Sustainable Tourism through Networking and Collaboration

Module 3:
Sustainable tourism benefits to cultural heritage

Module 3. Sustainable tourism benefits to cultural heritage

Table of contents

Key words
Cultural heritage, image, tourism business, management, protection, proximity tourism

Learning objectives	*As a result of engaging with the materials in this module, learners are intended to achieve the following learning outcomes:* *Knowledge: the objective of this module is for readers to gain knowledge about the importance of the tourism image of a company from the point of view of culture and heritage, taking into account the expansion experienced by these concepts in recent years and its widespread introduction in the tourism sector.* *Skills: Improved ability to introduce the cultural heritage in a tourism product and make it ready for visiting. Particular attention is paid to the need to organize tourist visits in a way allowing tourists to interpret the heritage they are visiting.* *Competencies: encourage the need to protect cultural heritage, as the main base of tourism resources and the physical support of tourism activity for tourism MSEs.*
Methods	*Autonomous learning by reading and studying the course materials and the complementary sources and links provided in the materials*
Time schedule	*Time necessary for:* *Learning content (self-study): 1.5 hours* *Self-assessment questions: 5 minutes* *Additional time (depending on learners) is required to complete the learning activities and review complementary sources and links*

Introduction

This module includes three units related to tourism management in which emphasis is placed on three aspects linked to culture and heritage that are key to the business of tourism MSEs, such as the image of the company, the management of visits, and the need to protect heritage as an essential condition for the proper functioning of tourism.

In the first unit, the starting idea is the need to conceive the heritage of a destination not as something isolated, disconnected from its environment, but the opposite, as something that includes all the resources present in the destination, or at least those that can somehow contribute to the tourism sector. Therefore, we talk more about "territorial heritage" and not so much about "cultural heritage". The unit also addresses the issue of the image and the importance of any tourism MSE incorporates this global vision of the territory where they carry out their activity. However, the creation of a tourism image is very complex, since many variables intervene, each with its own importance, although it is also undeniable the weight that social networks have today, of which a special mention is made.

In the second unit, the starting point is that one of the main objectives of cultural heritage management must be its conservation, and that it is essential to make a correct management with the visits organised around it. In addition, the inclusion and commitment of the involved agents is essential: institutional, cultural, businesses, local population. That is, the "empowerment" of the local community. The best way to make heritage visits more profitable for tourism MSEs is to count on the local community, as it is the one that best known. The heritage, is part of it and also, the transformation that results from further development of tourism can not only end up generating benefits but also damages. Thus, the unit includes a few criteria so that the management of the visits to the territorial heritage is more effective and both the community and tourism MSEs come out benefitting, (a "win-win" approach).

Finally, in the third unit the basic idea is that cultural heritage must be seen as a resource to be protected and also as a reflection of the degree of quality and diversity of any tourism enterprise with a strong anchorage in the destination. The process of "touristification" of the territory means that today many more people are visiting many more places than before, so the worst possible scenario for the conservation of heritage is a mass with an incorrect management. The case of "proximity tourism" is also mentioned as an example of a "new" tourism modality that would fit with the principles of sustainable tourism and facilitate the insertion of secondary heritage in a tourism MSEs market with much closer potential customers.

Content

3.1. Presenting the culture and heritage: an image of a tourism enterprise

The expansion in recent decades of tourism based on culture and heritage - both material and immaterial, human and natural, has served to place on the "tourism map" many destinations with serious difficulties to gain a foothold in an increasingly competitive market. This is so because within

the concepts of "culture" and "heritage" there can be included a broad typology of resources and activities, some of which have always had this label, while others have not been recognised as such until more recently. At the same time, these elements have become basic and fundamental from the point of view of the image of a territory, its identity and its economic development, in general, and also, more particularly, from the point of view of tourism (Ashworth & Howard, 1999). Here we could mention the industrial heritage, geotourism, wine tourism or the extensive rural heritage, to name just a few examples. The construction of the heritage of a society has now acquired a new dimension and, therefore, it has reached a point where any element or resource present in a territory can end up from the perspective of heritage.

On the other hand, since we have been witnessing for some time how tourism destinations have been gaining more prominence as places that are driven to put their singularities in the foreground, we tend to value all those elements that serve to differentiate a destination from others. In this context of absolute and total "heritagization", it makes more sense the idea of speaking of "territorial heritage" instead of "cultural heritage", as something detached from its environment. This is much more evident when we are referring to places that in many cases do not have a well-known heritage nor that stands out much more than the rest. It is with this idea that it is easier to understand other geographical reading of heritage, which forms part of a more global development strategy and, of course, a more business-oriented strategy. And this without forgetting the singularities of the territory that, from a business point of view, will have to be considered if a certain degree of success in the tourism business wants to be achieved.

As long as the heritage and culture currently are able to attract specific segments of demand and they also generate new tourism practices, (or if they are not so new, they can enhance the existing ones), they have been incorporated into the tourism offer of the destinations. These destinations, in turn, have to include different variables, such as competitiveness, image, and sustainability, that in some cases they are not very used to do it. In this new context of greater competitiveness and differentiation, a specific terminology that should contribute to the diffusion and improvement of the image of the destinations and tourism businesses, makes more sense. We are referring, for example, to the increasingly widespread practice of promoting and selling "tourism experiences".

Probably in many situations the image of **tourism MSEs** is not a matter that is taken into account, until the business is already underway, and even then it is likely that it occupies an ancillary position in the list of priorities of the entrepreneur, usually more concerned with other more urgent issues, in the very short term, when the image is usually something that yields results rather in the medium and long term (Liu, 2017). From that it follows that **tourism MSEs** may not get the most out of their image, although in a sector such as tourism, which includes elements such as accommodation of various types, travel agencies and other intermediaries, equipment, catering, activities of an increasingly broad typology, etc., the image is fundamental from the first moment.

The image of any **tourism MSE** will have to incorporate, among others, the degree of involvement of the entrepreneur with the territory where he/she is carrying out his/her activity, and the values that he/she is wishing to transmit. Of course, an essential condition is that the entrepreneur knows the territory, not only he/she lives in it, but he/she also knows very well the tourism potential and the limits of the territory, the maximum capacity to host tourism activities and assimilate their possible impacts, (both positive and negative and of whatever kind). (See Module 4 for the concept of carrying capacity). In other words, any **tourism MSE** must have as one of its highest priorities the

coherence between what the territory offers, (that we should not forget, it is its main resource base), and what it gives back: visitors, tourists, income, employment, image, knowledge, dissemination and appreciation of heritage, among other aspects.

Why is the issue of the image of a company so important? From the outset we must bear in mind that the tourism image has been recognized as one of the elements that most influence the competitiveness of a tourism destination. In the current context that is characterised by the fact that nothing is permanent or stable, it is important that companies achieve a good competitive advantage, by offering products and activities that are difficult to imitate and that endure over time. Getting a good image can be an effective way of positioning and differentiation in the market.

It is important that the image of the companies in the sector be able to transmit confidence and reliability, the perception in the consumers that they are not going to make mistakes when they hire the service and that they do not have the feeling that they have wasted their time traveling. After all, as the "touristification" of the territory has reached levels never seen before (Urry & Larsen, 2012), the competition is so high that the consumers may have serious difficulties in deciding on one or another offer. Consequently, in addition to variables such as trust, reliability, credibility, or transparency among others, we must also incorporate the singularity. This singularity can be given by that territorial heritage that has been previously mentioned, that can be adapted to the demands of tourism or at least contribute to them to a high degree. Taking into account that the image is the representation of a territory, as well as of a company, image should have a connection to the idea or perception that consumers themselves have been able to create, previously to the commercialisation of the destination, its products, heritage and culture in general.

The tourism agents must be able to create the tourism image of the destination in order to persuade tourists in their decision making. However, the creation of a tourism image is a fairly complex process and it could include aspects such as impressions, ideas, expectations or beliefs that people have from a set of elements that in one way or another the destination is disseminating. Moreover, it has to be considered the fact that each individual captures the information in a different way, processes it from past experiences or previous aspects to end up creating his/her final and ideal image. Thus, **tourism MSEs** can benefit from this "influential" factor to promote their destination, taking into account that the global image of the destination that each individual creates is often stereotyped, and at the same time it is also shared by all the people who do not live in the place.

On the other hand, in the process of creating the image there must also take into consideration other agents who do not have to be directly related to the tourism sector, such as journalists, communication companies, or people who express their opinions or experiences about the destination and that they can exert a great influence, (they could be called "influencers"). It would seem that the means and platforms through which to promote the image of the destination and of the companies, nowadays are numerous, varied, local or foreign, with different forms of working, but at the same time complementary.

In the current context, the Internet and social networks undoubtedly play a fundamental role in the creation and dissemination of images, also contributing to modify the way in which destinations relate to their potential tourists (Munar *et al*., 2013). In fact, social networks have already become an indispensable tool in the promotion and revitalisation of heritage and tourism based on this heritage in any destination. Users no longer only look for information but also create it, and they

share content. Therefore, social networks are decisively influencing the way in which the destination communicates its image due to the strategic factor required by this new digital scenario.

Although tourism promotion involves the transmission of information from the responsible organisations to potential tourists, this scenario requires specialised knowledge and attention to the transformations generated by the emergence of new information and communication technologies (Gössling, 2017). Starting from the idea that it is inconceivable the existence of any tourist without access to a social network, or that does not have a personal profile in more than one, it is essential to know how those networks work, what they are for, and how to make good use of them. For example, Facebook and Google+ are conceived as entertainment networks, LinkedIn has a rather professional profile; Twitter would work as a microblogging, while Instagram, Flickr and Pinterest have become popular as basically image networks. Whatever it is, the reach of any social network is undeniable today.

Social networks and the Internet allow us to obtain a large amount of data coming from their impact on tourists. For a **tourism MSE**, the creation of a virtual community integrated by a group of people with common interests can help the customer loyalty. After all, the function of a social network is to operate in three areas: communication, (platform where knowledge sharing), community, (users groups), and cooperation, (between managers and users as well as between them).

As a result of the importance that social networks are acquiring in the field of tourism in general and the dissemination of culture and heritage in particular. It is very common that many destinations have different profiles that end up converging in the content to be able to offer the visitor a more representative and attractive global image of the destination. From all this we can deduce the enormous importance that new variables have gained for the image of any **tourism MSE**, and by extension also that of the destination where it carries out its activity. We are referring to variables such as the digital marketing strategies to be implemented, the e-branding, the possibilities of creating an intelligent destination, the penetration capacity of social networks and, ultimately, the fundamental role of a professional profile that responds to that of ICT Manager. However, despite this, we should not rule out, much less, the role that the word-of-mouth continues to have today, that one speaks well of a company or a destination.

Learning activity 3.1:

Describe, briefly, the image of your company, what it intends to symbolise and what messages it intends to convey.

Have you ever compared the image the company wants with the one perceived by tourists?
If so, what conclusions reached?
If not, would that be a good idea? How could you make such a comparison?

Is the concern with the protection of cultural heritage clear in the company's image? If not, should it be clearer?

3.2 Managing and promoting visits to local communities and culturally / historically sensitive sites

One of the main objectives of cultural heritage management - both tangible and intangible - must be its conservation, (or at least a significant sample of it), with future generations in mind (Fusco & Nijkamp, 2016). However, it must also seek an appropriate presentation and interpretation of its value for the present generations, through methodologies that serve to transmit the message of said value, both to visitors and also to the local community itself, since sometimes the latter is the first to ignore that value. Culture is a very important variable of any territory and for any sustainable development model, because culture influences human relations, consumer behaviour, interaction with the environment, etc. Therefore, sustainable tourism cannot be culturally neutral and consequently any cultural heritage management exercise will require an understanding of the specific characteristics of the traditional development model of the territory and its community, demographic particularities, identity, diversity, social changes that have taken place over time, present and future community challenges, etc. For that, probably the most feasible is the inclusion and commitment, in a more direct or indirect way, of the stakeholders involved: institutional (e.g. local government), cultural, entrepreneurs, local population, etc. (Strzelecka *et al.*, 2017). In this sense, it is essential to count on the local community itself and, in addition to count on the knowledge it has of the place, (it is a first-hand information source), since it is assumed that the development and promotion of tourism through local cultural heritage is done to its own benefit (Murphy, 1985). Therefore, a certain component of ethics also intervenes here from the moment that the community has to receive the expected benefits of the introduction and/or enhancement of tourism, but also the damages that derive from this.

In the field of cultural tourism, the premise is that any trip is "cultural" since tourists have the opportunity to acquire an experience from another territory that, although it may be more or less similar to their daily environment, it is different. Certainly, the more different one environment from the other, what we would call "cultural distance", the tourist experience can be more intense. Therefore, the authenticity of the tourism product is fundamental and would also explain that certain activities included in the more generic label of "cultural tourism" are currently booming (community tourism, ethno tourism, agritourism, ecotourism, etc.).

However, this sought authenticity is not directly related to that aforementioned cultural distance. Many times, and as discussed in the next unit, the tourist may wish to find it in nearby environments, from a geographical point of view, and at the same time distant in terms of their level of knowledge, economic model, lifestyle, landscape, etc. In other words, for a person who resides in a big city and is not used to traveling, it can be so "exotic" to take the plane or a cruise to another continent as to take the car for a weekend stay in a rural accommodation relatively close to where he/she lives, and participate in the most daily productive activities, (milking cattle, pruning fruit trees, harvesting, etc.).

Just the unknown can be the basis for a more authentic tourism experience and one of the keys to make it possible is a good management of the tourism product, but also of the visits organised around it. In this sense, in addition to the role that the public administration must have in relation to heritage, (restoration, protection, maintenance), **tourism MSEs** are the responsible stakeholders for the correct and effective heritage management, those that can guarantee benefits for the destination, (not only in economic, but also in social and environmental terms). For this, **tourism MSEs** may take into account some aspects such as the following:

- Since the tourist may wish to know the local history and culture, it should be kept in mind the material heritage resources such as: important buildings, (of whatever kind and function), production centres, popular architecture, diverse craftsmanship in its many forms, clothing, pottery, metal work, painting, etc.).
- It has also to be supported the preservation of the traditional aspects of culture, (personal stories, legends, experiences, and other aspects more related to the intangible heritage such as religious manifestations, traditions, beliefs, music, dance, gastronomy, markets, folklore, etc.), and contribute to the research on the community's past, its customs, etc.
- Encourage meetings or a more authentic contact between the local community and the tourist, that is, that the tourist does not end up having an experience neither decontextualised nor, above all, trivial or superficial. Of course, in order for this to be possible, the tourism company must procure as much as possible local jobs, and also provide the necessary training, as already pointed out in Module 2. After all, tourism, independently of its modality, it is a sector that is fundamentally based on the quality of the provision of a service and an experience, and behind it there are people who have to deal with people.
- The management of the cultural heritage of a destination - not strictly local - should also ensure that the tourism movement - and the resulting impacts - do not focus on a single node (or a few). Since it is often mentioned the need to introduce the territorial context in which heritage is framed, the most logical is the creation of products that include resources, perhaps of less interest, that are dispersed along the destination, that encourage tourists to move around. It would be like the creation of "antennas" from a centre of greater interest that acts as "magnet" or main attraction pole.
- From the point of view of the visit, in addition to the qualities required for good guidance, it is necessary to plan a visit as a whole, (e.g. the design of the content, timing, introductory and closing talks), and especially the tourist's opportunities to interpret what is taught (the heritage interpretation). It should not be forgotten that in cultural tourism interpretation implies enriching and making the visit a comprehensible experience for the tourist; and this forces the guide or company to bring the visitor closer to the local reality that he/she visits and for which he/she allocates time and resources.
- Since we are talking about sustainable tourism, **tourism MSEs** must have the ethical dimension as one of their priorities. This can be translated into: codes of behaviour for visits to sensitive places, non-sale or exhibition of elements not allowed by law, contribute to the protection of "sensitive" places and not prevent access to local residents, not jeopardise the provision of basic services for the community, (water, energy, sanitation, etc.), among other considerations.

Learning activity 3.2:

*To what extent is the provision of more authentic tourist experiences a concern of the management of your company? Is this concern clearly reflected in the tourism products offered? Can you identify, taking into account the aspects considered above, the **two** main aspects that still need to be developed in your company at this regard? How could you do it?*

3.3 Protecting cultural heritage

From the point of view of sustainability, nowadays no business is conceived, neither from a **tourism MSEs** perspective, without keeping in mind the maintenance of the resource base that makes it possible, or at least that the negative impacts that are generated are assumable by all. As a result, cultural heritage must be seen as a resource to be protected and it should also be understood as a relevant piece of the degree of quality and diversity of any tourism project or business with a strong anchorage in the destination.

Following the premise of the "touristification" cited above, it is clear that today many tourism destinations that base their main offer on cultural heritage receive a growing influx of visitors, whether tourists or just day visitors. Therefore, it can be affirmed without being wrong that they have entered fully into the circuit of mass tourism. Although it would not be necessary to relate automatically the masses of visitors with negative impacts towards the conservation and protection of the heritage resources, the certain thing is that to deny this it would be to take a wrong position. In other words, although bad management has a higher influence than a large number of visitors, both variables in the same equation, is surely the worst possible scenario if we talk about sustainability, conservation and protection of those resources that make possible the tourism business (Robinson & Picard, 2006; Afric & Urosevic, 2017). Of course, the fact of having a label that indicates the degree of interest and importance of a resource does not guarantee, far from it, a good management or that it is safe from the negative impacts that derive from an "uncontrolled" tourism activity. The most significant example of this would be UNESCO's list of endangered world heritage. However, we do not have to go to these examples of world-renowned cultural heritage, since on a local scale we would find many more cases.

Since heritage tourism resources, both tangible and intangible, are located in a certain place, it is not logical that they are commercialised in a decontextualised, "deterritorialised", manner. That is to say, it would not be understood if it was explained or valued by separating it from the processes of social construction of the territory of which they are a part, or from their geographic and cultural context. For example, it does not make sense to explain the operation of an old factory or mine -as an industrial heritage resource without referring to the historical, economic, and territorial factors that led to its existence, nor to the demographic, social, environmental impacts that its functioning and existence generated. Here is where **tourism MSEs** play a key role, as they are very close to the territory where they carry out their activity. Therefore, the concepts of territory, culture and heritage must be managed under a same perspective when implementing tourism projects in terms of sustainability. However, the preservation of cultural heritage happens, not because of its non-use, but rather the opposite, due to the use and obtaining of certain benefits, (not limited to the strictly economic one). The conservation and valorisation of the heritage appears as the best guarantee, rather than conservation itself, (Richards, 2007).

We must bear in mind that the reasons why cultural heritage has now become an object of protection – on different scales - are also the same ones which also motivate the visit of tourists: exceptionality, unique character, prestige, image, etc. However, we should also differentiate here between different types of heritage. On the one hand, the one is known as worldwide, that attracts millions of people and that has its own problems (management, conservation). On the other hand, the immense cultural heritage of a much more modest character that we find scattered throughout the territory and with its inclusion in the economic resources base of a territory, is what has given rise to talk about the process of "touristification" in all its meaning. It is the latter that could start from a situation, in principle, more advantageous from the point of view of its conservation, but at

the same time unfavourable from the perspective of its protection. This apparent contradiction would be explained as follows: on the one hand, as it is a "new" or little known tourism heritage, it has not been receiving a large number of visitors, so the footprint that the activity has left is scarce or null (for the good and for the bad). However, it is also true that many times that heritage that is not known beyond the local environment, and that has received little attention from the local managers, ends up being a heritage that is not valued and therefore not worthy of a certain degree of protection and even less, conservation.

The debates on the conservation and protection of the cultural heritage should not go the separate ways of those that take place on their enhancement and productive reuse, since a purely economic approach has often proved to be unsustainable. In the same way, a strictly "conservationist" approach does not lead anywhere either. In a certain way, it is necessary to recognise that the future of an immense part of the cultural heritage depends, to a greater or lesser extent, on tourism (McKercher & Du Cros, 2009). This does not imply not being able to consider a new framework of relations between the cultural heritage, its due protection, the territory, its society and tourism agents, tourism and new ways of using the heritage and "touristizing" the territory.

From this point of view, and since there is more and more talk of alternative models of growth and economic development, seen as absolutely necessary today, then why not transfer this idea to tourism and contribute to the creation and implementation of new products or activities that are based on the respectful use of cultural heritage and also contribute to its protection? An example of this would be the so called "proximity tourism", linked to the concept of "slow tourism", and of which lately there is a growing number of experiences, (Fullagar *et al.*, 2012). Tourism is an activity that allows people to live different experiences from the usual ones in places different from the usual ones, and the globalisation of information facilitates a better knowledge of distant territories than of those closest to where people live. On the contrary, the basis of the proximity tourism is that the offer of places close to the visitors themselves and at the same time unknown, favours the revaluation of the daily spaces and with it a modest, but more sustainable, process of local development, and the need to conserve and protect the local cultural heritage.

In addition, this new concept of tourism closer to the territory and people would also facilitate the insertion in the tourism market of those elements of heritage that have never deserved special attention from anyone, not even by the community itself. In a certain way, it would be like putting into value what is most daily, not only the heritage itself but also the landscape and the economic activities that have been modelling it over time. It would also be the denial, in part, of what is often said that not all the heritage is or has to be of tourist interest. Without denying this premise at all, what is intended is that even those elements that are not considered interesting are included in a product that stands out more for its overall, for the whole, and not so much for the relevance of a very specific element to the detriment of the interest of the others. In other words, that those less known heritage elements do not remain hidden.

In this sense, and setting the example of wine tourism, so widespread today in many countries, for a **tourism MSE** that bases its main activity in the production of wines but that it does not produce prestigious brands and is not well known beyond its region, perhaps the most suitable for expanding its business, in addition to the traditional visit to the winery and wine tasting, could be: the inclusion of elements of rural heritage of little interest on their own (e.g. traditional rural architecture); making people participate in certain agricultural tasks (e.g. picking the grapes during the harvest

period); offering tours around the area that explain how the geophysical elements (climate, soil, etc.) can contribute to the obtaining of a certain type of wine; getting to know traditions related to the wine production; etc.

Learning activity 3.3:

Would it be interesting to put into practice the idea of "proximity tourism" in the offer of your company?
What impacts could it have locally and at the sustainability level?

Useful links	https://en.unesco.org/themes/protecting-our-heritage-and-fostering-creativity%20 *UNESCO's website on the need to protect heritage and encourage creativity.*
	https://www.icomos.org/en/ *Website of the International Council on Monuments and Sites, organization whose main objective is the promotion of theory, methodology and technology applied to the conservation, protection and enhancement of monuments and sites of cultural interest.*
	https://www.interreg-central.eu/Content.Node/6-cultural-final.pdf *This is a booklet that was financed by the Central Europe Program under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and introduced to the CENTRAL EUROPE story, showcasing 18 cultural heritage projects that were co-financed in the period 2007-2013.*
	https://www.europarc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/2012-Parks-and-Benefits-COLLECTION-OF-EXAMPLES-IN-THE-FIELD-OF-SUSTAINABLE-TOURISM.pdf *List of sustainable tourism experiences of EUROPARC Federation, the umbrella organization for Europe's protected natural areas.*
	http://www.slowtourism-italia.org/en/aboutus/ *Italian website that promotes slow tourism and proximity tourism.*

Summary of key points

• Cultural heritage must be seen as a resource to be protected and it should also be understood as a relevant piece of the degree of quality and diversity of any tourism project or business with a strong anchorage in the destination.

• Within the concepts of "culture" and "heritage" there can be included a broad typology of resources and activities, some of which have always had this label, while others have not been recognised as such until more recently.

• The image of any tourism MSE will have to incorporate, among others, the degree of involvement of the entrepreneur with the territory where he/she is carrying out his/her activity, and the values that he/she is wishing to transmit.

• Any tourism MSE must have as one of its highest priorities the coherence between what the territory offers and what it gives back: visitors, tourists, income, employment, image, knowledge, dissemination and appreciation of heritage, among other aspects.
• Tourism MSEs, jointly with public administrations, are the responsible stakeholders for the correct and effective heritage management, those that can guarantee benefits for the destination.
• Proximity tourism can facilitate the insertion in the tourism market of those elements of heritage that have never deserved special attention from anyone, not even by the community itself.

Integrative learning activity for Module 3: Position Paper

Systematise the reflections you made while engaging with the module materials. Outline the aspects, which need to be considered for your enterprise to improve its sustainability performance.

Indicative structure:
1.General awareness of the sustainable tourism benefits to cultural heritage and the way your company implements it;
2. Identification of the most relevant cultural resources and heritage in your company environment, using the Resource-mapping Tool;
2. Strengths of your company for protecting cultural heritage and identity;
3. Weaknesses hindering the progress towards a more sustainable performance;
4. Identification of the aspects that need to be improved. Do you have any immediate ideas on how to do it? If yes, list them. If not, proceed with the other Sustain-T modules. Structured around the GSCT Criteria, they may inspire such ideas.

Bibliography

1.	Afric, K., & Urosevic, N. (2017). Valorisation of Cultural Heritage in Sustainable Tourism. *Management*, *12(3)*, 199-215.
2.	Ashworth, G., & Howard, P. (1999). *European Heritage, Planning and Management.* Bristol: Intellect.
3.	Fullagar, S., Markwell, K.W., & Wilson, E. (eds.) (2012). *Slow Tourism. Experiences and Mobilities*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
4.	Fusco, L., & Nijkamp, P. (2016). *Cultural Tourism and Sustainable Local Development*. London & New York: Routledge.
5.	Gössling, S. (2017). Tourism, Information Technologies and Sustainability: an Exploratory Review. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(7), 1024-1041.
6.	Liu, Y.Y. (2017). Destination Images for Marketing Sustainable Tourism Destinations. *Economy & Business Journal, 11(1)*, 520-525.

7.	McKercher, B., & Du Cros. H. (2009). *Cultural Tourism: the Partnership between Tourism and Cultural Heritage Management*. London: Routledge.
8.	Munar, A.M., Gyimóthy, S., & Liping, C. (eds.) (2013). *Tourism Social Media: Transformations in Identity, Community and Culture*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
9.	Murphy, P.E. (1985). *Tourism: a Community Approach*. London & New York: Methuen.
10.	Richards, G. (2007). *Cultural Tourism: Global and Local Perspectives*. New York, London & Oxford: The Haworth Hospitality Press.
11.	Robinson, M., & Picard, D. (2006). *Tourism, Culture and Sustainable Development*. Paris: Unesco.
12.	Strzelecka, M., Bynum, B.B., & Woosnam, K.M. (2017). Place Attachment and Empowerment: Do Residents Need to be Attached to be Empowered?. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *66*, 61-73.
13.	Urry, J., & Larsen, J. (2012). *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*. London: Sage.

Glossary	
Cultural heritage	*It is a concept loaded with subjectivism and that is dynamic over time, it does not depend so much on the objects or goods that could be included, but on the values that society attributes to them in each moment of history, and that determine which goods are those that must be protected and preserved for posterity.*
Cultural heritage management	*Set of actions and procedures implemented by organisations, entities and companies in order to maintain the values of cultural heritage for the enjoyment of present and future generations. In addition, the management must try to present this heritage in a way that serves to convey the message of the importance of the value of heritage through the construction of a general awareness among society.*
Touristification	*Process by which nowadays any territory is of tourism interest, which would reflect that tourism has ended up by "appropriating" all the resources present in a territory and converts them into tourism products.*
Proximity tourism	*That tourism that is based on the offer of places close to the visitors themselves but at the same time unknown, (the unknown does not have to be very far), and that favours the revaluation of the daily spaces, and with that a modest and also sustainable process of local development.*
Destination image	*The perception that a tourist has of a destination based on criteria of knowledge, affinity or affectivity. The expression of all the knowledge, impressions, prejudices and emotional thoughts that an individual has about a particular place.*

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This document reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

13

| Social networks | Structures that represent a set of individuals, entities, organisms, that are interrelated and that share interests and contents in the form of information, files, photos, audios, music, videos, etc. |

Sustain-T

2017-1-ES01-KA202-038128

WWW.SUSTAIN-T.EU