growth and job creation*. Geneva. Dataset extracted from: <http://reports.weforum.org/travel-and-tourism-competitiveness-report-2017/downloads/>.
- WEF. (2015). *The travel & tourism competitiveness report 2015: Growth through Shocks*. Geneva. Dataset extracted from: <http://reports.weforum.org/travel-and-tourism-competitiveness-report-2017/downloads/>.
- WEF. (2017). *The travel & tourism competitiveness report 2017: Paving the way for a more sustainable and inclusive future*. Geneva. Dataset extracted from: <http://reports.weforum.org/travel-and-tourism-competitiveness-report-2017/downloads/>.
- WTO. (1993). *Tourism report year 2000 and beyond*

*qualitative aspects*. Madrid, Spain: World Tourism Organization.

Yoon, Y., Gursoy, D., & Chen, J. S. (1999). An investigation of the relationship between tourism impacts and host communities' characteristics. *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 10(1), 29–44.