Tourism as Industry and Field of Study:

Using Research and Education to Address Overtourism

Kathleen M. Adams and Peter M. Sanchez

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The purpose of this article is (1) to highlight the dual, Janis-faced, nature of the study of tourism as an industry and as a field of study; (2) to discuss how education is used to promote sustainable tourism and prevent overtourism, both in the academic arena as well as where tourism occurs; and (3) to offer suggestions concerning the value of education as an avenue for harmonizing the Janus-faced character of tourism, in order to foster a tourism industry that can better achieve global sustainability.

Design/methodology/approach: This paper combines literature review with assessment. The authors use existing literature on overtourism, tourism education, and critical tourism studies to provide insights into how education can help enhance sustainable tourism practices.

Findings: The authors find that there are two "faces" of tourism education, one focusing on growth and capital accumulation, and the other on the critical analysis of tourism, highlighting problems with the industry. The authors propose that this Janus-faced approach to tourism education should be reconciled to enable the promotion of sustainability in the industry and in tourist destinations.

Practical implications: This chapter outlines an educational path for tourism and hospitality programs, as well as for local publics, to foster more sustainable forms of tourism and avoid overtourism. Unsustainable tourism, however, is a global problem that requires a concerted international solution.

Originality and value: The authors apply the concept of Janus-faced tourism to better understand the divergence between theoretically oriented tourism education in the academy and practically oriented tourism education in management and hospitality schools. This analysis offers suggested paths towards transforming education in both hospitality schools and in local destinations to foster scale-appropriate forms of sustainable tourism.

Keywords: Overtourism, sustainable tourism, tourism education, critical tourism studies, Janus-faced tourism.

In the summer of 2015, after an absence of seven years, we returned to the Trastevere

neighbourhood of Rome where we had lived for a year. When we resided there, the

quarter was hailed in guidebooks as the "most Roman" of Rome's neighbourhoods,[1]

with its narrow cobblestone streets and photogenic grandmothers clustered on folding

chairs outside their apartment buildings, chatting and catching rare breezes on balmy

days. When we lived in that picturesque quarter, we learned to navigate the

grandmothers, meandering walking tour groups, and tipsy foreign students who flocked

to the neighbourhood's relatively cheap eateries, bars and clubs on weekend evenings.

But by 2015, the zone had transformed: the narrow arteries leading to the

neighbourhood's celebrated first-century basilica, Santa Maria de Trastevere, were now

clogged with tourists. The scattered souvenir shops lining those lanes had multiplied,

their displays of postcards and refrigerator magnets spilling out into the alleyways

further choking movements for residents and tourists alike. Many of the small, locally

oriented shops we remembered had been replaced by trendy tourist-oriented

restaurants, and Airbnb signs now adorned the entryways of many apartment

complexes. While tourism was certainly lively when we resided in the neighbourhood,

by 2015 the zone was in the throes of overtourism. Even though we were simply visitors

on this return trip, the negative changes that had taken place were palpable. While

catching up with a local grocer whose dry foods shop had been a fixture in the

neighbourhood for decades, we heard about more of those transformations. As he

lamented, "None of us can afford to live here anymore—foreigners and investors are all

buying up the apartments and making them into Airbnbs for the tourists." He solemnly

went on to observe that shop rents were escalating, and he was uncertain how much

longer he could hold on. Other Trastevere friends had already moved away from the area, fleeing the climbing rents and unrelenting nightly ruckus of partying tourists and international students. Most of the grandmothers were now gone. For these Trastevere residents, overtourism was palpably challenging the sustainability of their livelihoods and neighbourhood quality of life.

The scenario above is one that is increasingly common throughout the world, in cities ranging from Hong Kong to Barcelona. Overtourism, however, affects all locations: cities, national parks, heritage sites, coastal areas, and islands. While recently the coronavirus has put overtourism on hiatus—a clear reminder that tourism as a monoculture is dangerous—the need for systematic research and education with an eye toward rendering tourism more sustainable is clear. In this chapter we argue that the study of tourism has a Janus-faced character where one face views tourism as a road toward development (focusing on job creation and capital accumulation), while the other face highlights the ills of the tourism industry (focusing on problems wrought by the overreliance on tourism, the leakage of capital, and the many issues associated with overtourism). Even though sustainable tourism has entered the lexicon of both faces of tourism, in our assessment, tourism as a path toward development still tends to eclipse the face that advocates limits to tourism growth. Our recommendation is that we continue to expand research on sustainable tourism – and overtourism – so that we can more fully educate all stakeholders about the benefits and costs of tourism. In recent years, the literature on sustainable tourism has mushroomed, but most of the work on overtourism to date has tended to concentrate more heavily on European destinations. In order to more effectively train tourism students in strategies for addressing

overtourism in the locales where they will work, we need more case studies from additional parts of the world that are currently underrepresented in the literature. We also stress that for a holistic sustainable tourism approach to succeed, educational and policy efforts must take place at the local, regional, national, and global levels.

Part 1: The Classic Janus Face of Tourism Education

Although the world's first tourism-oriented school was founded in 1893 on the shores of Lake Lemans in Lausanne, Switzerland, its focus was on training future hotel professionals and thus education emphasized pragmatic skills such as accounting, languages and hospitality.[2] Such was also the case for what was purportedly the world's first four-year tourism-oriented university program, established in 1922 at Cornell University, with the vision of training undergraduates to become professional hotel staff and hospitality managers.[3] It was not until many decades later, in the 1970s, that a few pioneering universities began offering courses emphasizing the critical analysis of tourism dynamics. In this section we contrast the deeply entrenched educational objectives, values and orientations that tend to dominate tourism management schools with the objectives, values and orientations characteristic of tourism studies in theoretically focused academic disciplinary settings, such as cultural anthropology, sociology, political science, and geography. To illustrate possible pathways for resolving these tensions, this section also discusses the recent rise of new groups (such as Critical Tourism Studies) attempting to bridge these divisions by fostering conversations between social justice-oriented tourism management scholars and critical theory-oriented scholars. Likewise, we also note the birth of new management models such as

"ambidextrous tourism management" that challenge the traditional monolithic focus on continued growth, regardless of its costs to local environments and communities. We believe the recent emergence of these groups and models offer new possibilities for the future of tourism education, particularly in relation to issues of overtourism and sustainability.

We have previously characterized this paradoxical divide between the economic, growth-driven approach to tourism and the critical analysis of its problematic dynamics and unintended consequences as the "Janus-faced character of tourism" (Sanchez and Adams 2008). In a similar vein, Aramberri (2010, p.9, 26-28) subsequently dubbed the clash between the management ("how to?") and the theoretical ("why?") realms of tourism research as the "scissors crisis." His use of this analogy is drawn from Trotsky's observations pertaining to 1920s Russia, when the dramatically varying rates of industrial and agrarian prices "threatened to inevitably pit the two pillars of Soviet power…[the industrial proletariat and the peasantry] against each other" (Aramberri 2010, p.9). In the "scissors" analogy, the clash is inevitably an irreconcilably destructive one. We prefer to envision the contrast in less pessimistic terms, as tourism's dual faces, since we feel the current moment offers some possibilities for bringing these two distinctive approaches to tourism into more productive dialogue.[4]

Tourism and Hospitality Studies: Growth Still Eclipsing Sustainability?

Sustainability has entered the curriculum in most, if not all, tourism and hospitality programs around the world. The hope is that students enrolled in these programs will enter the tourism industry with a solid understanding of sustainable

tourism so that tourist destinations will not experience the worst effects of tourism –

overtourism. We note, however, that other negative effects of tourism include inequality,

the leakage of tourism-generated revenues, and the unintended disruptive social and

political consequences when tourism is used as a desperate attempt to rescue an

economy, as the case of Cuba demonstrates (Sanchez and Adams, 2008). Ideally,

sustainable tourism would eliminate or minimize these negative effects. Focusing on

sustainability, however, can often clash with the goals of economic development –

creating jobs and bringing in hard currency. Consequently, using education to promote

sustainable tourism will require that hospitality and tourism programs place much

greater emphasis on sustainable tourism and the environmental, social and cultural

values they espouse.

However, as we all know, simply including sustainability as a menu item in the

broader curriculum of tourism and hospitality programs will not be enough to remedy the

situation. First, there is the issue of how sustainability is presented in these programs.

After conducting a content analysis of course profiles from 60 top tourism and hospitality

programs, Cotterell et al. point out that evidence "…suggests that tourism students are

graduating with narrow understandings of sustainability … (2019, p.882)." The problem

does not stop there. The authors conclude (Cotterell et. al., 2019, p.898):

> … universities need to teach tourism students about much stronger and varied
>
> conceptualizations of sustainability that consider different perspectives including
>
> "very strong sustainability" rather than from a predominantly neo-liberal business
>
> viewpoint that can lead to overtourism issues.

Tourism and hospitality programs must therefore accomplish two difficult steps. First, they must enhance their focus on sustainability so that students acquire a richer, more nuanced understanding of both its importance and avenues for its implementation. That is, a program's curriculum should enable students to develop skills necessary for effectively developing policies and practices that promote sustainable tourism. Many tourism and hospitality programs remain hesitant to strengthen the focus on sustainable tourism, however (Wilson and von der Heidt, 2013). Second, these academic programs need to more fully embrace sustainable tourism to ensure that the focus on development does not overshadow efforts at sustainability. These two steps will not come easily, in that most of the tourism and hospitality programs are housed in business schools which favour employing the tourist industry for local and national growth and are thus less focused on sustainability, which would require some curtailment of tourist visits (Boyle, Wilson and Dimmock, 2015; and Inui, Wheeler and Lankford, 2006). Bluntly stated, tourism and hospitality programs are training students to go into careers in the tourism industry, an industry that relies upon the continued expansion of tourism for its profits.

Undermining tourism growth and profits will be a hard sell unless the industry can be regulated, or governments and investors can be convinced that tourism's long-term survival depends upon some degree of curtailment. Overtourism may be the phenomenon that launches this discussion, and the COVID-19 pandemic's (temporary?) decimation of tourism may prompt some further rethinking of continuing to rely on tourism's unchecked expansion as an economic panacea. It is essential, therefore, that hospitality programs incorporate critical studies of tourism's ramifications into their

curriculums, as a mechanism for moving away from the classic primary emphasis on tourism as a vehicle for economic advancement. Having looked at the business oriented "face" of tourism education and its tendency to emphasize growth, we turn now to address the social science "face" of tourism education, which has classically emphasized the critical analysis of tourism dynamics

Critical Approaches to Teaching Tourism in the Academic Realm

Pinpointing the beginnings of the academic study of tourism –particularly its relation to sustainability--is a difficult endeavour, as the topic emerged in different disciplines at different times. Butler (2015) observes that occasional studies of tourism's environmental and economic impacts appeared as early as the 1930s but it is not until the 1950s and 1960s that a broader body of theoretically-informed research on tourism begins to emerge, mostly in geography and economics (Leite and Graburn, 2012). By the 1960s, most social science studies approached tourism in relatively uncritical terms, assuming continued tourism growth was a promising avenue for development. This is not surprising as this was the developmentalism decade with many scholars suggesting that economic "take-off" was the only true path to national progress (Rostow, 1960). As Graburn and Jafari summed up: "In the 1960s, the benefits of tourism were unquestioned. Research assumed that tourism was a labour-intensive growth industry, beneficial to both the Third World and the hinterlands of metropolitan countries" (Graburn and Jafari, 1991, p.3). However, in the 1970s scholars from various disciplines began examining the negative consequences of excessive tourism (ibid, p.4), and some of these early studies of national parks, island destinations and resort towns addressed

themes pertaining to "recreational carrying capacity" or "tourism saturation" address terrain we now label overtourism (e.g. Stankey and Lime, 1973; Wall and Wright, 1977; Hills and Lundgren, 1977; Singh, 1978; de Kadt, 1979). Most scholars point to the 1970s as the era when the social scientific study of tourism began taking shape (Cohen, 1984, p.374; Crick, 1989). Coincidentally, this was also the decade in which the first theoretically oriented university-level social science courses on tourism appeared.

For instance, the earliest experimental class on the anthropology of tourism was introduced at the University of California Berkeley in 1976 by Nelson Graburn (1980, p.56).[5] Graburn's pioneering tourism classes addressed tourism's history, cultural structures and impacts, and included works by Dean MacCannell's (1976) *The Tourist*, Erik Cohen's (1974) conceptual classification of tourists, and Valene Smith's (1977) edited volume *Hosts and Guests* (arguably the first anthropology "text" on tourism and it's ramifications[6]). One half of Graburn's class content addressed tourism's economic, cultural, and social "impacts" in various types of locales, ranging from islands, fragile environments (ecologically or structurally), to industrial settings (Graburn, 1980, p.60). By the early 1990s, Graburn's template had taken root and those teaching tourism social sciences classes generally included theories directly related to sustainability and overtourism (although the term was not yet born). For instance, when one author of this chapter (Adams) first taught the Anthropology of Tourism in 1989, she included critical inquiries into the ramifications of excessive tourism for small communities, discussions of destination carrying capacities, and of geographer Richard Butler's (1980) classic model of a tourist area's life cycle (TALC), from discovery and development to decline.[7]

Today's tourism classes in various social science disciplines, generally continue to incorporate many of these classic works while adding new theoretical critiques of the tourism industry's overzealous neoliberal pursuit of growth, from the perspectives of political economy (i.e. Bianchi 2012), political ecology (i.e. Mostafanezhad and Norum, 2019), social movements (i.e. Milano, Novelli and Cheer, 2019) and resilience (i.e. Cheer and Lew, 2017; Hall, Prayag and Amore, 2018). In sum, we can see the Janus-faced character of tourism studies in the bifurcated emphases of tourism education in hospitality schools and social science disciplines.

Bridging the Educational Divide: Promising Developments

Despite the historically Janus-faced character of tourism education, with its classic contrast between predominantly growth oriented ("how to") education in tourism management schools and more theoretically-critical analyses in tourism social science classes, we find this a promising moment for productive exchanges between these two educational realms. Today, a growing number of scholars in both the social sciences and tourism schools are interested in uncovering avenues for rendering tourism more beneficial to local communities. More scholars in the social sciences are increasingly committed to public interest applications of their theoretical and field-based knowledge, turning their attention to the "how to" and becoming actively engaged in ventures to develop sustainable tourism enterprises (i.e. Stronza, 2005, 2010, also see Adams, 2005) and to educate government officials and the public about the devastating effects of overtourism (i.e. Cole, 2012). Likewise, more scholars based in tourism management schools are trained in critical tourism theory and interested in fostering sustainable

forms of tourism development (i.e. Dolezal, Trupp and Bui, 2020; Holdren and Novelli, 2011).

The recent rise of critical tourism studies (CTS) has fostered a new arena for collaboration and dialogue between scholars, practitioners and educators concerned with lassoing tourism for achieving the common good. Critical tourism studies arose a little over a decade ago, and is gradually taking root, with biennial conferences in Europe, North America and the Asia-Pacific region. CTS is premised on the need for more systematic analyses of how both the practice of tourism and analyses of it are embedded in asymmetrical power relations and hegemonic discourses (Ateljevic et al., 2007; Swain, 2009; Ateljevic et al., 2012; Wijesinghe and Mura, 2018). This small but growing group of social-justice-oriented scholars from both tourism management schools and university social science departments are now working towards interdisciplinary approaches to tourism that embrace cultural plurality and empower local stakeholders (e.g. Coles, Hall and Duval, 2006; Hollinshead, 2016). Recent CTS conferences, such as the 2020 CTS-Asia Pacific conference in Japan, have been rich venues for presentations and discussions addressing the challenges posed by overtourism, COVID-19, and strategies for fostering resilience and empowerment for local stakeholders in tourism destinations. In short, the work of CTS is gradually fostering new dialogues between tourism industry educators, social scientists, travel writers, and others, and we anticipate that a new body of educational materials will emerge from this work. We are hopeful that these intellectual exchanges and the long term partnerships that emerge from them will more effectively address some of the paradoxes embedded in the very fabric of tourism, particularly the fact that the ideals of

sustainability (be it social, environmental, political or cultural) are at loggerheads with neoliberal global capitalism.

In a similar vein, emergent business models such as "ambidextrous tourism management" offer revolutionary new visions for tourism enterprises, potentially enabling them to better harmonize with environmental change (Mihalache and Mihalache, 2016). As outlined by various authors, ambidextrous tourism management entails simultaneously embracing two opposing inclinations: (1) market-focused "exploitation" and (2) developing radical, proactive innovations and new capabilities that are attuned to changing local conditions (Brooker and Joppe, 2014; Séraphin and Butcher, 2018; Séraphin and Yallop, 2019).

In short, we believe these new cross-cutting groups (such as Critical Tourism Studies) and models (such as ambidextrous tourism management") offer new possibilities for the future of tourism education. But we also need to move beyond the academic and managerial domains and work with local communities and governments that are dealing with the most pernicious form of unsustainable tourism – overtourism.

Part 2: Overtourism Education "In the Field"

When identifying venues for overtourism and sustainability education, most of us tend to immediately think of universities and tourism schools. However, education can happen in multiple arenas. This section briefly highlights additional beyond-the-classroom venues for effecting change. First, we discuss overtourism education in destinations where tourism transpires, highlighting a case study where scholarly research on the life-threatening challenges posed by tourism overdevelopment was shared with local

citizens and leaders, with the aim of effecting change. Next we turn to civil society where frustrations with overtourism have led to the development of degrowth social movements. These grassroots mobilizations serve to educate both local officials and broader publics. Finally, we look briefly at efforts to deal with overtourism in locations other than major cities and point out that we must learn from these cases as well.

Sharing Overtourism Research Findings Locally: Pressing for Policy Revision Via Educational Seminars

One often-overlooked form of education regarding the more subtle ramifications of overtourism takes place in the field, in our scholarly research settings. While overtourism's erosion of the quality of life in places where tourists and locals are crowded elbow-to-elbow is clear to all, in some places its ramifications are more subtle and local stakeholders are less likely to connect the dots between tourism and emerging hardships. In other places, residents are fully aware of the costs of overtourism, but they lack the avenues or agency to push back. In still other locales both these factors are at play.

One example of in-the-field overtourism education comes from the island of Bali, where annual tourist arrivals have outnumbered the population for years. In 2020, prior to the Covid-19's travel disruptions, Bali was poised to host 18.2 million visitors, more than four times its population.[8] On Bali, water is central to local religious practices and wet rice agriculture. It is also prevalent in touristic representations of the island as an exotic paradise, and figures prominently in resort landscape designs. Activist tourism anthropologist-geographer and former tour operator Stroma Cole's political ecology study of water distribution on the island revealed that villagers' ever-increasing

difficulties accessing water was tied to the unchecked development of tourism on the island (Cole, 2012; Cole and Browne, 2015). By some estimates, tourists and resorts consume 65 percent more water than the Balinese, prompting shortages that disproportionately impacted socioeconomically disenfranchised residents. Even middle-class Balinese face low water pressure and irregular waterflow. Cole (2012, p.1223) notes that scholars such as Charara et. al. (2010) have found promise in educational outreach to tourism sector managers and political leaders since many of them lack understanding of water conservation issues. But as Cole and Browne conclude for Bali, "Whilst there are obvious indications that…[the island's] water resources are over stretched, there is no feedback loop to the institutional structures that would help enable appropriate responses from the user groups or governance system" (Cole and Browne 2015, p.439).

        Cole also observes that broader Indonesian cultural orientations further inhibited Balinese from decrying the situation. Indonesia is a highly stratified society and villagers are schooled to enact "blind obedience" to the national government, as well as to defer to those with economic, political or cultural power (Erb, 2000; Cole, 2012). Moreover, at the national level, Indonesian ethnic groups are inculcated to put their needs behind those of the nation (Cole, 2008). According to Cole's calculus, locals have limited ability to pressure tourism developers and the state to address the island's growing water crisis by rethinking Bali's current mass tourism model. Thus, in 2015, Cole agreed to play the role of outsider scholar-educator provocateur, and offered a highly publicized public seminar on Bali entitled, "Is Tourism Killing Babies?"[9] As her talk detailed, the (over)tourism-induced water crisis has disproportionately brutal consequences for

poorer Balinese women, as their dry wells and unaffordable bottled water prices oblige them to purchase cheaper water from dubious sources, ultimately sickening their infants. Present at Cole's seminar were Bali's Head of the Water Department, the Chairperson of the Hotel and Restaurant Association and fleets of reporters. The ensuing headlines in local and international newspapers prompted two NGOs to begin promoting public education on the issue, and one charity to install rain catchment water pipes in Bali's driest region.

Cole's post-field research onsite public education efforts are very much in keeping with the principles of public interest anthropology, which advocates not only sharing research results with local stakeholders, but actively contributing to the quality of life, social justice and equality in the locations where we conduct our research (Adams 2005). Cole's pioneering work illustrates how researchers (especially when they are outsiders) can serve as megaphones to educate tourism decision-makers and government officials about controversial dimensions of overtourism that relatively disempowered locals may not be positioned to comfortably or effectively protest. Moreover, Cole's work shows how public seminars in tourism destinations offer avenues for educating tourists and broader publics about the normally invisible (to non-locals) ramifications of their holidays. On a small scale, such destination-based public education can spur tourists to alter their behaviour and can prompt innovative efforts by NGOs, governments and other enterprises to address the problems posed by overtourism.

Overtourism Education of Broader Publics (and Tourists) Via Social Movements

Numerous tourist locations and cities have made important strides in developing strategies for addressing overtourism, showing that local governments and civil society can also help to educate us, and each other, on the need to tackle tourism related problems. Unlike in hierarchical environments like Bali, these European movement participants can fearlessly embrace their rights to set their own local agendas and are more than willing to challenge the tourist industry and local governments. Perhaps the most prominent example are the numerous efforts that neighbourhood groups have pursued in the city of Barcelona, where local struggles with overtourism have been documented for some time (i.e. Fava and Rubio, 2017; Martins, 2018). By 2008, Catalan anthropologist Manuel Delgado had coined the term 'turismofobia' to describe the situation, in an article published in the Spanish newspaper El País (2008). The term captures the many frustrations that residents of Barcelona felt about the excessive tourism taking place in their city. Since then sentiments against tourists have grown in many other European cities, climaxing in protests in several Spanish cities in summer 2017. The result of these grassroots demonstrations has been the development of social movements focusing on tourism degrowth (Milano, Novelli and Cheer, 2019). These movements toward tourism degrowth have emerged in several other cities, most notably Venice (Bertocchi and Visentin, 2019). These grassroots efforts help to educate their members not only about how to work towards addressing overtourism problems, but also on how to pressure local and national governments. In part due to these grassroots pressures, the idea of Smart Tourist Cities is starting to take root, and city governments are beginning to add tourism planning to their sustainable practices (Ivars-Baidal, Garcia-Hernandez and Mendoza de Miguel, 2019). One of the most important

outcomes of these grassroots efforts has been the creation of a network of cities –

Network of Southern European Cities against Touristification (*Red de ciudades del sur

de Europa ante la turistización*) – that are working together to mitigate the negative

effects of overtourism. The anti-tourism movements therefore are diffusing in Europe

and may diffuse beyond Europe in the future. With these types of social movements

education of citizens as well as local and national governments will inevitably occur.

We must learn from the efforts of social movements and local governments. This

knowledge would then need to be incorporated into the curriculum of tourism and

hospitality programs and disseminated to local and national governments, as well as to

citizen groups (social movements) focused on tourism. The rapid diffusion of information

on the ills of tourism and strategies for treating these ills is crucial if we are to achieve

even a modest level of sustainable tourism.

Where to From Here? Expanding Research on Overtourism for More Comprehensive Sustainability Education

Having reviewed various venues in which overtourism and sustainability

education can transpire, we now shift to briefly discuss the need for expanded studies of

those locations taking steps to defend themselves against overtourism. With some

notable exceptions, up until the present, the majority of overtourism research has

focused on European cities or destinations in the global North (e.g. Ivars-Baidal, García-

Hernández and Mendoza de Miguel, 2019; Bertocci and Visentin, 2019; and Milano,

Novelli and Cheer, 2019). More research, however, is needed on the experiences and

overtourism policies developed in Asian, African, Latin American, and Middle Eastern

destinations. Multiple locations in the Non-Western world as well as in the developing

world have experienced overtourism and tourism monoculture for decades. Jamieson and Jamieson argue that while overtourism is affecting Asian urban heritage areas, "…many of those responsible for managing urban heritage areas lack the skills and competencies to prevent it or mitigate its effects" (2019, 581). What other factors might be at play in these non-European destinations? As suggested earlier, in some cases the inability to take action against overtourism may not be due to a lack of skills, rather authoritarian states and cultural norms hindering or repressing the emergence of degrowth social movements may pose obstacles (as illustrated by the Bali example). If we are to develop educational strategies for mitigating the negative effects of overtourism in different parts of the world, we need more ethnographically grounded studies of overtourism in different, non-Western locales. Many of these locations have already taken steps towards reduce the ills of unsustainable tourism and we can learn from those efforts.

Some Latin American destinations have attempted to deal with overtourism: their experiences can offer educational and practical insights into sustainable tourism. One case of extreme tourism limitation is that of the Guna (formerly Kuna) indigenous people in Panama. The Guna achieved local autonomy from Panama in 1938, and since that time they have resisted tourism development in their territory, Guna Yala, although this emphasis on curtailing growth has led to some conflict among the Guna (Bennett 1999). In the 1960s, US investors owned some small hotels in the territory. By the 1970s, the Panamanian Institute of Tourism (IPAT) developed plans to build a large hotel complex, but the Guna resisted these efforts at tourism development on their land (Chapin, 1990). In 1999, the authors visited the autonomous territory of Guna Yala, which spans almost

911 square miles, including over 300 islands (many of them very small) and a wooded

fringe of coastal land in the north western coast of Panama. What struck us on our visit

was the pristine beauty of the beaches and islands, and the absence of cars, large

buildings, mega-resorts, etc. The hotel in which we stayed, a relatively short canoe ride

from the tiny airport on the nearby island of *Porvernir*, was small and relatively spartan.

In the years since our 1999 visit, some tourism development has occurred: by 2013,

fifty-one small hotels operated in Guna Yala, with a total occupancy of 854 guests

(Savener, 2013, p.71). Given the size of the territory and its proximity to both the

Panama Canal and Panama City (which has fully embraced tourism), however, Guna

Yala appears to have achieved a sustainable degree of tourism development. The case

of the Guna might help us to understand, and teach other tourist locations, about the

potential benefits (but also the potential loses) of severely limiting tourism. Clearly, one

advantage of the Guna is their near absolute autonomy. Perhaps, further study of this

case might suggest that a potential path towards tourism sustainability for ethnic

minorities in nation states lies in establishing some form of regional autonomy, much as

Navaho pueblos have done in the American Southwest.

    In short, research on overtourism must continue to be expanded beyond the

current predominant focus on European cities. We need more case studies from the

developing world, as the calculus surrounding debates about overtourism in less

wealthy nations is different. These countries have more pressing need for hard currency

and employment opportunities for their citizens. Most of the European cities

experiencing overtourism – Barcelona, Venice, Amsterdam, etc. – are much better

positioned to deal with the loss of tourism revenues than are places like Old Havana,

San Cristobal de las Casas, Angkor, and Bali. In short, if we are to effectively teach about shifting away from overtourism towards more sustainable practices, we need additional nuanced case studies from a broader range of nations and destinations.

Part 3: Necessary Steps to Promote Sustainable Tourism Holistically: Conclusions

While positive steps have taken place at the local, regional and national levels and in the academic world to promote education concerning the negative ramifications of overtourism, as outlined above, global action is needed to address the problem systematically and holistically. Overtourism has all the characteristics of a global problem: Global problems are difficult to solve because we live in what international relations theorists describe as an anarchic world, where no central authority exists (Waltz, 2001). The anarchy in the system makes it exceedingly difficult to solve a collective problem, since there are no agreed upon rules and enforcement mechanisms leading most actors to evade the costs of solving the problem. Why would a cruise ship company, a hotel chain, an international restaurant, or a city dependent on tourism dollars unilaterally curtail its revenues if other are not doing the same? The only way to solve a global problem is to find ways to minimize the negative effects of international anarchy.

According to international relations theorists, only three ways exist to solve a global collective action problem in a state of international anarchy (Goldstein and Pevehouse, 2008). One is through force. This solution is clearly not desirable, since it would entail one country or group of countries imposing rules and enforcement

mechanisms. A second solution is through ideational change, which would involve convincing all stakeholders that change is necessary, requires immediate action, and is beneficial for everyone in the long term. This is where education can play an essential role, by fostering strong sustainable tourism attitudes in all stakeholders and by educating all stakeholders in strategies for cultivating sustainable tourism (here case studies are especially useful). As we have suggested, however, while sustainable tourism can be (and has already been) introduced in the curriculum of tourism programs, there is a long way to go before we can claim success in reaching a strong and pervasive sustainable tourism attitude amongst all stakeholders. This strategy should be not be abandoned, but rather our educational efforts in and beyond the classroom need to be redoubled before we can hope to address overtourism and foster more environmentally, culturally, and socially sustainable tourism.

Ideational change alone (via education), while an essential start, will not suffice. The third avenue for solving a collective action problem is to develop global rules and norms that promote sustainable tourism. Without global oversight, some destinations will be hesitant to curtail tourism if their efforts simply result in another location gaining tourist dollars at their expense.[10] Moreover, transnational corporations in the tourism industry can pressure cash-strapped nations into accepting unsustainable amounts of tourists and into granting excessive economic concessions, in the classic "race to the bottom." The pressures for continued tourism growth are still with us, even though in some affluent countries, cities have started taking measures to reduce tourist visits.

In conclusion, to curtail overtourism and foster sustainable tourism, in tandem with tourism education around the world, a truly global strategy is required. All

stakeholders must become convinced that sustainable tourism will be mutually beneficial. In addition, skills must be developed to enable stakeholders to implement strategies that will not only turn tourism into a source of revenue but will also protect the environment and preserve the cultural integrity and lifestyles of local communities. To create this ideational change, educational programs must retool their curricula in ways that makes sustainable tourism a key goal of all tourist endeavours, drawing on lessons learned in various types of destinations around the world. Tourism locations suffering from overtourism must build bonds with other competing destinations, working together and learning from each other. In addition to education and cooperation, the UNWTO must develop into a more influential international organization with the ability to establish enforceable rules of conduct that will promote sustainable tourism. Tourism in destinations like Rome, Old Havana, Barcelona, San Cristóbal de las Casas, Dubrovnik and Bali, should not undermine the quality of life of residents of those locations for the sake of tourism income. The answer lies in educating all stakeholders, embracing and promoting policy diffusion, and setting global, enforceable rules that will help us all become savvy travellers, bringing some prosperity directly to communities, while also allowing future generations to travel. Maybe then will tourism's two faces gaze in the same direction.

References

Adams, K. (2005), "Public Interest Anthropology in Heritage Sites: Writing Culture and Righting Wrongs", *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* Vol. 11 No. 5, pp. 433–439.

Adams, K. (2018), "Local Strategies for Economic Survival in Touristically Volatile Times: An Indonesian Case Study of Micro-Vendors, Gendered Cultural Practices and Resilience", *Journal of Tourism Culture & Communicatio*n, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 287-301.

Aramberri, J. (2010), *Modern Mass Tourism*, Emerald, London.

Ateljevic, I., Morgan, N. and Pritchard. A. (2012), *The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies: Creating an Academy of Hope*, Routledge, London.

Ateljevic, I., Pritchard, A. and Morgan, N. (2007), *The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies: Innovative Research Methodologies*, Routledge, London.

Bennett, J. (1999), *"*The dream and the reality: Tourism in Kuna Yala," *Cultural Survival Quarterly, Vol.* 23, pp. 33-35.

Bertocchi, D. and Visentin, F. (2019), "The Overwhelmed City: Physical and Social Over-Capacities of Global Tourism in Venice", *Sustainability*, Vol. 11, pp. 1-19.

Bianchi, R. (2012), "Towards a new political economy of global tourism revisited", Sharpley, R. and Telfer, D. (Eds.), *Tourism & Development: Concepts and Issues* (2nd Edition), Channel View Publications, Clevedon, pp. 287-331.

Boyle, A., Wilson, E. and Dimmock, K. (2015), "Transformative education and sustainable tourism: The influence of a lecturer's world view", *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 252-263.

Brooker, E. and Joppe, M. (2014), "Developing a tourism innovation typology: Leveraging liminal insight", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 53, pp. 500–508.

Butler, R. (1980), "The concept of a tourism areas cycle of evaluation: Implications for management of resources", *Canadian Geographer*, Vol. 24 No.1, pp. 5–12.

Butler, R. (2015), "The evolution of tourism and tourism research", *Tourism Recreation Research,* Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 16-27.

Chapin, M. (1990), "The Silent Jungle: Ecotourism Among the Kuna Indians of Panama", *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, Vol 14, p. 42-45.

Charara, N., Cashman, A., Bonnell, R. and Gehr, R. (2010), "Water use efficiency in the hotel sector of Barbados", *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 19 No.2, pp. 231–245.

Cheer, J. and Lew, A. (Eds.) (2017), *Tourism, Resilience and Sustainability: Adapting to Social, Political and Economic Change,* Routledge, London.

Cheer, J. and Lew, A. (Eds.) (2017), *Tourism, Resilience and Sustainability: Adapting to Social, Political and Economic Change,* Routledge, London.

Cohen, E. (1974), "Who is a tourist? A conceptual classification", *Sociological Review,* Vol. 22, pp. 527-555.

Cohen, E. (1984), "The sociology of tourism: Approaches, issues, and findings", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 10, pp. 373–392.

Cole, S. (2008), "Living in hope: Tourism and poverty alleviation in Flores", Burns, P. and Novelli, M. (Eds.), *Tourism Development: Hopes, Myths and Inequalities*, CABI International, Wallingford, pp. 272-289.

Cole, S. (2012), "A political ecology of water equity and tourism: A case study from Bali", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 1221-1241.

Cole, S. (2014), "Tourism and water: from stakeholders to rights holders, and what tourism businesses need to do", Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol. 22 No.1, pp. 89-106.

Cole, S. and Browne, M. (2015), "Tourism and Water Inequity in Bali: A Social-Ecological Systems Analysis", *Human Ecology*, Vol 43 No. 3, pp. 439-450.

Coles, T., Hall, C. and Duval, D. (2006), "Tourism and post-disciplinary enquiry", *Current Issues in Tourism*, Vol. 9 No. 4/5, pp. 293–319.

Cotterell, D., Hales, R., Arcodia, C. and Ferreira, J. (2019), "Overcommitted to tourism and under committed to sustainability: the urgency of teaching "strong sustainability" in tourism courses", *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol.* 27 No. 7, pp. 882-902.

Crick, M. (1989), "Representations of international tourism in the social sciences: Sun, sex, sights, savings and servility", *Annual Review of Anthropology,* Vol. 18, pp. 307-344.

de Kadt, E. (Ed.) (1979), *Tourism: Passport to Development? Perspectives on the Social and Cultural Effects of Tourism in Developing Countries*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Delgado, M. (2008), "Turistofobia." *El País*, 11 July, available at https://elpais.com/diario/2008/07/12/catalunya/1215824840_850215.html (accessed 27 April 2020).

Dolezal, C., Trupp, A. and Bui, H. (Eds.) (2020), *Tourism and Development in Southeast Asia*. Routledge, Abingdon.

Erb, M. (2000), "Understanding tourists: Interpretations from Indonesia", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 709-736.

Fava, N. and Rubio, S.P. (2017), "From Barcelona: The Pearl of the Mediterranean to Bye Bye Barcelona", In Bellini, N. and Pasquinelli, C. (Eds.), *Tourism in the City*, Springer, Cham, Switzerland, pp. 285–295

Finney, B. and Watson, K. (Eds.) (1975), *A New Kind of Sugar: Tourism in the Pacific*, East-West Center, Honolulu.

Goldstein, J.S. and Pevehouse, J.C. (2008), *Principles of International Relations*, Pearson/Longman, New York, NY.

Graburn, N. (1980), "Teaching the Anthropology of Tourism," *International Social Science Journal,* Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 56-68.

Graburn, N. and Jafari, J. (1991), "Introduction: Tourism social science", *Annals of Tourism Research,* Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 1-11.

Hall, M., Prayag, G. and Amore, A. (2018), *Tourism and resilience: Individual, organizational and destination perspectives*, Channel View Publications, Bristol.

Hills, T. and Lundgren, J. (1977), "The Impact of Tourism in the Caribbean: A Methodological Study", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 4 No. 5, pp. 248-267.

Holden, A. and Novelli, M. (2011), "Guest editorial: The changing paradigms of tourism in international development: placing the poor first – Trojan horse or real hope?", *Tourism Planning and Development*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 233-235.

Hollinshead, K. (2016), "Postdisciplinarity and the rise of intellectual openness: The

    necessity for "plural knowability" in tourism studies," *Tourism Analysis*, Vol. 21,

    pp. 349-361.

Inui, Y., Wheeler, D. and Lankford, S. (2006), "Rethinking Tourism Education: What

    Should Schools Teach?" *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism*

    Education, Vol. 5 No.2, pp. 25-35.

Ivars-Baidal, J., Garcia-Hernandez, M. and Mendoza de Miguel, S. (2019), "Integrating

    Overtourism in the Smart Cities Agenda", *Review of Tourism Research*, Vol. 17

    No. 2, pp. 122-139.

Jamieson, W. and Jamieson, M. (2019), "Overtourism management competencies in

    Asian urban heritage areas", *International Journal of Tourism Cities,* Vol. 5 No. 4,

    pp. 581-587.

Leadbeater, C. (2017), "Will new limits on visiting Machu Picchu save Peru's most

    famous Inca citadel?" *The Telegraph*, June 21, available at

    https://www.telegraph.co.uk/travel/destinations/south-

    america/peru/articles/machu-picchu-new-rules-for-access/ (accessed on 29 April

    2020)

Leite, N. and Graburn, N. (2012), ""Anthropological interventions in tourism studies",

    Jamal, T. and Robinson, M. (Eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Tourism Studies,*

    SAGE, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 35-6.

Let's Go Inc. (2008), *Lets Go Europe, 2008,* St. Martin's Press, New York, NY.

MacCannell, D. (1976), *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*, Schocken,

    New York, NY.

Martins, M. (2018), "Tourism Planning and Tourismphobia: An Analysis of the Strategic Tourism Plan of Barcelona 2010-2015", *Journal of Tourism, Heritage & Services Marketing*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 3-7.

Mihalache, M. and Mihalache, O. (2016), "Organisational ambidexterity and sustained performance in the tourism industry", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 56, pp. 128–163.

Milano, C., Novelli, M. and Cheer, J. (2019), "Overtourism and degrowth: a social movement perspective", *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* Vol. 27 No.12, pp. 1857-1879.

Mostafanezhad, M. and Norum, R. (2019), "The anthropocenic imaginary: Political ecologies of tourism in a geological epoch", *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 27, pp. 421–435.

Pattullo, P. (2005), *Last Resorts: The Cost of Cruise Tourism in the Caribbean* (2nd edition), Latin American Bureau, New York, NY.

Prideaux, B. (2000), "The Resort Development Spectrum: A new approach to modeling resort development", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 225-240.

Rostow, W. W. (1960), *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Sanchez, P.M. and Adams, K. M. (2008), "The Janus-Faced Character of Tourism in Cuba", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 27-46.

Savener, A. (2013), "A Host Gaze Composed of Mediated Resistance in Panama: Power Inversion in Kuna Yala", in Moufakkir, O. and Reisinger, Y. (Eds.), *The Host Gaze in Global Tourism*, CAB International, Oxfordshire. pp. 67-80.

Scheyvens, R. (Ed.) (2010), *Tourism and Poverty*, Taylor and Francis, Abingdon.

Séraphin, H. and Butcher, J. (2018), "Tourism Management in the Caribbean,"
Caribbean Quarterly, Vol. 64 No.2, pp. 254-283.

Séraphin, H. and Yallop, A. (2019), "Proposed framework for the management of
resorts Mini Clubs: an ambidextrous approach", *Leisure Studies*, Vol 38 No. 4,
pp. 535-547.

Singh, T. (1978), "Tourism and the environment: Towards better reconciliation", *tourism
Recreation Research*, Vol 3 No. 2, pp. 5-10.

Smith, V. (1953), "Travel Geography Courses for a New Field", *The Journal of
Geography*, Vol. 52 No. 2, pp. 68-72.

Smith, V. (Ed.) (1977), *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*, University of
Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Stankey, G. and Lime, D. (1973), *Recreational Carrying Capacity: An Annotated
Bibliography*, US Department of Agriculture (Forest Service, General Technical
Report), Ogden, UT.

Stronza, A. (2005), "Hosts and Hosts: The Anthropology of Community-Based
Ecotourism in the Peruvian Amazon", *National Association for Practice of
Anthropology Bulletin,* Vol. 23, pp. 170–190.

Stronza, A. (2008), "Partnership for Tourism Development", in Moscardo, G. (Ed.),
Building Community Capacity for Tourism Development, CABI, Oxfordshire, pp.
101-115.

Stronza, A. (2010), "Commons management and ecotourism: ethnographic evidence from the Amazon", *International Journal of the Commons*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 56-77.

Swain, M. (2009), "The cosmopolitan hope of tourism: Critical action and worldmaking vistas", *Tourism Geographies,* Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 505-525.

Wall, G. and Wright, C. (1977), *The Environmental Impact of Outdoor Recreation*, Department of Geography Publication Series No. 11, University of Waterloo, Waterloo.

Waltz, K. N. (2001 [1959]), *Man, the state, and war: A theoretical analysis*. Columbia University Press, New York, NY.

Wijesinghe, S. and Mura P. (2018), "Situating Asian tourism ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies: From colonialism to neo-colonialism," in Mura, P. and Khoo-Lattimore, C. (Eds.), *Asian qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies and methods,* Springer, Berlin, pp. 95-115.

Wilson, E. and von der Heidt, T. (2013), "Business as usual? Barriers to Education for Sustainability in the Tourism Curriculum", *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, Vol 13 No. 2, pp. 130-147.

---

[1] As *Let's Go Europe, 2008* asserts, "You can't get more Roman than Trastevere" (Let's Go Inc., 2008, p.586).

[2] See https://www.ehl.edu/en/about-ehl/our-history. Accessed April 20, 2020.

[3] See https://sha.cornell.eR.du/about/history/. Accessed April 20, 2020.

[4] Nevertheless, we suggest the economic growth value has eclipsed tourism's negative, consequences documented by critical tourism studies. The term "sustainable tourism" is

a good example, since this concept envisions resolving the tensions and contradictions between tourism growth and preserving environments and local lifestyles. The sustainability concept "has a pervasive obscuring effect" (Mostafanezhad and Norum (2019, p.428). Drawing on Swyngedouw (2007), Mostafanezhad and Norum further observe that "a policy of sustainability is constructed around a single Nature, insofar as there are a multitude of natures and a multitude of existing or possible socio-natural relations, perpetuates…a condition that forecloses the possibility of a real politics of the environment" (Mostafanezhad and Norum 2019, p.428). These authors underscore the point we make here: pursuing sustainability is desirable, but it is also, paradoxically, often in conflict with the values of economic growth emphasized in our current neoliberal capitalist era.

[5] However, Valene Smith, who became a pioneer in tourism anthropology, introduced a "travel geography" class at Los Angeles City College in 1952, as a Geography Department offering (Smith, 1953).

[6] Though Finney and Watson's (1975) Pacific-focused volume of case studies appeared earlier, Smith's *Hosts and Guests* was more widely adopted in tourism anthropology classes.

[7] In the intervening years, Adams classes incorporated critiques of these classic theories, as have other tourism studies scholars. For instance, she includes Prideaux's (2000) critique of Butler's TALC model, modules on social justice, ethics, sustainability, and community-based tourism, drawing from Scheyvens (2010), Stronza (2008), Ateljevic, Morgan and Pritchard (2012), Cole (2012, 2014), Cheer and Lew (2017), Adams (2018) and others.

[8] This estimate derives from HospitalityNet. See

https://www.hospitalitynet.org/news/4089844.html.

[9] Personal communication, Stroma Cole, March 2017. Also see:

http://equalityintourism.org/stroma-coles-bali-presentation-on-tourism-related-water-

shortages-in-bali/.

[10] Caribbean islands for example, have been hesitant to impose head taxes on cruise

ship passengers fearing ships will port elsewhere (Pattullo, 2005).