

Tourism and Wellbeing: Failures of Theory, Research and Practice



by Larry Dwyer

Cite this Article

Dwyer, L. (2025). Tourism and Wellbeing: Failures of Theory, Research and Practice. *Highlights of Sustainability*, 4(3), 192–204. <https://doi.org/10.54175/hsustain4030012>

Article

Tourism and Wellbeing: Failures of Theory, Research and Practice

Larry Dwyer 

School of Business, University of Technology Sydney, Broadway, NSW 2007, Australia;
Email: larry.dwyer@uts.edu.au

Abstract Across the social sciences, wellbeing measures are being developed to cover a more comprehensive picture of factors contributing to quality of life. However, ongoing neglect of the wellbeing outcomes of tourism activity has restricted the relevance of much tourism research, practice and policymaking globally. These include failure to recognise human wellbeing as the primary aim of any industrial development, including tourism; adherence to a superficial conception of the nature of wellbeing and its measures; a failure to acknowledge that human wellbeing, beyond “needs”, is an essential component of sustainable development; tourism stakeholder adherence to a primarily static, rather than dynamic conception of sustainability; failure to distinguish between “weak” and “strong” sustainability; uncritical adoption of a pro-growth mindset that is steadily depleting and degrading the resources and the wellbeing of life on the planet; failure to incorporate wellbeing outcomes into tourism business mission statements; and failure to treat seriously the need for tourism degrowth at least for some sectors of the industry. To address such failures, tourism decisionmakers must incorporate stakeholder wellbeing outcomes into conceptual analysis, empirical research and policy assessment.

Keywords sustainable destination development; tourism policy; wellbeing outcomes

1. Introduction

Reflecting the global dominance of neoliberalism, destination GDP growth, measuring the change in the value of the goods and services produced in an economy in a given year, has become the standard measure for international economic benchmarking and the rationale for private and public sector obsession with growth [1]. However, while growth in GDP is central to the neoliberalism policy agenda, and an important objective sought by tourism destinations worldwide, it does not measure resident quality of life, happiness or wellbeing [2,3]. Despite acknowledgement of this limitation, GDP growth remains the dominant objective of destinations worldwide [3].

Over the past two decades, within the *Beyond GDP* approach, wider measures of social progress are being developed to either complement, adjust or replace GDP growth [4–6]. A core thesis of *Beyond GDP* is that the ultimate purpose of any industrial development is to improve the individual and social wellbeing of current and future generations of life on Earth [7–9]. Economic metrics are now regarded as just one type of measure alongside other indicators that better capture the range of factors contributing to economic, social, and environmental wellbeing. Consistent with this position, global surveys indicate strong support for the view that human wellbeing should be a fundamental objective of public policy, wellbeing outcomes are now widely regarded as essential in identifying and pursuing alternative paths of sustainable development [10]. Academic interest in the concept of wellbeing is demonstrated by an evolving body of literature investigating its nature, sources and measures [6,11–13].

Several governments have recently attempted to incorporate resident wellbeing outcomes in policy implementation and assessment, identifying a range of sources of wellbeing and associated indicators. The Wellbeing Economy Governments (WEGo) partnership (<https://weall.org/wego>), with member countries—Iceland, Wales, Finland, Scotland, New Zealand, with Canada closely associated [14–16], affirms that “development” entails delivering human and ecological wellbeing. WEGo countries base policymaking on three key principles: “respect for planetary ecological boundaries, ensuring equitable distribution of wealth and opportunity for all residents; and efficient resource allocation to enhance social wellbeing” [17]. Numerous other countries are now according wellbeing outcomes an important role in the public policy cycle, incorporating

Open Access

Received: 3 July 2025
Accepted: 28 August 2025
Published: 8 September 2025

Academic Editor
Haywantee Ramkissoon,
University of South Australia,
Australia

Copyright: © 2025 Dwyer. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use and distribution provided that the original work is properly cited.

Highlights of Science

measures developed by their national statistical agencies to operationalise the notion of wellbeing [8–10,17,18].

While development of wellbeing measures has received increased attention in the social sciences, curiously, tourism stakeholders are yet to fully appreciate the importance of wellbeing estimates in industry decision-making, public policymaking, and research. Except for some studies [19–21], the formulation and use of wellbeing measures is yet to engage the serious attention of tourism researchers. Despite some lip service being accorded to opportunities for tourism expansion to enhance resident wellbeing, for the most part, wellbeing outcomes are not measured, and do not reflect the sources and indicators identified in the established wellbeing frameworks developed in recent years. In much of the tourism research effort, wellbeing outcomes associated with industry development are typically marginalised, given an overly narrow meaning that limits their relevance to tourism practice and policy, or else neglected entirely. For tourism research to take the *Beyond GDP* approach seriously requires a rethinking of societal goals to accord stakeholder wellbeing outcomes an essential role in tourism planning, development and policy analysis.

This paper identifies several important areas where tourism stakeholders (researchers, firms and governance institutions) have failed to respond adequately to challenges posed by the *Beyond GDP* approach, failing to incorporate wellbeing outcomes into tourism policy, research and practice. One area of concern involves failure to recognise human wellbeing as the ultimate purpose of industrial development, including tourism. Another involves a general adherence to a superficial conception of the nature of wellbeing and its measurement, reflecting insufficient understanding that enhancement of human wellbeing is an essential feature of sustainable development. A related concern involves tourism stakeholder adherence to a primarily static, rather than dynamic conception of sustainability that requires development to range over both the present and future time periods. Another failure relates to an inadequate understanding that sustainable development of the tourism industry depends crucially on changes in the quantity and quality of capital assets that bequeath wellbeing opportunities to future generations. The extent to which these stocks can be substituted for one another is also neglected. Failure to distinguish between “weak” and “strong” sustainability has restricted debate on ways to prioritise the economic, social and environmental wellbeing outcomes associated with tourism development. This issue depends on the effects of different types of impacts on stakeholder wellbeing. Mainstream tourism development and research are also uncritically embedded within a pro-growth mindset that is steadily depleting and degrading the resources and the wellbeing of life on the planet, with consequent failure to treat the need for tourism degrowth with the seriousness it deserves. A selected research agenda is identified to address these failures.

2. Failure to Acknowledge the Importance of Wellbeing Measures

It is widely agreed in the social science literature that the ultimate objective of public policy is human wellbeing, present and future [7–9]. This implies that tourism research and destination management should incorporate stakeholder wellbeing outcomes associated with tourism development into conceptual analysis, empirical studies, policy intervention and assessment, in an integrated way. Wellbeing outcomes provide more detailed information to inform tourism analysis and policy than do standard performance indicators that focus on physical or monetary impacts only. To affect people’s lives, measures of stakeholder wellbeing must be employed in the tourism policy cycle [22].

Historically, wellbeing issues have been relatively neglected within tourism research. In much of the tourism literature relating to SDG achievement, for example, positive wellbeing outcomes are either ignored completely or simply assumed to attach to progress toward SDG achievement [23]. Studies of tourism participation in the SDG agenda reveal an almost complete neglect of wellbeing measures and outcomes [24–26]. A Special issue of the *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* on measuring sustainable tourism indicators, while acknowledging that “what doesn’t get measured doesn’t get managed”, ignores the need to construct wellbeing measures [27]. A focus on physical or monetary impacts, rather than stakeholder wellbeing outcomes has limited the relevance of the tourism research effort on conditions for achieving sustainable development, as well as its policy significance [28,29].

A wellbeing framework can identify important sources of wellbeing among destination stakeholders and also highlight interventions to improve wellbeing. There is a substantial and evolving social science literature concerning the nature of wellbeing and its appropriate measures [30,31]. Despite some differences in emphasis, wellbeing is commonly conceived to be a multi-

dimensional concept incorporating life satisfaction, happiness, material comforts, individual freedoms, opportunities, thriving, flourishing, mental states and capabilities [12,32]. This conceptualisation implies that individuals should have the freedom to make choices in life according to their awareness, aspirations, and capabilities. By and large, however, tourism research, with its emphasis on survey-based visitor and resident “perceptions”, “satisfactions” or “sentiments” associated with tourism projects or developments, has made little progress in conceptualising the notion of “community or resident wellbeing” [28,33]. Survey-based “perceptions” often ignore the fact that subjective wellbeing comprises at least three elements: *life satisfaction*, *affective/emotional feelings and states*, *eudaimonia* relating to thriving and self-worth [34], each with different drivers and consequences [35]. Objective sources of wellbeing include *material living standards* (income, wealth, housing quality), alongside *quality of life variables* such as mental and physical health, fair income distribution, education and skills, decent work and other workplace features, social relationships, opportunities for civic engagement, work-life balance, financial security, personal safety, and environmental quality [10,11].

Subjective wellbeing measures taken alone can be an unreliable guide to public policy, given that individuals are often poor judges of their own wellbeing, tending to weight future wellbeing outcomes relatively lowly or not at all in decision-making [30]. A focus on narrow subjective wellbeing measures seems to have led tourism researchers to ignore the objective conditions that support inter-generational wellbeing and hence sustainable development [28]. However, it cannot be assumed that policies to promote the wellbeing of the present generation will necessarily promote future stakeholder wellbeing. Distinguishing the sources of intra- and inter-generational wellbeing allows sustainability considerations to be embedded into tourism analysis and policy [21,22].

Indicators associated with different sources of wellbeing can be presented in dashboard fashion to estimate the wellbeing outcomes pertaining to a particular tourism development activity [10]. A dashboard, comprising a mix of subjective and objective sources of wellbeing, provides a firmer basis for development policies than does a focus on resident perceptions and sentiments [6,11]. Internationally comparable measures of individual, household and social wellbeing are being developed by statistical agencies and researchers, often with community input from public surveys and visioning exercises, to provide a credible basis for guiding destination developments [36,37]. An ideal wellbeing framework comprises both “generic” indicators based on credible frameworks and “contextual” indicators relating to dimensions of wellbeing that have particular importance to a particular destination community [38,39]. A list of wellbeing measures with particular relevance to tourism development is displayed in Dwyer [23].

Despite advances in wellbeing measurement across the social sciences, the tourism policy and research literature has failed to develop measures in a strategic way, with different researchers employing different wellbeing concepts and formulating different metrics for this concept. Typically, tourism researchers continue to “cherry-pick” indicators from various data sources rather than select them from an established wellbeing framework [28,33]. To be more relevant to debates on resource allocation to promote sustainable development, the tourism research effort needs to adopt or develop measures as developed in the wider social sciences, particularly those employed by governments and statistical agencies to guide public policy making [21,39].

3. Failure to Convert Impact Measures to Wellbeing Measures

An important question, generally ignored by tourism researchers, is how impact measures can be converted to wellbeing outcomes. While standard approaches to achieve sustainability tend to focus on the estimated economic, social and environmental impacts of developments, treating wellbeing seriously implies that policymakers must go beyond identification of impacts to estimate the associated wellbeing outcomes.

There are two main ways wherein stakeholder wellbeing outcomes can be incorporated into tourism analysis and policymaking. One option is to identify and select particular wellbeing indicators to occupy the dashboard alongside standard indicators of destination performance [19,40]. An alternative is to employ a range of wellbeing indicators to act as a “lens” or “prism” to convert the monetary and physical impacts of tourism development to stakeholder wellbeing outcomes, intra- and inter-generationally. This option takes seriously the view that wellbeing measures do not simply complement standard performance measures; rather, they comprise the *ultimate* or *overarching* measures of tourism destination performance. The wellbeing lens, guiding investments that expand residents’ capabilities for creating and sustaining

wellbeing [41], has been employed recently in a range of studies of tourism development and resident wellbeing, including destination competitiveness, tourism progress in progressing the SDG agenda, tourism productivity, overtourism, tourism degrowth, and smart tourism [22,29,41,42].

A list of advantages to tourism stakeholders of employing a wellbeing lens to convert tourism impacts to wellbeing outcomes appears in Table 1.

Table 1. Advantages in use of a wellbeing lens to estimate tourism outcomes.

-
- converts tourism’s impacts into stakeholder wellbeing outcomes
 - allows tourism stakeholders to develop strategies to enhance social wellbeing
 - helps to identify groups in society experiencing deprivation in wellbeing
 - informs policies to enhance wellbeing outcomes associated with different stakeholders
 - applies to different stages of the policy cycle, *ex ante* and *ex post*
 - can be revised over time as improved measures become available
 - helps destination managers to monitor social progress associated with tourism development over time.
 - provides more relevant information for decision-making than standard performance measures
 - allows a detailed assessment of how policy interventions contribute to individual and societal wellbeing
 - facilitates the effective allocation of resources in tourism-related developments
 - enables the trade-offs in any set of alternative policy choices to be more transparent
 - highlights societal wellbeing outcomes of tourism developments that may otherwise be overlooked
 - enables destination managers to play a more substantial role in the wider processes of economic development
 - informs public and private sector strategies directed towards “designing for wellbeing”
 - increases public accountability of tourism planning and management
 - shared wellbeing objectives help to forge stronger links in strategy development between actors in public, private, and civil society
 - fosters international co-operation in respect of alternative tourism development policies
-

Sources: [18,21,22,40].

A wellbeing lens can inform decisionmakers about stakeholder wellbeing outcomes associated with alternative tourism development strategies. This highlights preferred destination development paths. Indicators comprising the wellbeing lens ideally must reflect an understanding of the nature of wellbeing, its sources and indicators. Many of the benefits identified in Table 1 have already been realised in the strategies of WEGo countries in recent years [16–18]. In particular, the approach has enabled conversion of tourism’s impacts into stakeholder wellbeing outcomes, enabled tourism stakeholders to develop strategies to enhance social wellbeing, facilitated the effective allocation of resources in tourism-related developments, and has helped to identify groups in society experiencing deprivation in wellbeing.

4. Failure to Understand the Dynamic Nature of Sustainability

The most widely accepted definition of sustainability employed by tourism researchers is that of “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” [43]. On this view, sustainable development comprises three key components or pillars—economic, social and environmental. Notwithstanding that sustainable development is a dynamic, complex, adaptive and evolving process, tourism researchers tend to apply a “static” conception of sustainability [44,45]. Historically, the major focus of tourism stakeholders has been on identifying and measuring current economic, social and environmental impacts (physical or monetary) of tourism development, rather than stakeholder future “needs” or wellbeing outcomes [28,36]. However, for human society to progress and to achieve the sustainable development of any industry over time, there must exist transmission mechanisms for changes today to affect the wellbeing of future generations. Across the social sciences, it is recognised that sustainability requires the maintenance or improvement of the capital assets (economic, human, social, natural) that generate wellbeing presently and, in the future [6,46]. The nature of each type of capital stock is identified in Table 2.

The quantity and quality of capital stocks determine the range of consumption opportunities and experiences potentially available to both the current and future generations. For destination development to be sustainable, the present generation must bequeath to the following generation a stock of capital resources that supports wellbeing *per capita* at a level at least as substantial as that currently experienced by the present generation [46]. Since it is the capital stock that transmits opportunities for intergenerational wellbeing, this approach supports public policy focused on improving the capacity of different types of capital to enhance the wellbeing of destination residents now and in the future [6,10]. To date, except for some isolated voices [29,33], tourism

Table 2. Nature of Main Capital Stocks.

Economic Capital. Economic capital generates tourism GDP, tourism employment, tourism productivity, and a fair wage, enhancing resident material living conditions. Capital formation expands the range and quality of goods and services available in a destination, creating opportunities to improve social wellbeing.

Human capital includes educational achievement, health status, skill levels, capabilities of destination residents, enabling participation in, and enjoyment of a range of activities and experiences inside and external to the workplace.

Social capital refers to the value derived from social connections and networks, including trust, shared norms, and relationships, that enable individuals and groups to effectively achieve common purposes that generate wellbeing outcomes.

Natural capital comprises the renewable and non-renewable natural resources of a destination as well as the ecosystem services that provide provisioning, cultural, support and regulatory services to support all life.

Source: [6,9,11].

researchers have tended to ignore the connection between changing capital stocks and resident wellbeing outcomes across generations. The essential dynamic dimension of sustainable development, and the role of changing capital stocks as transmission mechanisms for determining inter-generational wellbeing, cannot be captured within static models of the type typically constructed by tourism researchers. For research on sustainable tourism development to become more theoretically grounded, the role of changes in capital stocks and stakeholder wellbeing outcomes generated must be acknowledged [21,28].

5. The SF-MST: A Narrow Framework

UN Tourism (formerly UNWTO) has recently published the *Statistical Framework for Measuring Sustainable Tourism (SF-MST)*, based on an awareness that standard economic measures of sustainability do not capture important dimensions of resident quality of life [47]. The SF-MST seeks to provide a more detailed picture of social progress, “putting people’s wellbeing at the heart of tourism decision-making” to provide a better balance between the economic, social, and ecological dimensions of sustainable development [47]. The SF-MST has received strong support from major international institutions, agencies and stakeholders and has also been endorsed by all 193 UN member states as the agreed framework for measuring sustainable tourism development, including the SDGs (<https://ecobnb.com/blog/2024/03/global-standard-measure-sustainability-tourism>, accessed 3 May 2025). The SF-MST has been touted as “groundbreaking” and a new global standard for measuring tourism sustainability (<https://www.unwto.org/tourism-statistics/measuring-sustainability-tourism>, accessed 26 March 2025) and “what matters most to people and planet” (<https://www.environmentenergyleader.com/2024/03/un-adopts-global-standard-statistical-framework-for-sustainable-tourism>, accessed 13 April 2025).

Unfortunately, the SF-MST fails to incorporate robust wellbeing measures alongside its recommended range of “sustainability” indicators. The framework is unashamedly embedded within the neoliberal worldview, substantially limiting its scope and policy significance [38]. The SF-MST makes no attempt to explore the nature of “wellbeing” or propose wellbeing measures beyond simple survey-based subjective measures of tourist and host community “satisfaction” or “sentiment”. The role of changes in the quantity or quality of capital stocks in achieving wellbeing outcomes for both the present and future generations is ignored. The report also ignores the ongoing efforts of a growing number of government statistical agencies in a worldwide effort to develop and embed wellbeing indicators into the public policy cycle which clearly has relevance for tourism development. Despite emphasising that an “appropriate” balance must be established between social, environmental and economic impacts in order to deliver long-term sustainability for a destination [47], the SF-MST does not investigate the extent to which different types of capital stocks are substitutable for one another in achieving this outcome or how a ranking process is to be undertaken. Substantial improvements must be made to the SF-MST if it is to fulfil its anticipated role of “putting people at the heart” of tourism analysis and policy making.

6. Failure to Distinguish Weak and Strong Sustainability

Despite increased recognition that resident wellbeing is the ultimate objective of public policy [7–9,13], tourism research tends to emphasise sustainable development itself as the primary aim, while marginalising and even ignoring the wellbeing outcomes of development. As argued above, sustainable tourism development involves determining which types of capital can be depleted today and which types should be preserved for tomorrow. According to the *weak sustainability* view, the different types of capital are substitutable for each other, implying that they are

interchangeable in respect of maintaining wellbeing over time. On this view, any particular form of capital asset can be depleted provided “proceeds” are reinvested in the other forms of capital [46]. In contrast, *strong sustainability* asserts that some types of capital (particularly natural capital) cannot be depleted or degraded beyond threshold levels, especially those environmental resources and ecological goods and services that are essential for life support [45,48].

While tourism stakeholders in general appear to adopt a strong sustainability stance, at least implicitly, little effort has been made to investigate the theoretical and practical implications of applying strong sustainability conditions in tourism destination planning and development. This neglect stems relates to failure to install wellbeing as the ultimate objective of tourism development. To prioritise wellbeing outcomes and to make informed trade-offs between capital stocks, a primary aim of development must be identified [9,10]. A consensus position advanced between advocates of weak and strong sustainability [49] is one that allows substitutability between capital types to some extent (consistent with weak sustainability), but subject to maintaining critical thresholds of particular types of capital stocks, which, because of their uniqueness, cannot be replicated (consistent with strong sustainability). At bottom, informed trade-offs between the different types of capital assets employed in tourism development and the implications for sustainability cannot be made without estimating their relative contributions to intra- and inter-generational wellbeing [39,48,50].

7. Tourism’s Pro-growth Mindset

Economic growth is a common objective of most governments and business firms globally, despite its potential to irreversibly deplete the planet’s resources and its ecosystems, substantially degrade environmental quality, generate emissions in excess of Earth’s biophysical boundaries, drive global warming and create a large range of socio-economic inequalities.

Tourism demand (particularly “overtourism”) is a major factor in the growth process, depleting and degrading the natural and socio-cultural environments on which tourism activity itself depends [51]. The same as for governments and business activity worldwide, the core objective of tourism destination managers remains the pursuit of tourism growth, regarded as an essential enabler of sustainable destination development [52,53]. In the background report relating to the SF-MST, for example, the “tremendous growth” in tourism activity is highlighted as a positive feature of the global industry [47]. However, claims that tourism’s capacity to improve quality of life rests on sustained economic growth often marginalise or ignore non-material types of values [41,42]. The pro-growth stance, embedded into the mindsets of destination managers, business operators and tourism researchers, is evidenced by the large volume of journal literature and industry reports, formulating strategies for the tourism industry to resume growth following various crises, such as 9/11, SARS, the Global Financial Crisis, and the COVID-19 Pandemic [54].

While acknowledging the adverse environmental and socio-economic impacts associated with industry growth globally, the prevailing mainstream view is that the unwelcome impacts of growth can be minimised through improved management practices, combined with improvements in technology and efficient and effective policy interventions [52]. Despite growing criticism by researchers [54,55], this “growth management” view continues to be supported by major international bodies such as UNEP, OECD, and UN Tourism, emphasising the importance of “green”, “inclusive” or “responsible” growth to achieve and maintain sustainable industry development [47,56–58]. Three types of criticisms of the growth management approach to tourism development can be identified.

First, critics point out the obvious effects of tourism “business as usual” within the growth management approach. The global tourism industry continues to be characterised by overtourism, social injustices and environmental degradation. It is evident that green growth management is not working, and the social and environmental costs of economic growth across the entire planet are increasing rapidly. Rational behaviour on the part of tourism stakeholders demands changing a losing development strategy.

Second, critics claim that personal wellbeing depends more on the fairness of the distribution of income and wealth rather than on their absolute levels. Empirical research has shown that greater GDP growth does not improve social wellbeing beyond a certain threshold level of living standard [59]. This finding undercuts arguments in favour of tourism-led economic growth, at least for developed destinations. Since material wellbeing, beyond some threshold level, is not closely associated with economic growth, by implication, beyond a certain level of GDP per

capita, tourism development strategies should emphasise quality of life measures rather than the contribution to GDP growth. To date, however, the consequences of the Easterlin findings have largely been ignored by tourism researchers. Growth models developed by tourism economists typically focus on contributions to resident income and wealth while ignoring the importance of values unrelated to material wellbeing [42].

A third type of criticism is that growth management approaches assume the potential for the “decoupling” of economic growth from resource depletion and associated emissions [56]. While *relative decoupling* occurs when the rate of resource use or environmental impact increases less rapidly than the rate of economic growth, *absolute decoupling* refers to a situation where resource use or the level of environmental impact actually decreases [60]. Only if absolute decoupling is achieved will growth management of any industrial activity, including tourism development, actually employ less material throughput with fewer emissions overall. There is increasing evidence, however, that technological progress cannot result in absolute decoupling, irrespective of any associated managerial efficiencies [61–63].

The decoupling issue has significant implications for the growth management approach to tourism development. Remarkably, the SF-MST report ignores the “decoupling” challenge. However, if absolute decoupling is unachievable, tourism GDP cannot grow indefinitely without generating further adverse environmental impacts. By implication, the net-zero emissions goal will forever be unattainable.

Growing recognition that decoupling is unachievable has given rise to the “Degrowth approach” to industrial development [62]. Proponents of degrowth advocate an equitable downscaling of materials and energy throughput across all industries globally [62,63]. This approach seeks to combine industrial strategies aiming to increase *efficiency* in production with a concern for *sufficiency*, that is, “the direct downscaling of economic production in many sectors alongside reduction of consumption” [60]. Sympathetic to this research effort, critics of tourism’s growth management stance are now addressing the potential for selective degrowth to serve as a viable alternative [42,54,55]. Tourism industries identified as candidates for downsizing include aviation, cruise tourism, and mass tourism in vulnerable urban areas [54].

If the primary goal of tourism development is stakeholder wellbeing, then so also is the goal of tourism degrowth. The impacts of reduced GDP on social wellbeing depend on the types of goods and services that are selected for “downsizing” in production and consumption [62]. While it may be conceded that degrowth is likely to negatively impact upon *material* wellbeing, particularly in its early stages, the longer-term consequences for overall *social* wellbeing may well be positive [42]. The degrowth alternative, which is slowly gaining adherents, has substantial consequences for tourism sustainable development theory and practice and warrants greater attention from destination managers, tourism researchers and various stakeholder groups.

8. The Failure to Develop New Models for Tourism Businesses

Given that private sector business activities play a significant role in shaping the environmental, social and economic, impacts of industrial development, the effort to enhance stakeholder wellbeing outcomes should extend to beyond the public sector to include business operations. The leading international standard for identifying how business operators and investors should address their impacts on people, the planet and society is the OECD *Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct* [64]. The *Guidelines* aim to minimise adverse impacts associated with business operations, products and services, at the same time encouraging their positive contributions to economic, environmental and social progress. Responsible business conduct (RBC) principles are acknowledged to be a crucial component of the *Beyond GDP* agenda, addressing such issues as respect for human rights, protecting the environment by employing sustainable consumption and production patterns, acting ethically and transparently, and engaging with an extended group of stakeholders, internally and externally [64].

While flirting with the notion that business operator adherence to RBC principles can enhance “social wellbeing” or “quality of life”, these notions remain undefined in the *Guidelines* report. Consistent with the arguments presented in earlier sections of this paper, wellbeing measures are required if the *Guidelines* are to have a greater relevance to business decision-making. To this end, it is now realised that new types of business and social organisations are required, with wellbeing outcomes built into firms’ mission statements as organisational purpose, rather than serving as “optional extras”. Recent years have seen the development of “commercially viable” business models that can foster positive social and environmental change [65,66]. Hybrid

organisations challenge the assumption that organisations are “disassociated” from social and ecological systems. These “hybrid” business models challenge traditional assumptions about the nature of the firm and its role in society, as well as existing notions of “sustainable business activity” [67]. The mission statements of hybrid businesses explicitly embed sustainability principles, and hence wellbeing outcomes, into organisational decision-making. Explicit objectives include a clear focus on social and environmental goals as additional to financial objectives; simultaneously reducing negative environmental/social impacts and increasing positive impacts; decoupling organizational success from the assumed need for continuous market growth; advocating longer time horizons, combined with slower business development and localisation of production; creating opportunities to foster the wellbeing of internal and external stakeholders, with emphasis on mutually beneficial relationships; positive and engaged leadership seeking to interact progressively with stakeholders to forge shared values, while promoting their business model throughout the institutions and markets in which they operate [66,68].

Research on the nature and implications of hybrid business models for sustainable development has yet to influence tourism research, representing another failure of effort alongside those identified above. While various challenges await tourism researchers in this field, opportunities exist to provide an ethical basis for these models that is lacking to date in model development. While advocates of hybrid models emphasise the importance of notions such as sharing, concern, empathy, responsibility, compassion and trust [67] little attention has been given to wellbeing outcomes as the fundamental rationale for business activity. While serious challenges further development of hybrid models in general and the tourism industry specifically, the application of the aforementioned wellbeing lens can inform business operators of the wellbeing outcomes to stakeholders (internal and external) associated with their firm’s operations, and facilitate their prioritisation.

9. Implications for Research

Recognising that human wellbeing is the fundamental public policy objective, tourism research needs to better integrate stakeholder wellbeing outcomes into empirical and conceptual analysis and policy assessment criteria. A wellbeing lens can help to assess and monitor changes in stakeholder wellbeing associated with alternative development paths. Wellbeing outcomes with particular relevance to tourism communities can inform the content of the indicators employed for other tourism destinations and contexts, potentially enriching the study of wellbeing in general.

Tourism researchers in general have failed to appreciate that human wellbeing is an essential dimension of the sustainable development concept [69]. To be relevant to decisions regarding appropriate resource allocation, the potential wellbeing outcomes to stakeholders associated with alternative development paths must be assessed. In this effort, tourism researchers should employ wellbeing measures consistent with established wellbeing frameworks. This would require the inclusion of objective dimensions of wellbeing into the tourism planning and assessment exercise alongside the narrower subjective variables favoured by tourism researchers. In this respect, tourism researchers need to analyse the links between the subjective and objective sources of stakeholder wellbeing in tourism development contexts. Understanding the interconnections between different areas of wellbeing and how these differ for different communities and stakeholders will result in more effective and better-targeted policy interventions for currently disadvantaged demographic groups within the destination.

While agreeing that human wellbeing is a core objective of tourism development, researchers could explore the relevance of other ethical bases for tourism theory and practice. One possible ethic is that of “Extended Anthropocentrism”. This ethic recognises that human survival depends upon the well-being of other species and ecosystems, emphasises human responsibility to preserve nature in perpetuity, and affirms the value of protecting, conserving and efficiently using natural resources as well as cultural/heritage environments [70]. For tourism stakeholders, some version of extended anthropocentrism can serve as an ideal “conservation ethic” to drive sustainability thinking and practice. Except for some attention given to ethical issues, tourism researchers have neglected this crucial topic [71,72].

Researchers need to investigate the links between the impacts of tourism development and stakeholder wellbeing outcomes. As noted, the much-hyped SF-MST does not identify robust wellbeing indicators for tourism analysis and policy purposes. Tourism researchers need to adopt, and/or adapt, the types of wellbeing measures developed by other social scientists and employed

by policymakers if their studies are to be relevant to the wider public debates on efficient and effective resource allocation to enhance social wellbeing. Tourism economics is well-suited to this task but needs to incorporate advances in sustainability theory and practice that are taking place in the wider research literature [28]. An important task for tourism research involves extending the range of SF-MST recommended indicators to treat wellbeing more seriously to enhance its relevance to tourism analysis and policy. Given that destination managers and tourism researchers typically adhere to a narrow conception of the nature of wellbeing and its measures, a strong research effort is needed to expand the scope of this notion in tourism study. These issues should be addressed in further refinements of the SF-MST [38].

As noted above, tourism research on sustainable destination development tends to emphasise the intra-generational rather than inter-generational wellbeing outcomes, neglecting the role of capital stock changes as a mechanism for wellbeing transmission into the future. If the capitals approach is to inform sustainable tourism development while capturing the multidimensional complexity of the wellbeing concept, its scope needs to be extended beyond restrictive models [28]. Research challenges include the valuation of capital stocks, linking changes in capital stocks to present and future wellbeing outcomes, assessing the relevance of weak vs strong sustainability principles, determining which aspects of capital stocks are “critical” or otherwise, and overcoming the behavioural and institutional barriers to incorporating wellbeing measures into the different stages of the policy cycle [21,28,71].

A major challenge for the capitals approach is that of valuating the different types and components of capital. The quantity of capital may be measured either according to its *asset* value or in relation to the resulting *flow* of benefits [6]. While measurement of manufactured capital and some types of natural capital with market prices is fairly straightforward, measurement of human, social, and natural capital requires “shadow pricing” to correct for situations where market prices are distorted or absent altogether [6]. The dominant approach to measurement is the “hybrid capital approach” employing both physical and monetary measures of stocks and flows informed by participatory techniques to determine community values [70]. Tourism economists have largely ignored these valuation issues relevant to sustainable destination development [28,41].

For tourism analysis and policy to become more relevant to, and consistent with, advances in sustainability theory and practice emerging from the wider research literature, researchers need to develop more future-directed sustainability indicators. New metrics are under development to assess the contribution of the different capital stocks to sustainable resident wellbeing [6,8,9,73]. Greater effort is needed to determine how these capital assets are to be valued in the different contexts of tourism development, and their links with stakeholder wellbeing. Tourism researchers must confront some important measurement challenges in the effort to develop frameworks of analysis that truly integrate current and future resident wellbeing. To date, the dynamic links between changes in capital stocks and resident wellbeing outcomes remain under-researched.

The extent to which different capital stocks are substitutable for one another also presents an ongoing problem for tourism researchers, practitioners, and destination managers. In particular, the issue of weak vs strong sustainability in tourism contexts deserves a stronger research effort. Tourism researchers need to investigate how wellbeing outcomes might be weighted and how those weights can change over time. This can help destination managers to make informed decisions about trade-offs among changes in the different types of stocks associated with alternative development paths. Natural capital aside, there is a strong case for regarding unique social, cultural, and historic artefacts and rituals, and historically valued architecture, as “critically important” to the present and future wellbeing of destination stakeholders. Extending the scope of the components of “critical capital” to relate more closely to resident values such as sense of belonging and social connection has substantial implications for identifying the preferred direction of sustainable development of the tourism industry. Further research can develop indicators of critical levels of different tourism-related capital assets.

Another failure of tourism research relates to a continued adherence to the pro-growth ethic that underpins much of the mainstream analysis and policy prescriptions. To date, little formal or empirical work has been undertaken to investigate the likely wellbeing outcomes of policy interventions to “resize” tourism. Research is needed into the types of goods and services that, given their contribution to wellbeing, should be prioritised in production and consumption, and those that should be downsized or eliminated completely [42]. There is need also to identify those institutions, agencies and organisations that can support or restrict the degrowth process. Barriers to downsizing tourism may variously be related to the entrenched growth imperative of

neoliberalism, concerns about job losses and reduced living standards, and decisionmaker difficulties in changing deeply ingrained beliefs about progress and wellbeing. A substantial research effort is needed to articulate the nature and sources of the potential impediments to the tourism industry downsizing both in its entirety and by particular sub-sectors. Tourism stakeholders can inform research on the ideal characteristics of a post-degrowth tourism industry that embeds wellbeing measures into private and public sector decision making [28,41,42]. With potential to evolve into collaborative industry-academic research, this strategy may be well worth exploring.

Private sector tourism operators can play an important role in achieving and maintaining sustainable destination development. Tourism researchers need to study the “hybrid” business models under development for their tourism relevance. Hybrid models applied to tourism can help to reconceptualise the nature of tourism firms and their purpose, including the nature and scope of the tourism “value chain”. Researchers should also take up the opportunity to study the theoretical and practical relevance of the wellbeing lens to tourism operators.

While important, these topics comprise only some items in the required research agenda. Nor is the above discussion intended to minimise the challenges facing tourism researchers and practitioners seeking to address the identified “failures”. Existing mindsets are often deeply embedded and almost impossible to change. Vested interests can prevent changes in “business as usual”. A transformative shift in values of all stakeholder groups, divorced from neoliberalist thinking, is essential for success in incorporating wellbeing outcomes into tourism analysis and policy making [7,13,17,54]. Enablers of the required shift in the collective mindset are still being debated [18,24,74]. Such issues, important as they are, have not been addressed in this paper.

10. Conclusion

This paper has identified several important areas where tourism stakeholders (researchers, firms and governance institutions) have yet to meet the challenges posed by the *Beyond GDP* approach, failing to acknowledge that enhancement of human wellbeing is an essential component of sustainable destination development, with consequent failure to incorporate wellbeing outcomes into tourism policy, practice and research.

A major area of concern has involved failure to recognise human wellbeing as the primary aim of any industrial development, including tourism. Tourism researchers explicitly or implicitly take sustainability to be the primary ultimate aim despite the fact that it is a complex notion requiring trade-offs between different types of impacts—economic, social and environmental. Only with an overarching end-in-view can these different impacts be prioritised or balanced. Rather than acting merely as complementary to standard performance indicators, wellbeing outcomes comprise the overarching assessment criteria for evaluating tourism destination performance over time.

A related source of failure of tourism research stems from researchers’ and destination managers’ adherence to a narrow and superficial conception of the nature of wellbeing and its measurement. More comprehensive measures of present and future wellbeing over and above resident perceptions and sentiments are required if analyses of the effects of destination development are to have policy significance. This failure has been compounded by adherence to a primarily static, rather than dynamic conception of a “sustainability path” linking past and future wellbeing outcomes. A failure to investigate the mechanisms for generating future stakeholder wellbeing has resulted in a neglect of the role that capital stock changes can play in influencing inter-generational wellbeing outcomes. This failure has also led tourism researchers to ignore restrictions on the extent to which different types of capital stocks are interchangeable with each other. Despite a large literature in the social sciences on the conditions underpinning “weak” and “strong” sustainability, the crucial importance of this distinction for identifying “critical tourism resources” and preferred paths of destination development has been ignored.

It has also been argued that mainstream tourism development and research tend to be uncritically embedded within a pro-growth mindset that is steadily depleting and degrading the resources and the wellbeing of life on the planet. Failure to fully appreciate the role that tourism development is playing in an activity that depletes and degrades natural resources and places stress on planetary ecological boundaries. This has resulted in a failure to take tourism degrowth seriously, even with respect to selected sectors. Given that tourism degrowth has the potential to enhance immaterial dimensions of stakeholder wellbeing, this topic demands great attention from tourism researchers. The paper has also argued that wellbeing considerations should assume greater importance in tourism business decision-making. The recent emergence of “hybrid”

models of the firm, configured to address explicit social and environmental issues in addition to financial concerns, has relevance for tourism operators. To date, these models lack an accepted ethical basis. It was argued that the tourism planning and implementation process has accorded insufficient attention to wellbeing outcomes as a driver of the direction of tourism development.

The global effort to develop wellbeing frameworks to drive public policy has substantial relevance for tourism theory, practice and policy. The *Beyond GDP* approach has exerted less influence on tourism research than in the other social sciences. Consequently, the potential for wellbeing metrics to guide tourism policy away from “business as usual” is a neglected area of research. To measure “what truly matters” to tourism stakeholders, a greater research effort needs to be undertaken regarding the role of wellbeing metrics in tourism-related public and private sector policymaking. Acknowledging that wellbeing is the ultimate policy aim, tourism researchers need to integrate stakeholder wellbeing outcomes into conceptual analysis, empirical findings and policy assessment. While various challenges remain in addressing the identified failures, this paper has attempted to identify steps that need to be taken to enhance destination capacity to deliver wellbeing outcomes from tourism development.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Data Availability

No new data were created or analysed in this work. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Conflicts of Interest

The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

References

1. Bleys, B. (2012). Beyond GDP: classifying alternative measures for progress. *Social Indicators Research*, 109(3), 355–376. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-011-9906-6>
2. Costanza, R., Hart, M., Posner, S., & Talberth, J. (2009). Beyond GDP: The need for new measures of progress. *The Pardee Papers*, 4.
3. Jansen, A., Wang, R., Behrens, P., & Hoekstra, R. (2024). Beyond GDP: a review and conceptual framework for measuring sustainable and inclusive wellbeing. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 8(9), e695–e705. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196\(24\)00147-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(24)00147-5)
4. Stiglitz, J., Sen, A., & Fitoussi, J. P. (2009). *The measurement of economic performance and social progress revisited: Reflections and overview*. Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress, Paris. <https://sciencespo.hal.science/hal-01069384/document> (accessed 6 September 2025).
5. Stiglitz, J. E., Sen, A., & Fitoussi, J.-P. (2009). *Mismeasuring our lives: Why GDP doesn't add up*. The New Press.
6. Stiglitz, J., Fitoussi, J., & Durand, M. (2018). *Beyond GDP: Measuring what counts for economic and social performance*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264307292-en>
7. Dalziel, P., Saunders, C., & Saunders, J. (2018). *Wellbeing economics: The capabilities approach to prosperity*. Springer Nature.
8. Fioramonti, L., Coscieme, L., & Mortensen, L. F. (2019). From gross domestic product to wellbeing: How alternative indicators can help connect the new economy with the Sustainable Development Goals. *The Anthropocene Review*, 6(3), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053019619869947>
9. Costanza, R., Erickson, J. D., Farley, J., & Kubiszewski, I. (Eds.). (2020). *Sustainable wellbeing futures: A research and action agenda for ecological economics*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
10. Durand, M. (2020). What should be the goal of public policies? *Behavioural Public Policy*, 4(2), 226–235. <https://doi.org/10.1017/bpp.2019.45>
11. Durand, M. (2015). The OECD better life initiative: how's life? and the measurement of wellbeing. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 61(1), 4–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/roiw.12156>
12. Tov, W. (2018). Wellbeing concepts and components. In E. Diener, S. Oishi, & L. Tay (Eds.), *Wellbeing Concepts and components Handbook of Wellbeing*. DEF Publishers.
13. Briguglio, M., Czap, N., & Laffan, K. (2025). *Wellbeing and Policy: Evidence for Action*. Routledge.
14. Costanza, R., Fioramonti, L., Kubiszewski, I., Markowitz, D., Orr, C., Trebeck, K., et al. (2020). Creating a Wellbeing Economy Alliance (WEAll) to motivate and facilitate the transition. In R. Costanza, J. Erikson, J. Farley, & I. Kubiszewski (Eds.), *Sustainable Wellbeing Futures* (pp. 399–407). Edward Elgar Publishing.

15. Wellbeing Economy Alliance. (2021). https://wellbeingeconomy.org/wp-content/uploads/WEAll-brochure_2021Update_FINAL_Feb17.pdf (accessed 2 January 2025).
16. Wellbeing Economy Alliance. (2023). *For an economy in service of life*. <https://weall.org> (accessed 2 January 2025).
17. Abrar, R. (2021). Building the transition together: WEALL's perspective on creating a wellbeing economy. In É. Laurent (Ed.), *The Wellbeing Transition: Analysis and Policy* (pp. 157–180). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-67860-9_9
18. Durand, M., & Exton, C. (2019). Adopting a wellbeing approach in central government: Policy mechanisms and practical tools. In J. Helliwell, R. Layard, & J. Sachs (Eds.), *Global Happiness and Wellbeing Report*. Global Happiness Council, Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
19. Berbekova, A., Uysal, M., & Assaf, A. G. (2022). Toward an assessment of quality of life indicators as measures of destination performance. *Journal of Travel Research*, 61(6), 1424–1436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875211026755>
20. Berbekova, A., Assaf, A. G., Uysal, M., Tsionas, M., & Parmeter, C. F. (2025). Quality of life performance index for tourism destinations. *Tourism Management*, 108, 105091. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2024.105091>
21. Dwyer, L. (2025). Tourism Development in a Wellbeing Economy. *Sustainability*, 17(8), 3706. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17083706>
22. Dwyer, L. (2024). 'Measuring What Matters': Resident Well-Being and the Tourism Policy Cycle. *Sustainability*, 16(22), 9718. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16229718>
23. Dwyer, L. (2022). Tourism contribution to the SDGs: applying a well-being lens. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 32, 3212. <https://doi.org/10.54055/ejtr.v32i.2500>
24. Farmaki, A., Altinay, L., & Font, X. (Eds.). (2022) *Planning and Managing Sustainability in Tourism: Empirical Studies, Best-practice Cases and Theoretical Insights*. Springer Cham.
25. Rajani, F., & Boluk, K. A. (2022). A Critical Commentary on the SDGs and the Role of Tourism. *Tourism and Hospitality*, 3(4), 855–860. <https://doi.org/10.3390/tourhosp3040053>
26. Fauzi, M. A. (2025). Sustainable tourism and sustainable development goals (SDGs): a state-of-the-art review of past, present, and future trends. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 27, 2841–2862. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-023-04077-0>
27. Miller, G., & Torres-Delgado, A. (2023). Measuring sustainable tourism: A state of the art review of sustainable tourism indicators. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 31(7), 1483–1496. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2023.2213859>
28. Dwyer, L. (2023). Why Tourism Economists should treat wellbeing more seriously. *Tourism Economics*, 29(8), 1975–1994. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13548166221128081>
29. Dwyer, L. (2023). Resident wellbeing and sustainable tourism development: the 'capitals approach'. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 31(9), 2119–2135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1990304>
30. Austin, A. (2016). On wellbeing and public policy: are we capable of questioning the hegemony of happiness? *Social Indicators Research*, 127, 123–138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-0955-0>
31. Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., & De Neve, J.-E. (Eds.). (2020). *World Happiness Report 2020*. Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
32. Adler, A., & Seligman, M. (2016). Using wellbeing for public policy: theory, measurement, and recommendations. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 6(1), 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v6i1.429>
33. Dwyer, L. (2023). Tourism development and sustainable wellbeing: a beyond GDP perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 31(10), 2399–2416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1825457>
34. Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Tay, L. (2018). Advances in subjective wellbeing research. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2, 253–260. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0307-6>
35. Stone, A., & Krueger, A. B. (2018). Understanding subjective wellbeing. In J. E. Stiglitz, J.-P. Fitoussi, & M. Durand. (Eds.), *For Good Measure: Advancing Research on Well-being Metrics Beyond GDP* (pp. 163–202). OECD Publishing.
36. Exton, C., & Shinwell, M. (2018). Policy use of wellbeing metrics: Describing countries' experiences. In *OECD Statistics Working Papers* (No. 2018/07). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/d98eb8ed-en>
37. OECD. (2020). *How's life? 2020: Measuring wellbeing*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9870c393-en>
38. Dwyer, L. (2024). Measuring the Sustainability of Tourism (SF-MST): New Wine in an Old Bottle? *Sustainability*, 16(14), 5867. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16145867>
39. Dwyer, L. (2023). Tourism Development to Enhance Resident Well-Being: A Strong Sustainability Perspective. *Sustainability*, 15(4), 3321. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15043321>
40. Uysal, M., Berbekova, A., & Kim, H. (2020). Designing for quality of life. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 83, 102944. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102944>
41. Dwyer, L. (2024). Treatment of Wellbeing in Tourism Economics. In H. Konu & M. K Smith (Eds.), *Tourism and Wellbeing*. Edward Elgar.
42. Dwyer, L. (2024). Tourism Degrowth and Resident Wellbeing. *Journal of Tourism, Sustainability and Wellbeing*, 12(3), 206–225. <https://doi.org/10.34623/s9m9-gq43>
43. Brundtland, G. H. (1987). *Our Common Future: The World Commission on Environment and Development*. Oxford University Press.
44. Hjørth, P., & Bagheri, A. (2006). Navigating towards sustainable development: A system dynamics approach. *Futures*, 38(1), 74–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2005.04.005>
45. Barbier, E. B., & Burgess, J. C. (2017). The Sustainable Development Goals and the systems approach to sustainability. *Economics*, 11(1), 2017–2028. <https://doi.org/10.5018/economics-ejournal.ja.2017-28>

46. Arrow, K. J., Dasgupta, P., Goulder, L. H., Mumford, K. J., & Oleson, K. (2012). Sustainability and the measurement of wealth. *Environment and Development Economics*, 17(3), 317–353. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355770X12000137>
47. UN Statistical Commission. (2024). *Statistical Framework for Measuring the Sustainability of Tourism (SF-MST)*.
48. Pelenc, J., & Ballet, J. (2015). Strong sustainability, critical natural capital and the capability approach. *Ecological Economics*, 112, 36–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.02.006>
49. Davies, G. R. (2013). Appraising weak and strong sustainability: Searching for a middle ground. *Consilience*, 10, 111–124. <https://doi.org/10.7916/consilience.v0i10.4635>
50. Carmody, C. (2012). *Considering future generations Sustainability in theory and practice. Economic Roundup*, 65–92.
51. Butler, R. W., & Dodds, R. (2022). Overcoming overtourism: a review of failure. *Tourism Review*, 77(1), 35–53. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-04-2021-0215>
52. Edgell, D. L. (2020). *Managing Sustainable Tourism: A Legacy for The Future* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
53. Butcher, J. (2023). *What Path Should Global Tourism Take?* Tourism Horizons. <https://tourismshorizon938.substack.com/p/what-path-should-global-tourism-take> (accessed 3 June 2025).
54. Fletcher, R., Murray Mas, I. M., Blanco-Romero, A., & Blázquez-Salom, M. (2019). Tourism and degrowth: An emerging agenda for research and praxis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27, 1745–1763. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1679822>
55. Dwyer, L. (2023). Tourism Degrowth: Painful but Necessary. *Sustainability*, 15(20), 14676. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su152014676>
56. United Nations Environmental Program. (2011). *Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication*.
57. Boarini, R., Murtin, F., & Schreyer, P. (2015). Inclusive Growth: The OECD Measurement Framework. In *OECD Statistics Working Papers* (No. 2015/06). OECD Publishing.
58. OECD. (2024). Creating economic prosperity through inclusive and sustainable tourism: G7/OECD policy priorities paper. In *OECD Tourism Papers* (No. 2024/01). OECD Publishing.
59. Easterlin, R. A., & O'Connor, K. J. (2020). The Easterlin Paradox. In *Discussion Paper Series* (No. 13923). Institute of Labor Economics (IZA).
60. Parrique, T., Barth, J., Briens, F., Kerschner, C., Kraus-Polk, A., Kuokkanen, A., et al. (2019). *Decoupling Debunked. Evidence and Arguments Against Green Growth as a Sole Strategy for Sustainability*. European Environment Bureau.
61. Fletcher, R., & Rammelt, C. (2017). Decoupling: A key fantasy of the post-2015 sustainable development agenda. *Globalizations*, 14, 450–467. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2016.1263077>
62. Kallis, G., Paulson, S., D'Alisa, G., & Demaria, F. (2020). *The case for degrowth*. John Wiley & Sons.
63. Hickel, J. (2023). On technology and degrowth. *Monthly Review*, 75(3), 44–50.
64. OECD. (2023). *Economic Policy Making to Pursue Economic Welfare* (OECD Report for the G7 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors).
65. Haigh, N., & Hoffman, A. (2012). Hybrid organizations: The next chapter in sustainable business. *Organizational Dynamics*, 41(2), 126–134.
66. Haigh, N., & Hoffman, A. (2014). The new heretics: Hybrid organizations and the challenges they present to corporate sustainability. *Organization & Environment*, 27(3), 223–241. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026614545345>
67. Davies, I. A., & Chambers, L. (2018). Integrating hybridity and business model theory in sustainable entrepreneurship. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 177, 378–386. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.12.196>
68. Alberti, F. G., & Varon Garrido, M. A. (2017). Can profit and sustainability goals co-exist? New business models for hybrid firms. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 38(1), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBS-12-2015-0124>
69. Brandt, N., Exton, C., & Fleischer, L. (2022). *Wellbeing at the heart of policy: lessons from national initiatives around the OECD* (No. 01/2022). Forum New Economy.
70. Dwyer, L. (2018). Saluting while the ship sinks: the necessity for tourism paradigm change. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(1), 29–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1308372>
71. Holden, A. (2019). Environmental ethics for tourism-the state of the art. *Tourism Review*, 74(3), 694–703. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-03-2017-0066>
72. Fennell, D. A. (2019). Sustainability ethics in tourism: The imperative next imperative. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 44(1), 117–130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2018.1548090>
73. Kulig, A., Kolfoort, H., & Hoekstra, R. (2010). The case for the hybrid capital approach for the measurement of the welfare and sustainability. *Ecological Indicators*, 10(2), 118–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2009.07.014>
74. Mason, N., & Büchs, M. (2023). Barriers to adopting wellbeing-economy narratives: comparing the wellbeing economy alliance and wellbeing economy governments. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 19(1), 2222624. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2023.2222624>