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1 Why is tourism not an evolutionary science?
Understanding the past, present and future of destination evolution

Patrick Brouder, Salvador Anton Clavé, Alison Gill and Dimitri Ioannides

Introduction

More than a century ago, Thorstein Veblen (1898) famously asked 'Why is economics not an evolutionary science?'. At its core, Veblen's paper of the same name questioned the dominant thinking of the day that economic systems tended towards equilibrium, arguing instead that economies evolve over time. Thus, it is not enough to merely describe the economy, but rather conceptualize it in terms of long-term change processes and development (Boulton 2010). While the study of economic systems has slowly opened up to account for Veblen's ground-breaking thinking, there is no denying that the epistemological parameters of classical economics still dominate scholarship on economic systems well over 100 years later.

Evolutionary economics has emerged as an important part of economic studies in recent decades (Dosi and Nelson 1994), and its natural progression to economic geography was heralded as recently as 1999 in Boschma and Lambooij's crossover paper 'Evolutionary economics and economic geography' (Boschma and Lambooij 1999). In the decade which followed, many geographers presented the case for a distinct sub-discipline of 'Evolutionary Economic Geography' (EEG), where 'we start from the definition of economic geography as dealing with the uneven distribution of economic activity across space. An evolutionary approach specifically focusses on the historical processes that produce these patterns' (Boschma and Frenken 2011: 286).

EEG has had a marked influence on economic geographers, prompting certain observers to ask whether this amounts to 'yet another turn' in the subject's progression, following so-called turns such as the critical turn and relational turn (Grabher 2009). Empirical research has delivered results in studies of industrial clusters and regions with historical legacies in manufacturing (e.g. Klepper 2007), clearly focusing on the regional level (e.g. Neffke et al. 2011). The Handbook of Evolutionary Economic Geography was published in 2010 (Boschma and Martin 2010a) and the sub-field continues to be adopted by geographers working in various regional environments. Tourism appears to lend itself particularly well to an EEG empirical approach, especially within localities that depend heavily on this sector for their economic revival and diversification (Brouder 2014a).
Has tourism research been limited by a lack of an evolutionary perspective? Many tourism researchers have long been interested in the development of destinations over time, though they have resisted the temptation for simplistic modeling of destination development with early calls for multilinear models of tourism development (Coen 1979). The most influential model for the evolution of tourism destinations was put forward by Butler (1980) in the Tourist Area Life Cycle (TALC) Model. The primary concern of the TALC model was understanding resource management under conditions of increasing visitor numbers, but the stages of the model from exploration (in the early stage) to consolidation (during the peak stage) and beyond certainly implied ongoing evolutionary processes at work. EEG is one approach for helping academics understand change processes at the destination level and, as such, tourism geographers have become increasingly eager to utilize an EEG lens in their empirical studies.

This volume brings together a group of scholars who have been conducting research on tourism destinations using evolutionary approaches and, in particular, EEG perspectives. This introductory chapter offers an overview of EEG and tourism research to date and presents the empirical chapters that follow.

**Evolutionary economic geography**

Boschma and Martin (2010b) argue that EEG is a distinct sub-discipline in economic geography and not a subset of either neoclassical or institutional approaches. EEG research pays attention to the long-term processes of change in the spatial economy, with an empirical focus on individuals and firms at the regional level. EEG theorists have been inspired by Schumpeter (1934) and emphasize novelty and innovation through human creativity as the main drivers of economic evolution. Thus, there is a focus on knowledge creation and dissemination throughout firms and within regions. While knowledge creation is inherently a dynamic process, EEG theory also deals with long-term change and the barriers to dynamic knowledge creation are just as important as the aids.

EEG has three antecedent theoretical pillars on which it has developed: path dependence, complexity theory, and Generalized Darwinism (Boschma and Martin 2010b). Path dependence is an established area of research within economic geography (Arthur 1994; David 1997). It implies that history matters and that feedback loops in, for example, a region's economy become self-reinforcing over time. This can lead to increased product and market development for a particular sector and can result in increasing sectoral productivity and regional prosperity over time. However, path-dependent regional economic evolution also tends towards regional 'lock-in', whereby the processes of knowledge creation and sharing, regional institutions and political support for the dominant path tend to reinforce that path over time. Lock-in can prove successful for decades, but behind the overt success is a hidden change in the exposure of the regional economy — by placing all of the regional 'eggs in one basket'. This classic pattern of success followed by collapse is most notable in the former industrial regions of Europe and the 'rustbelt' of North America. Much of the research on EEG has been inspired by the 'industrial ruination' (Mah 2012), which has affected formerly prosperous regions, with scholars hoping to understand ways to break away from regional path-dependence before ruination occurs. As tourism has reached maturity in many destinations, the same worries relating to the negative outcomes of path dependence have become concerns of researchers but also locals. In many mass tourism destinations, tourism's status as a single-sector economy thus raises the specter of future regional ruination.

Martin and Sunley (2015:10) argue that 'local and regional economies are complex, multilayered systems, both connected to and in part also constitutive of their (competitive) environments, and that to understand fully their evolutionary development over time requires analysis of their multi-scalar and interdependent character'.

Entrepreneurs and labour operate in complex, multiple environments (e.g. social, cultural, technological, institutional, industrial), and these environments are interdependent and marked by reciprocal causality (Martin and Sunley 2015). Neither is any one sector self-contained and there is interaction between sectors as well as within sectors. While this point is obvious, it is important to remember since most empirical studies, and this is certainly the case in tourism studies, tend to be reduced to single-sector examinations. An evolutionary perspective opens up for broader conceptualizations, which may be incorporated into empirical studies. For example, the concept of co-evolution is utilized in EEG studies and shows that new paths may emerge endogenously and grow independently of the dominant path (or paths) while still interacting with those paths due to the complex environment at the regional level. Co-evolution within the region or between sectors thus negotiates the tension between the interdependent environments and the individual agencies.

The terminology of generalized Darwinism is the most obvious marker of EEG studies. Generalized Darwinism includes the concepts of novelty and continuity, variety, selection and retention. It is promulgated as a universal, multi-level approach to studies in social and economic evolution (Hodgson and Knudsen 2010). In EEG it is the widely used terminology for understanding how knowledge is constantly produced and reproduced in a given region. Some scholars argue that institutions are an important part of a generalized Darwinian framework of economic evolution (Essletzbichler 2009; Hodgson and Knudsen 2010), while others argue that the evolutionary project in economic geography cannot supplant institutional geography (Mackinnon et al. 2009). An important distinction in EEG (in comparison with other regional development frameworks, e.g. innovation systems and agglomeration economies) is that regions are not seen as units of selection, but rather as selection environments upon which evolutionary processes operate (Boschma and Martin 2010b). An important focus in generalized Darwinism is the desire for variety, in contrast to diversification per se, as a driver of regional innovation and growth. The distinction between variety and diversification centres on the idea that it is related variety, which is similar enough to other things going on
in the region that it is complementary without being in direct competition. This would lead to a situation which is optimal for regional development. This idea is readily applicable at the destination level since tourism is a sector made up of a number of related industries.

**Destination evolution**

Since the emergence of interest in studying tourism as an activity that creates and develops productive spaces, a range of significant studies on destination evolution has appeared (Saarinen 2004; see also Table 1.1). Pioneer approaches such as those of Gilbert (1939) were followed by further endeavours through the 1950s, which combined empirical and theoretical considerations within the frame of different regional academic traditions of tourism geography (especially the French, German and Anglo-American approaches). These analyses mainly focused on the role of tourism demand as the main driver of economic and spatial change (Wolfe 1952; Christaller 1964). Several models (e.g. Plog 1973; Doxey 1975; Miossec 1977; Stansfield 1978; Cohen 1979) revealed that the impacts of tourism are linked to specific stages of destination development. These frameworks also provided the ability to build in acceptance that destinations can experience processes of rejuvenation if they are able to adapt themselves to the changing habits and preferences of the visitors (see Pearce 1989). Parallel to this is a long tradition of empirical research, mainly focused on the analysis of the specific history of each destination. Usually these studies portray destination evolution as a process mainly caused by the growth in the number of tourists and by changes in the provision of services, facilities and infrastructure for tourists (see Brey et al. 2007 for a complete review).

Inspired by the aforementioned literature and, especially, the concept of the Product Life Cycle (Vernon 1966; Cox 1967), Butler’s TALC model (Butler 1980) appeared as a fundamental framework for analysing the evolution of destinations. The TALC model has been used to study a myriad of destination cases and has also been a source of inspiration for further conceptual work on destination development. For instance, Haywood (2006) has called for an adjustment of approach to how tourism scholars utilize the TALC, by arguing for the necessity to move away from the notion of changed stages or states and instead to focus on the actual processes of change. Others have sought to validate it (see Butler 2006a, 2006b) and to modify and extend it (Hovinen 1981; Haywood 1986; Cooper 1992; Getz 1992; Ioannides 1992; Benedetto and Bojanic 1992; Meyer-Arendt 1993; Agarwal 1997; Baum 1998; Priestley and Mundet 1998; Faulkner 2002; Russell and Faulkner 2004). The TALC has generated the most relevant destination evolution research stream. It is even more relevant than historical studies related to specific destinations (see, for instance, Walton 2000; Cirer 2005; and Battilani and Pature 2011).

Nevertheless, parallel to the adoption of the TALC model as a convenient theoretical framework, other longitudinal models have also been proposed since the 1980s. For example, the French analyst Chadefaud (1987) built a useful

---

**Table 1.1 Selected papers on destination evolution with approaches other than Evolutionary Economic Geography.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Main contribution</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>Changes and growth of the built-up area in seaside health resorts acting as residential population attractors with a spatial development perspective.</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfe</td>
<td>Interest on the processes of change of tourism destinations and its potential effects with special interest in second-home areas.</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christaller</td>
<td>Tourist flows and patterns explaining the spatial distribution of tourist places from a demand perspective.</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plog</td>
<td>Changes in the tourist market are related to subsequent changes in the destinations visited. Destinations decline is unpredictable and inevitable.</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doxey</td>
<td>Model suggesting that communities pass through a sequence of reactions as the impacts of tourism in a destination become more pronounced.</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miossec</td>
<td>Destination evolution is driven by the continuous adaptation of demand and supply with 5 phases from a pioneering stage to a congestion stage.</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stansfield</td>
<td>Seminal case-study about rejuvenation of tourism destinations. Rejuvenation is possible if destination emphasises its (unique) locational advantages.</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>Discussion of the need to conceive multilinear models of tourism development illustrated by an elaboration of MacCannell’s fundamental concepts.</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Seminal model – Tourism Area Life Cycle (TALC) – starting a long trend of research on the evolution of tourist-areas demand. Defines pattern and stages in the tourist area’s evolution.</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gormsen</td>
<td>Spatio-temporal model explaining common factors in the development of destinations over increasingly peripheral zones of the world.</td>
<td>1981, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chafeaou</td>
<td>The ‘collective myth’ – the mental representations of demand – as the driver of the tourism product’s evolution.</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Focus on development from a spatial perspective. Tourism development linked to urbanization process. Comparative spatial evolutionary model for contemporary beach resorts.</td>
<td>1991, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill</td>
<td>Uses growth theories to highlight importance of social and political processes in the evolution of resort destinations.</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agarwal</td>
<td>Exploration of the theoretical relationship between Butler’s TALC and the restructuring thesis.</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipe MIT</td>
<td>Distinction between types of spaces created by tourism and types of spaces transformed by tourism and exploration of links between them.</td>
<td>2002, 2005, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Main contribution</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavithroodorou</td>
<td>Theoretical model of tourism evolutionary patterns from an economic geography perspective, illustrating the interaction of market and spatial forces in destination evolution and development</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andriotis</td>
<td>Identification of the principal characteristics determining morphological change of coastal resorts in a predictable sequence of stages</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agarwal</td>
<td>Relevance of relational spatiality for spatial planning in coastal resort restructuring</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anton Clave</td>
<td>Categorization of different types of mature Mediterranean mass coastal destinations according to the (re) development strategies implemented by decision-makers</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>Paper positioning sustainable mass tourism as the desired outcome for most destinations. It defines three distinctive paths: the market-driven organic, the regulation-driven incremental, and the hybrid induced</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavlovich</td>
<td>Critique of the linear models of destination evolution based upon the concept of networks as rhizomic. Change as anti-hierarchical, self-organised and locally inspired</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clivaz et al.</td>
<td>Development of the concept of &quot;touristic capital&quot; of resorts in order to analyse their specific trajectories over time</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diachronic model to analyse the evolution of destinations/products based on the relationship between the dominant and dominated classes' mental representations (see Suchet 2015). The spatio-temporal model of Gormsen (1981, 1997) defined stages in temporal development of tourism in seaside resorts according to the following aspects, taking an evolutionary, global scope: availability of specific tourist services; source of capital for development; origin of supplies (local, regional or further afield); effects of tourist traffic; and the environmental stress imposed upon the coastal area. Additionally, Smith (1992) identified coastal-area tourism development as a process of urbanization that could be clearly defined in terms of physical expansion, functional diversification and environmental impacts.

Following in this vein, the new millennium has seen the appearance of several new contributions. For example, Agarwal (2002) framed the analysis of the destination evolution processes within the concept of restructuring, and Gill (2000) examined social and political dynamics in the evolution of a new mountain-resort destination. Building a comprehensive general theory of tourism development, the Equipe MIT (2002, 2005, 2011) in France strongly argued how tourism has the capacity to allow places to emerge with new systems of actors and new social and urban practices (see also Stock 2003). Parallel to this, Prideaux’s (2004) Resort Development Spectrum (RDS) related the evolution of destination resorts to long-term changes in demand, while Pavithroodorou (2004) theoretically explored the evolutionary patterns of destinations linking markets and spatial evolution. Additionally, Andriotis (2006) returned to the domain of morphological studies such as those of Meyer-Arendt (1993) and Smith (1992) and defined the morphological transformation of Mediterranean coastal destinations through a number of developmental stages. Beyond the specific value of each of these separate constructs, their most important contribution was their ability to introduce new perspectives to the issue of the evolution of destinations and to continue the debate about the utility, the limitations and the findings obtained from the well-established TALC model.

More recently, other approaches have appeared, reflecting that the evolution of destinations is highly dependent on enacting human agency. Anton Clave (2012a) categorized different types of mature Mediterranean mass coastal destinations according to the redevelopment strategies implemented by decision-makers. Clivaz et al. (2014) used the concept of 'tourist capital of resorts' to discuss how collective agency could generate a metamorphic dynamic able to facilitate the conversion of resorts into urban places. Pavlovich (2014) adopted the Deleuzian concept of networks as rhizomic, in the sense that they are anti-hierarchical and change can occur in an unexpected manner in any direction, and thus, through collaboration, network connections are fundamental in destination change. In notable contrast with other previous approaches, these contributions focus the analysis on the evolution of destinations as places instead of analysing changes of tourism in places. Also during this period, Weaver (2012) differentiated between organic, incremental and induced paths in mass tourism, and Agarwal (2012) went back to the restructuring approach. In her 2012 paper she utilizes Healey’s (2004) conceptualizations of space and place and explores the role of relational spatiality in destination restructuring.

All of the cited papers were produced with a general evolutionary (but non-dependency) interest and they illustrate how the study of destination development dynamics has been a relevant issue in tourism studies. Nevertheless, much has to be done to synthesize the diversity of concepts used by these authors in order to develop a coherent approach. However, taken together, they indicate the existence of certain key issues other than the evolution of demand, facilities and services that should be discussed when analysing destination evolution. Obviously, these approaches could also be linked to other tourism analysis perspectives, such as resilience (Tyrell and Johnston 2008; Calgaro et al. 2014; Lew 2014), the well-established research on sustainability development (Bramwell and Lane 2012) and tourism geography relational approaches (Pastras and Bramwell 2013), including, in this last case, the aforementioned research on destination regeneration as viewed from a relational perspective (Agarwal 2012).

In contrast with early frameworks focused on the role of demand in destination evolution, the most recent understanding of destination change includes the role of the social, economic and political context in enabling and constraining change processes. Both Haywood (2006) and Butler (2004) state that analysis needs to be
context specific to fully identify causes and effects of tourism destination evolution. Moreover, Agarwal (2005) points out that resort changes have to be examined in a global context, linking resort development with global change, local governance and collective action. Nevertheless, most models focus overwhelmingly on the evolution of tourism activities and in so doing they offer inadequate explanation of change dynamics at the destination level (Agarwal 1994). Thus, tourism destinations, like other places, evolve by means of dynamic processes, including the necessary mobility of people (not only tourists), of capital, of goods and of information (Jackson and Murphy 2002). Currently, most analyses acknowledge that it is not possible to study the evolution of destinations without also including social, cultural, economic, and environmental changes and challenges (Amin 2002). So, analyses of destination evolution need further conceptual development of the local and global contextual forces inducing change (Butler 2004; Agarwal 2005; Dodds 2007), and research must encompass the idea that destinations are complex places with residential, productive and social functions extending beyond tourism with co-evolving trajectories (Equipe MIT 2002).

Also, when analysing the evolution of destinations, researchers increasingly consider tourism development as a socially constructed process. According to Verbólo (2003: 152), tourism development might be 'seen as a dynamic, on-going social process, a constructed and negotiated social process that involves many social actors (individuals, groups and institutions) who continuously reshape and transform it to fit it to their perceptions, needs, values and agendas'. In this sense, as widely evidenced, research on destination evolution must focus on analysing the impact of stakeholders' decisions and interventions in response to either external or internal influences (Haywood 1986, 2006; Cooper and Jackson 1989; Ioannides 1992; Antón-Clivé 2012b; Pavlovic 2014; Clivé et al. 2015).

Furthermore, current approaches to tourism destination evolution tend to avoid the implicit determinism outlined by many initial demand-oriented evolution models. This determinism has been linked to the existence of a carrying-capacity threshold for a destination that, when reached, forces it to regenerate in order to survive. There are well-known cases of mature destinations that have been able to overcome declining paths and increase their ability to attract markets (Russett and Faulkner 2004; Aigüell et al. 2005; Ivars et al. 2013). A central lesson from these destinations is that renewed success and survival are the result of a shared strategic vision and the deep involvement of key stakeholders in the construction of an atmosphere of political, entrepreneurial and social consensus for new development. Forgetting this lesson could lead to incorrect forecasts about irreversible tendencies towards decline as has been the case in some of the best-known second-generation Mediterranean destinations (Knowles and Curtis 1999).

From a critical analysis approach, Stock (2003) further questions the existence of deterministic demand growth thresholds since the determining (and deterministic) impacts leading to decline are more of an ideological a priori than actual scientific observation. Stock claims that such a priori positioning comes from the frontal rejection of mass tourism, which many authors adopt (Stock 2003).

All in all, current developments point out the strong need to explore and discuss how these different perspectives are contributing to a deeper understanding of destination evolution and how research can move from the 'what' to the 'how' and 'why' (Brouder 2014b). Within tourism geography, Brouder and Eriksson (2013a) and Ma and Hassink (2013) have started to deal with the synergies between the TALC and EEG, while other authors have begun adopting certain EEG concepts as a way to better understand the specific mechanisms behind the evolution of destinations as places (e.g. Gill and Williams 2011, 2014).

EEG, which has been used to analyse the evolution of other specialized places and regions (Boschma and Frenken 2006; Boschma and Martin 2010a), is now emerging as a promising framework of tourism research in order to enhance understanding of 'how' and 'why' tourism destinations evolve over time (Ioannides et al. 2015). As is discussed in the following chapters of this volume, EEG has released within tourism studies the potential of powerful economic geography notions such as branching (Brouder and Eriksson 2013b), co-evolution (Brouder and Fullerton 2015; García-Cabrera and Durán-Herrera 2014; Ma and Hassink 2013; Larsson and Lindström 2014; Randelli et al. 2014), path creation (Gill and Williams 2011, 2014), path dependence (Bramwell and Cox 2009; Chen and Bao 2014; Ma and Hassink 2013; Williams 2013), path plasticity (Halikier and Therkelsen 2013) and survival (Brouder and Eriksson 2013b). Additionally, path creation and other economic geography approaches are also in the works, for example, with relational economic geography (Sanz-Ibáñez and Antón Clavé 2014) and, in attempts to determine the role of coupling between local and global stakeholders in destination evolution, with Global Production Network analysis (Niewiadomska 2014; Sanz-Ibáñez and Antón Clavé 2016). Moreover, specific research approaches to single types of tourism destinations have also been proposed, for example the dynamic and contested state of urban tourism (Brouder and Ioannides 2014).

To sum up, EEG concepts are creating a new framework to aid not only in understanding how destinations evolve over time, but also in interpreting the role of tourism as a way of accumulating capital in destinations and its implications in terms of the dynamics of economic variety, environmental (in)equity and social justice. EEG also highlights how transformations of destinations as places help them survive as communities. All in all, it can be argued that by incorporating an EEG lens in tourism research we can begin to respond to Britton's (1991: 466) critical perspective about the geography of tourism when he stated that 'by treating tourism almost solely as a discrete economic subsystem, many revealing links have been missed between tourism and other politically and theoretically important geographic issues which demonstrate the wider role and position of tourism in capitalist accumulation'. The eighteen papers already published on tourism and EEG (see Table 1.2) and the eight empirical chapters included in this volume are an initial attempt by tourism scholars to engage with EEG and, as shall be seen, a lot of important work has been done and has opened the door to further avenues of enquiry.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gill &amp; Williams</td>
<td>Case study of path dependence in Whistler Resort, Canada</td>
<td>Journal of Sustainable Tourism</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooder &amp; Eriksson</td>
<td>Regional Branching towards tourism in north Sweden's resource-based regions</td>
<td>Tourism Geographies</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma &amp; Hassink</td>
<td>Case study of path dependence and co-evolution in Gold Coast, Australia</td>
<td>Annals of Tourism Research</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elskjær &amp; Therkelsen</td>
<td>Path dependence and 'path plasticity' in Denmark's coastal tourism regions</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsgeographie</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooder &amp; Eriksson</td>
<td>Conceptual overview of the nexus of EEG and tourism studies</td>
<td>Annals of Tourism Research</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Understanding of tourism mobilities as path-depending or path-creating</td>
<td>Journal of Sustainable Tourism</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randelli et al.</td>
<td>Path creation and regional lock-in within rural tourism in Italy</td>
<td>Land Use Policy</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooder</td>
<td>Review of 'EEG and Tourism' sessions at AAG Meeting 2013</td>
<td>Tourism Geographies</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen &amp; Bao</td>
<td>Path dependence in the evolution of resort governance models in China</td>
<td>Tourism Geographies</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooder</td>
<td>Review of EEG and tourism papers to date and list of future research paths</td>
<td>Tourism Geographies</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Hall's (2011) work on why a lack of policy learning restricts the development of sustainable tourism governance over the long term. This central evolutionary question of learning in regions is also in focus in Carson and Carson’s study (Chapter 6), where institutional lock-in has limited the development of sustainable tourism. Carson and Carson acknowledge the inter-sectoral pressures of institutions in resource-dependent communities, but they also go deeper to show how intra-sectoral failures in tourism seem to be repeated over time as a lack of learning from the past limits the future. Thus, these three chapters show that learning is key for sustainable governance in tourism destinations and that only localized strategic learning leads to contextualized strategic action.

Complexity theory is also a major element of several of the chapters in this volume. Halkier and James (Chapter 2) and Meekes, Parra and de Roo (Chapter 9) choose to utilize a complex adaptive systems (CAS) approach in their studies. In Chapter 9 the authors attempt to merge notions of CAS with EEG concepts and to capture the CAS for tourism and recreation in one region of the Netherlands. While the study is more of a snapshot in time rather than a longitudinal study, the authors highlight the usefulness of evolutionary concepts such as self-organization and emergence in understanding complex change. At the same time, Halkier and James (Chapter 2) tie the extant studies on CAS in tourism (e.g., Farrell and Twinning-Ward 2004) to the emerging use of resilience approaches in tourism geography (Lev 2014). Halkier and James’s use of Boschma’s (2014) notions of adaptation and adaptability in regional resilience is of particular interest in understanding how complex change includes both short-term adjustment to circumstance and long-term strategic planning.

In Chapter 5, Sanz-Bláez, Wilson and Anton Clavé focus on key ‘moments’ in destination evolution, arguing that at certain points in time there is a clear and marked shift in a destination’s path trajectory and that analysing such shifts alongside and in addition to the general development trajectory over time will lead to a more nuanced understanding of human agency in destination evolution. Niewiadomska’s study (Chapter 7) examines the regional development implications of one key moment in Central and Eastern Europe – the post-communist opening of markets and the resultant influx of international hotel chains. By focusing on knowledge transfer, Niewiadomska shows how EEG concepts are useful in understanding how external knowledge helps to create new paths during hotel operations and, ultimately, how post-communist regions ‘de-lock’ themselves from their unproductive past.

Related to the concept of complexity discussed above, co-evolution features as an important theme of several chapters in this volume. In Chapter 4, Hassink and Ma present a research framework for co-evolution in tourism areas. They see co-evolution as a cognate concept to the TALC (Butler 1980), arguing that an understanding of co-evolution is not just necessary but, in fact, well suited to tourism-area analyses since such areas are marked by a myriad of products, sectors and institutions operating at various levels in a destination. Moreover, Hassink and Ma argue that co-evolution strengthens work on tourism regional innovation systems and so adds to the depth of understanding in tourism geography. Broader and Fullerton (Chapter 8) use the concept of co-evolution to interrogate the assumed unilinear development of tourism in the Niagara region of Canada. They argue that even within tourism in one small region there are multiple, co-evolving paths and that these distinct, albeit inter-related, paths have their own nuanced institutional environment. This intra-regional disjuncture means that sustainable tourism development is not optimized. While these studies do not engage deeply with generalized Darwinism, the presence of co-evolution in the empirical cases means there is scope for deeper engagement going forward.

In summary, we believe that the contributions to this volume are timely as concerns about the sustainability of maturing tourism destinations increase and as tourism development continues to expand to ever more communities and regions across the globalizing world. In the following chapters, the reader will find a set of research papers which explore long-term change in a diverse set of tourism destinations, with all studies drawing inspiration from EEG. The concluding chapter by Ioannides and Broader reflects on the evolution of tourism research over time and the central place EEG will have in the direction of future research.
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