

Authenticity in the Perspective of Sport Tourism: Some Selected Examples

Authors' contribution:

- A) conception and design of the study
- B) acquisition of data
- C) analysis and interpretation of data
- D) manuscript preparation
- E) obtaining funding

Emanuel Hurych

Masaryk University Brno, Czech Republic

ABSTRACT

Authenticity is usually understood as something similar to truth, or as a kind of ability of one "to be oneself". However, for the philosophical approach, authenticity presents a more complex and complicated term. This conception has been followed in existentialism and fundamental ontology, where it has been examined and analyzed in depth (especially by Martin Heidegger). This paper deals with the search for some potentiality of the authentic modus of being through the practice of some forms of sport tourism. We selected and described four model types of sport tourism activities. Then, we designed and selected some factors of authenticity. The evaluation of authenticity within the selected activities according to the factors was applied in a two-round process of evaluation. The results of the process are explained and discussed. In conclusion, authenticity is presented as a concept that is not strongly influenced by outer settings, but is rather strongly connected with personal attunement and individual (or group) perception of the outer world.

KEYWORDS

Fundamental ontology, sport tourism models, temporality, factors of authenticity, attunement

Introduction

The major aim of this text is to introduce some deeper meanings of authenticity as a phenomenon in the context of tourism. Through some selected examples from the context of sporting forms of tourism, we try to emphasize the concrete possibilities that can support the authentic being from a philosophical approach. It seems to be very complicated to overtake the very abstract nature of the ontological characteristics of authenticity. That is why some distinctive terminological delimitation should be provided within this introduction.

In the first section, we focus on the everyday understanding of authenticity and its inclusion in the context of tourism. The adjective "authentic" is often perceived as a common and widely understood term that means "original", "reliable", or "credible" (Klimeš, 1987, p. 43). It is possible to come across this interpretation of authenticity in tourism or in the context of traveling quite often. Coming from the above-mentioned definitions, two criteria may be established to distinguish different modes of traveling according to the rate of authenticity. The third criterion is connected with the explanation of authenticity used in the form of an imperative in the everyday context: "to be yourself". All three criteria have been projected by the author. According to them, authenticity is presented by:

1. The presence of the physical perception. Visiting real places provides real and unmediated experience which differs from the experience of watching TV documentaries or reading travel books.
2. Credibility of described events and stories. Reports of places or events are provided by a direct participant and are supported with documents (photos, videos, etc.). However, some stories could be distorted, or they could contain some elements of fabrication that decrease the rate of authenticity.
3. Behavior based on free will and a natural approach. This understanding of authenticity is probably the closest to some philosophical interpretations. It means that “you try to be yourself in any situation.” It emphasizes an active way of acting that does not stem from being indoctrinated or ordered to do something. This approach includes quite a high rate of spontaneity. However, it is very difficult to evaluate (or even measure) this rate in an objective way. The factors are very subjective here. Nevertheless, many travelers can at least intuitively perceive the authenticity (in this way) of their traveling.

These three criteria present quite simplified interpretations of authenticity. In his studies about temporality, Martin Heidegger speaks about “a vulgar concept of time”. Here, he would probably understand the above-mentioned criteria as “a vulgar concept of authenticity”. It does not mean that they cannot be considered in a study about the authenticity of traveling, but they should be developed and reconstructed under more sophisticated philosophical concepts. We would like to present some of them in the following lines. One of them is Heidegger’s fundamental ontology, where a key role for our reasons is presented by the phenomena of *das Man* and temporality.

Theoretical background

Authenticity is a common term not just in everyday speech, but also in philosophical studies. It has been presented in its implicit form in plenty of studies from ancient to modern times. We can also notice some later concepts in which authenticity is explicitly explained. Johann Gottlieb Fichte brought very original insights into the nature of self-consciousness or self-awareness. His concept of *das Ich* (Waibel, 2015) influenced many later studies.

One very distinctive thinker who developed a problem of self-consciousness in a specific way was Søren Kierkegaard in his concept of the three stages on life’s way. He proposed that the individual passes through these three stages on the way to becoming a true self: the Aesthetic, the Ethical, and the Religious (Onwunali, 2012). These enable the human individual to decipher which pattern of life to choose as the journey here on earth continues.

Following these thoughts, Martin Heidegger built a robust conception of fundamental ontology in which authentic and inauthentic modes of being are given a very important role. Some selected ideas of Heidegger related to our topic will be mentioned in the next subchapter.

Some other modern thinkers should definitely be mentioned in this context. In his existential approach to the world, Jean Paul Sartre said that “existence precedes essence.” Sartre thus wanted to maintain that man intrinsically has no nature. Like Heidegger, he believed that man is thrown into this world, a process that is not of his own doing, and is then condemned to determine what he will be. We exist first and determine our essence by means of choice (Mart, 2012).

In his work *Totality and Infinity*, Emmanuel Levinas introduced the term of “the Face of the Other”. This is a very important step that helps us go beyond the Heideggerian strongly individual understanding of authenticity. For Levinas, one’s response to other human beings as they are embodied, quite literally, in their faces is a primary philosophical category. In his excerpt from a longer dialogue, Levinas presents a brief exposition of his theory of the Other (Levinas, 1991).

The plain and clear concept of authenticity was not developed by any of the above-mentioned thinkers. The reasons are quite obvious: this phenomenon is too abstract and so tied to ontological pre-understanding that any transfer into the world of practical worries and ordinary measurable settings fails. It is much more suitable to use the inauthentic modes of being for those reasons. They are more understandable, and thus easier to evaluate.

The authentic possibility of the human being in the context of Martin Heidegger's thinking

Within *Being and Time* (Heidegger's key work), the term authenticity is used in many different ways. We cannot afford to focus on all of them within this text; it would be more or less counterproductive. We prefer to apply a selection of his ideas aimed at the specific situations within our field of interest. We can find a significant vocabulary and a good number of very specific terms in *Being and Time*. Some English translations of Heidegger's work lead us to confusing explanations or even misinterpretations. To prevent this, we prefer using at least some of the original (German) terms of Heidegger.

Although the term authenticity occurs a number of times in *Being and Time*, its exact and clear definition can hardly be found here. In general, the authentic form of being requires a human being to accept himself, meaning that he is able to bear his existence and care for his being. The inauthentic possibility of being is presented by escaping from the responsibility for one's being. This involves some kind of renunciation of the possibility of being oneself. Heidegger uses the specific term *Dasein*, which is translated as "Being-there". According to Heidegger, only "Being-there" – presented with "Being-in-the-world" (*In-der-welt-sein*) – can be authentic. The key existentials for authenticity is "Care" (*Sorge*). Heidegger recalls a fable about the creation of man. Here, "Care" began to model a subject from clay. Then it asked Jupiter to give it a spirit, and he did.

"Then she wanted her name to be bestowed upon it, Jupiter forbade this and demanded that it be given his name instead. While 'Care' and Jupiter were arguing, Earth (Tellus) arose, and desired that her name be conferred upon this creature, since she had offered it part of her body. They asked Saturn to be the judge. And Saturn gave them the following decision, which seemed to be just: 'Since you, Jupiter, have given its spirit, you should receive this spirit at death; and since you, Earth, have given its body, you shall receive its body. But, since Care first shaped this creature, she shall possess it as long as it lives. And because there is a dispute among you as to its name, let it be called homo, for it is made out of humus (earth)'"
(Heidegger, 2003, p. 197).

The fact that "Care" possesses man for his whole life can be explained as a key for understanding authenticity via "Care".

Dasein is committed to searching out the authentic via the inauthenticity of its "Being-in-the-world," and Heidegger said that authentic existence is not something which floats above everyday fallingness. He postulated that a proper instrument is needed for seizing the everydayness, and he said that that instrument is "Care" (Dreyfus, 1991). As we "fall away from ourselves" in the condition of inauthenticity, Heidegger said that we simultaneously fall into a frenetic busyness and an emptiness that gives rise to a sense of the uncanny. As we flap about feeling "homeless", our everyday familiarity is shattered (Steiner, 1978).

Heidegger also sees authenticity strongly connected with "Being-towards-death" (*Sein-Zum-Ende*). He argues an existential project of authentic "Being-towards-death" in which death is the most proper possibility of *Dasein*.

The opposite of an authentic form of being is presented by *das Man*. It is connected with the phenomenon of the Others. "The 'others' whom one designates as such in order to cover over one's own essential belonging to them, are those who *are there* initially and for the most part in everyday being-with-one-another" (Heidegger, 1996, p. 118).

"The 'who' is not this one, not that one, not oneself, not some people, and not the sum of them all. The 'who' is the neuter, the 'they'" (Dreyfus & Wrathall, 2005, p. 7).

The significant characteristics of all of Heidegger's concepts of authenticity are presented in *Being and Time*. Authenticity as a phenomenon is much more understandable here in the construct of its negative delimitation. The inauthentic modes are described relatively strictly in an understandable manner. We can understand much more about what is not authentic than about what is actually authentic from Heidegger. For many authors, this is a weak point of Heidegger's concept of authenticity.

However, we would like to use these characteristics for our practical purposes. While some ontic and ontological characteristics of *Dasein* are very complicated and not easily understandable for many readers,

the negative delimitation of authenticity (in the form of the inauthentic modes) can be presented as a clear and intelligible concept. This is very important if we consider the topic of tourism, which should be studied from a practical approach. Our concept of the authenticity of sport tourism is primarily based on examining the inauthentic modes of being because they can be observed more clearly than the authentic ones.

Some selected forms of tourism and possible insight into their authenticity

Sport tourism is a generally used term that is quite understandable in the international context. We would like to emphasize that we have selected some traditional forms of sport tourism: hiking, cyclotourism, and river canoeing. There are many more modern forms of tourism that can be referred to as “sport”, such as ski mountaineering, canyoning, ice-climbing, and paragliding. However, in the context of authenticity, we prefer to select some forms of sport tourism that are both simple and natural. The first reason for this selection is that we can consider them as having been anchored and monitored for long periods of time. Another reason is our effort to contribute to some kind of “renaissance” of simple, natural, and generally accessible movement activities. Generally accessible means that the requirements of the activities – physical condition, motion abilities, and technical equipment – are reasonable for ordinary healthy people without any special training, do not involve specific materials or equipment, and are affordable.

Some may argue that our selection is too traditional, considering the wide spectrum of modern possibilities that travel agencies and other providers offer. These objections are tolerable in the context of tourism itself, but if we want to find some features of authenticity within tourism, we must determine a reasonable response to them. Returning to Heidegger, we can recall his warning against dependence on modern technologies. In his work *The Question Concerning Technology*, Heidegger once again returns to discuss the essence of modern technology, naming it *Gestell*, which he defines primarily as a sort of enframing. It refers to gathering together that which sets upon man, i.e., what challenges him to go forward and reveal what is real as standing-reserve (Waddington, 2005). *Gestell* is related to the technological tyranny that presents an escape into the inauthentic being where everything is already decided and resolved.

Within tourism, we can find (perhaps only sometimes and only for some people) plenty of examples of modern technology being used in strange ways. Hurych gives an illustration of the inauthentic mode of travelers’ behavior connected with GPS navigation. *Gestell* in the acoustic form here says: “After 200 metres turn left!” This imperative can present (at least) some kind of transfer of responsibility for the decision from the traveler to a machine or instrument (Hurych, 2012).

That is the reason for our preference for activities that are not so closely connected with the subjective being (in Hegel’s terminology) or with “ready-to-hand” attitudes (a Heideggerian term). In other words, these activities do not demand any specific instruments (even uncomplicated, sophisticated, or expensive instruments). We have chosen hiking (H), river canoeing (RC), and cyclotourism (CT). Of course, the second and third activities demand the use of a canoe (or, alternatively, a kayak or raft) and a bicycle. However, this type of equipment is widely available and relatively cheap (at least in their standard versions).

1. Hiking is one of the most natural forms of movement. Berger (2008, p. 11) says: “Hiking can help us escape from the hurried and complicated world which often stresses us (...) No matter how fast you walk, every trip should give you a safe, pleasant, and unforgettable experience.”¹
2. Cyclotourism is not as thorough in observation. We are also more limited by suitable routes than in the case of hiking. A biker is faster than a hiker, so he cannot see as many natural beauties in detail. On the other hand, a biker has a higher radius of action. The popularity of MTB (mountain bike) cycling has transferred bikers from wide, crowded roads to paths and cycloroutes, meaning they are closer to natural settings. The example of MTB displays an ambiguity of some categorical statements about the exclusively negative influence of modern technologies. At least in relation to nature, the technological improvements can sometimes be profitable (as in MTB). Some authors consider a relationship to nature (in a broad sense) as one of the factors that can support the authentic mode of being. Jirásek

¹ Translated by the author.

(2015) points out five factors of nonreligious spirituality: authenticity, relation to others, relation to nature, sense of life, and transcendence. In this concept, the rate of authenticity, as well as the positive relationship to nature, contributes to developing a more spiritual approach in a person. Here, via spirituality, we can see a very strong link between authentic being and a relationship to nature.

3. River canoeing is the most specific of the selected activities. This activity appears to be very limited in its choice of routes because it is conducted by first selecting a river or stream. Here we are speaking especially about rivers (not about lakes or seas), since this is a very specific activity in the Czech environment. There are a lot of significant features, and we can use the experience of this kind of tourism as a concrete example, i.e., for methods of thinking or entertainment that are closely connected to this type of sport tourism. For the Czech people, canoeing is related to the “tramping movement,” part of a very significant way of life and specific culture (including tramping settlements, songs, clothing styles, etc.). The very specific atmosphere of river canoeing is also connected with some features of romance that can be considered (in both positive and negative ways) in the context of authenticity.

We argue that these three activities are suitable for evaluating the features of authenticity (or inauthenticity). As they are very common and well-known activities, there is no need to describe them in more detail.

Some selected viewpoints for investigating authenticity

It is very difficult to measure authenticity, as is explained above. That is why there are only a few attempts at measuring authenticity within empirical investigations. We are persuaded that authenticity cannot be studied without a philosophical approach. One of the authors who connected the empirical research of authenticity with its philosophical basis is James Leonard Park. In his book *Becoming More Authentic: The Positive Side of Existentialism*, he developed an instrument called *The Authenticity Test*, which is a questionnaire containing 100 items. The questionnaire had respondents answer questions such as “To what degree do I still copy other human beings?” and “Do I hold a job that existed before I came along?” as well as “Do I smoke?” and “Do I watch sports or soap operas on television?” The answers are evaluated in the scale. For some answers, there is just a 2-point scale evaluation (yes=1 point and no=0 points), while the 4-point scale is used for the majority of them (very much=3 points, somewhat=2 points, very little=1 point, and none=0 points).

As the author admits,

“Of course, questions, which must necessarily ask about facts of your life, cannot get to the real core of Authenticity – our reasons and motives. Also, questions can only sample your life at random. If you smoke (Question 4), this behavior stands for hundreds of other ‘choices’ you have made because of peer pressure rather than personal autonomy” (Park, 2007, p. 7).

Some philosophers emphasize that this method of measuring authenticity has a highly problematic basis. The strongest objection says that only modes of inauthenticity can be measured because only they contain instrumentality. Furthermore, instrumentality presents a key condition for measurability. On the other hand, the authentic presence of a human being is immediate, and it is not possible to grasp it in measurable time (Chvatík, 1998). Thus, we return to the Heideggerian approach to authenticity and recall his inauthentic modes in the world called *das Man*. Here it is clear that a scale questionnaire used as a quantitative instrument (gathering points and working with them in statistical analyses) is not the most suitable implement for evaluating authenticity.

This opinion was taken into consideration by Josef Oborný and his authenticity research in kinanthropology based on semantic analysis. Oborný (2004, pp. 135-137) monitors some features of authenticity and searches for the authentic and inauthentic modus of the relationship of a sportsman/woman with his/her own personality. His bipolar evaluation (authentic – inauthentic) seems to be more suitable for our needs than the numeric evaluation in the scale questionnaire. That is why we prefer a similar method for our purposes.

Methods

It is necessary to emphasize that this paper does not contain any empirical data. This is a theoretical construct that is in search of the most suitable methods for considering some kind of evaluation of authenticity in the context of sport tourism. A group of five factors was constructed for these purposes. We propose that they can be related to the authenticity of the selected activities. Of course, the evaluation is based on the subjective level, so the results of this evaluation do not bring any comparison (in the statistical meaning). Instead, they present some viewpoints for other analyses based on the verbal description.

From our point of view, the most important thing to do is to introduce some criteria displaying which parameters can be considered determining factors for the concerns of authenticity.

As we mentioned, we selected three model types of sport tourism activities – H, CT, and RC. The fourth model activity is represented by the “ordinary trip” (OT). For a more concrete image, we can describe it as a standard family week stay at the seaside transported by plane and organized by a travel agency. It is definitely a very artificial model construct that can hardly be used in this form for empirical investigation. After all, the other activities display a similar effect. However, our major point is to uncover some intrinsic characteristics of the selected activities. The nature of the model is only to serve for common comparison and as a mediator of the transfer from quantity to quality.

We designed and selected some factors of “authenticity”. The brackets here are a reminder that this is just one of the possible understandings of the term authenticity. The enumeration of the factors remains open, and others may be added. However, we argue that for our purposes these five factors should be enough.

1. Physical contact with natural settings. This refers to direct contact with living and non-living nature (perception of temperature, humidity, touch, sounds, smells, etc.) equaling the authenticity of the direct experience.
2. Physical demands of the activity. This means the average and approximate difficulty of the performance connected with the selected activity. This kind of authenticity is related to real (not virtual) effort contingent on the change of physiological functions.
3. Determinateness. This is about how much and how exactly the activity is planned and which possibilities for free choice are disposable. This kind of authenticity (low determinateness) is connected with escaping from *Gestell* and, as a consequence, from instrumentality.
4. Adventure, danger, and strong experience. The entrance into a world of uncertainty and insecurity is required. This type of authenticity is exempt from “within-time-ness” through the acquisition of a peak or zone experience (Bednář, 2009).
5. Particularity of knowledge. This is about the possibility of slowing down, stopping, or penetrating beneath the superficial façade of traveling. This kind of authenticity prevents the occurrence of routine perception and the acceptance of projected sequences.

Results and discussion

The evaluation of authenticity within the selected activities according to the factors was established as follows: A = authentic, I = inauthentic, X = not possible to judge. We applied a two-round process of evaluation. In the first round, just one symbol is matched to each factor within each activity, corresponding to the principles of three-valued logic. The results are displayed in Table 1.

Concerning the first round, we can see that the basic characteristic for H, CT, and RC is the evaluation A. This finding is in harmony with the aim of our selection, and we can return to this point during the explanation of the results of the second round. Now we can pay attention to the cases of I and X. Within the first round, we can understand them as weak points of the activity (concerning authenticity). H Activity received X in Factor 4 (in a general sense, this can be considered neutral). CT Activity is evaluated as neutral in Factor 5 (generally, the speed of the ride is too high for some detailed knowledge). For RC, there is Factor 3, which is neutral (the route is limited by the riverbed and the water level presents determination, as well).

A completely different situation can be found with OT Activity. Here, Factors 1, 4, and 5 can be considered neutral (this mostly depends on the individual approach of every person). Factors 2 and 3 are evaluated as I. This is because the main purpose of OT is to take a rest (Factor 2) and the program is organized by a travel agency (Factor 3).

Table 1. The selected activities and their characteristics (1st round)

The factor of authenticity	H	Selected activity		
		CT	RC	OT
1. Physical contact with natural settings	A	A	A	X
2. Physical demands of the activity	A	A	A	I
3. Determinateness	A	A	X	I
4. Adventure, danger, and strong experience	X	A	A	X
5. Particularity of knowledge	A	X	A	X

Source: own study.

This construct itself seems to be very artificial and vague. However, we can accept it as simply a temporal instrument. Its sense will be explained only in comparison with the second round of evaluation. As was mentioned before, the first round was based on the principles of three-valued logic (for each case, just one solution was possible). This imperative leads to some tendentiousness and to some deformations for practical purposes. There is no space for any specific features and distinctions that are eliminated by modeling the situations. We can use an example from the statistical settings to explain: Having a group of 100 respondents, we can count that their average age is 40. However, for Respondent 1, who is 10, as well as for Respondent 2, who is 88, this statistical information is completely irrelevant. In spite of this fact, the average age can present an important piece of information about the research group if it is interpreted and applied correctly.

For the second round of evaluation, we applied a different method. We tried to consider all of the possible approaches (not just the mainstream ones). This does not mean that any symbol could be matched with any activity. We have to admit that this could really happen in some extreme cases. However, our aim is different: it is to find a complementary solution. This does not present an opposite approach to the first round. We do not want to include cases that are extreme or marginal. Even the cases that could be understood as very minor ones were not included. Unlike the first round, there is no need to deliberate over selecting just one solution. Here, we can consider all the variants that can be real after a rational assessment. The results of the second round of evaluation are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2. The selected activities and their characteristics (2nd round)

The factor of authenticity	H	Selected activity		
		CT	RC	OT
1. Physical contact with natural settings	A	AX	A	AXI
2. Physical demands of the activity	AX	A	A	AXI
3. Determinateness	AX	AX	AXI	AXI
4. Adventure, danger, and strong experience	AXI	A	A	AXI
5. Particularity of knowledge	AX	XN	AX	AXI

Source: own study.

The idea that all of the situations can be possible, which was mentioned above, was proven true in the case of OT Activity (in all factors). For some average evaluation within the first round, it was possible to decide and select one majority solution. However, for the second round, we have to accept the AXI combination for all of the cases. The other activities are in a completely different situation. For these, the evaluations of the first round were rather indicative, while the second round displays more concrete results.

We can comment on them according to each factor. Factor 1 provides A for H and RC Activities. Physical contact with nature is necessary and self-evident here. For CT, the evaluation AX was given. A biker can be close to nature, but he/she can also just ride and focus on different things. This is a typical situation for some training types who prefer to follow the physiological characteristics of their ride (however, we are still speaking about cyclotourism).

Factor 2 is connected with A in CT and RC Activities. The physical demands on the travelers are generally true (no matter how much they can differ according to speed and settings). For H Activity, evaluation AX was chosen because the physical difficulty can be very different in terms of absolute difficulty (speed, terrain) or relative difficulty (depending on every person's condition). Factor 3 is a bit more complicated. Concerning H and CT Activities, AX was chosen. X here means the influence of routine, submissive behavior when a leader of the group decides, etc. In the case of RC Activity, the delimitation is even stronger, and sometimes it is decided well ahead of time where the trip will end for the day and where the camp is located (these cases are quite frequent in practice).

The evaluation A for Factor 4 can be taken as too categorical in CT and RC Activities. Nevertheless, adventure is a major motivation in many cases, and some danger is presented in each case. For H Activity, AXI seems to be a logical solution. Factor 5 is evaluated with AX in H and RC Activities. Major cases are related to A, but for a great group of travelers, the detailed perception cannot be self-evident (and it is not logically necessary), so X is included. Concerning CT, we can say that X is typical. A is problematic because of the nature of this kind of movement. For some bikers who focus on the ride itself, the evaluation I can be included.

A comparison of both tables provides us with some information that can be taken as a background for other reflections. What is clear is the fact that the evaluations A, X, and I are in each separate case very strongly dependent on the circumstances. For the most part, these circumstances cannot be forecast or regulated by the actors. Our results do not present any exact solution, which often occurs in empirical studies. Together with the theoretical analysis of the authentic (and inauthentic) modes of being, we gain insight on how to approach future studies of authenticity in tourism, or, to be more exact, sport tourism.

Conclusions

Using some concrete examples of sport tourism activities, we have displayed that authenticity can be followed more in detail if we create a factor structure as a methodological instrument. Within the factors, we can better understand how the authenticity of some concrete activities could be supported. However, if we had wanted to measure authenticity exactly, we would have faced serious problems. These problems are connected with two possible methods of evaluating authenticity. If we want to find a subjective perception, we can use a questionnaire. The problem here lies in the fact that when asking a person about the authenticity of his/her actions, the inauthentic person typically responds with a positive answer. This is the main problem of *The Authenticity Test* by James Leonard Park, as well as many similar investigations. While there are a lot of correction instruments in psychology (e.g., reliability tests), they mostly fail in the evaluation of authenticity. If we want to apply any other (more objective) methods, such as observation or indirect statements, the problem is that these methods can only grasp the outer manifestation of authenticity. They cannot tell us anything about the inner perception of the person.

We do not intend to conclude that authenticity is completely closed to investigations and that there is no sense in examining it in the context of concrete actions. There are some activities that support and develop the authentic form of being. Some of the selected activities in sport tourism belong to this type. Considering the five selected factors, we can establish a platform that supports authentic forms of tourism. However, we cannot say that only these activities are more authentic than others.

Heidegger speaks about the necessity of basic attunement, which includes the authentic modus of astonishment (Hlavinka, 2002, p. 68). Specific attunement and the ability to be astonished can provide a way towards the authentic form of being. This process can be supported by aiming to select activities that have the potential to develop authenticity. We argue that the selected activities (H, CT, and RC) have this

potential (at least under the construct of the five applied factors). The selection of a suitable activity does not automatically guarantee that we will be more authentic. This is just an opportunity. Moreover, a clear description and rejection of inauthentic elements in our everyday behavior can help us develop authenticity in a proper way.

In spite of all these positive items, it is not possible to measure any person's rate of authenticity. Nobody can say "I am more authentic than somebody else". This is not a sports match, with winners and losers. It is just a challenge which should be accepted.

REFERENCES

- Bednář, M. (2009). *Pohyb člověka na biodromu: cesta životem z pohledu (nejen) kinantropologie* /Movement of human being at biodrom: the way in life from point of view (not only) kinanthropology/. Prague, Czech Republic: Karolinum.
- Berger, K. (2008). *Turistika* /Sport Tourism/. Prague, Czech Republic: Slovart.
- Chvatík, I. (1998). Problémy s autenticitou II /The Problems with Authenticity II/. *Reflexe*, 19, 1–17.
- Dreyfus, H. (1991). *Being-in-the-World: A Commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time, Division I*. Cambridge, UK: The MIT Press.
- Dreyfus, H.L. & Wrathall, M.A. (2005). *A Companion to Heidegger*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Heidegger, M. (2003). *Philosophical and Political Writings*. London, UK: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.
- Heidegger, M. (1931). *Vom Wesen der Wahrheit* /About The Truth of Being/. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Vittorio Klostermann.
- Heidegger, M. (1996). *Being and Time*. Albany, USA: State University of New York.
- Hlavinka, P. (2002). K pojmu událost u Martina Heideggera /About the term of event in Martin Heidegger's work/. *Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomouensis Facultas Philosophica, Philosophica V*, 65–72.
- Hurych, E. (2012). Potenciální úskalí pozitivistické glorifikace e-learningových vyučovacích metod. /The Potential Troubles of the Positivistic Glorification of Some E-learning Didactic Methods/. In H. Vojáčková (Ed.), *Tvorba e-learningových opor na VŠ: E-learning na VŠPJ*, /Creating E-learning Teaching Materials at CPTJ/ (pp. 19–27). Jihlava: College of Polytechnics.
- Husserl, E. (1988). *Cartesian Meditations*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Jirásek, I. (2015). Spiritualita a zdraví: ideové podloží pro zkoumání empirických dat /Spirituality and health: Ideological background for empirical data study/. *Československá psychologie*, 59(2), 174–186.
- Krell, D.F. (Ed.) (1992). *Daimon life – Heidegger and Life Philosophy*. Bloomington, USA: Indiana University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1991). *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Mart, C.T. (2012). Existentialism in Two Plays of Jean-Paul Sartre. *Journal of English and Literature*, 3(3), 50–54.
- Oborný, J. (2004). Authentic and depersonalized experience in sport (Notes on the problems of depersonalization and manipulation in sport). In J. Kosiewicz & L. Jaczynowski (Eds.), *Physical Activity in Integrating Europe* (p. 135–139). Warsaw: Akademia Wychowania Fizycznego w Warszawie.
- Onwunali, K.U. (2012). The Notion of Spheres in Soren Kierkegaard: A Philosophical Insight. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(5), 121–127.
- Park, J.L. (2007). *Becoming More Authentic: The Positive Side of Existentialism*. Minneapolis, USA: Existential Books.
- Steiner, G. (1978). *Heidegger*. London, UK: The Harvester Press Limited, Sussex.
- Waddington, D. (2005). A Field Guide to Heidegger: Understanding the Question Concerning Technology. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 37(4), 568.
- Waibel, V.L. (2015). *Fichte und Sartre über Freiheit*. /Fichte and Sartre about Freedom/. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter.

AUTHOR'S ADDRESS: Emanuel Hurych
Masaryk University
Faculty of Sports Studies
Kamenice 753/5
625 00 Brno
Czech Republic
E-mail: eman.h@tiscali.cz

Received: 13 October 2016; Accepted: 1 December 2016