



## Sustainable Tourism Practices for Environmental Protection and Economic Development

Mimoza Zhubi<sup>1</sup>, Dren Zhubi<sup>2\*</sup>, Idriz Kovaçi<sup>1</sup>, Alberta Tahiri<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Tourism and Environment, Tourism and Hotel Management, University of Applied Sciences in Ferizaj, Ferizaj 70000, Kosovo

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Technology and Technical Sciences, University of St Kliment Ohridski, Veles 1400, Macedonia

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Management in Tourism, Hospitality and Environment, University “Haxhi Zeka”, Peja 30000, Kosovo

Corresponding Author Email: [zhubidren@gmail.com](mailto:zhubidren@gmail.com)

Copyright: ©2026 The authors. This article is published by IETA and is licensed under the CC BY 4.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

<https://doi.org/10.18280/ijstdp.210716>

### ABSTRACT

**Received:** 26 October 2025

**Revised:** 10 January 2026

**Accepted:** 20 January 2026

**Available online:** 31 July 2026

#### Keywords:

*sustainability, biodiversity, community, development, stewardship, conservation, economy, tourism, environmental*

Sustainable tourism has become a central strategy for addressing the dual challenges of environmental protection and economic growth in destinations experiencing increasing visitor pressure. This paper explores the effectiveness of sustainable tourism practices in balancing ecological preservation with the economic needs of host communities. The study adopts an analytical approach, reviewing existing frameworks of sustainable tourism management and examining case studies where conservation measures and development objectives are integrated. Emphasis is placed on practices such as waste reduction, renewable energy adoption, biodiversity protection, and community-based tourism initiatives. Results indicate that when tourism is managed through sustainability-oriented policies, it contributes to reducing environmental degradation, improving resource efficiency, and enhancing the resilience of ecosystems. At the same time, sustainable tourism generates employment opportunities, supports local entrepreneurship, and fosters inclusive economic development. Findings further highlight that stakeholder collaboration, particularly between local authorities, businesses, and communities, is essential for ensuring the long-term success of sustainability initiatives. However, challenges remain in areas such as monitoring compliance, balancing short-term economic interests with long-term conservation goals, and addressing the uneven distribution of benefits. The paper concludes that sustainable tourism, if systematically applied, can serve as a model for integrating environmental stewardship with economic advancement, offering valuable lessons for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Tourism has become one of the world's most dynamic and rapidly expanding industries, contributing significantly to global economic growth, employment generation, and cultural exchange. According to the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), the sector accounted for approximately 7% of global exports in goods and services before the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, reflecting its critical role in international development [1]. However, this rapid expansion has also produced profound environmental challenges, including resource depletion, waste generation, and ecosystem degradation [2]. The growth of mass tourism, combined with insufficient regulatory oversight, has heightened concerns over the environmental sustainability of popular destinations, particularly in developing regions where natural resources constitute the primary tourism asset [3].

Sustainable tourism has therefore emerged as a global policy and research priority aimed at reconciling environmental protection with economic advancement. Defined by the UNWTO as “tourism that takes full account of

its current and future economic, social, and environmental impacts,” sustainable tourism seeks to balance the needs of visitors, industry, the environment, and host communities [1]. It is grounded in the broader framework of sustainable development articulated by the United Nations’ 2030 Agenda, which emphasizes inclusive growth, responsible consumption and production, and the protection of terrestrial ecosystems [4]. Sustainable tourism refers to tourism development that balances economic viability, social equity, and environmental protection while addressing the needs of visitors, the tourism industry, and host communities [5].

Artificial Intelligence and sustainable tourism are supported by the 2030 Agenda framework, which aims for inclusive development, environmental protection and responsible use of resources [4].

Tourism is considered an important instrument for advancing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), as it contributes to and affects the economic, social, and environmental dimensions of sustainable development [6]. Practices such as local employment and decent work contribute directly to SDG 8, promoting economic growth and social inclusion [7].

Responsible consumption and production in tourism, including waste management and energy efficiency, are closely linked to SDG 12, reducing negative environmental impacts [4].

According to Leung et al. [8], when properly planned and managed, tourism in protected areas can support biodiversity conservation, strengthen visitors' appreciation of natural resources, and generate economic benefits for local communities.

Despite the growing body of literature advocating for sustainability, many destinations struggle to operationalize sustainable tourism principles in practice. A persistent gap exists between policy rhetoric and implementation, often due to limited institutional capacity, inadequate monitoring systems, and competing short-term economic interests [9, 10]. Furthermore, while numerous studies have explored environmental conservation or economic benefits separately, fewer have systematically analyzed how both dimensions can be harmonized within a single policy framework. The challenge lies in integrating economic resilience with environmental stewardship while ensuring that tourism remains inclusive and locally beneficial [11].

This study addresses that gap by examining sustainable tourism practices that promote both ecological preservation and economic development. It emphasizes measures such as renewable energy adoption, biodiversity protection, waste reduction, and community-based tourism initiatives, which have demonstrated potential to reduce environmental degradation and enhance local livelihoods [12]. Moreover, stakeholder collaboration among governments, private enterprises, and community organizations is analyzed as a critical determinant of long-term sustainability outcomes [13]. By adopting an analytical and case-based approach, the study contributes to ongoing debates about how tourism can simultaneously serve as a vehicle for conservation and economic empowerment.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the Literature Review, synthesizing theoretical and empirical perspectives on sustainable tourism and its environmental-economic linkages. Section 3 outlines the Research Methodology, describing the analytical framework, case selection, and data interpretation methods used in this study. Section 4 presents the Results, followed by Section 5, which provides an in-depth Discussion of the implications of sustainable tourism practices for both environmental protection and economic development. Finally, Section 6 offers the Conclusions, summarizing key findings and proposing policy and practical recommendations for advancing sustainability in the tourism sector.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of sustainable tourism has evolved over the past four decades as a multidimensional framework that integrates ecological preservation, socio-cultural integrity, and economic viability. Early scholarship conceptualized sustainability primarily in environmental terms, emphasizing conservation and resource management [14]. However, later studies expanded the focus to include the social and economic dimensions of tourism development, aligning the field more closely with the principles of the Brundtland Report, which defined sustainable development as meeting "the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations

to meet their own needs" [15]. Within this context, sustainable tourism has come to represent not merely a subset of environmental policy but a holistic governance approach encompassing environmental, economic, and social pillars [16, 17].

Scholars widely agree that tourism's sustainability depends on balancing the benefits of economic growth with the costs of ecological degradation [18]. This balance is particularly critical because tourism, while fostering employment and regional investment, can simultaneously lead to increased carbon emissions, waste production, and habitat loss if not carefully managed. Studies [3, 13] argue that sustainable tourism must transition from rhetorical commitment to operational practice through enforceable standards, performance indicators, and stakeholder accountability. These mechanisms are essential for converting abstract sustainability principles into measurable outcomes such as energy efficiency, biodiversity conservation, and community well-being.

Recent research highlights the role of community-based tourism (CBT) and local participation as cornerstones of sustainability. CBT initiatives empower residents to shape tourism development according to local priorities, thereby strengthening social capital and reducing leakages of economic benefits [19]. Scholars [12, 20] emphasize that community involvement enhances both environmental stewardship and social inclusion, creating a symbiotic relationship between host communities and visitors. Nevertheless, the literature also cautions that CBT's success depends on governance capacity, equitable benefit distribution, and the avoidance of elite capture [21].

Hence, sustainability cannot be achieved without transparent institutional frameworks that promote cooperation among governments, private sectors, and civil society actors [9].

A parallel body of literature explores the technological and managerial innovations that can foster sustainability within tourism systems. The adoption of renewable energy sources, digital monitoring tools, and waste-reduction technologies has been shown to significantly lower the ecological footprint of tourist destinations [22]. Smart tourism and circular economy models are increasingly recognized as enablers of resource efficiency and resilience [1]. Furthermore, strategic destination management, integrating land-use planning, visitor-flow regulation, and green certification programs, plays a crucial role in ensuring that tourism activities remain within ecological carrying capacities [11]. These managerial innovations, however, require adequate data infrastructure, skilled personnel, and continuous policy adaptation to remain effective in rapidly changing environments.

The literature also identifies persistent challenges that hinder the realization of sustainable tourism. Among the most frequently cited barriers are short-term profit orientation, fragmented policy coordination, and insufficient monitoring of sustainability indicators [10, 17]. In many developing economies, weak governance structures and limited financial resources constrain the ability to enforce environmental standards. Moreover, the uneven distribution of tourism benefits exacerbates socio-economic inequalities, undermining the participatory ethos that sustainability demands [20]. Academic discourse increasingly calls for integrating concepts such as resilience, adaptive governance, and inclusive development into sustainability models to address these shortcomings [23]. This evolution reflects a broader shift toward understanding sustainability not as a fixed

state but as a dynamic process of learning, negotiation, and innovation.

In synthesis, the literature underscores that sustainable tourism is not a uniform or universally applicable model but a context-dependent process shaped by institutional capacity, cultural values, and ecological conditions. Its successful implementation hinges on aligning economic incentives with environmental ethics and embedding sustainability within governance systems rather than treating it as a peripheral policy goal. Despite extensive theoretical discussion, empirical gaps remain regarding how specific sustainability practices, such as renewable energy adoption, biodiversity protection, and community participation, jointly contribute to both environmental and economic outcomes. This gap justifies the analytical orientation of the present study, which aims to examine sustainable tourism as a mechanism for achieving environmental protection and economic development through integrated, evidence-based approaches.

### **3. SUSTAINABLE TOURISM PRACTICES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

#### **3.1 The concept of sustainable tourism**

Sustainable tourism was formalized as a concept within the broader discourse of sustainable development, aiming to balance economic benefits, environmental protection and social well-being. According to the study [24], sustainable tourism is one that “addresses the needs of visitors, the industry, the environment and host communities, while safeguarding opportunities for future generations”.

#### **3.2 Sustainable tourism practices and environmental protection**

A significant body of literature focuses on the role of tourism practices in reducing environmental impacts. Studies identify key practices such as:

- waste management,
- efficient use of energy and water,
- limiting tourist flows to carrying capacity, and
- preserving biodiversity through protected areas.

However, Bramwell and Lane [25] note that environmental measures are often applied in a piecemeal manner and without long-term monitoring mechanisms.

A critical strand of literature challenges the “double dividend” narrative [26]. Therefore, sustainable tourism should not be treated as a “win-win” solution, but as a political and institutional process, requiring compensatory policies and the active involvement of local stakeholders [27].

A study [28] showed that the lack of involvement of local communities in decision-making increases resistance to environmental policies and reduces their effectiveness.

### **4. NATURAL TENSIONS AND TRADE-OFFS IN SUSTAINABLE TOURISM**

Sustainable tourism aims to balance economic benefits, environmental protection, and social well-being; however, in practice, these objectives may involve trade-offs that are difficult to reconcile [28].

Critical literature emphasized [29] that sustainability should be understood as a negotiated process among stakeholders with competing interests, where trade-offs and compromises are often inevitable.

Optimistic “double dividend” arguments often understate the trade-offs involved in sustainable tourism, since protecting fragile environments may require reducing tourism intensity, with possible short-term costs for local income and employment [30].

In Kosovo, cases such as Bjeshkët e Nemuna show that environmental restrictions in national parks have created tensions with local communities that depend economically on tourism [31].

In Brezovica, conflicts between tourism development plans and natural resource protection have delayed investments and increased local economic insecurity [32].

Empirical studies show that the lack of involvement of local communities in decision-making increases resistance to environmental policies and reduces their effectiveness [33].

Experience from the Western Balkans (e.g., Dubrovnik) shows that limiting mass tourism for environmental and social reasons can trigger strong opposition from local economic actors [34, 35].

### **5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This study adopts an integrative and analytical research design aimed at examining how sustainable tourism practices contribute simultaneously to environmental protection and economic development. The methodological approach combines qualitative synthesis with comparative case analysis, enabling a multidimensional understanding of the relationship between sustainability-oriented policies and their real-world outcomes. The central premise of the methodology is that sustainable tourism is best studied through a mixed evidence base, drawing on theoretical frameworks, empirical findings, and contextual case material, to capture the complexity of interactions among ecological, social, and economic variables [36].

Accordingly, data were collected through an extensive review of academic journals, policy reports, and institutional documents published by global organizations such as the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). These materials provided both empirical evidence and policy insights into sustainability implementation, management challenges, and measurable outcomes across different regions and scales of governance.

Multi-level governance is considered essential for the implementation of sustainable tourism, but there is no universal model suitable for all contexts [35].

The effectiveness of governance depends on institutional capacities, coordination between levels and the socio-economic context [37].

In small and developing countries, hybrid models (central leadership + local implementation) are more functional than full decentralization [37].

In contexts with weak institutional capacities or risk of corruption, decentralization without accountability mechanisms can worsen the management of tourism resources [38].

For Kosovo, the literature and institutional reports suggest

that multi-level governance is effective only when accompanied by:

- strong central coordination,
- real involvement of local communities, and
- technical support to municipalities [31].

Lack of community involvement in decision-making increases resistance to environmental policies and reduces their effectiveness [28].

Data were analyzed using thematic content analysis to identify recurring patterns, conceptual linkages, and policy implications. Each case was examined according to four analytical dimensions: (1) environmental outcomes (e.g., waste reduction, energy efficiency, biodiversity conservation), (2) economic outcomes (e.g., employment generation, income diversification, local entrepreneurship), (3) social outcomes (e.g., community participation, cultural preservation), and (4) governance mechanisms (e.g., stakeholder collaboration, policy enforcement, monitoring). Coding procedures were guided by a grounded theory logic, allowing themes to emerge inductively from the data rather than being imposed a priori [39]. This iterative process helped establish a conceptual model linking sustainability practices to their direct and indirect effects on destination resilience.

Triangulation was employed to strengthen methodological rigor and minimize bias. By cross-verifying evidence from academic literature, institutional reports, and secondary statistical data, the study ensured reliability and internal validity. Where possible, findings were compared across multiple case settings to assess convergence and divergence in sustainability outcomes. This cross-case synthesis facilitated the identification of generalizable principles, while preserving the contextual specificity of each destination [40]. In doing so, the research balances empirical richness with analytical abstraction, offering insights that are both theoretically grounded and policy relevant.

Ethical considerations were also central to the research process. All data sources were publicly available and properly attributed in accordance with academic integrity standards. The study avoided normative assumptions, focusing instead on a critical interpretation of existing evidence. Furthermore, the methodology adhered to the principles of transparency, reproducibility, and objectivity, essential criteria for academic credibility and replicability in high-impact journals [41]. Limitations such as the potential subjectivity of qualitative interpretation and the variability of data availability across destinations are acknowledged and mitigated through the triangulated approach and consistent application of inclusion criteria.

This methodological design allows for an in-depth exploration of sustainable tourism as a multidimensional system of environmental, economic, and social interdependence. By synthesizing evidence across disciplines and contexts, the study contributes to the scholarly understanding of how sustainability-oriented tourism can function as both a conservation strategy and a driver of inclusive economic growth. The approach not only provides empirical depth but also supports the development of policy-relevant recommendations that align with global sustainability goals and local development priorities.

## 6. RESULTS

Across the sampled cases, sustainability-oriented

destination management was associated with measurable environmental gains. Programs that combined waste prevention with circular-economy measures reported statistically significant drops in solid waste and material intensity in accommodation and food services, aligning with national data that identify hotels and restaurants as high-leverage nodes for waste reduction [42]. Protected-area destinations that tightened carrying-capacity rules and visitor-flow management recorded improved biodiversity indicators relative to comparable sites without governance upgrades, with recent comparative evidence confirming that governance quality, not designation status alone, explains conservation performance [43]; These patterns are reinforced by multi-country evidence showing strong public support for the “30×30” conservation target, which reduces the political cost of adopting stricter ecological safeguards in tourism hotspots [44].

Economic outcomes moved in parallel, where sustainability was operationalized through local value capture. Nature-based tourism projects with formal benefit-sharing and local procurement exhibited employment multipliers and income effects that exceeded those of conventional models, with recent World Bank analyses documenting robust local spending linkages in protected-area destinations and practical methods to measure [45] Sector-wide macro indicators likewise point to a strong post-pandemic recovery under sustainability constraints, with Travel & Tourism contributing about 10% of global GDP and supporting ~357 million jobs in 2024, conditions that, when channeled through green business models, translate into inclusive growth at destination scale [46]. Case-level econometric studies of community-based or ecotourism interventions in rural settings similarly report employment and income gains when governance ensures local participation and transparent revenue [47, 48].

Destination governance and stakeholder collaboration emerged as decisive mediators of dual outcomes. Where authorities convened multi-actor coalitions, municipal agencies, park administrations, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), and resident groups, environmental indicators (e.g., habitat condition, waste intensity) improved in tandem with business resilience, consistent with new empirical work on “dynamic governance” in island and archipelago destinations [49]. In the hospitality subsector, the coupling of stakeholder engagement with green innovation amplified performance, yielding higher energy efficiency and environmental scores than either practice alone [50]. A complementary stream of evidence shows that mega-events can catalyze permanent sustainability upgrades in accommodation facilities when policy requires legacy standards [51].

Technology adoption was a consistent operational driver of environmental gains; recent reviews in African and small-market contexts find accelerating uptake of on-site renewables (solar thermal/photovoltaic (PV)), heat-pump retrofits, and digital energy-management systems in hotels, with reported reductions in utility bills and carbon intensity, key to sustaining margins while meeting environmental targets [52]. Cleaner-production retrofits further reduced water use and solid-waste outputs in accommodation facilities, demonstrating quick-payback abatement options that can scale through green-finance instruments [53].

Circular-economy roadmaps for hospitality reinforce these findings, identifying food-waste prevention and materials recirculation as top-tier levers [54].

Notwithstanding these gains, the analysis also surfaced critical implementation risks, first, conservation outcomes deteriorate when protected status expands faster than management quality, a pattern flagged by global monitoring initiatives and urging a pivot from “area-based” to “effectiveness-based” targets [44]. Second, weak safeguards or rights-based lapses can undermine the social license of conservation-linked tourism, as highlighted by recent governance controversies around protected-area financing in East Africa, events that stall investment and erode trust [55]. Third, uneven benefit distribution dampens local support; the most successful cases explicitly tied revenue-sharing and SME participation to conservation compliance. Collectively, these findings indicate that sustainable tourism delivers dual dividends when three conditions co-exist: (i) enforceable ecological standards, (ii) inclusive economic mechanisms, and (iii) accountable, data-driven governance.

## 7. DISCUSSION

The findings presented in this study reveal that sustainable tourism has moved beyond a theoretical aspiration and is increasingly becoming a measurable, policy-driven mechanism for integrating environmental protection with local economic advancement. The results affirm that destinations adopting clear sustainability frameworks, anchored in renewable energy transition, biodiversity conservation, waste reduction, and community empowerment, achieve more stable long-term outcomes. This is consistent with recent empirical analyses showing that sustainability-driven destinations exhibit higher resilience to global shocks, including pandemics and climate-related crises [56]. Such resilience underscores that sustainability is not merely an ethical preference but a strategic imperative for the tourism sector in an era of global uncertainty.

A striking outcome of this analysis is the centrality of governance quality and institutional coherence in determining the success or failure of sustainable tourism initiatives. Recent research demonstrates that multi-level governance, where national, regional, and local institutions align policy goals and share accountability, produces more effective sustainability outcomes than fragmented, short-term interventions [57]. Destinations that embedded sustainability principles into statutory frameworks, rather than voluntary guidelines, were able to ensure compliance, transparency, and monitoring effectiveness. Furthermore, participatory governance models, incorporating community voices, civil society organizations, and private-sector stakeholders, created stronger legitimacy and reduced conflicts over resource use. These findings corroborate emerging scholarship emphasizing that sustainable tourism cannot thrive in institutional isolation; it demands networked governance and adaptive capacity [58].

Another dimension deserving attention is the transformative role of innovation and technology. Recent study [59] showed that the integration of digital monitoring systems, artificial intelligence, and green technologies, such as smart sensors for waste management and blockchain-enabled sustainability reporting, has improved both environmental performance and tourist satisfaction. Destinations deploying smart-tourism tools have been able to track carbon footprints, optimize visitor flows, and encourage low-impact travel behaviors in real time. The rise of data-driven sustainability management represents a paradigm shift: from reactive environmental

protection to proactive, evidence-based decision-making. However, as the literature warns, technological innovation must be complemented by institutional readiness and ethical governance to avoid techno-centric solutions that marginalize smaller actors or reinforce existing inequalities [60].

While tourism contributes substantially to local income and job creation, the equitable distribution of these benefits often determines community support for conservation initiatives. Empirical work across emerging economies highlights that community-based tourism and cooperative business models foster stronger social cohesion and reduce leakages of financial benefits.

The integration of circular economy principles into tourism, such as waste valorization and resource recirculation, exemplifies how tourism can evolve into a restorative industry rather than an extractive one. These conceptual developments also open new research frontiers, particularly regarding the metrics for evaluating sustainability performance. Current frameworks still rely heavily on economic indicators; however, the emerging consensus advocates for hybrid measures that integrate ecological footprint reduction, cultural integrity, and social well-being [61].

The discussion reinforces that sustainable tourism is both a scientific challenge and a societal opportunity. It requires continuous collaboration between policymakers, researchers, and communities to bridge the gap between rhetoric and reality. Destinations that achieve this integration, through governance, technology, inclusivity, and ethical commitment stand as exemplars of how tourism can serve as a genuine force for environmental stewardship and equitable development in the twenty-first century.

## 8. CONCLUSIONS

This study concludes that sustainable tourism represents a pivotal framework for reconciling economic development with environmental stewardship, provided that its implementation is grounded in strong governance, inclusive participation, and continuous innovation. The research confirms that destinations adopting sustainability-based management models experience tangible environmental improvements, such as reduced waste, enhanced biodiversity, and lower carbon emissions, while simultaneously generating equitable economic benefits for local communities. These findings validate the premise that sustainable tourism, when properly operationalized, serves as both a conservation instrument and a driver of socio-economic resilience.

This conclusion emphasizes four critical aspects: synthesis of findings, theoretical contribution, policy implications, and directions for future research. First, the synthesis highlights that sustainability outcomes depend less on the mere adoption of green initiatives and more on the quality of institutional coordination, stakeholder collaboration, and policy integration. Second, the theoretical contribution lies in advancing a holistic model of “strong sustainability,” where environmental protection, economic inclusion, and social equity are not treated as separate dimensions but as mutually reinforcing systems. This multidimensional framework strengthens the scholarly understanding of tourism’s role in achieving global sustainability targets, particularly those embedded in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs 8, 12, and 15).

From a policy perspective, the findings provide actionable

insights for governments, destination management organizations, and private-sector actors. Policymakers should institutionalize sustainability by embedding it into national tourism strategies, legal frameworks, and fiscal incentives, ensuring consistent monitoring and accountability. Likewise, community engagement must evolve beyond participatory rhetoric to genuine empowerment through local ownership, skills development, and fair benefit distribution. The evidence further suggests that innovation ecosystems, encompassing smart technologies, renewable energy, and circular economy practices, can accelerate sustainability transitions if supported by adequate governance capacity and transparent data systems.

For practitioners, this study underscores that sustainability is no longer an optional dimension of competitiveness but a determinant of long-term viability. Destinations that strategically integrate environmental and socio-economic performance are better positioned to attract responsible investors, meet evolving consumer preferences, and withstand crises such as pandemics and climate-induced disruptions. The tourism sector must, therefore, evolve toward a regenerative paradigm that restores ecosystems, strengthens communities, and redefines value creation beyond short-term profits.

The study acknowledges its methodological boundaries and proposes avenues for future inquiry. While the qualitative synthesis and case-based analysis provide depth, longitudinal and mixed-method studies are needed to quantify causal relationships between sustainability practices and long-term resilience indicators. Future research should also investigate the equity dimensions of sustainable tourism, including the role of gender, youth, and marginalized communities in shaping and benefiting from sustainable tourism governance. Moreover, comparative studies across regions, particularly between developed and emerging economies, would help identify context-specific success factors and policy transferability.

Sustainable tourism stands at the intersection of ecological necessity and economic opportunity. When underpinned by ethical governance, innovation, and inclusivity, it can evolve into a transformative force that balances prosperity with planetary well-being. The practical and theoretical insights generated by this research contribute meaningfully to the global discourse on sustainable development and provide a foundation for future studies, policy reforms, and strategic decision-making within the tourism sector.

## REFERENCES

- [1] UNWTO. (2023). International Tourism – 2023 starts on a strong note with the Middle East recovering 2019 levels in the first quarter. World Tourism Barometer. [https://webunwto.s3.eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/2023-05/UNWTO\\_Barom23\\_02\\_May\\_EXCERPT\\_final.pdf?VersionId=gGmuSXLwfm1yoemsRrBI9jKUAWVmc9gYD](https://webunwto.s3.eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/2023-05/UNWTO_Barom23_02_May_EXCERPT_final.pdf?VersionId=gGmuSXLwfm1yoemsRrBI9jKUAWVmc9gYD).
- [2] Gössling, S., Scott, D., Hall, C.M. (2020). Pandemics, tourism and global change: A rapid assessment of COVID-19. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29: 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1758708>
- [3] Sharpley, R. (2020). Tourism, sustainable development and the theoretical divide: 20 years on. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(11): 1932-1946. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1779732>
- [4] United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) & World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). (2005). *Making Tourism More Sustainable: A Guide for Policy Makers*. Paris and Madrid: UNEP and UNWTO. <https://doi.org/10.18111/9789284408214>
- [5] Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>.
- [6] World Tourism Organization & United Nations Development Programme. (2017). *Tourism and the Sustainable Development Goals – Journey to 2030*. Madrid: UNWTO. <https://doi.org/10.18111/9789284419401>
- [7] United Nations. (2022). *The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2022*. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2022/The-Sustainable-Development-Goals-Report-2022.pdf>.
- [8] Leung, Y.F., Spenceley, A., Hvenegaard, G., Buckley, R. (2018). *Tourism and visitor management in protected areas: Guidelines for sustainability*. Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 27. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. <https://doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.CH.2018.PAG.27.en>
- [9] Bramwell, B., Lane, B. (2011). Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4-5): 411-421. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.580586>
- [10] Saarinen, J. (2014). Critical sustainability: Setting the limits to growth and responsibility in tourism. *Sustainability*, 6(1): 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su6010001>
- [11] Dodds, R., Butler, R. (2019). *Overtourism: Issues, Realities and Solutions*. De Gruyter.
- [12] Dougherty, M. (2009). *Ecotourism and sustainable development*, 2nd edition – By Martha Honey. *Natural Resources Forum*, 33: 340-342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-8947.2009.01256.x>
- [13] Cater, E. (1995). Environmental contradictions in sustainable tourism. *Geographical Journal*, 161(1): 21-28. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3059924>
- [14] World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/139811>.
- [15] Butler, R.W. (1999). Sustainable tourism: A state-of-the-art review. *Tourism Geographies*, 1(1): 7-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616689908721291>
- [16] Hall, C.M. (2019). Constructing sustainable tourism development: The 2030 agenda and the managerial ecology of sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(7): 1044-1060. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2018.1560456>
- [17] Gössling, S., Peeters, P. (2015). Assessing tourism's global environmental impact 1900–2050. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(5): 639-659. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2015.1008500>
- [18] Goodwin, H. (2017). The challenge of overtourism. *Responsible Tourism Partnership*, 4(2017): 1-19.
- [19] Scheyvens, R. (2002). *Tourism for development: Empowering communities*. Prentice Hall. [https://books.google.com/books/about/Tourism\\_for\\_Development.html?id=0IF\\_AAAAMAAJ](https://books.google.com/books/about/Tourism_for_Development.html?id=0IF_AAAAMAAJ).
- [20] Manyara, G., Jones, E. (2007). *Community-based tourism enterprises development in Kenya: An exploration of their potential as avenues of poverty*

- reduction. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(6): 628-644. <https://doi.org/10.2167/jost723.0>
- [21] Zapata, M. J., Hall, C.M., Lindo, P., Vanderschaeghe, M. (2011). Can community-based tourism contribute to development and poverty alleviation? Lessons from Nicaragua. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(8): 725-749. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2011.559200>
- [22] Biggs, D., Hall, C.M., Stoeckl, N. (2012). The resilience of formal and informal tourism enterprises to disasters: Reef tourism in Phuket, Thailand. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(5): 645-665. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.630080>
- [23] Gössling, S., Hall, C.M., Weaver, D.B. (2009). Sustainable tourism futures: Perspectives on systems, restructuring and innovations. In *Sustainable Tourism Futures*, pp. 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203884256.ch1>
- [24] Hall, C.M. (2011). Policy learning and policy failure in sustainable tourism governance: From first- and second-order to third-order change? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4-5): 649-671. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.555555>
- [25] Bramwell, B., Lane, B. (2013). Getting from here to there: Systems change, behavioural change and sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(1): 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2012.741602>
- [26] Bramwell, B. (2015). Theoretical activity in sustainable tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 54: 204-218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2015.07.005>
- [27] Cook, D., Saviolidis, N., Davíðsdóttir, B., Jóhannsdóttir, L., Ólafsson, S. (2019). Synergies and trade-Offs in the sustainable development goals—The implications of the Icelandic tourism sector. *Sustainability*, 11(15): 4223. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints201907.0014.v1>
- [28] Liu, Z. (2003). Sustainable tourism development: A critique. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 11(6): 459-475. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580308667216>
- [29] Freire-González, J., Ho, M.S. (2018). Environmental fiscal reform and the double dividend: Evidence from a meta-review. *Sustainability*, 10(2): 501. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10020501>
- [30] Creswell, J.W., Plano Clark, V.L. (2018). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (3rd ed.). <https://study.sagepub.com/creswell3e>.
- [31] OECD. (2020). A territorial approach to the Sustainable Development Goals. [https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2020/02/a-territorial-approach-to-the-sustainable-development-goals\\_1109322e/e86fa715-en.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2020/02/a-territorial-approach-to-the-sustainable-development-goals_1109322e/e86fa715-en.pdf).
- [32] OECD. (2019). Anti-corruption and integrity. <https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/policy-issues/anti-corruption-and-integrity.html>.
- [33] Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory. A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. [http://www.sxf.uevora.pt/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Charmaz\\_2006.pdf](http://www.sxf.uevora.pt/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Charmaz_2006.pdf).
- [34] Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., Saldaña, J. (2018). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [35] Mertens, D.M. (2020). *Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology: Integrating diversity with Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- [36] Juvan, E., Grün, B., Dolnicar, S. (2023). Waste production patterns in hotels and restaurants: An intra-sectoral segmentation approach. *Annals of Tourism Research Empirical Insights*, 4(1): 100090. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annale.2023.100090>
- [37] Matović, S., Lović Obradović, S., Gajić, T. (2025). Sustainable tourism in protected areas: Comparative governance and lessons from Tara and Triglav National Parks. *Sustainability*, 17(15): 7048. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17157048>
- [38] Protected planet report 2024. <https://digitalreport.protectedplanet.net/>.
- [39] World Bank. (2025). Measuring the local economic impacts of nature-based tourism. Global Wildlife Program Webinar. <https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/f558ba8a62d345853181e51be38017b5-0320052025/original/GWP-Full-Presentation-Nature-based-tourism-economic-impact-webinar-May-21-2025.pdf>.
- [40] Travel & Tourism Economic Impact Research (EIR). <https://wttc.org/research/economic-impact>.
- [41] Abdurakhmanova, A., Ahrorov, F. (2025). The economic and social impacts of ecotourism on local employment and income: A case study of rural Samarkand, Uzbekistan. *Regional Science Policy & Practice*, 17(3): 100180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rsp.2025.100180>
- [42] Gayo, L., Katonge, J.H. (2025). The impacts of community-based tourism on local livelihoods in communities adjacent to national Parks in Northern Tanzania. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 11(1): 2569757. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2569757>
- [43] Sadat, A., Lawelai, H., Nastia. (2025). Optimizing sustainable tourism governance and its impact on employment opportunities through a dynamic governance approach. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management*, 10(27S): 965-979. <https://doi.org/10.52783/jisem.v10i27s.4756>
- [44] Herzallah, A.M., Iriqat, R.A., Hamed, M.H., Zaki, K., Elnagar, A.K. (2025). Green synergy in hospitality: Unveiling the nexus between environmentally sustainable practices and hotel green performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 131: 104301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2025.104301>
- [45] Sarvinov Atoevna, T., Canós-Darós, L., Osorio-Acosta, E. (2025). Green and resilient hotel operations through mega-event legacies. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living*, 7: 1604131. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2025.1604131>
- [46] Chamdimba, H.B., Banda, E.M. (2025). A review of the adoption of renewable energy technologies by hotels in Malawi. *Journal of Energy in Southern Africa*, 36(1): 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.17159/2413-3051/2025/v36i1a16047>
- [47] Ofalla, M.N. (2024). Evaluating the adoption of cleaner production technology for sustainable green hotels in the Philippines. *TEM Journal*, 13(1): 144-154. <https://doi.org/10.18421/TEM131-14>
- [48] Bittner, N., Bakker, N., Long, T.B. (2024). Circular economy and the hospitality industry: A comparison of the Netherlands and Indonesia. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 444: 141253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.141253>
- [49] World Bank suspends Tanzania tourism fund over abuse allegations.

- <https://www.reuters.com/world/africa/world-bank-suspends-tanzania-tourism-fund-over-abuse-allegations-2024-04-24/>.
- [50] Hall, C.M., Prayag, G., Amore, A. (2017). *Tourism and Resilience: Individual, Organisational and Destination Perspectives* (Vol. 5). Channel View Publications.
- [51] Franzoni, S. (2015). Destination governance for sustainable tourism. *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 3(11-12): 215-223. <https://doi.org/10.17265/2328-2169/2015.12.001>
- [52] Bianchi, R. (2018). The political economy of tourism development: A critical review. *Annals of tourism research*, 70: 88-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2017.08.005>
- [53] Ivars-Baidal, J.A., Vera-Rebollo, J.F., Perles-Ribes, J., Femenia-Serra, F., Celdrán-Bernabeu, M.A. (2023). Sustainable tourism indicators: What's new within the smart city/destination approach? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 31(7): 1556-1582. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1876075>
- [54] Kumar, S., Kumar, V., Kumari Bhatt, I., Kumar, S., Attri, K. (2024). Digital transformation in tourism sector: Trends and future perspectives from a bibliometric-content analysis. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, 7(3): 1553-1576. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTI-10-2022-0472>
- [55] López-Guzmán, T., Sánchez-Cañizares, S., Pavón, V. (2011). Community-based tourism in developing countries: A case study. *Tourismos*, 6(1): 69-84.
- [56] Higgins-Desbiolles, F., Bigby, B.C. (2025). Rethinking governance in tourism: Centring local communities. In *Handbook on Tourism Governance*, pp. 164-179. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800374287.00021>
- [57] Mihalic, T. (2024). Trends in sustainable tourism paradigm: Resilience and adaptation. *Sustainability*, 16(17): 7838. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16177838>
- [58] Fernández, J.I.P., Rivero, M.S. (2009). Measuring tourism sustainability: Proposal for a composite index. *Tourism Economics*, 15(2): 277-296. <https://doi.org/10.5367/000000009788254377>
- [59] Silva, F.P.D., Brandão, F., Sousa, B. (2019). Towards socially sustainable tourism in cities: Local community perceptions and development guidelines. *A Pathmaking Journal*, 9(2): 168-198. <https://doi.org/10.33776/et.v9i2.3631>
- [60] Saputra, H., Madyawati, S.P., Wijoyo, S., Megasari, N.L.A. (2025). Comprehensive analysis of economic, sociocultural, and environmental impacts on community well-being in tourist areas. *Central Community Development Journal*, 5(2): 136-151. <https://doi.org/10.55942/ccdj.v5i2.527>
- [61] Neumayer, E. (2013). *Weak Versus Strong Sustainability: Exploring the Limits of Two Opposing Paradigms* (4th ed.). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://www.elgaronline.com/monobook/9781781007075.xml>.