Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Society & Natural Resources
An International Journal

ISSN: 0894-1920 (Print) 1521-0723 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/usnr20

New Challenges for Managing Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas: An Exploratory Study of the European Landscape Convention in Sweden

Daniel N. Laven, Sandra Wall-Reinius & Peter Fredman

To cite this article: Daniel N. Laven, Sandra Wall-Reinius & Peter Fredman (2015) New Challenges for Managing Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas: An Exploratory Study of the European Landscape Convention in Sweden, Society & Natural Resources, 28:10, 1126-1143, DOI: 10.1080/08941920.2015.1013166

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2015.1013166

Society and Natural Resources, 28:1126–1143

ISSN: 0894-1920 print/1521-0723 online
DOI: 10.1080/08941920.2015.1013166

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

New Challenges for Managing Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas: An Exploratory Study of the European Landscape Convention in Sweden

DANIEL N. LAVEN, SANDRA WALL-REINIUS, AND PETER FREDMAN

European Tourism Research Institute (ETOUR), Mid Sweden University, Östersund, Sweden

"Sustainable tourism" has emerged as the dominant paradigm for managing visitor use in protected areas. An important consequence of this approach is that management tends to focus on issues inside protected-area boundaries. Recently, broader landscape-oriented approaches have gained attention (e.g., the European Landscape Convention [ELC]). These strategies strive to achieve sustainable landscape protection and often identify tourism as a key development strategy. Using Sweden as an example, this article explores the intersection of the landscape concept—as articulated in the ELC—with the contemporary notion of sustainable tourism management in protected areas. This exploratory study was conducted using qualitative research methods. While study participants reported strong potential in landscape-oriented approaches, they also identified key challenges including "institutional negotiation and conflict" and "confusion and uncertainty about the landscape concept." The article concludes by addressing the implications for enhancing sustainable tourism management through adoption of landscape-oriented approaches.

Keywords land use policy, parks and protected areas, sustainability

"Sustainable tourism" is the dominant paradigm for managing visitor use in protected areas (e.g., Eagles and McCool 2002). For example, Manning et al. (2011) states that "the field of parks and outdoor recreation has been a leader in defining and applying the concept of sustainability" (25) through use of frameworks such as Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) (Stankey et al. 1985). One consequence of this approach is that management has focused on issues inside protected-area boundaries.

Recently, broader approaches such as the European Landscape Convention (ELC) have gained attention. It has been noted that landscape-oriented approaches like the ELC will have important implications for management of protected areas (see Table 1). These shifts include transitions from (a) centralized planning and management to areas managed in partnership; (b) areas managed solely for their outdoor recreation values to areas managed for their working landscape values; and (c) areas

Received 25 June 2013; accepted 25 July 2014.
Address correspondence to Daniel N. Laven, European Tourism Research Institute (ETOUR), Mid Sweden University, Kunskapens väg 1, Östersund 831 25, Sweden. E-mail: Daniel.Laven@miun.se

Table 1. Evolution of protected area management (adapted from Phillips 2003)

	Protected areas: As they were (~1870–1989)	Protected areas: As they are becoming (~1990 into the future)
Objectives	Set aside for conservation and valued as wilderness; managed mainly for tourists and visitors; about resource protection.	Managed also with economic and social objectives; designated also for rehabilitation, restoration, and community development purposes.
Governance	Controlled by central governments.	Controlled by many partners that integrate local, regional, national, and international interests.
Local people	Managed without regard to the interests of local stakeholders.	Managed to meet the needs of local stakeholders.
Broader context	Developed separately and managed as islands.	Developed as networks, including buffer zones and green corridors.
Approach to management	Managed reactively and from short time perspectives.	Managed adaptively from longer term perspectives.
Financing	Publically funded through tax revenues.	Funded from many sources, which are often characterized by public-private partnerships.

financed publicly to areas financed by many sources (the categories in Table 1 illustrate general trends, not fixed categories). These shifts will also have important implications for tourism, particularly in and around protected areas (Higham and Vistad 2011).

Using Sweden as an example, this article explores the intersection of the landscape construct—as articulated in the ELC—with the notion of sustainable tourism management in protected areas (Eagles and McCool 2002; Manning et al. 2011). Study findings and implications are then discussed in a broader protected area and tourism context.

Theoretical and Policy Context

Sustainable Tourism and Protected Areas

The sustainability paradigm emerged largely from the 1987 report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (Edwards 2005). The concept generally refers to development that meets current social, environmental, and economic needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet those same needs (e.g., Goodland 1995). While "sustainable tourism" has been described as tourism that is managed according to the principles of sustainable development (e.g., Butler 1999), recent scholarship treats the concept as a "balance between the

consumption, transformation, and creation of tourism resources'' (Liu 2003, as cited in Prince 2011, 12). The rationale for this definitional shift is articulated by Hardy, Beeton, and Pearson (2002):

> Given the reactionary nature of sustainable tourism to current paradigmatic approaches and the difficulties associated with defining it, this leads to the question of whether sustainable tourism will be able to be developed theoretically and practically, or is it simply reactionary rhetoric? There is no doubt that many facets of the tourism industry, from operators to government agencies, have adapted their operations to practice sustainable tourism. (490)

It is precisely within this context that protected areas have long been, and continue to be, important components of sustainable tourism development strategies (e.g., Fredman, Hörnsten Friberg, and Emmelin 2007; Manning 2007; Higham and Vistad 2011). The linkage between protected areas and sustainable tourism can be traced to their shared roots. The American national parks movement of the early 20th century was an important component of today's growing nature-based tourism industry (Shaffer 2001; Wall-Reinius 2009), and the capacity for protected areas to generate tourism revenue has received considerable attention (e.g., Stynes et al. 2000; Saayman and Saayman 2006; Huhtala 2007; Warwick and Hall 2009; Mayer et al. 2010; Fredman and Yuan 2011). Much of this research has focused on how tourism enhances socioeconomic benefits while minimizing negative environmental impacts (Eagles and McCool 2002; Tumusiime and Vedeld 2012). Such studies contribute to the growing popularity of using sustainable tourism in protected areas as part of broader economic development strategies.

This line of research reflects only one conceptualization of the sustainable tourism paradigm. For instance, McCool and Moisey (2001) suggest there are three primary meanings reflecting a continuum of views from industry-centered to more broadly socially centered: (i) sustaining tourism (i.e., how to maintain tourism businesses over time); (ii) sustainable tourism (i.e., a ''more gentle,'' small-scale form of community-oriented tourism, typically); and (iii) tourism as a tool for social and economic development.

Significant critique, however, has been directed toward notions of sustainable tourism, particularly related to issues of poverty, equity, climate change, and codes of conduct (e.g., Garrod and Fennell 2004; Gössling and Hall 2005), as well as the theoretical divide between sustainable tourism and its parental paradigm of sustainable development (Sharpley 2000). Furthermore, Liu (2003) has critiqued sustainable tourism research and identified six key issues that tend to be overlooked in the literature, including the role of tourism in promoting sociocultural progress, as well as issues of intragenerational equity. In a similar critique, Buckley (2012) reviewed more than 5000 publications and found that the main driver for improvement in sustainable performance is regulation rather than market measures and concludes that the industry is not yet close to sustainability.

Protected Area Management in Sweden

According to Swedish law, national parks should be large continuous areas of national interest and can only be established on public land in accordance with

national legislation and International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) criteria (Naturvårdsverket 2007). Most Swedish National Parks are considered IUCN category 1b (wilderness areas), many of which are included in the EU ''Natura 2000'' network.

Sweden hosts five UNESCO Biosphere Reserves (Kristianstad Vattenrike, Lake Vänern Archipelago and Mount Kinnekulle, Nedre Dalälven River Landscape, Blekinge Archipelago, and Eastern Vättern Scarp Landscape), all of which were established after 2005. Biosphere reserves seek to integrate conservation of biological and cultural diversity with economic and social development through partnerships between people and nature. This more holistic approach differs from the Swedish tradition of primarily preserving nature from people (Lundmark and Stjernström 2009).

Swedish decision makers have expressed a growing interest in social values associated with the country's environmental policy, which has had implications for tourism in protected areas. For example, the 2001 Swedish government writ ''En samlad naturvårdspolitik'' stated, ''Nature tourism and nature conservation should be developed for their mutual benefit'' (Swedish Government Writ 2001/02 2001, 173). The policy concludes that Sweden has a long tradition of ''protecting'' and ''preserving'' environmental values, but when it comes to ''presenting'' these values much more can be done, especially in terms of cooperation with local partners. Such policies reflect a shift from more traditional top-down perspectives in the planning of nature-based tourism toward approaches that better integrate local participation (Fredman and Sandell 2009).

As a result, the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency launched the ''Protect, Preserve, Present'' program in 2004 to enhance management of protected areas. The program focuses on local participation, management planning, outdoor recreation, tourism, visitor information, monitoring, and evaluation (Naturvårdsverket 2004). The Swedish government further codified its intent to integrate social values in environmental policy through a directive issued in 2008, referred to as ''Sustainable Protection of Nature Areas'' (Prop. 2008/09:214 2008). This directive emphasizes that protected areas should be managed so they are accessible resources for regional development, tourism, and public health. Consequently, management of sustainable tourism in protected areas in Sweden is now facing many of the governance and implementation questions associated with the emergence of a landscape approach as expressed by the ELC and reflected in Table 1.

Landscape and the European Landscape Convention

The concept of landscape does not simply refer to the land itself, but to the land as understood from a particular point of view or perspective. Landscape is both the geographical phenomenon and the human perceptions of it (Olwig 2007; Wylie 2007). Landscapes change because of the dynamic interaction between natural and cultural forces (Wall-Reinius 2012). Consequently, understanding landscapes requires a contextual approach that includes land-use practices along with the changing sociocultural and economic context in which a landscape is embedded (Wylie 2007; Wästfelt et al. 2012). Examples of landscape-oriented approaches include the IUCN Category V designation (Phillips 2002), consideration of agro-biodiversity values in protected area management (Ahmed et al. 2008), and efforts to use landscapes as a mechanism for promoting civic engagement and building civil society (Brown, Mitchell, and Beresford 2005).

Antrop (2006) has critically examined the intersection of the landscape and sustainability concepts. From this perspective, Antrop (2006) argues that the landscape concept is undergoing a "profound transition," whereby "the concept of landscape broadens and differentiates according to the context" (195). In other words, sustainable landscape planning management demands context-specific approaches. In many instances, this involves multiple land uses and interests that overlap in the same landscape. Such dynamic and multifunctional landscapes can create new opportunities for sustainable development activities precisely because of their relevance to a broader suite of stakeholders. As a result, there is growing recognition that such multifunctional approaches to landscape management (e.g., IUCN Category V) may contribute to more sustainable and robust use of land and resources compared to more "single-minded" approaches that focus on one resource or objective (e.g., Naveh 2001; Brandt and Vejre 2004).

From this notion of the landscape concept, the ELC explicitly defines landscape as "an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors" (Council of Europe 2000). By ratifying the ELC in 2010, Sweden has committed to:

- Recognizing landscapes in law.
- Raising awareness of the value of landscapes among private organizations, public authorities, and society at large.
- Promoting public involvement in decision making and actions concerning landscapes.

Because the ELC is in its infancy in Sweden, our study explores how key actors approach sustainable tourism in relation to protected areas with respect to the emerging concept of landscape as expressed in the ELC. Our intention is to support more effective implementation of the convention in the Swedish context.

Study Methods

This exploratory study uses a methodological approach referred to as developmental evaluation (Patton 2011). Development evaluation is designed to understand the initiation or implementation of new programs and policies under conditions of complexity (Rey, Tremblay, and Brousselle 2013). A developmental evaluation approach is especially appropriate for our study because of Sweden's recent adoption of the ELC, the anticipated need for new program development associated with the convention, and current uncertainty about how landscape-oriented approaches may affect protected area management in Sweden (i.e., the shifts summarized in Table 1).

Qualitative methods were used because of the exploratory nature of this research. An interview protocol was developed and in total 13 people were interviewed during 2012. Eleven of the interviews were conducted individually; one interview was conducted with two members from the same division of a national policy office dealing with ELC issues ($n = 13$). Our sample included representatives from government ministries, national governmental agencies, regional authorities, protected-area managers, not-for-profit organizations, and university professors. Study participants were identified using a combination of the key informant technique (e.g., Kumar, Stern, and Anderson 1993) and the snowball sampling strategy (Goodman 1961) in the following way: Four initial study participants were selected

because of their in-depth knowledge about—and history in working with—the ELC in Sweden. These initial study participants were asked who else should be interviewed on this topic area. The key informant technique is appropriate for obtaining information from individuals whose organizational roles imply they have knowledge about the topic under study (Biernacki and Waldorf 1981).

The interview protocol was semistructured and consisted of two parts. In part 1, study participants were asked a series of general questions about sustainable tourism development and implementation of the ELC in Sweden. In part 2, study participants were asked a series of more specific questions about their perceptions of the strengths and challenges of implementing the ELC in Sweden. Such interview questions are consistent with the literature on developmental evaluation (Patton 2002; 2011).

With the consent of each respondent, all interviews were recorded and transcribed in a confidential manner. All 12 interviews were conducted by the same individuals, and interviews generally lasted 1 hour and yielded transcripts ranging from 8 to 25 pages. Multiple coders were used and then a check-coding process was performed on a random sample of 30% of the transcripts to ensure intercoder reliability (Miles and Huberman 1994), Study data were then analyzed qualitatively for categories and themes related to issues of ELC implementation and sustainable tourism development across the 13 study participants (Patton 2002). Study participants were offered the opportunity to review the transcript from their interview and to review the resulting analysis to help ensure the validity of study findings.

Results

Within the methodological framework already described, four themes emerged from analysis of the study data: (a) institutional negation and conflict among key implementation actors; (b) confusion and uncertainty over the landscape concept; (c) opportunities for enhancing sustainable tourism development; and (d) future challenges for the landscape–sustainable tourism nexus. The following section presents each theme using interview data to illustrate key points.

Institutional Negotiation and Conflict

The clearest theme in our data set was the acknowledgment that the ELC represents a broader policy interest than the mission of any specific agency in Sweden. For example, every study participant identified some form of institutional negotiation and conflict among key actors as the strongest force affecting ELC implementation. Ten of 13 study participants described specific examples of institutional negotiation and conflict (e.g., actor conflict, actor negotiation, actor turf). These study participants used phrases like ''turf struggles,'' and referred to notions such as ''narrow,'' ''protective,'' and ''stovepiped''[1] to describe the current relationships among institutions involved in ELC implementation. One governmental official explained the situation like this:

> One problem is the state is almost always represented by one sector or another. . . . So it's one sector [that] starts the cooperation. Then I think

> the problem [is] in many cases that the state, within itself, has not had the cooperation [across] the sectors. (Interview 5)

A majority of study participants (9 of 13) identified the lack of a single entity "in charge" as a constraint for effective ELC implementation. While the Swedish National Heritage Board (Riksantikvarieämbetet) coordinates implementation of the convention, each agency implements the ELC within its own management units (e.g., the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency [Naturvårdsverket] is responsible for implementation in the national parks, etc.). According to several senior government officials who participated in the study, this has created a situation whereby agencies want the ELC portfolio but not the responsibility for doing the implementation work. One official involved in early ELC negotiations described the problem this way: "It's a couple of agencies that today [are] quarreling about who should have the responsibility even though none of them really want the responsibility because they know it's so much work" (Interview 3).

Two other study participants, both of whom work for regional authorities directly involved in ELC implementation, noted that their organizations simply lack available staff resources to handle the convention. The absence of capacity further exacerbates the lack of "administrative ownership" described above (i.e., no single entity is clearly "in charge").

When asked how the current implementation environment could be improved, nearly every study participant (12 of 13) described the need for more substantial collaboration across agency boundaries. About half of these study participants (6 of 12) felt that the various authorities involved in ELC implementation need to identify areas of consensus and "embrace the opportunities" offered by the convention. Three study participants at higher policy levels used especially strong language when describing the need for more effective interagency collaboration, which further underscores the importance of such collaboration for moving beyond the institutional challenges that have thus far characterized ELC implementation. One agency employee directly involved in ELC implementation offered this perspective: "[We need to make the issue of] landscape in civil society broader than the interest [of specific agencies]" (Interview 11).

Confusion and Uncertainty about the Landscape Concept

Confusion and uncertainty about the landscape concept emerged from our data set as a primary source of the institutional difficulties described above. For example, when asked what the concept means—and how the ELC seeks to operationalize this notion—every study participant expressed a slightly different view of the concept, particularly in relation to the ELC. Moreover, five study participants specifically mentioned the challenge of obtaining a shared understanding of the landscape notion. According to one protected area manager, a key challenge is the spatial variation in the way stakeholders understand landscape: "I think landscape . . . is perceived differently by different stakeholders . . . depending on where you're from, you get one perspective. If you're from somewhere else you get maybe a different perspective" (Interview 1).

Three other study participants noted difficulties that their own organizations face in developing actions around a concept that can have very different meanings for different actors. Several study participants reported that different perceptions of landscape, held

by different actors, can be an obstacle for initiating collaborative action. One study participant, directly involved in the landscape-protected area nexus, gave this perspective:

> You could say that [my organization] neglects this definition [of landscape] and that we go around it because the definition is just meaningless. It means anything, everything. . . . And if we say, okay, everyone can define landscape as they want, then okay, we leave it and then we focus on the rest. (Interview 6)

As the preceding data suggest, study participants frequently used language to describe the ambiguity of the landscape concept in terms of "if landscape is everything, maybe it's nothing."[2] For example, one interviewee noted that landscape can be applied to "anything from mountain tops to cityscapes" (Interview 4), while other study participants used terms like "vague," "everything," and "too subjective" when discussing how their organization approaches landscape. Our data further suggest that issues of uncertainty and confusion around the landscape concept ultimately require a political or policy solution. One senior government official in the heritage sector noted that more work is needed to achieve a shared understanding of the concept: "We have really not defined the word 'landscape,' not in Sweden and we have not really questioned ourselves what does the word 'landscape' mean in the convention" (Interview 3).

Opportunities for Enhancing Sustainable Tourism Development

Despite the challenges already articulated, our data also show that ratification of the ELC—and a shift toward landscape-oriented approaches more generally—may offer opportunities for enhancing sustainable tourism development, especially for protected areas in Sweden. This sense of opportunity was expressed most strongly in terms of taking a "whole systems" or "more integrated" approach. For example, one long-time manager of a nongovernmental organization in the Swedish mountain region offered this perspective:

> One would take more account of the landscape as a whole, which I think that [sic] is pretty bad at the moment in Sweden [because] we tend to look at individual objects. But . . . in connection to tourism and experiences, one must look at the whole experience of the landscape. (Interview 4)

The notion of a "whole systems" approach was also frequently discussed in the context of creating greater social and ecological connectivity between protected areas. Speaking from this point of view, 12 of 13 study participants felt that a landscape approach may enhance protected area management by creating mechanisms for looking beyond park or reserve boundaries. As reported earlier, nearly every study participant (10 of 13) acknowledged that the current governance and management structures are too narrow, or "stove piped," to integrate landscape, sustainability, and development issues. One park manager framed the issue in terms of enhancing zoning strategies around protected areas:

> We have a national park in Sweden called Fulufjället. In the planning process for establishing [the park] they had this issue [of] what happens

> outside the border. . . . There was heavy forestry there. . . . It's very tricky and the state had no real power to put in buffer zone thinking. [But] if you had a landscape concern of the whole thing between the national park and the rest of the landscape—how to have some kind of a buffer area that goes between the various protected areas and the landscape, it would be very good for national parks. Otherwise [all] you have is this island. (Interview 12)

As the preceding data excerpts suggest, study participants identified a range of issues for improving the sustainability profile of tourism. Two of the most commonly mentioned issues were transportation and development/infrastructure impacts. The "whole systems" issue is especially important from an eco- or nature-based tourism perspective because, by definition, such tourism activities are comprised of flows of inputs (e.g., visitors, infrastructure) and impacts (e.g., economic activities, ecological effects) across protected area boundaries. Reflecting on this situation, one scientist noted that the convention should be used "as a tool [for] elaborating places where you've tried to develop sustainable tourism" (Interview 2).

Perhaps the most significant opportunity, as perceived by more than half of the study participants (7 of 13), is the potential for a landscape approach to spur more sustainable entrepreneurial activities that meet the needs of local residents. Two study participants discussed various "buy local" efforts (e.g., handcrafts; gastronomy), some of which are now operating at regional scales. One protected-area manager articulated the value added to entrepreneurial activities by a landscape approach this way:

> The core mechanism that generates income [for] sustainable tourism is the values in the landscape. When entrepreneurs are trying to develop [a nature-based] tourism business, their understanding increases about why need to be very protective of these values because it's their source of income. (Interview 1)

Six study participants connected issues of entrepreneurism with opportunities for broadening public discourse. Such dialogue was seen as the most important factor for advancing sustainable development efforts within a landscape context. One official felt strongly that landscape is a "common resource and a common responsibility" that, if managed from an integrated perspective, has the potential to be an important tool for tourism and community development (Interview 11). For another protected-area manager, the landscape concept articulated in the ELC has the potential to: "gather different [stakeholder] perspectives, and through [such dialog] you get an increased knowledge of other perspectives, thereby also increasing sustainability . . . that's what I feel the convention can do" (Interview 1).

A large majority of study participants (10 of 13) saw the potential for a landscape context to enable greater, and more meaningful, collaboration across public–private sectors, thereby catalyzing new entrepreneurial activities. One senior policymaker stated the issue this way:

> When you work with anything that should be sustainable, then you have to see the whole—you have to see things in a whole—you have to see the sectors together. You have to see the different areas of responsibility together and we have to work together with other sectors. I think that's

> key. . . . So I think in that way, landscape can be a ground to stand on to discuss . . . and come together in joint solutions. (Interview 3)

In summary, study participants perceived various opportunities in landscape-oriented approaches. The most significant benefit may be the potential for breaking down existing institutional and sectoral barriers, while engaging broad segments of society in dialogue. Interestingly, when asked to identify "good examples" that illustrate this potential, study participants often referenced the experience of Fulufjället National Park along with the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve program. Study participants also acknowledged that these issues constituted the greatest challenges for adopting landscape approaches.

Future Challenges for the Landscape–Sustainable Tourism Nexus

Whether discussing the challenges of public engagement or working in more integrated ways, nearly every study participant identified the need to improve trust between entities as an immediate issue (12 of 13). In describing the importance of trust, one long-time decision maker reflected on the "cost of recovery" when trust is broken:

> You must think about how to build trust. This [shifting toward more landscape-oriented approaches] is a very long process. And where you can do almost everything right and if just one thing—just once you can destroy everything for 10 s of years. (Interview 6)

This perspective was echoed by two other government officials (one national, one regional) who understood that developing tourism within an ELC context requires the engagement, support, and trust of a variety of landowners. The official working at the national level described the challenge this way: "I think the most important thing is you must have the support from the landowners. You can never have sustainable landscape use if you don't have the landowners and the local population [on board]" (Interview 5).

Emphasizing this issue of scale, the official working at the regional level acknowledged that many of these landowners have had mixed experiences working with conservation and/or tourism development initiatives, thereby undermining efforts to create trust:

> I think the most difficult thing is that tour[ism] here is so small. It's very difficult for [local entrepreneurs] to earn their lives on it, to get money enough. So it's difficult for the entrepreneurs to work it all out. (Interview 10)

Another challenge identified by study participants, involves how to conduct the broad public engagement that is so essential for landscape-oriented approaches (as discussed above). One respondent raised a host of public engagement issues that still need to be reconciled:

> What is complicated [from a] tourist [perspective about the] ELC is that it's not about local participation. It's about public participation. And who should [be] invited [to this dialogue]? The [current] tourists but also potential tourists? All Swedish tourists? That is a broad challenge. (Interview 2)

A related challenge involved limitations for regional authorities. This group of study participants reported that the vision articulated by the ELC is simply too large for current staff levels, especially for peripheral and smaller regions. One regional official explained the challenge like this: ''We already have [too many] things to do for the authorities. So we have not the resources to work with it'' (Interview 8).

Finally, six study participants expressed fear that the broadness of the ELC, in conjunction with the other challenges reported in this article, may result in very weak implementation or nonimplementation. Another regional official bluntly stated the issue this way: ''I'm afraid that maybe [the ELC] won't change our work at all. Because we know it's [just] a convention'' (Interview 10).

This perspective was reinforced by another respondent who has been professionally involved in landscape and development issues for the last 25 years:

> If there are going to be change, then all the actors must be trained in the convention. . . . So few know about it and [these issues] are not considered when addressing [new land use] questions . . . we have not at all been working on the issue and it is a challenge to start deal with it. (Interview 4)

Discussion

Study participants acknowledge that their respective organizations approach landscape management from their own institutional perspectives, and often in ways that are insufficiently integrated or ''too stovepiped.'' Since resource management in Sweden, as in many countries, tends to divide nature and culture into separate and sometimes exclusive administrative categories, management is rarely integrated even when these resources share the same geographic space (Wästfelt et al. 2012). This lack of integration has been identified as a chronic barrier for in environmental management (e.g., Knight and Landres 1998; Wondolleck and Yaffee 2000; Olsson, Folke, and Hahn 2004; Armitage 2007) and was an important rationale for ratification of the ELC in Sweden. At the same time, our results indicate that study participants perceive substantial opportunities associated with landscape approaches for the development of sustainable tourism in and around protected areas.

From this perspective, our discussion considers the two models that interviews most often referred to as ''innovative,'' namely, the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve Program and Fulufjället National Park. We focus on the implications of the biosphere and Fulufjället experiences for sustainable tourism initiatives in Sweden and beyond.

Biosphere reserves are designed to facilitate more participatory, cross-boundary, and integrated management (Pollock 2004; Ishwaran, Persic, and Tri 2008; Stoll-Kleemann and Welp 2008). Indeed, our strongest and most significant finding is that among the key actors interviewed for the study, there is a perception that biosphere reserves are better positioned to help navigate the institutional barriers that study participants associate with landscape-oriented approaches. McKinney and Johnson (2009) refer to this issue as the ''gap in governance'' (2), and a number of studies conclude that effective governance is the most critical implementation issue currently facing biosphere reserves and related models (Maikhuri et al. 2001; Sundberg 2003; Matysek, Stratford, and Kriwoken 2006; Olsson et al. 2007; Laven et al. 2010; Schliep and Stoll-Kleemann 2010).

Our findings also indicate that study participants perceive biosphere reserves as opportunities for innovation because of their "holisitic" and "systemic" view of sustainable tourism development. When asked to identify specific examples, study participants mentioned projects not typically associated with "classical" protected area management, such as local food development and regional transportation efforts. The ability of biosphere reserves to approach sustainable tourism development more broadly is important because it addresses a fundamental critique associated with sustainable tourism in protected areas: namely, that protected area management has primarily focused on the interests and agendas of outsiders, which often exclude local practices and everyday uses seen as less compatible with conservation or park management (Lundmark and Stjernström 2009; Wall-Reinius 2012).

The Fulufjället National Park experience has been, from a Swedish perspective, similarly innovative for several reasons (Wallsten 2003; Fredman, Friberg, and Emmelin 2006; Zachrisson et al. 2006; Fredman, Hörnsten Friberg, and Emmelin 2007). The park was established in 2002 to preserve a mountain region with distinctive low alpine vegetation and to provide visitor experiences of tranquility, isolation, and purity (Naturvårdsverket 2002). The area directly surrounding the national park is referred by the park agency to as the "gateway area,"[3] where most tourism operators providing services for visitors to Fulufjället are located. Tourism in the area primarily includes hiking and backpacking, fishing, and wildlife watching.

Both the processes of establishment and management of Fulufjället National Park include several approaches that put the park in a broader social context consistent with responses reported in this study. Most important for the success of establishing the park was probably the community-oriented process, which, following negative opinions among the local population, refocused dialogue from restrictive activities inside the park to economic development in the gateway areas (Wallsten 2003). This changed local opinion in favor of the park's establishment because of the perceived benefits associated with tourism (Zachrisson et al. 2006).

An important element in the establishment of the park was the tourism development project entitled "Fulufjället's Surroundings." The project emphasized the advantages that a national park would provide in the form of investment and job opportunities, and one outcome was the formation of the "Ring of Fulufjället" network of tourist entrepreneurs in the area surrounding the proposed park. This network has now developed into an association for the development of sustainable nature and culture tourism in the gateway area of Fulufjället (www.fulufjallet.nu). The establishment process also included several infrastructure investments for visitors, including improved roads, telecommunications, a visitor center and restaurant, a bigger parking area, and a new trail between the main parking area and the waterfall. By including the broader region in the planning and management of the park, greater and more accurate economic impacts were derived due to less leakage in the immediate area (Fredman and Yuan 2011).

Another key element of the park's management is a zoning system that divides the park into four zones with different management objectives: the Wilderness Zone, Low Activity Zone, High Activity Zone, and Developed Zone, distinguished by criteria relating to human influences, physical environment, expected visitor experiences, and appropriate activities. This was the first time that Swedish authorities instituted a zoning system that corresponds to the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum planning framework (Driver and Brown 1978; Clark and Stankey 1979). Using this zoning approach, the area was improved with signs and trail markers, while some

trails and old shelters were removed from the core wilderness zone. Large displays were established at several entry points around the park with visitor information, including the purpose of the different zones. Authorities believe that the zoning structure increases the parks' visitor capacity (Naturvårdsverket 2002). Given the emphasis on social issues in Fulufjället National Park, extensive visitor surveys were undertaken the year prior to and immediately after the park's establishment (Fredman, Friberg, and Emmelin 2006). These informed the management plan as well as an assessment of the short-term effects of the park (Fredman, Hörnsten Friberg, and Emmelin 2007), and the 40% increase in visitor numbers clearly points at the significance of protected areas as markers in the tourism production system (Wall-Reinius and Fredman 2007). However, tourism development in this context is not without challenges. For example, Fulufjället has attracted private investments such as the PAN Park Accommodation, a holiday village just outside the park border. Conflicts with the local community and other operators and insufficient visitor volumes resulted in this venture going out of business in 2012.

To summarize, the community-oriented process, gateway tourism development project, zoning approach, and visitor surveys at Fulufjället represent a more integrated approach to sustainable tourism in protected areas than has previously been the case in Sweden. Each of these components represents different mechanisms for looking beyond park boundaries, which spurs more sustainable entrepreneurial activities that meet the needs of local residents. We believe this approach is a good example of integration between ecological, economic, and social objectives as envisioned by the ELC.

Conclusions

Using Sweden as an example, this study offers an exploratory perspective on the challenges of adopting a landscape approach for managing sustainable tourism in protected areas. Although our study is limited to Sweden, the landscape and protected area contexts analyzed in the article are being implemented in a growing number of countries worldwide. Consequently, our findings can be insightful to other actors wrestling with ELC implementation even though this study is not generalizable in a statistical or inferential sense (Yin 2003; Ruddin 2006).

Our findings shed light on the challenges, opportunities, and tensions in the general shifts described in Table 1. Specifically, our study suggests that applying more integrated landscape approaches in protected-area contexts will remain challenging for the following reasons:

- Landscape approaches require new forms of communication between protected area stakeholders (both horizontal and vertical). Yet existing institutions appear unprepared to undertake this type of discursive approach to protected area management.
- Landscape approaches highlight the need for ongoing reconciliation of the cultural differences that result from more integrated management approaches. These include different institutional cultures (i.e., the different management agencies/authorities that will need to work together) along with cultural differences between local communities and visitor populations (e.g., PAN Park establishment at Fulufjället). Balancing these differences will be a key governance challenge for protected areas in landscape context.

- Landscape approaches require high degrees of trust between various stakeholder groups, many of whom have never worked together previously. Consequently, protected-area management must be about building and sustaining stakeholder trust inasmuch as it is about protecting resources and providing outdoor recreation opportunities. In many institutional settings, and for many protected area managers, such an approach represents new territory.

Despite these challenges, our analysis reveals strong similarities between the landscape approach as envisioned by the ELC and the biosphere reserve concept. In particular, our data set suggests that the biosphere reserve approach can blend top-down and bottom-up mechanisms in ways that facilitate landscape management as described by the ELC. In this way, implementation of the ELC, and the associated shifts described in Table 1, echo key themes in the regional planning literature (e.g., Knight and Landres 1998; McKinney and Johnson 2009)—specifically, that contemporary institutional and policy structures do not encourage broad, integrated landscape approaches in planning and management of sustainable tourism in protected areas in Sweden. We believe this an issue frequently encountered elsewhere and see the further pursuit of such regional planning questions as important agenda items for the sustainable tourism and protected-area management research communities.

Notes

1. In Swedish, the term "stovepiped" (stuprör) can used to describe organizations that lack horizontal integration across divisions, departments, or policy areas. The use of the term in Sweden mirrors the use of the term in North America from this organizational perspective.
2. This notion is adapted from Wildavsky's (1973) seminal paper, "If Planning is Everything, Maybe It's Nothing."
3. Since Howe, McMahon, and Propst (1997) described the concept, the "gateway community" has become widely associated with park planning and management issues. The term is commonly used in reference to communities adjacent to protected areas (e.g., Mules 2005).

References

Ahmed, T., J. Brown, A. Kothari, A. Phillips, and S. Stolton, eds. 2008. *Protected landscapes and agrobiodiversity values*. Heidelberg, Germany: IUCN and GTZ.

Antrop, M. 2006. Sustainable landscapes: Contradiction, fiction or utopia? *Landscape and Urban Planning* 75:187–97.

Armitage, D. R. 2007. *Adaptive co-management: Collaboration, learning, and multi-level governance*. Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press.

Biernacki, P., and D. Waldorf. 1981. Snowball sampling: Problems and techniques of chain referral sampling. *Sociological Methods & Research* 10:141–163.

Brandt, J., and H. Vejre, eds. 2004. *Multifunctional landscapes: Theory, values and history*. Southampton, UK: WIT Press.

Brown, J., N. Mitchell, and M. Beresford, eds. 2005. *The protected landscape approach: Linking nature, culture and community*. Cambridge, UK: IUCN.

Buckley, R. 2012. Sustainable tourism: research and reality. *Annals of Tourism Research* 39(2):528–46.

Butler, R. W. 1999. Sustainable tourism: A state-of-the-art review. *Tourism Geographies* 1:7–25.

Clark, R. N., and G. H. Stankey. 1979. The recreation opportunity spectrum: A framework for planning, management, and research. USDA Forest Service, General Technical Report (PNW-98). http://www.fs.fed.us/cdt/carrying_capacity/gtr098.pdf (accessed 3 April 2015).

Council of Europe. 2000. European landscape convention. http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/176.htm (accessed 22 May 2013).

Driver, B. L., and P. J. Brown. 1978. The opportunity spectrum concept and behavioural information in outdoor recreation resource supply inventories: A rationale. In *Integrated inventories of renewable natural resources: Proceedings of the workshop, January 1978, Tucson, Arizona*, ed. H. G. Lund et al., 24–31. USDA Forest Service, General Technical Report (RM-55). Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Experiment Station.

Eagles, P. F., and S. F. McCool. 2002. *Tourism in national parks and protected areas: Planning and management*. New York: CABI.

Edwards, A. R. 2005. *The sustainability revolution: Portrait of a paradigm shift*. Gabriola Island, Canada: New Society.

Fredman, P., L. Friberg, and L. Emmelin. 2006. *Visitor surveys at Fulufjället—Before and after national park establishment*. Östersund, Sweden: European Tourism Research Institute.

Fredman, P., L. Hörnsten Friberg, and L. Emmelin. 2007. Increased visitation from National Park designation. *Current Issues in Tourism* 10:87–95.

Fredman, P., and K. Sandell. 2009. Protect, preserve, present—The role of tourism in Swedish National Parks. In *Tourism and national parks. International perspectives on development, histories and change. Contemporary geographies of leisure, tourism and mobility series*, ed. F. Warwick and C. M. Hall, 197–208. New York: Routledge.

Fredman, P., and M. Yuan. 2011. Primary economic impacts at three spatial levels: The case of Fulufjället National Park, Sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 11:74–86.

Garrod, B., and D. A. Fennell. 2004. An analysis of whalewatching codes of conduct. *Annals of Tourism Research* 312:334–52.

Goodland, R. 1995. The concept of environmental sustainability. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 26:1–24.

Goodman, L. A. 1961. Snowball sampling. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 32:148–70.

Gössling, S., and C. M. Hall. 2005. *Tourism and global environmental change: Ecological, economic, social and political interrelationships*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Hardy, A., R. J. Beeton, and L. Pearson. 2002. Sustainable tourism: an overview of the concept and its position in relation to conceptualisations of tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 10:475–96.

Higham, J., and O.-I. Vistad. 2011. Tourism in protected natural areas: The Nordic–Baltic context. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 11:1–12.

Howe, J., E. T. McMahon, and L. Propst. 1997. *Balancing nature and commerce in gateway communities*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Huhtala, M. 2007. Assessment of the local economic impacts of national park tourism: the case of Pallas-Ounastunturi National Park. *Forest Snow and Landscape Research* 81:223–38.

Ishwaran, N., A. Persic, and N. H. Tri. 2008. Concept and practice: The case of UNESCO biosphere reserves. *International Journal of Environment and Sustainable Development* 7:118–31.

Knight, R. L., and P. B. Landres, eds. 1998. *Stewardship across boundaries*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Kumar, N., L. W. Stern, and J. C. Anderson. 1993. Conducting interorganizational research using key informants. *Academy of Management Journal* 36:1633–51.

Laven, D., C. Ventriss, R. Manning, and N. Mitchell. 2010. Evaluating U.S. national heritage areas: Theory, methods, and application. *Environmental Management* 46:195–212.

Liu, Z. 2003. Sustainable tourism development: A critique. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 11:459–75.

Lundmark, L., and O. Stjernström. 2009. Environmental protection: An instrument for regional development? National ambitions versus local realities in the case of tourism. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 9:387–405.

Maikhuri, R. K., S. Nautiyal, K. S. Rao, and K. G. Saxena. 2001. Conservation policy–people conflicts: A case study from Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve (a world heritage site), India. *Forest Policy and Economics* 2:355–65.

Manning, R. E. 2007. *Parks and carrying capacity: Commons without tragedy*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Manning, R., W. Valliere, L. Anderson, R. S. McCown, P. Pettengill, N. Reigner, S. Lawson, P. Newman, M. Budruk, D. Laven, J. Hallo, L. Park, J. Bacon, D. Abbe, C. van Riper, and K. Goonan. 2011. Defining, measuring, monitoring, and managing the sustainability of parks for outdoor recreation. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration* 29:24–37.

Matysek, K. A., E. Stratford, and L. K. Kriwoken. 2006. The UNESCO biosphere reserve program in Australia: Constraints and opportunities for localized sustainable development. *Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe Canadien* 50:85–100.

Mayer, M., M. Muller, M. Woltering, J. Arnegger, and J. Hubert. 2010. The economic impact of tourism in six German national parks. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 97:73–82.

McCool, S. F., and R. N. Moisey. 2001. *Tourism, recreation and sustainability: Linking culture and the environment*. New York: CABI.

McKinney, M., and S. Johnson. 2009. *Working across boundaries: People, nature, and regions*. Cambridge, UK: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Miles, M., and A. Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded source book*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mules, T. 2005. Economic impacts of national park tourism on gateway communities: The case of Kosciuszko National Park. *Tourism Economics* 11(2):247–59.

Naturvårdsverket. 2002. Fulufjällets Nationalpark: Skötselplan (Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, Management Plan of Fulufjället National Park). SNV Rapport 5246. http://www.naturvardsverket.se/Om-Naturvardsverket/Publikationer/ISBN/5200/91-620-5246-6/ (accessed 3 April 2015).

Naturvårdsverket. 2004. Protect, preserve, present: A programme for better use and management of protected areas, 2005–2015. Swedish Environmental Protection Agency Report 5483. Stockholm: Swedish Environmental Protection Agency. http://www.naturvardsverket.se/Om-Naturvardsverket/Publikationer/ISBN/5400/91-620-5483-X/ (accessed 3 April 2015).

Naturvårdsverket. 2007. *Nationalparksplan för Sverige. Utkast och remissversion*. Stockholm, Sweden: Swedish Environmental Protection Agency.

Naveh, Z. 2001. Ten major premises for a holistic conception of multifunctional landscapes. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 57:269–84.

Olsson, P., C. Folke, V. Galaz, T. Hahn, and L. Schultz. 2007. Enhancing the fit through adaptive co-management: creating and maintaining bridging functions for matching scales in the Kristianstads Vattenrike Biosphere Reserve Sweden. *Ecology and Society* 12:28.

Olsson, P., C. Folke, and T. Hahn. 2004. Social-ecological transformation for ecosystem management: The development of adaptive co-management of a wetland landscape in southern Sweden. *Ecology and Society* 9:2.

Olwig, K. R. 2007. The practice of landscape 'conventions' and the just landscape: The case of the European Landscape Convention. *Landscape Research* 32:579–94.

Patton, M. Q. 2002. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. 2011. *Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. New York: Guilford.

Phillips, A. 2002. Management guidelines for IUCN Category V protected areas protected landscapes/seascapes: World Commission on Protected Areas best practice protected area guidelines series no. 9. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Phillips, A. 2003. Turning ideas on their head: The new paradigm for protected areas. *George Wright Forum* 20:8–32.

Pollock, R. M. 2004. Place-based governance for biosphere reserves. *Environments: A Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 32:27–41.

Prince, S. 2011. Establishing the connections between the goals of sustainable development and creative tourism. Master's thesis, Department of Science and Technology, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden.

Prop. 2008/09:214. 2008. Hållbart skydd av naturområden, Regeringskansliet, Stockholm.

Rey, L., M. C. Tremblay, and A. Brousselle. 2013. Managing tensions between evaluation and research: Illustrative cases of developmental evaluation in the context of research. *American Journal of Evaluation* 35:45–60.

Ruddin, L. P. 2006. You can generalize stupid! Social scientists, Bent Flyvbjerg, and case study methodology. *Qualitative Inquiry* 12:797–812.

Saayman, M., and A. Saayman. 2006. Estimating the economic contribution of visitor spending in the Kruger National Park to the regional economy. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 14:67–81.

Schliep, R., and S. Stoll-Kleemann. 2010. Assessing governance of biosphere reserves in Central Europe. *Land Use Policy* 27:917–27.

Shaffer, M. S. 2001. *See America first: Tourism and national identity, 1880–1940*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Sharpley, R. 2000. Tourism and sustainable development: Exploring the theoretical divide. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 8:1–19.

Stankey, G., D. Cole, R. Lucas, M. Peterson, S. Frissell, and Wasburne R. 1985. The limits of acceptable change (LAC) system for wilderness planning. USDA Forest Service General Technical Report INT-176. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.

Stoll-Kleemann, S., and M. Welp. 2008. Participatory and integrated management of biosphere reserves: Lessons from case studies and a global survey. *GAIA-Ecological Perspectives for Science and Society* 17:161–68.

Stynes, D. J., D. B. Propst, W. Chang, and Y. Sun. 2000. *Estimating national park visitor spending and economic impacts: The MGM2 model. Report to the National Park Service*. East Lansing, MI: Department of Park, Recreation and Tourism Resources, Michigan State University.

Sundberg, J. 2003. Conservation and democratization: constituting citizenship in the Maya Biosphere Reserve, Guatemala. *Political Geography* 22:715–40.

Swedish Government Writ. 2001/02:173. 2001. En samlad naturvårdspolitik. Stockholm, Sweden: The Government Office.

Tumusiime, D. M., and P. Vedeld. 2012. False promise or false premise? Using tourism revenue sharing to promote conservation and poverty reduction in Uganda. *Conservation and Society* 10:15–28.

Wall-Reinius, S. 2009. A ticket to national parks? Tourism, railways and the establishment of national parks in Sweden. In *Tourism and national parks. International perspectives on development, histories and change*, ed. W. Frost and C. M. Hall, 184–96. New York: Routledge.

Wall-Reinius, S. 2012. Wilderness and culture: Tourist views and experiences in the Laponian World Heritage Area. *Society & Natural Resources* 25:621–32.

Wall-Reinius, S., and P. Fredman. 2007. Protected areas as attractions. *Annals of Tourism Research* 34:839–54.

Wallsten, P. 2003. The "inside-out" process: A key approach for establishing Fulufjället National Park in Sweden. *Mountain Research and Development* 23:227–29.

Warwick, F., and C. M Hall. 2009. *Tourism and national parks. International perspectives on development, histories and change. Contemporary geographies of leisure, tourism and mobility series*. New York: Routledge.

Wästfelt, A., K. Saltzman, E. G. Berg, and A. Dahlberg. 2012. Landscape care paradoxes: Swedish landscape care arrangements in a European context. *Geoforum* 43:1171–81.

Wildavsky, A. 1973. If planning is everything, maybe it's nothing. *Policy Sciences* 4:127–53.

Wondolleck, J., and S. Yaffee. 2000. *Making collaboration work: Lessons learned from innovation in natural resource management*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Wylie, J. 2007. *Landscape*. London: Routledge.

Yin, R. K. 2003. *Case study research design and methods*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Zachrisson, A., K. Sandell, P. Fredman, and K. Eckerberg. 2006. Tourism and protected areas: Motives, actors and processes. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science & Management* 2:350–58.