



LUND UNIVERSITY

Using Co-Design to Move The Discourse of Sustainable Tourism from Theory to Practice

Reid, Stuart

Published in:
Tourism Dimensions

2014

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Reid, S. (2014). Using Co-Design to Move The Discourse of Sustainable Tourism from Theory to Practice. *Tourism Dimensions*, 1(1).

Total number of authors:

1

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

Using Co-Design to Move The Discourse of Sustainable Tourism from Theory to Practice

Stuart Reid

Abstract

The ample systems-orientated rhetoric of sustainable tourism has not triggered much practical change because it is directed at the wrong level and the relevance of the discourse eludes local agents in tourism systems. Practical movement towards sustainable tourism hinges on finding tools that can aid practical moves by local tourism enterprises and, as the local contexts vary, a flexible approach is needed. The paper examines co-design as a tool that can aid enterprise movement towards sustainable tourism practice. The empirical basis is an exploratory case study of a single recreational enterprise situated in Kolding, Southern Denmark. Empirical material was collected through multiple methods, comprising; observation, key informant interviews, customer surveys (n=41) and a co-design workshop.

The case confirms the potential for co design as a means to provoke identification of practical moves towards sustainable tourism practice. The research builds upon the body of sustainable tourism knowledge by using the perspective of Complex Adaptive Systems theory to highlight the need for new tools. It investigates the scope of co-design as a suitable tool to foment practical steps towards sustainable tourism practice within the complex ecology of tourism systems. Co-design has not been previously examined within tourism contexts. As a single qualitative case, it is not appropriate to make statistical generalizations based upon this study.

Keywords : co-design, complex adaptive systems (CAS), schema, schemata, sustainable tourism.

Introduction

Sustainable tourism may be regarded as an unfolding discourse over an evolving concept (Bramwell & Lane, 1993), variously conceived and applied (Butler, 1999). The origins of the sustainable tourism discourse can be traced to other discourses spanning environmental degradation (e.g. Brown, 1984/ Carson, 1962), resource depletion (e.g. Daly & Townsend, 1993/Ehrlich, 1971/ Hubbert, 1962/Meadows, Meadows, Randers, & Behrens III, 1972) and social inequity (e.g. Brundtland, 1987/Frank, 1966). Through these discourses, the view of development changed: development was no longer seen as an economic activity bereft of socio-cultural and environmental effects and the sustainable development discourse emerged. The sustainable development discourse eventually spread to tourism. Brundtland's acclaimed expression of sustainable development, as that which "meets the needs of present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (1987:87) ultimately informed the concept of sustainable tourism (Bramwell & Lane, 1993/ Butler, 1999/Liburd, 2010); sustainable tourism being that which "takes full account of its current and future economic, social and environmental impacts" (UNWTO, 2010:xi) or that which "meets the needs of present tourists and host communities whilst protecting and enhancing needs in the future" (GDRC, 2013).

The unarguable appeal of the sustainable tourism concept soon met wide acceptance, with tourism agencies issuing a "steady flow of policy statements and initiatives towards sustainability" (Bramwell & Lane, 1993:2). It is apparently however, that the policy has produced little practical movement toward sustainable tourism. Instead, there is a "gaping chasm between the rhetoric and the reality" (Wheeller, 2005:271), with implementation failures at individual, enterprise and societal levels (e.g. see: Barr, Shaw, Coles, & Prillwitz, 2010/Bramwell & Lane, 1993/ Cohen, Higham, & Cavaliere, 2011/Wheeller, 2005). As Gössling, Hall, Ekström, Engeset, and Aall (2012, pp. 899-900) relate, global tourism is presently unsustainable and is arguably becoming even less so.

As Butler observes, the success of the term 'sustainable tourism' owes much to it being "all things to all interested parties" (1999:11) and it is this very generality, as Liburd (2010:6) notes, that has provided the scope for the extant gap between the theory and practice of sustainable tourism. In fact, the ample policy rhetoric may well have contributed by providing only the comforting illusion of progress, to the detriment of action. As Butler (1999:20) points out, "Simply saying...sustainable tourism is the way...will not ensure its adoption".

Bramwell and Lane (1993:4) aptly sum the problematic situation thus: "It easy to discuss sustainability. Implementation is the problem". The pressing pragmatic

Stuart Reid is Assistant Professor, University of Southern Denmark, Kolding. DK 6000

E-mail: strei13@student.sdu.dk

concern is to move the discourse from the theory to the practice. The solution lays in a nuanced understanding of what sustainable tourism means in practice. The first step is scraping the idea of sustainable tourism as “a goal that can be achieved” (Liburd, 2010:7), thereby shifting attention from the unattainable moving target to the means to actually move toward it. However, the ways to move towards the moving target of sustainability remain elusive. As Gössling et al. (2012:900) relate, “The need to achieve change in the tourism system remains... [but] it is less clear through which instruments”. Fundamentally, the pressing pragmatic challenge is finding the right tools to aid movement towards sustainable tourism in practice.

Literature Review

As movement toward sustainable tourism practice will occur in an environment of “complex organizational ecologies [and] dynamic network relations” (Gyimóthy & Larsen, 2013:5), it requires “adaptive management of complex adaptive systems [CAS]” (Liburd, 2010:7). The CAS perspective is practically useful in the nuanced understanding of the ailment and treatment of practical inertia in sustainable tourism. Specifically, the collective schemata within CAS, related to the notion of everyday paradigms as “a basic set of beliefs that guide action” (Guba, 1990:17), usefully expresses the practical and iterative aspects of the inherently dynamic process of sustainable tourism development.

Holland (1993:1) describes CAS as an “An ecosystem... a complex web of non-linear interactions” where multiplex interaction among agents produces system behaviour more complex than the sum of parts. Within CAS, agent behaviour is guided by “sets of rules that enable an agent to anticipate the consequences of its actions” (Holland, 1993:1); at human scale, these are “patterns of thought... ways of interpreting the world” (Gell-Mann, 1991:6), or “schema”. Schema mediate agents’ actions and the results inform both the individual schema, and the collective (dominant) schemata (Gell-Mann, 1991/Holland, 1993). So, as Gell-Mann (1991) explains, the dominant schemata may be displaced through competition with alternatives, whereupon agent behaviour influences how the new dominant schemata fares in competition with others, this feedback being “the essential feature of adaptation, evolution, or learning” (1991:6).

From the vantage of CAS, the movement towards sustainable tourism will necessarily occur in a contested arena, where the dynamic interplay of agents’ schemas collectively informs the evolving schemata propelling system adaptation; moreover, as each system is unique, the moves towards sustainable tourism will vary from one context to another. Accordingly, the way towards sustainable tourism is best viewed broadly,

as a “managerial philosophy” (Liburd, 2010:1) or schema - a way of thinking informing a way of doing. Ultimately then, system adaptation towards sustainable tourism requires that some agents take the nascent steps by putting the schema of Liburd’s (2010) “managerial philosophy” into practice.

Movement towards sustainable tourism rests on local agent involvement: the destination community must decide “what is to be sustained for whom and how” (Liburd, 2010:14) and then the local agents must take steps to give effect to the decision. Sustainable tourism policy has long recognized this, stating requirements for local stakeholders’ “willing participation” (Butler, 1999:20) or “informed participation” (UNEP & UNWTO, 2005:11-12) and the need for “collaboration at the local destination level” (UNWTO, 2010:xiii).

Local tourism enterprises are critical agents in the constellation of the local tourism system because they largely produce the tourism products that are consumed by tourists, a transaction typically also bringing socio-cultural and environmental impacts of some kind. So, the participation of local enterprise is essential. As Butler (1999:20) explains, “If the industry, at all scales, cannot be persuaded that it is in its own direct interest to commit to some principles of sustainability, then efforts of other stakeholders will have little effect”.

According to Gibson (1977), perception determines understanding of what the environment “affords”, and so influences the chosen “ways of living” in a niche. From this vantage, movement towards sustainability requires reconfigured tourism agent perceptions regarding what the tourism system “affords”. As the “global agenda for change” at the heart of the Brundtland report notes, there is a need “to help define shared perceptions” (1987:11). Transforming the sustainable tourism discourse from theoretical latency to practical potency rests upon individual agents’ adopting new ways of doing; however, before doing anything, the agents’ must perceive the need to act, an interest must ‘vest’. However, as Sivacek and Crano (1982) explain, “vested interest” only arises, and drives action, when something is relevant; and, if present tourism practice is anything to go by, local agents presently fail to see the relevance of the sustainable tourism discourse.

We might therefore postulate that the ample systems-orientated rhetoric has not triggered change because it is directed at the wrong level: systems do not move - the agents that comprise them do; the systems have not moved because the agents have not; the agents have not moved because the relevance of the discourse eludes them. If this is true,

Clarke's "movement in the correct direction" (1997:229) hinges on finding tools that can aid practical moves by local tourism enterprises and, as the local contexts vary, a flexible approach is needed.

A co-design approach shows promise because, as Kjaersgaard (2012:338) highlights, design is "not a simple rational and linear process". Minnemann and Harrison (1998:34) describe, design is a social activity, wherein the moment-to-moment work of design activity is informed by "interest-relative negotiation" in the construction and negotiation of meaning. Moreover, as knowledge is often situated, embodied and tacit, the most promising solutions may emerge as "serendipitous insights" from what may at first seem incidental "by-products of the design process" (Kjaersgaard, 2012:343). Hence in co-design, solutions may emerge from a dynamic flow of meaning negotiation within a social, or participatory, process. Co-design brings multiple perspectives to bear, so generating the rich material necessary for contextually relevant discussion about practical steps towards sustainable tourism at enterprise level. The participatory quality of co design allows the interest relevant negotiation to reveal the contextual insights needed for fruitful discussion of practically relevant steps toward sustainable tourism at enterprise level. Additionally, the emergent process of negotiated solutions is well suited to the treatment of steps towards the moving target of sustainable tourism within the dynamic and complex ecology of local tourism systems.

Research Question and Method

The overall intent of this study is to gain insight into the application of sustainable tourism within a given local enterprise; to assist theoretical understanding of CAS within tourism and to identify the scope for co-design as a method to aid enterprise movement towards sustainable tourism practice. Accordingly, the research question is:

How, and to what extent, can co-design assist a given enterprise to make steps toward sustainable tourism?

Research paradigms concern ontology, epistemology, and methodology (Guba, 1990). This study follows the paradigmatic tradition of interpretive social sciences research (Jennings, 2010); ontologically, the worldview (Heron & Reason, 1997) is relativist; the epistemological standpoint, "the theory of knowledge justification" (Audi, 2011:xiii) is subjectivist; and the strategy by which the ontological and epistemological principles are translated" (Sarantakos, 2005:30) is via single case study. Single case study is appropriate for examining unique phenomenon (Yin, 2005), such as ways to support movement towards sustainable tourism practice in a given local enterprise.

The case organization, SlotssøBadet, is a local health and

wellness enterprise located in Kolding, Southern Denmark. Although not solely a tourism enterprise, it does also operate in the realm of tourism, its services and products appealing to (and used by) domestic and international visitors as well as residents.

The theoretical frame draws on the CAS theory as described by Gell-Mann (1991) and Holland (1993), and related to sustainable tourism by Liburd (2010). The basic notion is that actions of local tourism enterprises will shape movement toward sustainable tourism systems and that co-design process may be a fit tool to trigger this. Accordingly, the research team sought to identify ways to enhance the sustainability of SB through a co-design process. The research was conducted over a, relatively short, seven-week period over 30 September-18 November 2013.

Qualitative material is drawn from several sources, including: document and website review; an escorted site visit and presentation from a senior manager; researcher participation and observation during a site visit as a customer; two semi-structured interviews with a key informant (a senior manager at the case organisation); a survey randomly administered to customers at the entry of the enterprise (41 respondents); and, culminating in an intensive co-design workshop (involving two key staff members of the case organisation and a manager of a local hotel working cooperatively with the case organisation).

Discussion And Findings

The first site visit and presentation 'set the scene', explaining that the enterprise comprised an Aquatic Centre, a Wellness Centre (sauna, steam room, spa and relaxation pools), merchandise shop, café, function centre, and gym (separately managed); and that the enterprise's activities and services included various aquatic classes, massage and skin treatments, as well as recreational and wellness events (Presentation, 2013). Moreover, it was explained that the venue was very popular, recording some 461,361 user entries in 2012, and although it was not solely a tourism enterprise, its services did attract many tourists too (Presentation, 2013). From this presentation and visit, the overall picture was that of an enterprise operating within a complex business environment spanning multiple market segments, including domestic and international tourists and competing for all these customers both with similar venues as well as providers of leisure alternatives; this indeed reflected the CAS environment of tourism as described by Liburd (2010). The presentation also revealed that the enterprise's core product was relaxation—the rising stress of modern life making "people more willing to pay for relaxing" (Presentation, 2013). To continue to attract and retain customers it was

considered important to “make innovation every day” and “be first mover” (Presentation, 2013); consequently, the enterprise had formed a dedicated innovation department and strived to deliver novel products, as shown by the current plans for a new small children’s pool with features “never seen before” (Presentation, 2013) and by efforts to hold interesting events to attract different customer segments and gain publicity (Presentation, 2013). Employees were considered central in customer service, by developing “good social relations” that enabled them to help customers have “great social experiences” at the venue; high customer satisfaction was considered important to generate repeat visitation and positive word-of-mouth (WOM) and “since over half our customers come from WOM we do not need to advertise” (Presentation, 2013). Additionally, the enterprise was concerned “to take part in social help... to help people with problems” (Presentation, 2013). Social benefits also arose from the fact that the enterprise provided some 110 local jobs (Presentation, 2013). However, the enterprise also used “a lot” of water (32,000m³ p.a. or 8% of Kolding’s total) and electricity (1.6m kW p.a.). At this point, the overall picture was of a nimble, innovative enterprise focused on its customers and aware of its wider role in society, but one seemingly unmindful of the environmental and social consequences of its resource consumption.

A subsequent review of the enterprise’s website and hardcopy promotional materials indicated scope for improvement in economic and environmental dimensions of sustainability. Particularly, although the research team found that the website was fresh and appealing, reflecting the innovative ethos of the enterprise, the structure and content of the website clearly undermined its effectiveness. Moreover, despite the fact that Germans made up some 40% of annual visitor nights in Southern Denmark (Statistics Denmark, 2013) both the hardcopy materials and the website were only provided in Danish. This suggested potential for improvement in economic sustainability; furthermore, as there was no apparent expression of environmental concern, an environmental sustainability gap was also indicated.

In the first key informant interview, the theme of ‘relaxation’ was reiterated - “relaxing is becoming a lifestyle” (Interview, 2013b), though product differentiation was noted with the Wellness Centre being for “top-end customers... willing to pay more to get more” (Interview, 2013b). Moreover, contrary to the earlier impression, international tourists were considered important; consequently, streamlined booking arrangements, special packages and discounts had been established with several regional accommodation providers (Interview, 2013b). These new discoveries reinforced the image of an economically sustainable enterprise attuned to

its customers.

The results of a customer survey confirmed that the venue appealed to a wide range of users including males (56%) and females (44%) of all ages and all walks of life, most of whom were from the local area (88%). Most (66%) visited the venue with others and remained for up to two hours (81%) in order to use the Gym (19%), Wellness Centre (17%), and Aquatic Centre (63%). Keyword responses indicated that customer perceptions mirrored the enterprise’s product themes (e.g. good atmosphere, relaxation, social experiences, wellness and health); and high levels of customer satisfaction were indicated by high repeat visitation (with 72.5% accessing the venue at least four times a month). This portrayed an enterprise that, in amply satisfying the needs of its many users, generated solid economic returns for the enterprise while delivering social benefits too.

During the second interview, a discussion of the ownership structure revealed that the Aquatic Centre was owned by Kolding’s local government and leased to the present management company, which also owned the other businesses and facilities in the complex (Interview, 2013a). Somewhat surprisingly, the Board had a social ethos, viewing themselves as “a foundation” (Interview, 2013a) aiming to deliver economic results but also benefit local society too; consequently, the Board included both local tourism and local clubs representative and all operating profits were reinvested into the facilities (Interview, 2013a). These new discoveries informed the understanding of the enterprise’s social and economic sustainability. Moreover, contrary to all previous impressions, it emerged that the enterprise was ostensibly committed to environmental sustainability and in fact employed measures such as automatic showers that ceased running every 30 seconds (to save water), energy efficient heating systems, solar energy systems, and ‘green’ products were used wherever it was possible to do so, despite higher cost (Interview, 2013a).. The management company even had Green Key certification (Interview, 2013a). There was also an evident desire to save more energy and to this end, the management had held discussions with local stakeholders about an innovative scheme to generate thermal energy from beneath the adjoining lake (Interview, 2013a). Initially, the research team’s mention of ‘stakeholders’ created some confusion, with the term being mistaken with that of ‘stockholders’ (those expecting a financial return). This was surprising because the meaning of the term was something the research team all simply ‘took for granted’; this is one of those “serendipitous insights” (Kjaersgaard, 2012:343) because it highlights the importance of common language in productive discourse. Once this confusion was cleared, the discussion revealed that the relationships

with local accommodation providers embraced a deep concern with mutually satisfying outcomes, whereby hotels reported guest feedback about visits to management and if the feedback was negative the management called the customer to find areas for service improvement (Interview, 2013a). Additionally, it was explained that the enterprise had forged close relations with some 100 other companies in Denmark, whose employees could gain access to the venue at special discounts, or privileged access to specific events. This all indicated the existence of the type of complex web relationships noted by Gyimóthy and Larsen (2013:5) and highlighted the complexity of the management challenges per the CAS of Liburd (2010). Yet again, this interview yielded new, deeper insights into the enterprise.

By taking on the role of customers to use the facilities at the enterprise, the observations of the research team contributed to a deeper understanding of the interaction of the enterprise with its customers. Particularly, it reinforced the image of a high quality facility, offering a wide variety of options for recreation and relaxation, where friendly, efficient and welcoming staff made a genuine effort to ensure that customers gained the most from their visit.

The deeper understanding of the enterprise that was gained through all the preceding research, provided rich material that usefully informed the co-design workshop. This workshop was attended by two senior members of staff, and one senior member of a local hotel (in a close working relationship with the enterprise), as well as the four members of the research team. In the workshop, three co-design models were employed to trigger reflective conversations and elicit ideas for sustainable enterprise development: 1) a 'front-stage, back-stage model', intended to trigger thinking about underlying enterprise values and how they are reflected in operation; 2) a 'stakeholder relationship model' intended to trigger thoughts about stakeholder connections; and 3) 'keyword cards', whereby keywords derived from the customer surveys, together with some extra words added by the research team, were used as 'conversation starters'. These models proved to be effective in stimulating active participation and engagement in information exchange. New stakeholder relationships, and enterprise values, were identified, for instance: there were close relations with key suppliers (heat and energy, catering and others) because "they help us operate"; there were close relations with event cooperators and networking companies because they "help us promote new events"; and there were ties with clubs and schools to "meet social obligations" arising from government funding requirements to ensure access; surprisingly, there were even links with competitors because "though we compete, we help to learn from each other too"

(Workshop, 2013). This again shows the complex network ecologies of Gyimóthy and Larsen (2013) at work in tourism. The keywords reflection was also effective in facilitating insightful discussions of values, confirming that the enterprise valued high quality service, good atmosphere, innovation and variety of offerings, relaxation and fun (Workshop, 2013). Significantly however, the word 'sustainability' (included as a keyword by the research team) met with a peculiar silence and it was very evident that the participants simply did not know how to address it. This is another "serendipitous insight" (Kjaersgaard, 2012:343) because it shows that the discourse of sustainability did not resonate with them, even though the workshop discussions, and the resulting ideas for enterprise development, in fact all related to the enterprise's sustainability. This indicates the need for more relevance (per Sivacek & Crano, 1982) to vest practical interest in the discourse of sustainability, and it illustrates the need for appropriate language and contextually informed discussion about the practical steps a given enterprise can take to move towards sustainability.

The workshop culminated in several new ideas for enterprise development, for example: attract more young people (15-25 years) though better promotion of existing student discounts and new discounts and offers; new and more events, and new facilities like a Wi-Fi area; develop innovative new products such as a water gym for aqua training; develop more links with local clubs and investigate ideas for new linked sporting events; reach out to international users by developing relationships with universities to promote the venue to foreign students and update to include other languages and provide better explanation of service packages and offers. Clearly, these types of aims largely related to markets and products; however, this did not address environmental issues but perhaps this is understandable given that earlier research had already revealed surprising efforts towards improved environmental performance. Notably, the ideas arising from the workshop did represent "movement in the correct direction" (Clarke, 1997:229) because, as far as the enterprise is concerned, their implementation would likely strengthen its economic and social sustainability, essential ingredients for enterprise survival. This highlights the need for a deep, contextual understanding of an enterprise as a basis for any conversation about steps towards sustainable tourism development; and also, that the conversation must be in language that the enterprise can recognize. Finally, while some might argue that the enterprise is not sustainable, such argument misses the pragmatic point; specifically, whether an enterprise is presently sustainable or unsustainable is not the question at stake, simply because the concept of sustainability as an 'end' that can be achieved is practically nonsensical. Instead, the pressing concern must be one

of practical movement towards sustainability, and the enterprise seemed intent on doing just that. According to these findings then, the answer to the research question is tentatively, 'yes': co-design does seem to offer the potential as a means to identify steps towards greater tourism enterprise sustainability. However, a resounding 'yes' rests on whether these steps are implemented or not, and this still remains to be seen.

Limitations And Further Research

Jennings (2010) relates that various paradigmatic standpoints have implications for the outcomes. Here, the subjective standpoint and single case approach limit generalizability. Testing co-design approaches as a means to trigger moves towards sustainable tourism in other tourism enterprises in Denmark and beyond could help to validate the findings. Moreover, although the indications are positive in this case, it is not yet possible to be sure that the tentative steps toward more sustainable operations will actually be implemented at SB. So it is yet possible that co-design may only be a means to find ways forward, and not trigger action. Longitudinal methods could be employed to answer this, through periodic interview and observation to assess implementation.

Longitudinal interviews could be used to assess revised views about sustainability over time, to see if perceptions show signs of change and inform greater understanding of practical steps towards sustainability. Longitudinal studies could also seek to determine if sequential co-design episodes might reinforce action and build momentum in an enterprise's steps towards sustainable tourism.

Conclusion

The profligate policy on sustainable tourism seems to have produced little practical movement; global tourism may even be less sustainable (Gössling et al., 2012). The generality of the concept may have contributed to this (Butler, 1999/ Liburd, 2010). The present challenge is to convert the concept into action (Bramwell & Lane, 1993; Butler, 1999). The solution requires scrapping the idea of sustainable tourism as "a goal that can be achieved" (Liburd, 2010:7) and shifting attention to the means to take practical steps to move toward sustainable tourism.

From the vantage of CAS, the dynamic interplay of agents' schemas collectively informs the evolving schemata propelling system adaptation and, as each system is unique, the moves towards sustainable tourism must vary from one context to another. Accordingly, the 'means' to move towards sustainable tourism is best viewed as a "managerial philosophy" (Liburd, 2010:1) or schema.

System adaptation towards sustainable tourism requires some agents to take the first steps. Local tourism enterprises can trigger "movement in the correct direction" (Clarke, 1997:229), transforming the sustainable tourism discourse from theoretical latency to practical potency; though this hinges on finding the right tools to elicit practical moves. A co-design approach seems well suited to this need, wherein relevant solutions emerge from a social, or participatory, process that brings multiple perspectives to bear, yielding deeper insight into the enterprise and its context.

This study involved case study of a recreational enterprise in Kolding, Southern Denmark to address the question: How, and to what extent, can co-design assist an enterprise to make steps toward sustainable tourism? The research showed that the enterprise is moving towards the moving target of sustainability; moreover, the co-design process culminated in enterprise development ideas that, if implemented, would enhance sustainability. So, according to this case, the answer to the research question is tentatively, 'yes': co-design does seem to offer the potential as a means to identify steps towards greater tourism enterprise sustainability, though in this case a firm 'yes' rests on the implementation of the identified ideas and this still remains to be seen.

The study underlines the emergent nature of the co-design research process and supports Kjaersgaard (2012) in that surprising insights may emerge incidentally, such as the importance of common language in this case. A co-design approach usefully provides the room for this to occur. The case also highlights the need for a deep, contextual understanding of an enterprise as a basis for any conversation about steps towards sustainable tourism and that the conversation must be in language the enterprise can recognize.

Further research is needed to confirm the usefulness of co-design process as a tool for contextually relevant discussion of pragmatic moves towards sustainability in tourism enterprise practice. Specifically, research could test co-design approaches in other tourism enterprises as a means to bring about practical moves towards sustainability; and, where scope exists to do so, it would be useful to test sequential co-design approaches to gauge scope for building momentum in an enterprise's steps towards sustainable tourism practice. The power to move enterprise agents toward sustainable tourism practice is essential if the complex adaptive systems of tourism are to actually respond to the comforting, but ineffective, policy discourse.

The discourse of sustainable tourism clearly portrays it as a 'moving target', so it is nonsensical to view sustainable tourism as an 'end' that can be achieved. The systems-

oriented rhetoric has not achieved much in this respect, though of course, the discourse itself is useful because it helps paint the backdrop for practical action. However, the pressing concern is to move beyond the discourse by fomenting the practical moves towards sustainability by the

individual enterprises that are the units in the system of the tourism industry, to change their schemas and vest practical relevance. It seems that a co-design approach could help to do just that.

References

- Audi, R. (2011), *Epistemology: A Contemporary Introduction to the Theory of Knowledge* (3rd ed.). New York, Routledge.
- Barr, S., Shaw, G., Coles, T., & Prillwitz, J. (2010), 'A holiday is a holiday': practicing sustainability, home and away. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18(3), 474-481, Available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2009.08.007> . Accessed on 13 January 2014.
- Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (1993), Sustainable Tourism: An Evolving Global Approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1(1), 1-5,.
- Brown, L. R. (1984), *State of the world 1984 : a Worldwatch Institute report on progress toward a sustainable society*, New York, NY, Norton & Co.
- Brundtland, G. H. (1987), *Our Common Future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*, United Nations.
- Butler, R. W. (1999), Sustainable tourism: A state of the art review, *Tourism Geographies*, 1(1), 7-25.
- Carson, R. (1962), *Silent Spring*. Boston, New York, Houghton Mifflin.
- Clarke, J. (1997), A Framework of Approaches to Sustainable Tourism, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5(3), 224-233.
- Cohen, S. A., Higham, J. E. S., & Cavaliere, C. T. (2011), Binge flying: Behavioural addiction and climate change, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(3), 1070-1089.
- Daly, H. E., & Townsend, K. N. (Eds.), (1993), *Valuing the earth: economics, ecology, ethics*, MIT press.
- Denzin, N. K. (2009), *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*, Piscataway, NJ, Transaction Publishers.
- Ehrlich, P. L. (1971), *The Population Bomb*, New York, Ballantine Books.
- Frank, A. G. (1966), The development of underdevelopment, *Monthly Review*.
- GDRC. (2013, 7 April 2012)., *The Sustainable Tourism Gateway - What is Sustainable Tourism*, Available at <http://www.gdrc.org/uem/eco-tour/st-what.html>, Accessed on 21 September 2013.
- Gell-Mann, M. (1991), Talk given January 9, 1990 in Santa Fe, New Mexico Working Paper Series, Santa Fe Institute, New Mexico, Santa Fe Institute.
- Gibson, J. J. (1977), *The Theory of Affordances Perceiving, Acting, and Knowing: Toward and Ecological Psychology*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum, 67-82
- Gössling, S., Hall, C. M., Ekström, F., Engeset, A. B., & Aall, C. (2012), Transition management: a tool for implementing sustainable tourism scenarios? ,*Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(6), 899-916.
- Guba, E. G. (1990), *The Alternative Paradigm Dialog*. In E. G. Guba (Ed.), *The Paradigm Dialogue*. Newbury Park, London, New Delhi, Sage Publications.

- Gyimóthy, S., & Larsen, M. (2013), Innovative Governance Strategies In Meetings Destination Networks (Lecture on 18 September 2013), Powerpoint Presentation, University of Southern Denmark, Kolding, Denmark.
- Heron, J., & Reason, P. (1997), A participatory inquiry paradigm., *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3(3), 274-294.
- Holland, J. (1993), *Echoing emergence: Objectives, Rough Definitions, and Speculations for Echo-class Models*, Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA, Santa Fe Institute.
- Hubbert, M. K. (1962), *Energy resources: a report to the Committee on Natural Resources* (Vol. 4), Washington, DC, National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council.
- Interview (2013a), [Interview with Senior Manager at SlotssøBadet, 11 November 2013].
- Interview (2013b), [Interview with Senior Manager at SlotssøBadet, 25 October 2013].
- Jennings, G. R. (2010), *Theoretical Paradigms Underpinning Tourism Research* (2nd ed.), Brisbane, John Wiley and Sons.
- Kjaersgaard, M. G. (2012), Serendipity and business development – Design anthropological investigations at The Post, Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association Conference 2012 , The State Of Our Union.
- Liburd, J. J. (2010), Introduction to Sustainable Tourism Development, In J. J. Liburd & D. Edwards (Eds.), *Understanding the sustainable development of tourism*, (pp.), Oxford, Goodfellow Publishers, 1-18
- Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. H., Randers, J., & Behrens III, W. W. (1972), *The Limits to Growth: A Report to The Club of Rome*, New York, Universe Books.
- Minnemann, S., & Harrison, S. (1998), Negotiating Right Along: An Extended Case Study of the Social Activity of Engineering Design, In A. B. Duffy (Ed.), *The Design Productivity Debate* , Springer London, 32-50.
- Presentation (2013), [SDU wellcome Den 30th, Sep. 2013].
- Sarantakos, S. (2005), *Social Research* (Third ed.), Houndsmill, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sivacek, J., & Crano, W. D. (1982), Vested interest as a moderator of attitude–behavior consistency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43(2), 210-221.
- Statistics Denmark. (2013), Statbank – Tourism, Available at <http://www.statbank.dk/statbank5a/selectvarval/define.asp?PLanguage=1&subword=tabel&MainTable=TURIST&PXSID=162717&tablestyle=&ST=SD&buttons=0>, Accessed on 17 October 2013.
- UNEP and UNWTO. (2005), *Making Tourism More Sustainable - A Guide for Policy Makers*, Paris, France, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).
- UNWTO. (2010), *Joining Forces – Collaborative Processes for Sustainable and Competitive Tourism*, Madrid, Spain, United Nations World Tourism Organisation (WTO).
- Wheeller, B. (2005), *Ecotourism/egotourism and development Nature-based tourism in peripheral areas: Development or disaster*.
- Workshop (2013), [Co-design Workshop with SlotssøBadet staff, 18 November 2013].
- Yin, R. (2005), *Case study research: Design and methods*, Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE.