Tourism Transformation, Spatial Justice and Inner Peripheries

Federico de Andreis[1] and Giulia Vincenti[2,3]
[1]University "Giustino Fortunato", Benevento, Italy
[2]Università degli Studi di Messina, Messina, Italy
[3]Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

giulia.vincenti@unime.it
f.deandreis@unifortunato.eu

Abstract: Climate change is profoundly reshaping tourism geographies, particularly in mountain regions and inner peripheral areas where historically dominant, climate-sensitive development models are becoming increasingly unstable. While a growing body of literature addresses tourism adaptation through the lenses of sustainability and resilience, less attention has been paid to the role of infrastructure in mediating uneven adaptation processes and their spatial justice implications. This contribution advances a critical, spatially grounded perspective on tourism transformation by conceptualizing infrastructure as a socio-spatial territorial mediator that selectively organizes accessibility, visibility, and investability across territories. Drawing on theories of spatial justice, uneven geographical development, and mobilities, the paper links tourism adaptation to processes of territorial selectivity and peripheralization. Mountain and inner peripheral regions – focusing on the Italian context–are approached as analytical laboratories in which the spatial effects of climate change and adaptation strategies become particularly visible. Historically, selective infrastructural investments oriented toward mass and seasonal tourism have generated strong path dependencies, locking territories into development trajectories increasingly misaligned with evolving climatic and socio-economic conditions. More recent adaptation strategies emphasize slow tourism, soft mobility, and low-impact infrastructures, often framed as inclusive and sustainable alternatives. The paper critically interrogates these narratives, arguing that "soft" infrastructures may function as new spatial filters, producing selective accessibility and symbolic valorization without necessarily redistributing essential services or long-term economic opportunities. To capture this tension, the paper introduces the concept of selective resilience as an analytical category that contributes to ongoing debates on uneven adaptation and spatial justice in tourism geographies. Rather than offering prescriptive solutions, the paper provides analytical tools to interpret how climate change, infrastructure, and tourism intersect in shaping future geographies of accessibility, marginality, and resilience in inner peripheral regions.

Keywords: Tourism Adaptation, Climate Change, Spatial Justice, Inner Peripheries, Selective Infrastructures

1. Introduction

Climate change is increasingly reshaping tourism geographies, challenging development models that have long relied on relatively stable environmental conditions and predictable seasonal patterns. This transformation is particularly evident in mountain regions and inner peripheral areas, where tourism systems have historically depended on climate-sensitive resources and on infrastructural arrangements oriented toward seasonal concentration and functional specialization. In these contexts, climate change acts not merely as an external shock affecting tourist demand, but as a structural force that exposes deeper territorial vulnerabilities embedded in long-term development trajectories (Scott, Gössling, 2022; Njoroge, 2015; Magnani, 2023).

A growing body of literature has addressed tourism adaptation to climate change, focusing on sustainability, resilience, and diversification strategies (Scott, Gössling, 2022; Njoroge, 2015; Xiao et al., 2020). While this research has significantly advanced understanding of sectoral responses to climatic stress, it has often treated space and infrastructure as secondary dimensions. Adaptation is frequently framed as a matter of practices, technologies, or governance instruments, while the infrastructural conditions that shape differential access to adaptation opportunities across territories remain underexplored. As a result, uneven spatial outcomes are often acknowledged but insufficiently theorized (Pathak et al., 2021; Janiszek, Krzysztofik, 2023).

This paper argues that infrastructure represents a critical analytical lens for understanding how climate change reconfigures tourism geographies, particularly in inner peripheral regions. Infrastructure does not simply enable tourism mobility; it actively mediates access, visibility, and investability, functioning as a socio-spatial device that selectively organizes space (Soja, 2010; Dunn et al., 2016, de Andreis, 2025). From this perspective, adaptation is not a neutral or evenly distributed process, but one that unfolds through historically sedimented infrastructural choices and produces differentiated territorial effects.

The concept of inner peripheries is central to this argument. Unlike external or remote margins, inner peripheries are territories located within economically developed regions but characterized by intermittent accessibility, functional dependence, and cumulative forms of marginality (Bock, 2016; Boschma, 2005). Their peripheral status is not given, but produced through long-term processes of selective investment, institutional

prioritization, and infrastructural path dependency. Climate change intensifies these dynamics by destabilizing the environmental and economic assumptions that have historically underpinned tourism-led development strategies in such areas.

Drawing on critical geography and tourism studies, this paper develops a conceptual framework linking tourism adaptation, spatial justice, and territorial selectivity. Rather than presenting original empirical data, the contribution adopts a theoretically grounded and interpretative approach, using mountain and inner peripheral regions–particularly in the Italian context–as analytical fields through which broader spatial dynamics can be critically examined. The framework builds on Soja's notion of spatial justice, Harvey's work on uneven geographical development and selective territorial investment, and insights from mobilities and post-tourism studies (Sheller, Urry, 2006; Urry, Larsen, 2011; Cresswell, 2011; 2012). Within this framework, climate change is understood not only as a driver of changing tourist preferences, but as a process that reorders the spatial logics of tourism systems by redefining which places remain accessible, functional, and symbolically visible.

Mountain and inner peripheral regions provide a particularly revealing analytical field for exploring these dynamics. In many European contexts, and especially in Italy, tourism development has historically been supported through selective infrastructural investments oriented toward mass tourism models, such as ski resorts, road-based accessibility, and mono-functional facilities (Debarbieux, Price, 2008; Scott; Gössling, 2022). These choices have generated strong path dependencies, locking territories into development trajectories that are increasingly misaligned with evolving climatic and socio-economic conditions.

More recently, adaptation strategies have increasingly emphasized slow tourism, soft mobility, and low-impact infrastructures as alternatives to climate-exposed models (Pileri, 2020; Moscarelli, 2021). While often framed as inclusive and sustainable responses, their spatial implications remain ambiguous. Existing research has only partially addressed how such "soft" infrastructures may operate as new forms of spatial filtering, producing selective accessibility and symbolic valorization without necessarily redistributing essential services or economic opportunities in inner peripheral regions.

Against this background, this paper adopts a critical, spatially grounded approach to tourism adaptation. Rather than offering prescriptive policy solutions, it aims to provide analytical tools for interpreting how tourism, infrastructure, and climate change intersect in shaping future geographies of accessibility, marginality, and resilience. By foregrounding inner peripheries and infrastructure as central analytical categories, the paper contributes to ongoing debates on uneven adaptation and spatial justice in tourism systems.

Although grounded in the Italian context, the analytical framework developed here has broader relevance for understanding uneven tourism adaptation in inner peripheral regions across Europe and other climate-sensitive territorial contexts.

2. Conceptual Framework: Tourism Adaptation, Spatial Justice and Territorial Selectivity

To conceptualize the uneven spatial effects of tourism adaptation to climate change, this paper brings together three complementary strands of critical scholarship: spatial justice, uneven geographical development and territorial selectivity, and mobilities-oriented approaches to tourism and infrastructure. Combined, these perspectives allow adaptation to be interpreted not simply as a set of responses to environmental change, but as a spatially differentiated process shaped by historically sedimented infrastructural choices and power relations.

The notion of spatial justice, as developed by Soja (2010), provides a foundational lens for examining how social and economic processes are unevenly distributed across space. Spatial justice emphasizes that inequalities are not only social or economic in nature, but are also produced, maintained, and reproduced through spatial arrangements, institutional decisions, and infrastructural configurations. From this perspective, access–to services, opportunities, and mobility–is a central dimension of justice, and its uneven distribution reflects deeper structural asymmetries. Applied to tourism adaptation, spatial justice invites attention to how climate change responses may redistribute benefits and burdens unevenly, privileging certain territories while leaving others increasingly exposed or excluded.

This spatial perspective is closely connected to Harvey's theorization of uneven geographical development and asymmetric territorial investment (Harvey, 2006). Harvey highlights how capital and public investment do not spread evenly across space, but instead concentrate selectively, producing landscapes of advantage and disadvantage. Infrastructure plays a key role in this process, as it both reflects and reinforces investment priorities over time. In tourism regions, selective infrastructural investment has historically shaped which places

become accessible, profitable, and visible, while others remain peripheral or functionally dependent. Climate change does not interrupt these dynamics; rather, it intensifies them by destabilizing the environmental assumptions that supported earlier rounds of asymmetric investment.

Within this framework, territorial selectivity refers to the systemic tendency through which certain areas are rendered more accessible, investable, and narratively central within tourism systems, while others are characterized by intermittent accessibility, weak service provision, and limited adaptive capacity. Selectivity is not understood as the outcome of isolated policy choices, but as the cumulative effect of long-term infrastructural trajectories, institutional priorities, and governance arrangements. Inner peripheral regions are particularly exposed to these dynamics, as their marginality is often produced not by remoteness alone, but by their relative position within broader spatial systems (Boschma, 2005; Bock, 2016).

A further contribution to the conceptual framework comes from mobilities and post-tourism studies, which have emphasized the role of movement, infrastructure, and representation in shaping spatial experience (Sheller, Urry, 2006; Cresswell, 2011; 2012; Urry, Larsen, 2011). From this perspective, mobility is not a neutral flow but a socially organized practice structured by infrastructures, norms, and imaginaries. Tourism infrastructures–whether large-scale facilities or diffuse networks–do not merely enable movement; they actively configure routes, thresholds, and points of access, shaping what can be seen, reached, and experienced.

This insight is particularly relevant in the context of climate adaptation, where a shift from concentrated, climate-sensitive infrastructures toward diffuse and "soft" infrastructures is increasingly promoted. Walking paths, cycling routes, trail networks, and micro-equipment are often framed as low-impact and inclusive alternatives. However, mobilities research suggests that such infrastructures can also function as filters, producing new hierarchies of access and visibility by privileging certain routes, landscapes, and forms of use over others. In this sense, adaptation strategies centered on slowness and soft mobility may reorganize tourism geographies without necessarily addressing underlying territorial inequalities (Romeo et al., 2025).

Bringing these strands together, this paper conceptualizes tourism adaptation as a spatially differentiated process, mediated by infrastructure and shaped by path dependency. Infrastructure is understood not simply as a technical support, but as a socio-spatial structuring element that structures access, conditions feasibility, and stabilizes certain development trajectories while constraining others. Adaptation, therefore, is not only about adjusting practices to climatic change, but about negotiating inherited spatial arrangements that unevenly distribute adaptive capacity (Darcy, Dickson, 2009).

This framework allows for a critical interrogation of adaptation narratives that emphasize resilience without addressing questions of justice and redistribution. In particular, it foregrounds the risk of selective resilience, whereby some territories succeed in repositioning themselves within evolving tourism systems, while others remain marginal due to persistent infrastructural and institutional constraints. By focusing on inner peripheral regions, the framework highlights how climate change interacts with long-standing processes of peripheralization, making visible the spatial consequences of adaptation choices.

The following section applies this conceptual framework to mountain and inner peripheral regions, examining how climate vulnerability, infrastructural path dependency, and territorial selectivity intersect in shaping tourism development trajectories. Italian mountain areas are approached as an empirical field through which these dynamics can be critically explored.

3. From Conceptual Framework to Empirical Focus

Building on this conceptual framework, the paper now turns to mountain and inner peripheral regions as a privileged empirical field through which the spatial effects of tourism adaptation can be examined. If infrastructure operates as a socio-spatial device shaping access, visibility, and adaptive capacity, then territories characterized by long-standing infrastructural selectivity and path dependency offer particularly revealing conditions for analysis.

Mountain and inner peripheral areas are not approached here as marginal by nature, but as spaces in which processes of peripheralization, differentiated investment, and uneven accessibility become especially visible under conditions of climate change. Their exposure to climatic variability, combined with historically sedimented tourism infrastructures, allows for a critical observation of how adaptation unfolds through inherited spatial arrangements rather than through neutral or evenly distributed adjustments.

From this perspective, focusing on Italian mountain regions enables an examination of how climate vulnerability

intersects with territorial selectivity, producing differentiated trajectories of tourism transformation. The following section therefore situates these territories within broader dynamics of infrastructural lock-in, peripheralization, and adaptive reconfiguration, providing the empirical grounding for the analytical arguments developed above.

4. Why Focus on Mountain and Inner Peripheral Areas

Mountain areas and inner peripheral territories represent a particularly revealing empirical field for observing how climate change is reshaping tourism geographies. In these contexts, vulnerability cannot be reduced to environmental or biophysical factors alone; rather, it takes on a more complex and layered character. It is also territorial, economic, and institutional, as it intersects with local economies that are often strongly dependent on consolidated seasonal models and with infrastructural arrangements shaped by selective decisions accumulated over time. Climate change thus intervenes in already fragile structures, amplifying pre-existing tensions and making visible the growing misalignment between emerging environmental conditions and inherited development trajectories.

Within this framework, climate change does not operate merely as a factor that "changes visitors' preferences" or reduces the reliability of key resources–most notably snow–but rather as a structural force that reconfigures conditions of accessibility, economic attractiveness, and symbolic visibility within tourism systems. Some territories gradually become less practicable or less investable, while others are able to maintain or renegotiate their position through uneven forms of adaptation (Scott, Gössling, 2022; Magnani, 2023). The literature on tourism adaptation clearly shows that these processes are far from neutral: they depend on local capacities, available resources, past development trajectories, material constraints, and governance arrangements, and they therefore produce differentiated–and often unequal–spatial outcomes (Njoroge, 2015; Scott, Gössling, 2022). In winter tourism, for example, perceptions, strategies, and adaptation practices vary significantly across territories and user groups, reflecting–and in some cases reinforcing–existing asymmetries in terms of infrastructure, access to capital, and adaptive capacity (Xiao et al., 2020).

It is in this sense that Italian mountain regions can be understood as a genuine "laboratory of peripheralization": not because they represent a natural or residual margin, nor because they are intrinsically disadvantaged, but because they make particularly visible the ways in which climatic vulnerability and territorial selectivity intertwine and reinforce one another. Peripheralization is not treated here as a given condition, but rather as the outcome of historical and institutional processes that have progressively differentiated access to resources, services, and development opportunities.

From this perspective, territorial selectivity can be understood as a systemic tendency to concentrate public and private investments, infrastructures, and access devices on only certain portions of space, rendering them "convenient," functional, and visible within dominant economic and tourism circuits. Other areas, although located within the same geographical context, remain characterized by intermittent forms of accessibility, strong functional dependence on external poles, and conditions of cumulative fragility, where environmental, economic, and social vulnerabilities overlap. Mountain regions allow these mechanisms to be observed with particular clarity, precisely because their climatic exposure amplifies the long-term effects of selective infrastructural choices.

In the Italian mountain context, such selectivity has historically translated into infrastructural and organizational arrangements strongly oriented toward relatively rigid and climate-sensitive tourism development models. The centrality of ski resorts and related facilities, the priority given to road-based accessibility, and the construction of equipment and services designed to sustain intense seasonal peaks and highly concentrated patterns of consumption have contributed to shaping local economies that are deeply dependent on specific environmental conditions and tightly synchronized tourist flows. Over time, this model has produced strong functional specialization in some places and, in parallel, the marginalization of others that are less compatible with the logics of seasonality and concentration.

These choices have generated strong path dependencies and forms of infrastructural and institutional lock-in that today appear increasingly misaligned with rapidly changing climatic conditions and with broader socio-economic transformations affecting inner and mountain areas (Scott, Gössling, 2022; Magnani, 2023). The declining reliability of climatic conditions–particularly in ski-based contexts–does not simply result in a sectoral crisis, but calls into question the entire set of decisions that have made certain territories highly dependent on a single development trajectory.

The issue, therefore, is not to schematically oppose an "old tourism" to a "new tourism," nor to suggest a linear substitution of models. Rather, the aim is to clarify how infrastructures–both material and institutional–have functioned and continue to function as socio-spatial devices that unevenly distribute opportunities and vulnerabilities. They do not merely support specific tourism uses, but actively shape which forms of adaptation are feasible and which, by contrast, become structurally difficult or even impracticable. In this sense, Italian mountain regions offer a privileged observatory for understanding how adaptation to climate change is not played out solely at the level of practices or tourist preferences, but at the deeper level of infrastructural trajectories and territorial selection mechanisms that underpin them.

5. Slow Tourism and "Soft" Infrastructures: a Change of Model or a new Form of Selection?

As tourism systems shift away from climate-exposed–and increasingly unstable–models toward adaptation strategies framed as sustainable and resilient, a significant share of recent policies and practices has converged on slow tourism, soft mobility, and low-impact infrastructures. Walking routes, cycling paths, greenways, trail networks, signage, micro-equipment, and rest areas are progressively promoted as alternatives capable of reducing tourism's environmental footprint while offering new forms of engagement compatible with fragile territorial contexts. This shift can also be understood in light of the so-called mobility turn, which has contributed to framing mobility not merely as functional movement but as a structuring dimension of social and territorial experience (Sheller, Urry, 2006), as well as through reflections on the tourist gaze, which highlight how the visibility, desirability, and recognizability of places are constructed through cultural, narrative, and infrastructural devices (Urry, Larsen, 2011).

From a territorial perspective, slow mobilities are often valued as immersive practices capable of strengthening relationships with the landscape, supporting processes of territorial education and narration, and offering modes of use considered more compatible with environmentally and socially sensitive contexts (De Vecchis, 2014; Castiglioni et al., 2020; Pileri, 2020; Paragano, Vincenti, 2021). Moreover, if marginality is understood as a relational rather than purely physical condition, these networks can be interpreted as attempts to reconnect proximities and link places, potentially mitigating some historically entrenched territorial asymmetries (Bock, 2016; Boschma, 2005; Moscarelli, 2021).

At this point, however, the issue becomes more complex, particularly in relation to the conceptual framework outlined in the abstract. "Soft" infrastructures are neither automatically inclusive nor intrinsically redistributive. Precisely because they operate through routes, thresholds, nodes, and minimum conditions of access, they can become new spatial filters, selecting what becomes accessible, practicable, and above all "narratable," while leaving other areas outside the geographies of valorization. On the one hand, slow routes may render previously overlooked places visible again; on the other, they may produce subtle yet effective hierarchies between territories that are crossed and those that are excluded, between nodes equipped with basic services and areas lacking the conditions required for use, and between landscape portions easily convertible into experience and others that remain marginal because they are incompatible with dominant imaginaries or local organizational capacities (Moscarelli, 2020; Moscarelli et al., 2022).

From this perspective, the main risk is not tourism development per se, but rather a selective form of valorization that generates symbolic capital and passing micro-economies without addressing the structural factors underpinning territorial inequality: access to essential services, less intermittent economic opportunities, and stable–rather than episodic – conditions of accessibility. Slowness may thus become a powerful register of territorial narration and legitimation, without automatically translating into redistribution or spatial rebalancing.

For this reason, rather than assuming slow tourism as an inherently virtuous solution or as a natural endpoint of climate adaptation, it is analytically more productive to treat it as a field of tension. A field in which processes of territorial reconnection coexist with practices of spatial selection, producing ambivalent effects on geographies of accessibility. Light infrastructures do not simply "reduce impact," but actively contribute to redefining which places become traversable, investable, and symbolically recognizable within contemporary tourism systems. In this sense, the apparent expansion of opportunities for use may go hand in hand with a new hierarchization of routes, where access is no longer determined by large mono-functional infrastructures, but by a territory's capacity to insert itself into selective networks of mobility, narration, and service provision.

The shift from concentrated infrastructural devices–typical of seasonal and climate-exposed tourism models–to diffuse networks does not necessarily imply a democratization of access. On the contrary, it may produce more

subtle forms of territorial selectivity, based on less visible yet equally effective criteria: continuity of routes, minimum service provision, management and maintenance capacity, and compatibility with specific imaginaries of use. Within this framework, adaptation to climate change risks translating into an unequal reorganization of opportunities, in which some territories succeed in reconfiguring themselves as attractive nodes within the new geographies of slowness, while others remain marginal due to the lack of material and institutional conditions required for stable accessibility.

From this standpoint, the central issue is not the sustainability of practices per se, but rather the transformations in geographies of accessibility and investability that accompany the shift in infrastructural paradigms. When adaptation moves from large facilities to diffuse networks, what changes is not only the scale of intervention, but also the way visibility, resources, and development expectations are distributed. Some places become traversable but not habitable, visible but not structurally supported, symbolically valorized without any corresponding strengthening of territorial resilience. In such cases, slowness functions more as a selective device than as an instrument of rebalancing.

It is precisely here that the notion of resilience takes on a meaning that cannot be reduced to the simple capacity to absorb the shock of climate change. When understood in a transformative sense, resilience refers to the possibility of unlocking development trajectories that are rigidly dependent on climatically misaligned models, by questioning the infrastructural, economic, and symbolic assumptions that sustain them. However, when adaptation is limited to reorienting modes of use without addressing the deeper structures of territorial inequality, the risk is that of differentiated resilience: effective for some places and insufficient for others, capable of ensuring continuity of flows without necessarily transforming the conditions that produce cumulative vulnerability (Scott, Gössling, 2022; Njoroge, 2015; Mitchell, 2003).

From this perspective, interrogating slow tourism ultimately means asking who benefits from adaptation, under what conditions, and with what long-term effects on the geographies of marginality and access. This does not imply denying its potential, but rather situating it within a critical reading of infrastructures as socio-spatial devices that, even when "light," contribute to selecting territories, ordering priorities, and defining what can–and cannot–become resilient in a context of structural climate change.

6. Conclusions: Adaptation, Infrastructure and Selective Resilience

Tourism adaptation to climate change cannot be adequately understood without a spatially grounded analysis of infrastructure and territorial selectivity. Moving beyond sectoral or practice-oriented approaches, adaptation emerges as a process shaped by historically sedimented infrastructural trajectories, uneven investment patterns, and differentiated conditions of accessibility. Climate change thus appears not only as an environmental stressor, but as a structural force that reorders tourism geographies by redefining which places remain accessible, investable, and symbolically visible within tourism systems.

Mountain and inner peripheral regions highlight these dynamics with particular clarity. These territories are not marginal by nature, but have been progressively shaped by asymmetric infrastructural choices that privileged specific development models–most notably seasonal and climate-sensitive forms of tourism–while constraining alternative trajectories. Under conditions of climatic instability, such inherited configurations reveal their limits, exposing the vulnerability of development paths increasingly misaligned with evolving environmental and socio-economic conditions. In this sense, inner peripheries function as critical frontiers where the spatial consequences of adaptation become especially visible.

The growing emphasis on slow tourism and soft infrastructures as adaptive responses to climate change exemplifies the ambivalence of contemporary transformation strategies. Although frequently framed as inclusive and sustainable alternatives, these approaches do not automatically translate into spatial redistribution. Light infrastructures can operate as socio-spatial filters, selectively organizing routes, nodes, and thresholds of access, and producing new hierarchies of visibility and valorization. Symbolic recognition and episodic micro-economies may thus emerge without addressing deeper structural inequalities related to service provision, economic continuity, and stable accessibility.

To capture this tension, the notion of selective resilience proves particularly useful. Selective resilience refers to forms of adaptation that enable certain territories to reposition themselves within changing tourism systems, while others remain exposed to cumulative vulnerability due to persistent infrastructural and institutional constraints. From a spatial justice perspective, resilience cannot be evaluated solely in terms of continuity or recovery, but must be assessed in relation to how adaptive capacity, resources, and opportunities are unevenly

distributed across space.

By foregrounding infrastructure as a socio-spatial spatial mechanism, tourism adaptation can be reframed as a question of spatial justice rather than as a purely managerial or environmental challenge. Infrastructure actively shapes territorial futures by stabilizing certain imaginaries of development while foreclosing others, mediating access to mobility, investment, and symbolic recognition. This perspective allows for a critical reading of adaptation strategies that prioritize visibility and circulation without addressing the structural conditions that underpin long-term marginality.

The analytical framework developed here contributes to broader debates on uneven adaptation by integrating spatial justice, territorial selectivity, and mobilities perspectives into the analysis of tourism transformation. It provides a conceptual framework for interpreting how climate change interacts with infrastructural path dependency. Rather than advancing prescriptive solutions, the focus remains on understanding the spatial effects of adaptation processes and the conditions under which they reproduce or challenge existing inequalities.

Future research could extend this approach to other inner peripheral contexts, including rural hinterlands, post-industrial regions, or climate-exposed coastal interiors, in order to further explore how infrastructural trajectories shape adaptive capacity across different territorial settings. Such comparative perspectives would deepen understanding of how adaptation, accessibility, and justice intersect in diverse spatial configurations.

Ultimately, adaptation to climate change in tourism should be understood as a deeply spatial process that reorganizes access, visibility, and opportunity. Without confronting the infrastructural and territorial conditions through which adaptation operates, responses to climate change risk reinforcing selective resilience rather than enabling genuinely transformative and spatially just territorial futures.

Ethics Declaration

This study is based exclusively on secondary data and academic literature. It did not involve the collection of primary data, human participants, personal data, or sensitive information. Therefore, ethical clearance was not required for the research referred to in this paper.

AI Declaration

An artificial intelligence tool was used exclusively for linguistic proofreading purposes. Specifically, the tool was employed to improve the clarity, grammar, and stylistic consistency of the English language. The AI did not contribute to the conceptual development, data analysis, interpretation of results, or formulation of original arguments. All scientific content, interpretations, and conclusions remain the sole responsibility of the author.

References

Bock, B. (2016). Rural marginalization and the role of social innovation: A turn towards nexogenous development and rural reconnection. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 56(4), 552–573.

Boschma, R.A. (2005). Proximity and innovation: A critical assessment. *Regional Studies*, 39, 61–74.

Castiglioni, B., Cisani, M., & Piccolo, M. (2020). Camminare nel paesaggio come pratica educativa: una prospettiva geografica. *Studium Educationis,* 21(1), 65–81.

Cresswell, T. (2011). Mobilities I: catching up. *Progress in human geography*, *35*(4), 550-558.

Cresswell, T. (2012). Mobilities II: still. *Progress in human geography*, *36*(5), 645-653.

Darcy, S., & Dickson, T. J. (2009). A Whole-of-Life Approach to Tourism: The Case for Accessible Tourism Experiences. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management,* 16(1), 32-44.

de Andreis, F. (2025). *Trasporti e territorio*. tab edizioni, Rome.

Debarbieux, B., & Price, M.F. (2008). Representing mountains: From local and national to global common good. *Geopolitics*, 13(1), 148–168.

De Vecchis, G. (2014). *Geografia delle mobilità. Muoversi e viaggiare in un mondo globale*. Carocci, Rome.

Dunn, S., Wilkinson, S., & Ford, A. (2016). Spatial structure and evolution of infrastructure networks. *Sustainable cities and society*, *27*, 23-31.

Harvey, D. (2006). Neo-liberalism as creative destruction. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 88(2), 145–158.

Janiszek, M., & Krzysztofik, R. (2023). Green Infrastructure as an Effective Tool for Urban Adaptation–Solutions from a Big City in a Postindustrial Region. *Sustainability*, 15(11), 8928.

Magnani, E. (2023). La maggiore sfida per la sostenibilità del turismo nel XXI secolo: il complesso nesso tra cambiamento climatico e turismo. *Rivista Geografica Italiana*, 130(3), 7–24.

Moscarelli, R. (2020). Il turismo lento come occasione di pianificazione territoriale e di rinnovamento urbano: il caso del cammino di Santiago. *Archivio di studi urbani e regionali: 129(3),*152-174.

Moscarelli, R. (2021). Marginality: From Theory to Practices. In: Pileri, P., Moscarelli, R. (eds.), *Cycling & Walking for Regional Development. Research for Development.* Springer, Cham, 23-38.

Moscarelli, R., Introini, V., & Toma, G. (2022). Aree interne e turismo lento: un'analisi sulla coerenza delle politiche nazionali lungo la Via Francigena e la ciclovia dell'Acquedotto Pugliese. *Territorio*, 101, 1–18.

Njoroge, J.M. (2015). Climate change and tourism adaptation: literature review. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 21(1), 95–108.

Paragano, D., & Vincenti, G. (2021). Mobilità lente in aree interne. La Via Silente: tra nuove forme di valorizzazione territoriale e diffusione di modelli sociali alternativi. In: Castiglioni, B., Puttilli, M., & Tanca, M. (eds.), *Oltre la Convenzione. Pensare, studiare, costruire il paesaggio vent'anni dop*o. Società di Studi Geografici, Florence, 240–250.

Pathak, A., Beynen, P., Akiwumi, F., & Lindeman, K. (2021). Impacts of climate change on the tourism sector of a Small Island Developing State: A case study for the Bahamas. *Environmental Development*, 37, 100556.

Pileri, P. (2020). *Progettare la lentezza*, People, Busto Arsizio.

Romão, J., Zamparini, L., & Nijkamp, P. (2025). Editorial Introduction to the Special Issue on "Sustainable Transport and Mobility for Tourism in Nonurban Areas". *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 27(5).

Scott, D., & Gössling, S. (2022). A review of research into tourism and climate change. Launching the Annals of Tourism Research Curated Collection on Tourism and Climate Change. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 95, 103409.

Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space,* 38(2), 207–226.

Soja, E. (2010). Spatializing the urban, Part I. *City*, *14*(6), 629–635.

Urry, J., & Larsen, J. (2011). *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*, Sage, London.

Xiao, X., Perry, E.E., Gao, J., Lu, J. & Manning, R. (2020). Winter tourism and climate change: Exploring local and non-local snowmobilers' perceptions of climate change and adaptation behaviors. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism,* 31, 100299.