



**AALBORG UNIVERSITY**  
DENMARK

**Aalborg Universitet**

## **Tourism and Governance**

Dredge, Dianne

*Published in:*  
Education for Sustainability in Tourism

*DOI (link to publication from Publisher):*  
[10.1007/978-3-662-47470-9\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-47470-9_5)

*Publication date:*  
2015

*Document Version*  
Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Dredge, D. (2015). Tourism and Governance. In G. Moscardo, & P. Benckendorff (Eds.), *Education for Sustainability in Tourism: A Handbook of Processes, Resources, and Strategies* (Vol. I, pp. 75-90). Springer Publishing Company. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-47470-9\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-47470-9_5)

### **General rights**

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 -

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at [vbn@aub.aau.dk](mailto:vbn@aub.aau.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Preprint version accepted for publication in:

G. Moscardo & P. Benckendorff (Eds.) (2015 forthcoming), *Education for sustainability in tourism: A handbook of processes, resources, and strategies*. New York: Springer.

## Chapter 5

# Tourism and Governance

**Dianne Dredge**

Department of Culture and Global Studies, Aalborg University, Denmark and Griffith University, Australia

dredge@cgs.aau.dk

### Abstract

This chapter discusses tourism education for sustainability with a particular focus on the challenges and opportunities associated with preparing students to work within complex tourism governance settings. It takes the position that the development of tourism within a sustainability framework requires that tourism professionals effectively engage in dynamic social discourses where difficult trade-offs are made between competing demands. The challenge for tourism education is therefore to prepare graduates to work in these complex, value-laden, socio-political environments where they can proactively and positively contribute to developing forms of tourism that progress the objectives of sustainable development. This chapter explores this challenge in terms of a philosophic tourism practitioner education, and in doing so, discusses three key dimensions of this education: historical antecedents and contemporary knowledge and understandings of governance; competencies for tourism governance for sustainability; and ethical action-oriented practice.

**Keywords:** tourism, governance, philosophic practitioner, ship of the state, sustainability, education

### Introduction

In an increasingly connected world, where governments, business and civil society actors operate within complicated dynamic power sharing arrangements, the capacity to implement sustainable development lies in navigating complex relationships, and in being able to operate effectively to take joint action. Herein lies the challenge of education for sustainability, tourism and governance: tourism education must prepare graduates to work collaboratively with complex multi-scalar problems and to be comfortable with change, uncertainty, ambiguity and competing demands. They must embrace the challenge of addressing the wicked problem

of sustainable development with creativity, commitment and an understanding of their own agency. This chapter discusses tourism education for sustainability with a particular focus on the challenges and opportunities associated with preparing students to work within complex tourism governance arrangements.

Contemporary interpretations of governance have established that the concept involves the development and co-ordination of relationships between the state, business and civil society in an effort to 'steer' socio-economic systems (cf. Rhodes 1997; Pierre 2000; Hall 2011; Ladeur 2004; Bramwell 2011). In this view, designing, managing and operating governance systems to pursue sustainable development requires much more than a technical education. It requires a philosophic practitioner education inspired by pragmatism and critical management studies. In this philosophic practitioner education students learn to draw from the ideas, theories and tools found in literature and to develop experiential and contextualized knowledge gained from action, discussion, reflection and knowledge sharing. Consequently, a tourism education for sustainability should equip learners with a balance of knowledge, skills and acting abilities so that they can operate in complex social settings to pursue sustainable development (cf. D. Schon 1983; Tribe 2002; Dredge et al. 2012; Ruwhiu and Cone 2010).

This chapter starts from the viewpoint that sustainable development discourses have historically oversimplified the complex dynamic nature of this challenge. Sustainable development has been treated as an object, an end point or goal, where discussions have taken place without full appreciation of the various on-going and heavily intertwined roles and responsibilities of government, business and civil society (Bramwell and Lane 2006). This chapter takes the position that the development of tourism within a sustainability framework requires more effective engagement in a dynamic social discourse where difficult trade-offs are made between competing demands (Voss et al. 2006). In other words, sustainable development is not an end point but a dynamic process involving the sharing of knowledge, reflection, communication and the building of trust and mutual respect between actors who have different roles and responsibilities, sources of power and access to resources. Achieving a type and form of tourism that contributes to sustainable development must therefore involve new forms of dynamic problem framing, and handling and joint action must occur on multiple fronts (Bell and Morse 2007).

In addressing the challenge of how education can facilitate tourism that contributes to sustainable development, this chapter argues that graduates who will one day take up these challenging roles need to be well versed in three key areas of a philosophic practitioner education:

- Knowledge about governance and sustainable tourism that brings together both local knowledge and global interconnections.
- Practitioner competencies in a range of knowledge building, communication, dispute resolution, capacity building techniques and so on.
- Ethical action-oriented practice that draws from pragmatism and critical reflexive thinking.

Describing and developing these three areas of education is the purpose of this chapter, but before doing so this chapter will first discuss linkages between education for sustainability, tourism and governance and make a case for why tourism education must tackle head on the challenge of governance.

## **Education for Sustainability, Governance and Tourism**

For many tourism researchers and practitioners, discourses that link sustainable development and tourism have made little difference due largely to the simplicity with which the challenge has been treated (Bell and Morse, 2007). Reductionist approaches<sup>1</sup> to studying sustainable development, which often remove the political dimension of the problem (i.e. the existence of multiple interests, competing agendas and power differentials), often have limited value in addressing the practical problems of how to manage tourism. The challenge of sustainable development necessarily involves trade-offs between competing economic, social and environmental priorities, between short and long term outcomes, and between individuals and collectives with varying interests and degrees of power. Education has tended to minimize attention to these complex political dimensions, abstracting the real, difficult and vexed political trade-offs required between social, economic and environmental dimensions. As a result, recommendations become abstract, are ‘tacked on’ to what are deemed the main findings of research, and are phrased in such a way that governments, business or other organisations *should* do ‘this or that’. Such recommendations are often made in a vacuum without appreciating the roles, interests, power and resources that are available and they can be impractical or even irrelevant on the ground. The thorny issue then, is how governments, business and civil society actors can work together to address issues such as social justice and equity and ecological sustainability.

Over the last decade, a range of international organizations and their partners have been working to address this gap, recognizing the importance of and seeking to improve governance in order to facilitate sustainable development (Halle et al. 2013; Kemp et al. 2005). Drawing from the United Nations’ Agenda 21 and the discourses around Education for Sustainability (Wals 2009), education has a critical role to play in tackling the complexity of the sustainable development challenge in the following ways:

- *Education can promote and improve understandings of sustainable development.* Given that SD is a dialectical concept, and must be interpreted and given meaning within a context, education can impart the knowledge, skills and per-

---

<sup>1</sup> We recognize that reductionist approaches to the study of sustainable tourism management are inevitable given the complexity and interconnectedness of sustainable development problems. It is the inter-connections between studies that require more attention. Moreover, the nature of research funding and academic work in most countries exacerbates the challenge of taking a more integrative approach.

spective necessary to develop locally grounded yet globally connected awareness into the political and value-laden complexity of tourism and sustainable development.

- *Education can help to mobilize individuals and collectives by raising awareness.* Education can help build the capacity of individuals and collectives to share knowledge, raise awareness and make decisions that enhance active and responsible approaches to sustainability.
- *Education can improve the collective capacity of communities to act.* Where people can engage, reflect upon and learn together about SD, a ‘learning society’ is created that can address sustainability issues collectively to improve societal resilience to sustainability-induced stresses (e.g. climatic events, food security, etc.)

Activities and outputs associated with the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (DESD 2004-2015) have highlighted the role of education in finding ways to progress sustainable development. From this work, it becomes clear that alternative ways of thinking, valuing, communicating and acting are needed that allow the myriad of actors involved in making everyday decisions to balance and integrate social, environmental and economic concerns within daily life (Wals 2009). Here, governance becomes particularly important because it is through effective and coherent governance systems that different actors can come together to discuss, share knowledge, learn, make decisions and implement joint actions to progress sustainable development (Kemp et al. 2005). Sustainable development cannot be achieved without effective governance.

Governance involves the co-ordination of government, business and civil society actors in a process whereby knowledge is shared and actions are identified and implemented to achieve mutually beneficial goals that ‘steer’ society in a certain direction (Hall 2011; Beaumont and Dredge 2010). Given the number of actors involved, effective governance systems require both the creation and maintenance of effective spaces of dialogue, communication and knowledge interchange (i.e. governance processes) and formal administrative bodies that can develop and implement policies and regulatory frameworks (i.e. governance structures). These governance arrangements (both processes and structures) do not just exist but are dynamically created and modified over time by a range of actors involved in and affected by the problem. Issues change, actors move in and out of focus, knowledge flows and actors act based on their interpretation of this information. In this way, effective governance is like a moving target. Governance structures and processes must be both locally appropriate and yet globally engaged. The implications for preparing those who can work in this space to progress sustainability development are, therefore, significant.

In this context, the philosophic practitioner education, much discussed in a variety of professional fields, becomes relevant (cf. Schon 1983; Tribe 2002; Dredge et al. 2012; Schon and Rein 1994; Marinoff 2002). Without limiting the long line of philosophical thinking that has gone into developing the modern notion of the philosophic practitioner, such a person can be described as a ‘stand up philoso-

pher' (Marinoff, 2002), a professional who seeks to facilitate thinking about complex issues drawing upon philosophy as the basis for understanding contemporary problems and identifying concrete actions. It assumes that practitioners have moral agency (in this case to pursue sustainable tourism as a public good), and that this requires a well-developed understanding of values, rights, duties and virtues both of self and others (Helsep 1997). As such, a philosophical practitioner education draws together three areas of learning:

- Knowledge for governance including both local knowledge and its interconnections with global knowledge.
- Practitioner competencies in a range of knowledge building, communication, dispute resolution, capacity building techniques and so on.
- Ethical action-oriented practice that draws from pragmatism and critical reflexive thinking.

Each of these dimensions will now be examined.

## **Knowledge for Tourism, Governance and Sustainability**

### ***Historical development***

Governance is not a new term but can be traced back to classical philosophical discussions about who has the power and authority to administer public affairs and control the character (e.g. speed, direction, nature, etc.) of societal change. The etymology of the verb 'to govern' reveals important insights into the meaning of the term. It was Plato's *Republic* (Book VI) where the term *kubernan* was used in a metaphorical exploration of the 'steering' or 'piloting' of the 'ship of the state'<sup>2</sup>. And, while classical philosophy is rarely discussed in tourism education, Plato's imagery is a useful entry point for students to understand the complexity of modern concept of governance.

Plato likens the governance of the city-state to the steering of a ship:

... there is a captain who is taller and stronger than any of the crew, but he is a little deaf and has a similar infirmity in sight, and his knowledge of navigation is not much better. The sailors are quarrelling with one another about the steering --every one is of opinion that he has a right to steer, though he has never learned the art of navigation (Plato translated by Jowett 2008).

Plato describes the sailors (politicians) as ambitious men, unenlightened by philosophy and who seek to take the helm and steer the ship of the state using the art

---

<sup>2</sup> The term has earlier origins, but Plato's *Republic* is generally thought to be the first time the term was examined in detail. Later, the Latin verb *gubernare*, 'to direct, rule or guide' was picked up and used in French (*gouverner*) and made its way into Italian and English.

of persuasion and political strategy (Howland 2010). The implicit suggestion is that the ship owner should not surrender the helm to sailors ignorant of steersmanship, just like Athenian citizenry should not surrender the leadership of the state to those ignorant of statesmanship (Keyt 2006). A true steersman or pilot, according to Plato, is one who pays ‘attention to year and season and sky and stars and winds and all that belongs to his art’ (Rep.VI.488d5-7 in Jowett, 2008). Plato is casting the pilot as someone who is a stargazer who casts his gaze upwards to read the sky and heavens; he is not bothered to look horizontally upon the other sailors to assess their strategies or play their games. In this image, the true pilot is wise and knowledgeable about how to steer the ship; he is not concerned with the other sailors and their unscrupulous competition, neither is he particularly competent in such games. He is viewed as ‘... a babbler and a good-for-nothing by those who sail in ships governed that way’. In this image, Plato suggests that a truly knowledgeable pilot capable of steering society may not be recognized nor valued (he’s a good for nothing) by society at large.

While there is much more that can be gained from detailed analysis of the parable of the ship of the state (e.g. see Keyt, 2006; Howland 2010), Plato’s work is useful in our introduction to governance because it alludes to the multitude of competing interests seeking to steer society, and to the ethics and politics that characterize contemporary society. The ship owner (i.e. the citizenry) appear to be preoccupied with the benefits the sailors bestow upon them, while the sailors themselves (politicians) engage in nothing more than quarreling and strategies to dislodge each other from the helm. In such a scenario concern for the broader public interest (i.e. the conduct of trade to strengthen the city-state) is minimized as are all pre-occupied with their own private interests. Also worth reflecting upon at a deeper level, and which we will return to later in the chapter, are the characteristics of the true pilot (a metaphor for the philosopher in the Athenian state), their role in navigating the ship of the state and their relationship with politicians and citizens.

From this classical context, the key questions underpinning the study and teaching of governance are *who* governs, *how* they govern and in *whose interests* is the act of governing (Dredge and Jenkins 2007; Hall 2011). Over the years as different philosophical and ideological lenses have been applied, the answers to these questions have changed but the key questions underpinning the term governance remain the same.

### ***Modern development***

For most of the twentieth century, the ideas of Max Weber (1922) and John Maynard Keynes (Keynes 1936) were heavily influential in questions about *who* governs, *how* they govern and in *whose interests* is the act of governing. Whilst not wishing to limit the importance and wider impact of Keynes’ work, in essence government was seen as having a central role intervening in economic affairs to

stimulate employment and economic growth. Growing the economy through promoting consumption was the central tenet. Furthermore, through direct government intervention, governments could help to drive economic prosperity which would ultimately have flow-on effects for the well-being of society and serve broader public interests. Under the influence of these ideas tourism was a tool to promote regional economic development, generate foreign exchange and promote employment. Taking a central role, governments invested in tourism infrastructure (airports, roads, ports, protected areas, etc.) in an effort to stimulate further private sector investment in accommodation and attractions (Dredge and Jenkins 2007).

In another influential stream of thinking, Max Weber's contribution was to argue for the separation of political and bureaucratic arms of government since a professional public service could improve the rigor of government policy-making and make decisions more robust. The contributions of Keynes, Weber and their followers had an enormous influence on the expansion of western bureaucracies over the course of the twentieth century. Bureaucracy expanded both in terms of its size and its policy reach as new policy issues such as tourism and the environment emerged. However, critics of heavy-handed government intervention argued that governments did not have sufficient knowledge of market dynamics and could not be as efficient as the marketplace. As a result, ideas about the role of government in economic management began to change leading to new forms of organization (e.g. public-private partnerships and statutory corporations) and practices (e.g. privatization of public assets, commercialization and outsourcing of services) that were argued to be more efficient (see Dredge and Pforr 2008). In tourism this was manifested in, for example, the growth of public-private partnerships for destination management and co-funding for the promotion of tourism.

From the 1980s onwards, these shifting roles of government have led to significant changes in the way governments governed. The underpinning tenet of this neoliberal turn, summarized by David Harvey (2005), is that "human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within a framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade". Issues once considered public are now characterised by complex webs of relations between government and non-government interests, and governments must now work collaboratively with non-state actors to manage complex public-private sector issues (Bramwell, 2011).

This refocusing on how governments govern was driven by two main factors. First, driven by the increasing global hegemony of neoliberal economic management, historical notions that governments had 'command and control' and occupy center stage in governing have been replaced with a model of the modern state in which power is shared between public institutions, business and civil society actors (Bramwell 2006; Krutwyscho and Bramwell 2010). Second, increasing attention to wicked intractable problems such as climate change, poverty and social justice highlighted that both the power and the responsibility to implement change and move towards sustainable development lies in the capacity of multiple actors to share knowledge, reach mutual understanding and work together in implementing actions (Weber and Khademian 2008).



Over the last three decades, the term ‘governance’ has come to denote the co-ordination of government, business and civil society actors in a process whereby shared actions are identified to achieve mutually beneficial goals. As a result of widespread agreement that the answer to ‘*who* governs’ is a complex mix of public-private interests, attention has increasingly shifted to the remaining questions: *how* governance takes place and in *whose interests* is the act of governing. These questions can only be addressed within context because the different institutional settings, the diverse policy actors involved, and the different issues at play generate very different priorities and framings of the sustainable development challenge. We now turn to a discussion of *how* governance takes place in a tourism context, and *whose interests* do these contemporary tourism governance arrangements serve, since these questions are important for the preparation of philosophic practitioners.

### ***Tourism and Governance***

Any attempt to implement tourism within a framework of sustainability involves collaboration and joint action, and therefore involves developing and implementing effective governance arrangements (Bramwell 2007). Effective or ‘good’ governance arrangements have received considerable attention over the last ten years, with a number of authors discussing the characteristics of a generic framework of tourism governance that embraces sustainability and that seeks an open and participatory framework to balance social, economic and environmental concerns (e.g. Dredge and Pforr 2008; Ruhanen et al. 2010; Dredge 2006; Moscardo 2011). These characteristics suggest that a governance framework for sustainable tourism should be:

- Inclusive of different values and issues and encourage the participation of all individuals and organisations with an interest in sustainable tourism governance
- Consistent with the rule of law
- Transparent in the flow of information and in the way that different interests and power are mediated in decision-making
- Responsive to the widest range of interests
- Oriented towards consensus building and the development of shared understandings and objectives
- Effective in communication and problem solving
- Efficient in its use of resources
- Accountable to the widest range of individuals and groups with an interest both now and in the future.

In practice however, a range of factors complicates the task of developing ‘good governance’ arrangements. First, tourism interacts and overlaps with a

range of other policy areas including, for example, transport, immigration, regional development, environmental management and economic policy. As a result, policies and actions aimed at implementing sustainable tourism must be situated within a broader policy framework of which tourism is only one component. The coordination of actions relies on an integrated approach to sustainable development that has all agencies sharing the same values, agreeing on the same objectives and coordinating their actions in how to get there. Given the fragmentation of the policy space, the dynamics of global-local politics and the flow of both public and private interests, achieving the required level of policy co-ordination is extremely challenging (Bramwell and Lane 2011; Dredge and Jenkins 2007).

Second, the influence of the state as the primary driver of policy is declining. Governments have withdrawn from active and direct engagement in policy implementation, seeking instead to use other indirect instruments as a means of achieving their policy aspirations. For example, legal and regulatory instruments to achieve government policy outcomes are being replaced by financial incentive measures (e.g. tax breaks, co-funding programs, etc.), market-led tools (e.g. ecolabelling and accreditation schemes), voluntary guidelines and education programs that rely on private sector support and, quite often, capital investment. The uptake of such measures is reliant on industry capacity, support and good will, which often vary according to economic conditions of the time.

Third, in a case study of the Netherlands (but likely to be applicable in a many countries), Bressers and Dinica (2008) note that while sustainability is 'hot' and tourism is 'booming', sustainable tourism is clearly 'low politics'. A key reason for this observation lies in the policy gaps resulting from a decentralization of policymaking across numerous agencies. The policy challenge of developing tourism that contributes to sustainable development falls into a gap where there is a lack ownership over the problem and a lack of interest in sustainability the beyond financial sustainability of the private sector.

Fourth, in further work Dinica (2008) also notes that despite a generic or symbolic commitment to sustainable tourism development, in practice public agencies take a weaker position on sustainable development because the dominant political ideologies associated with neoliberalism provide a powerful blueprint for the governance of economic sectors such as tourism. This blueprint dictates that industry is better equipped and more knowledgeable about what sort of policy it needs and has come to wield significant power in policy-making. Dredge and Jenkins (2009) have noted similar observations in Australia, as has Bramwell (2011) in the United Kingdom. The problem with this approach of course, is that industry concerns are generally much more short-term and financially focused, and longer-term market failures (e.g. environmental degradation, climate change, rising fuel prices) are not addressed until a (quite often, costly) tipping point emerges.

At an operational level however, the above factors make it difficult to implement a pre-determined or prescribed model of good governance for tourism. Local conditions and contexts mean that such 'good' governance guidelines should be considered aspirational tools to engage with critically and creatively while also employing the lens of local experiences and situated knowledge (cf. Klijn and

Skelcher 2007; Considine 2002; Dredge and Pforr 2008; Grindle 2008; Bramwell 2011). For example, the capacity of actors to participate and contribute, the type and distribution of knowledge and expertise available, local drivers of development, community aspirations and the balance of power, control and resources to make things happen are all factors that can render prescribed models of good governance for tourism little more than a hollow promise.

The missing link here between the promise of effective governance for sustainable tourism and its implementation lies to some extent in the blending of knowledge, skills and professional capacity of the *in situ* philosophic practitioner. Considering the skills required for such a practitioner is therefore an important aspect of tourism education for sustainable development.

### **Competencies for Tourism Governance for Sustainability**

The above discussion highlights the need for knowledge about governance to be included in tourism education for sustainability. But knowledge alone is not enough. Building on Plato's parable of the ship of state, being knowledgeable about how to steer (towards sustainability) is only half the challenge, and that skills are also necessary to manage the other stakeholders (e.g. the public, the politicians) so that they too share the same goals and work effectively towards these ends. Here the distinction between skills and competencies comes to the fore: 'skills' signifies proficiency; an aptitude or an ability to undertake a task learned through practice, training and/or experience. 'Competencies' on the other hand denotes a set of related abilities that enable a practitioner to undertake a complex job effectively. Charting a course towards sustainability, managing disparate stakeholders while simultaneously assessing and responding to the range of global and local factors that may push the ship off course therefore requires not just a range of skills but a deeper and more robust set of competencies.

A number of authors have identified core competencies in governance for sustainability, and which provide useful insights for tourism. Loorbach (2007), for example, argues that governance for sustainability involves:

- Simultaneously considering different policy domains at multiple levels and in different systems
- Adopting a long term perspective as a framework for short term actions
- Employing a multi-actor approach
- Employing both backcasting and forecasting to reconcile uncertainty
- Embracing pragmatism, critical thinking and reflection

Drawing from discussions in the tourism literature, those involved in tourism governance for sustainable development require a similar range of competencies (e.g. Belhassen and Caton 2011; Jamal and Menzel 2009; Tribe 2002; Dredge et al. 2012) including, for example:

- Dealing with complexity and uncertainty
- Stakeholder engagement, partnership management and conflict resolution
- Critical thinking, systems and futures thinking
- Action oriented skills to motivate and manage change
- Practical and creative problem solving skills
- Project and process management skills
- Leadership skills

Weik, Withycombe and Redman (2011) argue against a ‘laundry list’ of competencies arguing instead for a conceptually embedded set of interlinked competencies that reflect the problem solving process. In the view of these authors, professionals working in the realm of governance for sustainability should be able to develop, test and implement strategies for sustainable development. In this case, competencies would include:

- Strategic competence – the capacity to identify and steer towards a stronger sustainability position and away from unsustainable trajectories
- Systems thinking competence – capacity to analyse socio-ecological systems, identify leverage or intervention points and assess trade-offs
- Anticipatory competence – the capacity to anticipate, adapt and redirect development trajectories based on an understanding path dependencies and probable causes and consequences
- Normative competence – the capacity to assess alternative strategies and interventions against sustainability criteria
- Interpersonal competence – the capacity to build collaboration, co-produce knowledge and craft a shared vision within diverse stakeholder groups.

Greater engagement with the development of these competencies in education for sustainability will facilitate stronger governance for sustainability.

## **Ethical Action Oriented Practice in Tourism Governance for Sustainability**

This chapter has so far established that both knowledge of governance and competencies in a range of areas provide important foundations for a philosophic practitioner education. However, even together, they are still not enough. The third dimension of a philosophic practitioner education for tourism governance for sustainability brings together both knowledge and competencies in ethical action-oriented practice.

Since Greek times Aristotle talked of *phronesis*, a form of practical wisdom that determines how one should act virtuously for a greater good by drawing together knowledge (*episteme*) and technical capabilities (*techne*) (cf. Tribe 2002; Barnett and Coate 2005; Dredge et al. 2012). *Episteme* is scientific, universal and

context independent knowledge and *techné* is pragmatic craft knowledge – how to do things in a particular context. Phronesis is a ‘pragmatic, variable, context-dependent and oriented toward action’ type of education (Kinsella and Pitman 2012 p.2).

Without limiting the richness of historical discussions around phronesis, in tourism the philosophic practitioner education attempts to capture the ambition of preparing graduates to take an ethical, mindful and engaged role in society. Others go further, prompting social scientists to muster their social and political agency to drive positive change (Flyvbjerg 2001; Flyvbjerg et al. 2012; Dredge and Hales 2012; Hollinshead et al. 2009). But how to teach ethical action oriented practice—the bringing together of *episteme* and *techné*—is challenging to say the least in contemporary educational settings. Aristotle’s world was different to ours so how can we extract guidance from this ancient concept? At the very least, Aristotle’s world was divided into classes and races of people; education and philosophy were the pursuits of the elite; women were precluded from intellectual work; and learning took the form of Socratic discussion (Kinsella and Pitman 2012). In contrast, our contemporary educational settings are characterised by increasing class sizes and socio-economic diversity and modularized content delivered over a set number of weeks. There is often little opportunity to reflective question-oriented dialogue, and students are more interested in assessment than in learning and reflecting. Education and its role in serving a greater public good is little considered in daily practice although it lurks narrowly in many higher education policies as a tool for economic growth and employment. The question therefore becomes not *how to teach* but *how to create learning opportunities* for students to develop their relationship with the world of tourism, to position themselves in sustainability, and to reflect on their agency and the ethical practitioner they want to be. Proactive agents of governance for sustainability require this foundation.

Dredge, Jenkins and Whitford (2011) discuss the nature and characteristics of tourism policy making (and by default, governance) and the complex, dynamic context in which tourism graduates will work. For these authors, tourism governance is cast as a value-laden and complex activity that takes place in a variety of fluid policymaking spaces: ‘Policymaking takes place within governance and on the edges of organisations; it takes place at rallies and in restaurants, boardrooms and cabinets’ (p.). These ‘small’ spaces are where knowledge about tourism and the challenge of sustainable development is co-created and communicated. The philosophic tourism practitioner in tourism governance for sustainability works in these spaces, dynamically and continuously framing, reframing and sharing knowledge about the challenges and potential actions available to implement more sustainable, equitable and just forms of tourism.

For Kemmis (2012), phronesis is a quality of mind, character and action: it develops from the ‘sayings, doings and relatings’ of practice. From the boarder literature, a slew of adjectives describe such a practitioner: strategic, positive attitude to change, co-operative, entrepreneurial, action-oriented, awareness of and respect for others, awareness of ‘boundedness’ of one’s own thinking and knowledge, flexible, committed and a sense of purpose. Such list of personal qualities, whilst

illustrative, provides little guidance for how to deliver learning opportunities to develop the self and one's relationship with the world. For some, work placements and internships scaffolded with reflective learning strategies and assessments, provide promise (e.g. Wang et al. 2009; Arendt and Gregoire 2008; Owusu-Mintah and Kissi 2012). However, the extent to which such approaches can connect the learner with their positionality, situatedness, boundedness and potential agency remains unclear and underscores the importance of understanding professional practice by taking a genuine intellectual approach to reflection and action.

Developing an ethical action-oriented dimension to tourism education for sustainability that enables graduates to pursue stronger forms of governance for sustainability must include a range of learning opportunities. Graduates work within a huge range of jurisdictions, in different socio-political, economic and environmental settings, with a range of actors motivated by different interests and capacities, and they address a range of problems of varying complexity. They also bring with them quite different personal experiences, socio-economic and political backgrounds, different disciplinary influences and social networks. As such prescribed approaches to developing this ethical action-oriented dimension to tourism education for sustainability are not appropriate, although a mix of the following formal and informal, *in situ* and classroom learning opportunities have been discussed in literature as having merit:

- Analyzing and reflecting upon existing policy documents in terms of concepts such authorship, issues, interests, power and roles
- Rewriting an existing policy for a different audience or within a different socio-political context
- Responding to a proposed policy from different sectoral or disciplinary perspectives (e.g. from the perspective of an environmental scientist, an elected representative, a community activist, a law enforcement agency, etc.)
- Interviewing policy actors and governance agents about their role, power, interests, strategies, leadership and networks
- Attending and reflecting upon public rallies, meetings and community events
- Facilitating meetings and dispute resolution activities
- Attending and reflecting upon professional networking events

## Conclusions

This chapter has discussed tourism education for sustainability with a particular focus on the challenges and opportunities associated with preparing students to work within complex tourism governance settings. The challenge is to prepare graduates to work in complex, dynamic, value-laden, socio-political environments, proactively and positively contributing to developing forms of tourism that contribute to a stronger form of sustainable development. To meet this challenge a philosophic practitioner education is required that comprises three dimensions:

- Knowledge about governance and sustainable tourism that brings together both local knowledge and global interconnections.
- Practitioner competencies in a range of knowledge building, communication, dispute resolution, capacity building techniques and so on.
- Ethical action-oriented practice that draws from pragmatism and critical reflexive thinking.

Earlier in this chapter we introduced the parable of the ship of state, explored in Plato's Republic (Book VI). The parable provides useful imagery to help students understand the complex socio-political environment in which they need to work effectively if they are to pursue stronger forms of sustainability. In closing however, we need to point to the inherent danger of taking this or any parable of philosophy at face value. Howland (2010) warns us against assuming that only the helmsman or pilot possesses the overarching wisdom to steer society towards this greater goal. Critics drawing from historical lessons (e.g. the rise of Hitler) warn that when the pilot is vested with the authority and power to steer the ship, they may indeed be motivated by ignoble causes masked as public interest (Howland 2010). So, while a parable such as the ship of state is useful as a metaphorical entrance for students into the complexity of governance, it is important not to over-privilege its lessons, and to continually return to the parable, teasing it out to understand its strengths and weaknesses. This process itself is highly illustrative and leads to the development of critical thinking and reflection traits discussed above.

The lesson here is that whilst it is important to develop the three dimensions of a philosophic practitioner education discussed in this chapter so that graduates can participate in building stronger forms of governance for sustainability, graduates should not expect that they become the sole arbiters of the public good. Nor are they the only ones to possess the knowledge, competencies and ethical practices to steer tourism governance for sustainability. The practitioner of tourism governance for sustainability must engage with the variety of stakeholders and interests in tourism, and be aware that positive forms of tourism governance for sustainability emerge from social process.

## References

- Arendt, S.W., & Gregoire, M.B. (2008). Reflection by hospitality management students improves leadership practice scores. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 20(2), 10-15.
- Barnett, R., & Coate, K. (2005). *Engaging the curriculum in higher education*. New York: Open University Press.
- Beaumont, N., & Dredge, D. (2010). Local tourism governance: A comparison of three network approaches. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(1), 7-28.
- Belhassen, Y., & Caton, K. (2011). On the need for critical pedagogy in tourism education. *Tourism Management*, 32(6), 1389-1396.

- Bell, S., & Morse, S. (2007). Problem structuring methods: theorizing the benefits of deconstructing sustainable development projects. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 58(5), 576-587.
- Bramwell, B. (2006). Actors, power and discourses of growth. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(4), 957-978.
- Bramwell, B. (2007). Opening up new spaces in the sustainable tourism debate. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 32(1), 1-9.
- Bramwell, B. (2011a). Governance, the state and sustainable tourism: a political economy approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4/5), 459-477.
- Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2006). Editorial: Policy relevance and sustainable tourism research: Liberal, Radical and Post-Structuralist Perspectives. *14*, 1(1-5).
- Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2011). Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4-5), 411-421.
- Bressers, H., & Dinica, V. (2008). *Incorporating sustainable development principles in the governance of Dutch domestic tourism: The relevance of boundary judgements*. Paper presented at the International Sustainability Conference, Basel, 20-22 August 2008
- Considine, M. (2002). The end of the line? Accountable governance in the age of networks, partnerships, and joined-up services. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration*, 15(1), 21-40.
- Dinica, V. (2009). Governance for sustainable tourism: A comparison of international and Dutch visions. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(5), 583-603.
- Dredge, D. (2006). Policy networks and the local organisation of tourism. *Tourism Management*, 27(2), 269-280.
- Dredge, D., Benckendorff, P., Day, M., Gross, M. J., Walo, M., Weeks, P., et al. (2012). The philosophic practitioner and the curriculum space. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(4), 2154-2176.
- Dredge, D., & Hales, R. (2012). Embedded community case study. In L. Dwyer, A. Gill, & N. Seetaram (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in tourism: Quantitative and qualitative approaches* (pp.417-437). Cheltenham & Northampton: Edward Elgar.
- Dredge, D., & Jenkins, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Tourism planning and policy*. Milton, QLD: John Wiley and Sons.
- Dredge, D., Jenkins, J., & Whitford, M. (2011). New spaces of tourism planning and policy. In D. Dredge, & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Stories of practice: Tourism planning and policy*. Surrey & Burlington: Ashgate.
- Dredge, D., & Pforr, C. (2008). Tourism policy networks and tourism governance. In N. Scott, R. Baggio, & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Network analysis and tourism* (pp. 58-78). Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flyvbjerg, B., Landman, T., & Schram, S. F. (Eds.). (2012). *Real social science applied pronesis*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge Universty Press.
- Grindle, M. (2008). Good governance: The inflation of an idea. JFK School of Government. Boston: Harvard University.
- Hall, C. M. (2011). A typology of governance and its implications for tourism policy analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4&5), 437-457.
- Halle, M., Najam, A., & Beaton, C. (2013). The future of sustainable development: Rethinking sustainable development after Rio+20 and implications for UNEP. Winnipeg: International Institute for Sustainable Development.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Helsep, R.D. (1997). *Philosophic thinking in educational practice*. Westport CT: Greenwood Publishing.
- Hollinshead, K., Ateljevic, I., & Ali, N. (2009). Worldmaking agency - worldmaking authority: The sovereign constitutive role of tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 11(4), 427-443.



- Howland, J. (2010). Plato's *Republic* and the politics of convalescence. *American Dialectic*, 1(1), 1-17.
- Jamal, T., & Menzel, C. (2009). Good actions in tourism. In J. Tribe (Ed.), *Philosophical issues in tourism* (pp. 227-243). Bristol, Tonawanda & North York: Channel View Publications.
- Kemmis, S. (2012). Phronesis, experience and the primacy of praxis. In E. A. Kinsella, & A. Pitman (Eds.), *Phronesis as professional knowledge* (pp. 147-161). Rotterdam & Boston: Sense Publishers.
- Kemp, R., Parto, S., & Gibson, R.B. (2005). Governance for sustainable development: moving from theory to practice. *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 8(1), 12-30.
- Keynes, J.M. (1936). *General theory of employment, interests and money*. London: Macmillan.
- Keyt, D. (2006). Plato and the Ship of the State. In G. Santas (Ed.), *The Blackwell guide to Plato's Republic* (pp. 198-213). Laden, MA & Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kinsella, E.A., & Pitman, A. (2012). *Phronesis as professional knowledge*. Rotterdam & Boston: Sense Publishers.
- Klijin, E., & Skelcher, C. (2007). Democracy and governance networks: Compatible or not. *Public Administration*, 85(3), 587-608.
- Krutwaysho, O., & Bramwell, B. (2010). Tourism policy implementation and society. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(3), 670-691.
- Ladur, K. H. (2004). *Public Governance in the Age of Globalization*. Hants: Ashgate Publishing.
- Loorbach, D. (2007). Governance for Sustainability. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 3(2), 1-4.
- Marinoff, L. (2002). *Philosophic practice*. San Diego: Academic press.
- Moscardo, G. (2011). The role of knowledge in good governance for tourism. In E. Laws, E. Richins, J. Agrusa, & N. Scott (Eds.), *Tourist Destination Governance* (pp. 67-80). Wallingford: CABI Publishing.
- Owusu-Mintah, S.B., & Kissi, M. (2012). Assessing the effectiveness of internships in tourism education and training in Ghana. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Competemporary Research in Business*, 4(5), 521-540.
- Pierre, J. (2000). *Debating Governance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Plato translated by Jowett, B. (2008). The Republic Book VI. <http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/republic.7.vi.html>. Accessed 28 December 2013.
- Rhodes, R.A.W. (1997). *Understanding Governance: Policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Ruhanen, L., Scott, N., Ritchie, B. W., & Tkaczynski, A. (2010). Governance: A review and synthesis of literature. *Tourism Review*, 65(4), 4-16.
- Ruwhiu, D., & Cone, M. (2010). Advancing a pragmatist epistemology in organisational research. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 5(2), 108-126.
- Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schon, D. & Rein, M. (1994). *Frame reflection: Towards the resolution of intractable policy controversies*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tribe, J. (2002). The philosophic practitioner. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(2), 228-257.
- Voss, J.-P., Bauknecht, D., & Kemp, R. (2006). *Reflexive governance for sustainable development*. Cheltenham, UK & Northampton, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Wals, A. (2009). *Review of contexts and structures for education for sustainable development 2009*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Wang, J., Ayres, H., & Huyton, J.R. (2009). Job ready graduates: A tourism industry perspective. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 16(1), 62-72.
- Weber, E., & Khademian, A. (2008). Wicked problems, knowledge challenges and collaborative capacity builders in network settings. *Public Administration Review*, 68(2), 334-349.
- Wiek, A., Withycombe, L., & Redman, C.L. (2011). Key competencies in sustainability: a reference framework for academic program development. *Sustainability Science*, 6(2), 203-218.