

Warsaw, September 17, 2025

Adrian Lubowiecki-Vikuk, DSc, Assoc. Prof.
Department of Consumer Behavior Research
Institute of Management
SGH Warsaw School of Economics

Review of the doctoral thesis of Imanuella Romaputri Andilolo, M.Sc. *Determinants of sustainable tourist behaviour. The case of Australia, Indonesia and Poland*, prepared under the academic supervision of Prof. Aldona Glińska-Noweś, PhD, and Prof. Pauliina Ulkuniemi, PhD, of Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń.

This review has been prepared pursuant to the resolution of the Council for the Scientific Discipline of Management and Quality Sciences at Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, dated 25 June 2025, under which I was formally appointed to act as a reviewer of the above-mentioned doctoral thesis. The present review has been prepared in accordance with the requirements applicable to doctoral theses, as set out in the Act of 20 July 2018 – Law on Higher Education and Science (Journal of Laws of 2023, item 742, as amended), and in § 25 of Resolution No. 38 of the Senate of Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń of 26 September 2023, points 2, 3, and 5. In accordance with the aforementioned documents, the purpose of the review is for the reviewer to determine whether *the doctoral thesis constitutes an original solution to a research problem (...) and whether the doctoral student demonstrates a general theoretical knowledge in the relevant scientific discipline (...) as well as the ability to conduct independent research.*

The review of the doctoral thesis by Imanuella Romaputri Andilolo, M.Sc. has been conducted with regard to the following aspects: (1) subject matter and rationale for topic selection, (2) assumptions, objectives, and research questions, (3) research strategy, methodology, and tools applied, (4) structure and substantive content of the chapters, and (5) literature, formal presentation, and language quality. The review ends with an overall conclusion.

Trends and shifts in consumer behaviour are beginning to take a new direction, gradually moving towards embracing the principles of sustainable development. This concept is understood as a model of management in which meeting the needs of the present generation does not compromise the ability of future generations to satisfy their own. Within this framework, the natural environment forms the foundation of sustainable development, the economy functions as its instrument, and societal well-being is its ultimate objective (United Nations, 1987). This transition is not easy, as consumption is characterised by complex features stemming from the diversity and abundance of ways in which the needs of market participants are satisfied, particularly those of consumers, whose behaviour does not always align with the principles of sustainability (e.g., Buerke et al., 2017; Neves et al., 2025). In addition, consumers are not always able to make appropriate choices, which may have adverse consequences for the life of the local community or for the protection of natural resources (Assaker, 2024). This raises the issue of responsibility not only for oneself and one's own behaviour, but also towards the immediate and more distant social environment, as well as the natural environment. This aspect, in turn, constitutes an important context for the development of tourism and tourist destinations (Assaker, 2024; Chandran et al., 2021; Mohaidin et al., 2017). This represents a challenge for consumers of tourism services (Passafaro, 2020; Tasci et al., 2022), stemming from both hedonic and utilitarian motives for consumption. Currently, tourists' need for growth may involve better tourism experiences and improved quality of life. Continuity



includes resource efficiency and ecological integrity, economic viability and equity, social well-being, and cultural integrity (Gössling et al., 2009).

The main focus of the Doctoral Candidate's considerations is sustainable tourism and the sustainable behaviour of tourists. The concept of sustainable tourism is complex and, as such, has been criticised by scholars for its ambiguity. At times, its definition amounts to wishful thinking, becoming part of a rhetorical debate (e.g., Zhang & Chan, 2020). Certain scholars regard sustainable tourism as an oxymoron (Dann, 2017). This, in turn, translates into difficulties in defining sustainable tourist behaviour (e.g., Sharpley, 2020; Zhang & Chan, 2020), entailing a multitude of definitions. Consequently, there are considerable challenges in exploring the nuances of such behaviours and, ultimately, in identifying the actual determinants of sustainable tourist behaviour.

The search for the determinants of sustainable tourist behaviour is the subject of ongoing scholarly debate (e.g., Chandran et al., 2021; Neves et al., 2025; Saltik & Akova, 2025; Passafaro, 2020). A wide range of factors may influence such behaviour in tourism, creating challenges in their classification. Researchers employ their own classification systems. However, it can generally be assumed that the determinants of tourist behaviour encompass a variety of economic factors (at both the macro and micro scale), as well as non-economic factors (including socio-demographic, psychological, cultural, spatial, organisational and others). It is recognised that psychological factors (e.g., attitude, environmental consciousness/awareness, perceived behavioural control, knowledge, and ethics) are crucial to sustainable tourist behaviour (e.g., Mohaidin et al., 2017; Neves et al., 2025; Tasci et al., 2022). They also shape the choice of sustainable tourism destinations, which is closely associated with the 'pull' and 'push' factors that motivate consumers to engage in sustainable tourist behaviour (Mohaidin et al., 2017). These factors cover a wide scope, necessitating clear operationalisation that would enable a more profound understanding of the determinants shaping sustainable tourist behaviour. From the perspective of management and quality sciences, this is significant for researchers, organisations, tourism enterprises, and destination managers. For this reason, I believe that the Author has undertaken a task that is challenging for a young researcher, and the very attempt attests to her scholarly inquisitiveness.

The thesis under review aligns with scholarly reasoning that emphasises the role of internal and external factors shaping sustainable tourist behaviour. Despite scholarly appeals for the standardisation of measures of sustainable tourist behaviour (Chandran et al., 2021; Neves et al., 2025), the Candidate chose to conduct qualitative research in order to achieve a deeper insight into the role of the factors in question. Undoubtedly, this is an asset of the thesis. Furthermore, the thesis is set within an intercultural context, with interviews carried out among tourists from three culturally distinct countries (Australia, Indonesia, and Poland), thus addressing appeals made by the international research community (e.g., Neves et al., 2025; Tasci et al., 2022; Zhang & Chan, 2020). This enabled the identification of the general profile of the typical customers for this type of tourism. The selected subject matter, and the resulting research approach, align with the field of management and quality sciences. In my assessment, the research problem addressed in the thesis is timely, relevant, and demonstrates originality.

The thesis has a theoretical and empirical character. It consists of an introduction and six chapters (sections), which together form the main text comprising 204 pages. The remaining pages (pp. 205–313) contain references, lists of tables and figures, appendices, and the abstract in both English and Polish.

The work is organised in a manner similar to the conventional format of scientific papers published in international journals in the domain of management and quality sciences. I consider the high standard and this type of approach to be appropriate for a doctoral thesis. The dedicated 'Discussion' section (Chapter 5) demonstrates the Author's high level of awareness regarding the preparation of a research work, including a critical approach to the collected research material and to other research studies. The appendices (1–8) confirm the credibility and reliability of the qualitative research conducted.

In the **Introduction**, the Author has appropriately outlined the rationale for the study, emphasising the need to define who a 'sustainable tourist' actually is. Understanding who sustainable tourists are, what they value, and how they behave is crucial for enhancing sustainability practices within the tourism industry. What is surprising,

however, is that the Candidate does not provide a definition of the term 'sustainable tourist behaviour' used in the title of the thesis. Another shortcoming is the lack of a clearly articulated research gap. This gap relates not only to the identification and systematisation of internal factors (RQ1) and external factors (RQ2, RQ3) shaping sustainable tourist behaviour, together with their interpretation, but also to establishing the role of the country of origin (RQ4) in such behaviours. This part of the thesis does not define the temporal scope of the research. Furthermore, it fails to identify the study's practical or utilitarian objective.

Chapter 1 outlines various approaches to defining 'sustainable tourism', considering both scholarly and practice-based perspectives. The Author has adopted a critical standpoint, enabling an in-depth examination of the research topic in relation to the three pillars of sustainable development. The Author 'has not modified' (p. 6) the pillars per se (Figure 1.1., p. 18 [not p. 10]). However, she certainly refined the definition of 'sustainable tourism' within the framework of the sustainable development concept. In this part of the thesis, she highlighted the relationship between sustainability and specific types and forms of tourism. She also identified key stakeholders, with the tourist clearly occupying an unquestionably important position (p. 38).

Chapter 2 constitutes a (narrative) literature review, leading to the valid observation that researchers have described 'sustainable tourist behaviour' in a variety of ways (Table 2). Although the Author has provided an extensive description of the topic, the thesis does not adopt a sufficiently synthesised approach to demonstrate its substantive connection to management and quality sciences. There is no explicit clarification of how the term is to be understood within the context of the thesis. This is problematic, particularly as the Candidate frequently employs the term 'pro-environmental behaviour' in relation to tourists, despite the fact that the two concepts are not synonymous. The difficulty becomes even more apparent, as the Author herself wonders 'whether it is appropriate to simply classify a person as a sustainable tourist, or not' (p. 191).

In subsection 2.4, the Author indicates that she will describe the 'stages of travelling' (p. 52). This approach is somewhat unexpected, given that the stages of travel are closely derived from the stages of consumer behaviour (recognition, decision-making, in-journey, and post-return). Nevertheless, the Author goes on to describe the 'domains of sustainable tourist behaviour'. This is not the most accurate term, as the description clearly refers to core tourism services (transport, catering, and accommodation), as well as supplementary services. Nevertheless, their characteristics are interestingly juxtaposed with the concept of sustainable development.

From the perspective of the thesis subject, 'Determinants of Sustainable Behaviour', this is one of the most important subsections of the work. In this context, it is clear that the analysis of 'green purchase behaviour' by Joshi and Rahman (2015) [not Joshi (2015), p. 61, p. 71] has become a source of inspiration for the Author's subsequent considerations, even though the thesis focuses on sustainable behaviour. Furthermore, the established findings of Chandran et al. (2021), who directly investigated sustainable behaviour among tourists, have been disregarded.

In this theoretical part of the thesis, the Candidate refers to a PEST analysis (p. 62). However, she does not provide a substantive justification (and I will expect it to be addressed at the public defence):

Why should the determinants of sustainable tourist behaviour be examined through the prism of a method applied to analyse an enterprise's macro-environment?

The same applies to elements of the micro-environment, which may ultimately stem from the Author's dilemma in perceiving tourist behaviour as opposed to tourism demand. In this case, the Author refers to a study by Khalid et al. (2020), who in fact examined the development of the anaerobic waste-fermentation industry and did not address consumer behaviour, let alone that of tourists.

The last section of this chapter (subsection 2.6) outlines a conceptual framework (Figure 4). This general diagram encompasses nearly all of the variables (apart from 'unsustainable behaviour') that the Candidate identified through deductive reasoning. It is not clear on what basis the influence level

of the determinants was established (pp. 191–192). Moreover, the conceptual framework may be subject to debate. This is because the Author assumed that *'a person's internal factors influence their acceptance of external factors to decide for sustainable actions, and vice versa. These determinants are expected to elucidate the sustainable tourist behaviours at each tourism domain. This study attempts to determine whether and which internal factors influence external factors, and vice versa'* (p. 72). Does this imply that internal factors form the basis for accepting external factors (whose definition is not entirely clear), and that these are treated as moderators or mediators? The internal and external factors are of central importance in this context and their understanding and definition should be more precise.

Thus, in view of the claim that there exists an *'(...) incapacity to explain the relation between internal and external factors influencing each other, as presented in the conceptual framework'* (p. 190) and the fact that the respondents' country of origin was taken into account, it is challenging to establish mutual relationships. For instance, while culture is constant, price levels are subject to change. Within this unconventional approach, the author does not explain what leads to sustainable or unsustainable tourist behaviour.

Chapter 3 presents the research methodology. The Author employed a qualitative approach, adopting the interpretive paradigm. Considering that research on sustainable tourism and tourist behaviour is largely dominated by quantitative methods, I find this choice to be well-founded.

The Candidate arbitrarily selected the countries for the research (Australia, Indonesia, and Poland). Using the Country Comparison Tool, she investigated the existence of differences between these countries, consistent with the dimensions according to Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions (Figure 5). She additionally verified the overall level of tourist traffic in these countries. The selection of interviewees for the in-depth individual interviews was purposive. Nevertheless, four justified criteria were adopted (e.g., individuals in employment with higher education), resulting in the final inclusion of 11 participants from each of the selected countries ($N = 33$). Although no details are provided on data saturation, I consider this stage of the research to be satisfactory.

The Author properly prepared the in-depth semi-structured interviews (Appendix 9), which she conducted herself online between April and May 2024. It should be noted that the timing of the research could be of significance to its outcomes. For instance, tourist research in Poland is generally conducted immediately after the end of the winter or summer season, as tourists tend to recall their travel experiences most vividly in that period. It is worth noting that the Author makes reference to this particular limitation of her study (p. 200). She decided to ask questions on tourist journeys that had taken place during the preceding four years. In my view, this is an excessively long period, which would require justification. I did not find any information on the language in which the interviews were conducted (in relation to the Polish respondents). Nevertheless, the research material collected was appropriately subjected to thematic analysis, involving coding, categorising, and identifying patterns and themes (Appendix 10), while the respondent characteristics, typical of qualitative research, are a suitable complement to the analysis.

Chapter 4 provides a sound presentation of the gathered results, which are directly related to the conceptual framework (Figure 4). Some of the quoted statements lack the respondent's ID. Nonetheless, the other statements have been accurately rendered, as can be verified in the interview transcripts. However, it is unclear how the emotions (?) attributed to the interviewees as stemming from environmental concern (Table 6) were recognised, especially as some of these are traits, feelings, complex affective states, or even medical conditions (e.g., depression). Later, in the 'Discussion' section (p. 159), the Author notes that she took into account whether the interviewees felt a sense of responsibility for protecting the environment. However, the subjective assessment of consumer responsibility and emotions are two distinct matters.

The Author's capacity for synthesising results is evident in subsection 4.4 (although its title is rather enigmatic 'Summary and Conclusion for Tourist Behaviour at Tourist Domains').

It should be acknowledged that in the subsequent 'Discussion' section (**Chapter 5**), the Author constructed a logical line of argument, referring both to the research questions and to the findings of her own study as well as those of other authors. It is open to question whether the Author has genuinely succeeded in showing that *'guilt has been found to influence some individuals profoundly that has altered their travel behaviour to be more sustainable'* (p. 172). It would also seem that subsection 5.2.5 presents certain challenges for the Author, as it repeats the previously reported research results and introduces new themes.

The Author is aware of the limitations of her research, which she mentions repeatedly, particularly in subsection 5.4. It should be acknowledged that she can accurately identify directions for further research.

In the final part of the thesis (**Chapter 6**), the Author revisits the research objective and confirms its accomplishment. She provided comprehensive responses to each of the four research questions. Furthermore, she proposed an original approach to identifying the sustainable tourist, offering a detailed profile of 'the conscious sustainable tourist' and 'the incidental sustainable tourist'. I consider this aspect to be a strong point of the thesis. During the public defence, I would expect the Candidate to address the following questions:

Which of the internal and external factors are key to determining the profile of 'the conscious sustainable tourist' and 'the incidental sustainable tourist'?

What are the implications for tourism managers and destination managers based on the findings of Chandran et al. (2021) and on the Author's own research?

The thesis makes extensive use of English-language literature (research papers and chapters) relevant to the subject under investigation and related areas, supplemented by statistical data, industry reports, and suitably selected online materials (apart from Wikipedia, which is not a reliable source). Certain items in the Reference list are incomplete and lack consistency, e.g., in terms of capitalisation, alphabetical arrangement, and missing page numbers. The Reference list does not include all cited sources, such as certain items mentioned in the footnotes.

The work is generally well prepared. However, there are a few stylistic and editorial errors, as well as some repetition of certain phrases (e.g., 'Lew (2011) in his commentary (...)'; p. 6 and 75). The thesis lacks a list of pictures (Pic. 1.1, 1.2) and subsections 4.4.1–4.4.7 in the table of contents. Furthermore, the text contains a reference to 'Table 5.2 below' (p. 190), which is missing. The text has a good flow, although certain passages are rather dense and occasionally contain unclear expressions. The case in point is 'environmentally sustainable behaviour' (lack of clarification or connection to the terms most frequently used in the thesis, including those contained in its title). Furthermore, the term as used by Juvan and Dolnicar (2016) pertains specifically to tourists whose behaviour is environmentally sustainable, thereby restricting the range of consumer behaviours in the context of sustainable development. Moreover, the Author seems to have concentrated primarily on sustainable behaviours of tourists that place greater emphasis on environmental aspects than on economic or social dimensions. Additional lack of clarity may result from the manner in which this key section of the work is expressed: *'Based on this paradigm, this study uses qualitative method to explore the nuanced experiences of tourists regarding their behaviour while travelling. (...) This study conducts qualitative research with the intention to provide deeper understanding on complex social phenomenon as public pro-environmental behaviour is according to Filimonau (2018)'* (p. 76).

Despite shortcomings in the argumentation supporting the choice of determinants of sustainable tourist behaviour and in their substantiation, the Candidate has demonstrated a sound knowledge of general theoretical issues in the field of management and quality sciences, as well as the ability to conduct independent research work, including the appropriate selection of research instruments.

I would like to note that the critical comments provided stem from the duties of the reviewer and do not undermine the substantive content of the present thesis. They could be of additional value when preparing a research paper, a step I would recommend to the Candidate.

This doctoral thesis demonstrates the Candidate's knowledge in the discipline of management and quality sciences. Considering the selection of subject matter, the research objective, the structure and arrangement of the thesis, the methodology and research instruments applied, together with the formal presentation, I conclude that the doctoral thesis of Imanuella Romaputri Andilolo, M.Sc. *Determinants of sustainable tourist behaviour. The case of Australia, Indonesia and Poland* meets the expectations and the requirements for doctoral theses, as set out in the Act of 20 July 2018 – Law on Higher Education and Science (Journal of Laws of 2023, item 742, as amended).

My positive assessment stems primarily from:

- the relevance, timeliness, and originality of the subject matter addressed in the thesis, which is based on (declared) actual sustainable tourist behaviours,
- the alignment of the properly defined objective of the thesis with the adopted research strategy, as well as the selection of appropriate methodology and tools,
- the achievement of the main objective of the thesis and its cognitive value, as well as its contribution to the field of management and quality sciences in the form of a deeper understanding of the customer, namely the sustainable tourist and his or her behaviour,
- the high level of awareness demonstrated by the Doctoral Candidate that sustainable tourist behaviour stems not only from internal factors, but also from external determinants generated by the tourism sector (providers of primary tourism services and/or complementary para-tourism services),
- the sufficiently correct formal aspect of the thesis.

The thesis under review meets the requirements for the conferment of the doctoral degree in the field of social sciences, in the discipline of management and quality sciences, and I thus recommend its admission to public defence.

Zaprezentowana rozprawa doktorska świadczy o posiadanej przez Doktorantkę wiedzy w dyscyplinie nauki o zarządzaniu i jakości. Biorąc pod uwagę łącznie dobór tematyki, cel badań, strukturę i układ pracy, metodę i narzędzia badawcze, a także jej stronę formalną stwierdzam, że rozprawa doktorska mgr Imanuelli Romaputri Andilolo *Determinants of sustainable tourist behaviour. The case of Australia, Indonesia and Poland* spełnia oczekiwania oraz wymogi stawiane dysertacjom doktorskim określone w Ustawie z dnia 20 lipca 2018 r. Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym i nauce (Dz. U. z 2023 r. poz. 742 z późn. zm.).

Moje pozytywne stanowisko wynika przede wszystkim z:

- ważności, aktualności i oryginalności tematyki podjętej w pracy opartej na (zadeklarowanych) rzeczywistych zrównoważonych zachowaniach turystów,
- dopasowania do poprawnie określonego celu rozprawy strategii postępowania badawczego oraz dobór odpowiedniej metody i narzędzi,

- realizacji głównego celu rozprawy i jej walorów poznawczych, a także jej wkład w nauki o zarządzaniu i jakości w postaci głębszego zrozumienia klienta, jakim w tym przypadku jest zrównoważony turysta i jego zachowania,
- wysokiej świadomości Doktorantki, że zrównoważone zachowania turystów wynikają nie tylko z czynników wewnętrznych, ale także czynników zewnętrznych, które wychodzą od branży turystycznej (podmioty świadczące podstawowe usługi turystyczne i/lub uzupełniające usługi paraturystyczne),
- wystarczająco poprawnej strony formalnej rozprawy.

Recenzowana dysertacja stanowi podstawę do nadania stopnia naukowego doktora w dziedzinie nauk społecznych, w dyscyplinie nauki o zarządzaniu i jakości, dlatego też wnoszę o dopuszczenie jej do publicznej obrony.

Adrian Ambrosielu-Vulef

References

- Assaker, G. (2024). Does awareness of SDGs influence tourists' behavior? An examination of the determinants of sustainable travel behavior considering the UN2030 Agenda. *Consumer Behavior in Tourism and Hospitality*, 19(3), 339–351.
- Buerke, A., Straatmann, T., Lin-Hi, N., & Müller, K. (2017). Consumer awareness and sustainability-focused value orientation as motivating factors of responsible consumer behavior. *Review of Managerial Science*, 11(4), 959–991.
- Chandran, A., Mandal, S., Shanmugeshwari, M., Nair, G., Das, P., Ramachandran, N., & John, E. (2021). Sustainable tourist behaviour: Developing a second order scale based on three destinations. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 23(6), 984–1005.
- Dann, G.M.S. (2017). Unearthing the paradoxes and oxymora of tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 42(1), 2–10.
- Gössling, S., Hall, C.M., & Weaver, D.B. (2009). *Sustainable Tourism Futures Perspectives on Systems, Restructuring and Innovations*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Mohaidin, Z., Wei, K.T., & Ali Murshid, M. (2017). Factors influencing the tourists' intention to select sustainable tourism destination: a case study of Penang, Malaysia. *International Journal of Tourism Cities*, 3(4), 442–465.
- Neves, C., Oliveira, T., & Santini, F. (2025). Understanding the determinants of sustainable consumption behavior: Insights from a meta and weight analysis. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 393.
- Passafaro, P. (2020). Attitudes and Tourists' Sustainable Behavior: An Overview of the Literature and Discussion of Some Theoretical and Methodological Issues. *Journal of Travel Research*, 59(4), 579–601.
- Saltık, Z., & Akova, O. (2025). Who goes green? Demographic drivers of sustainable tourist behavior. *Anatolia*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2025.2549932>
- Sharpley, R. (2020). Tourism, sustainable development and the theoretical divide: 20 years on. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(11), 1932–1946.
- Tasci, A.D.A., Fyall, A., & Woosnam, K.M. (2022). Sustainable tourism consumer: socio-demographic, psychographic and behavioral characteristics. *Tourism Review*, 77(2), 341–375.
- United Nations. (1987). *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future*. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/139811?ln=en>
- Zhang, S., & Chan, E.S.W. (2020). A modernism-based interpretation of sustainable tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 22(2), 223–237.