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INTRODUCTION

Background

Most of us have had guests from outside of our own village, town or city visiting from time to time. Whether these are friends, relatives, colleagues, business contacts or acquaintances, they all place demands on you as a host. Apart from being fed and perhaps offered a bed, they need to be entertained. Chances are that you do as many others - show the visitors around. In doing so, you are likely to discover a new café; visit a church that you always wanted to see or walk up to that viewpoint you never noticed before. After the visit, both you and your guest might feel like you have learnt something; you about your community and the visitor about his or her destination. On their next visit, this guest might want to discover other parts of the destination and you will find out even more about your community.

This is the kind of development process that takes place in the meeting of two people coming from separate contexts and with different perspectives and knowledge. One might argue, however, that this process also occurs on an aggregated level, in the complex dilemma of developing a tourism industry, which involves attracting people for holidays to a place where other people live and work. Residents in the community might not object to visitors; they might even be in favour or engaged in the development of tourism. However, despite the positive attitudes of residents, the development of tourism can lead to detrimental social effects on the community. People get burnt out, excluded, disillusioned or move away; groups are sometimes engaged in destructive disputes and conflicts meaning that tax income, grants and other investments in time, money and efforts go to waste, leaving a collapsed tourism industry, lost jobs and bankruptcies in its wake. I would argue that these and similar situations could be prevented with better knowledge of the processes and crucial elements involved in community and tourism development.

By learning about local and regional tourism development, we can also gain a greater understanding of our society, which in turn can be of use when studying other fields. Increased knowledge about globalism and commercialism are examples of two areas where the study of tourism can contribute to sociology. These can be better understood through the study of tourism destinations and in particular how culture and nature based tourism is developed. Value systems can be revealed by studying cultural and natural resources perceived as ‘beautiful’ and ‘of value’ or on the other hand ‘disposable’ and ‘worthless’. Increasing commercialism can also be witnessed through the ‘blurring’ of the

1 Local and regional are relative concepts, whose content varies according to the starting-point. When these concepts are used in this thesis, ‘local’ refers to municipalities and the communities within and ‘regional’ includes counties or areas with parts from different municipalities.
boundaries between corporate businesses, public organisations and voluntary, idealistic associations. As the different concepts used for these three entities imply, they have traditionally had different purposes in their activities, which in turn are based on different values. In this thesis, I argue that these boundaries have become less distinct and that this is a reflection of increased commercialisation. Tourism is a useful field for studying this change, since tourism, as will be discussed below, by its nature involves both the corporate, public and voluntary sides of society. Studying tourism and the interaction between residents and visitors will also provide greater knowledge about how people deal with ‘others’ and their strategies in terms of avoiding, ignoring, ‘fighting’, benefiting financially and so on. Studying travel and tourism may also lead to further understanding of individuals’ needs of escapism, the eagerness to explore, changes in lifestyles and priorities in people’s daily lives.

What does the development of communities and tourism require to allow them to co-exist to the same place? What are the processes necessary for this co-existence to be possible and beneficial? Finding answers to these questions was the start of the research project this thesis is largely based on, conducted at ETOUR (The European Tourism Research Institute) in Östersund, Sweden, within a research department focusing on destination development. At ETOUR I was assigned a project entitled ‘Local and regional destination development’ and given the overall aim of finding social and cultural factors that facilitate and enable tourism development at a local and regional level. The project and subsequently this thesis satisfy three important cravings: the relatively limited amount of social research connected with tourism; the demand for more knowledge about tourism development within the industry and my own personal interest in the topic. The research project, which lasted from 1998 – 2002 included three empirical studies carried out over three years, which are presented briefly below.²

**Separate Worlds** – This first study was conducted during 1999 and focused on attitudes towards tourism development and co-operation between organisations involved in tourism in northern Sweden. Five places were studied: Kiruna, Skellefteå/Guldriket, Åre, Sundsvall and Tornedalen. The main reason for studying co-operation was that it had been identified by researchers, the industry and public representatives, as a key factor for successful tourism development. The aim of this particular study was therefore to gain greater knowledge about different organisations involved in tourism at a local and regional level, and about their attitudes towards, and values regarding, the development of tourism and co-operations within the same (Frisk, 2003).

**Mission Impossible?** – The first empirical study showed, among other things, that greater knowledge was needed regarding the attitudes, norms and values of the

---

² For a more detailed discussion regarding the methodology and methods used in the studies, see pages 26-36.
people in the organisations involved in tourism. This was therefore the focus of the second study (in Västerbotten, Sweden), which examined a planned Industrial Development Centre for tourism (IDC Tourism). During 2000, a project in Västerbotten was set up with the aim of investigating the possibilities of creating IDC Tourism. I followed this process and in particular, the attitudes and values of the people and organisations involved. Moreover, this study noted the obstacles and opportunities involved in creating this kind of organisation with the purpose of developing tourism (Frisk, 2000).

Leith and LIFT – The theme of studying groups with both commercial and political goals continued in the third study, a case study of ‘Leith Initiatives for Tourism’ (LIFT). This was a network of private, public and voluntary actors, whose aim was to develop tourism in Leith, part of the waterfront area of Edinburgh, Scotland. To fulfil this aim, the network sought to undertake sustainable initiatives that would be beneficial to the local community and businesses in the area, as well as visitors. The study of this network showed the importance, and difficulties, of trying to incorporate both commercial and non-commercial values in the development of tourism (Gibson, Lynch & Morrison, 2005 and Gibson & Lynch, 2006).

The above studies were all based on the notion that tourism is a phenomenon, a research field and an industry in itself, and that its complexity is visible through several dilemmas or paradoxes. In the following section, I outline the elements of complexity in tourism that are most relevant to this thesis. Many of the accompanying dilemmas and paradoxes will be discussed throughout the thesis. Tourism is also part of and an expression of our increasingly complex world. Therefore, before discussing the complexity of tourism, we need to touch upon the complexity of globalisation and the place of tourism in our wider society in order to grasp the implications for tourism at a local and regional level.

Outlining the complexity of tourism destination development

Global complexity

More than 1 billion people have access to and use the Internet and $1.4 trillion of foreign currency is traded every day. Many hundreds of millions of international journeys are made each year and there are thousands of global companies and trans-border associations. These are all examples of an increasingly complex world where technology, materials, systems, travel patterns, information etc are rapidly changing our world and reducing the distances between places and people. Complexity theories stress the systematic and dynamic nature of globalisation, a perspective that I would argue is, to a large extent, necessary for understanding tourism development. These approaches also acknowledge the duality of our times as a way of closing the
gap between structure and agent; systems and individuals; determinism and free will and similar concept pairs. Duality also extends to the relationship between the global and the local; they are seen as interdependent (e.g. Giddens, 1990 and Urry, 2003).

Global movements such as the ‘flow’ of information, material, money and people, continuously and increasingly affect everyday life in local societies across the world. However, small, localised changes may have global effects. This has been shown in the famous hypothetical example of the effects of the movement of a butterfly’s wings in South America on global weather systems far away (Urry, 2003). An empirical example of this is that a different approach to air transport in one corner of the world, has rapidly changed the opportunities for, and attitudes to, travelling (e.g. De Groote, 2005). In addition, it is argued that this pattern of travelling fuelled by low-cost airlines will have long-term effect on the global environment (Penner, Lister, Griggs, Dokken & McFarland, 1999). Thus, in this complicated world, we need to know more about the relationship between the global and the local. Instead of focusing on one or the other, there is a need for analyses that incorporate the complex interconnections between both global and local processes. These links determine how the culture and history of local communities is developed and communicated to the rest of the world, which in turn affects the conditions for tourism development in local places and regions (Appiduraj, 1990 and Urry, 1995, 2003).

Our contemporary society and its characteristics provide a vital background for tourism research. Incorporating this background into the study of tourism enables an understanding of the context it is part of.

These aspects of contemporary cultural globalisation mentioned above have clear implications for tourism. Tourism is both contributing to the globalisation of society and at the same time is a product of it. In other words, we can see ‘tourism as being deeply embedded in all aspects of life. As such the understanding of tourism contributes to the understanding of society’ (Shaw & Williams, 2004:276). To some extent, tourism and the flow of people, and the meeting of cultures this involves, creates a more homogenous culture worldwide. English is spoken, to varying degrees, in virtually every country; globalisation also makes further development of tourism possible and the development of low-cost carriers means that more people get easier access to tourist destinations. International monetary systems make it easier to access money while abroad, or as in the case of the Euro, obstacles such as exchanging currency are completely removed. Telecommunications and other technological changes have made it possible to communicate with your friends and family from virtually everywhere in the world.
Tourism complexity

The complexity of tourism is clearly shown in the many definitions of tourism. The word tourism is thought to originate from the Grand Tours to Europe, which were undertaken by young, aristocratic Englishmen in the 18th century, as part of their training to become administrators and political leaders (Coltman, 1989).3

Tourism has been defined as ‘the relationships and phenomena arising out of the journeys and temporary stays of people travelling primarily for leisure or recreational purposes’ (Pearce, 1991:1). This type of definition does not however include business tourism, whilst wider definitions such as that of the World Tourism Organization do. They state that ‘tourism comprises the activities of persons travelling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes’ (UNWTO, 1994). The latter type of definition however, has mainly been designed for gathering statistics and does not take into account related considerations such as recreation.

It is not the aim of this thesis to add yet another definition of tourism to the list, but rather to highlight the complex issues within tourism. For this purpose, tourism is seen as a political, economical, social and cultural phenomenon that changes in accordance with the society it is part of. Within social studies of tourism, this is a rather common perspective and has been debated regularly over recent decades (e.g. MacCannell, 1999; Smith, 1989 and Urry, 1990). Tourism is also seen as an industry with certain characteristics and problems, something discussed later.

Leisure tourism in essence involves attracting people to spend their holidays or other free time as visitors in a place where other people live and work. An escape from ones own working life to seek the pleasures of a more ‘hedonistic’ life style is part of the attraction and a necessity for leisure tourism, but the meeting of two life styles can sometimes lead to culture-clashes and social conflicts (Smith, 1989 and Smith & Brent, 2001). The majority of these meetings occur at certain places; i.e. by nature, tourism is bound to places; tourists travel to and visit destinations.4 Places have previously been defined as local areas where residents live, hand in hand with business life and the cultural and natural environment. Destinations are then places for tourists with attractions, accommodation, transport and other facilities (e.g. Ednarsson, 2005). I would argue for a wider definition of the concept of destinations that takes into account the complex nature of tourism. Destinations are therefore, in this thesis seen as places where people travel to as tourists as well as social communities where people live and work. Most destinations are not only

3 For a more detailed discussion of the definition of tourism and critical issues, e.g. Ednarsson, 2005; Karlsson, 1994 and Shaw & Williams, 2002.

4 For a more detailed discussion about destinations, see pages 44-45 and 55-58.
‘touristic societies’ but also communities with a history and culture not connected to tourism. Indeed, the majority of tourist destinations are also communities with an economical, social, political and cultural life (e.g. Framke, 2001). These worlds can clash, collaborate or simply co-exist.

As said, tourism and thus destinations are part of an increasingly globalised culture. As such, destinations must not be perceived as unsafe or too unfamiliar for potential visitors and ought to include certain elements that are recognised worldwide, e.g. places for exchanging currency, maps, guide books, service facilities and so on. On the other hand, in order to be distinguishable in the global ‘homogeneity’, destinations must to some extent be unique to attract visitors. In this, the search for uniqueness, having one major attraction can be crucial for destinations and from this attraction other lesser-known parts of the destination benefit. However, the more the destination relies on one large attraction, the more vulnerable it becomes to unforeseen events that might cause the attraction to loose its ‘magic’. Another part of the attraction of destinations is often the opportunities they offer to enjoy nature. Yet, how do tourism businesses earn their living from natural attractions where access is free? Thus, to a degree people at destinations must exploit natural and cultural resources to attract tourists. If however, they attract too many visitors, this may lead to over-crowding, the damaging of resources, the destruction of natural heritage, alienation and the exploitation of cultures, and so on; threatening foundations of the residents’ livelihood. Certain types of tourism that have emerged over the last decades such as eco-tourism, responsible or sustainable tourism, indigenous tourism etc, are reactions to this dilemma.

Tourism and its destinations are not static, they are a phenomenon that changes through development processes. In recent decades, tourism has gone through some substantial changes, which have had an impact on the nature of tourism as well as the notion of it. For example, the regional and global importance of tourism is being recognised more and more. This is a kind of commercialisation, where tourism becomes an industry. Furthermore, there has also been a considerable increase in tourism research and tourism education at many different levels. This combination of factors has contributed to, and reflects, a change in the status of and interest in tourism.

Tourism is often presented as one of the fastest growing and expanding industries in the world (e.g. Apostolopoulos, Leivadi & Yiannakis, 1996; Ryan, 1991 and Wanhill, 1996). The global development of tourism has to some extent been affected by natural disasters and terrorism in recent years, but figures for 2005 show that any stagnant trend the tourism industry was experiencing is over and for the first time tourism generated over 800 million international tourist arrivals in the world, an increase of more than 15%

\[5\text{ Although there are also nature-based destinations with few human inhabitants.}\]
compared to 2003. The industry is now experiencing its highest growth rate in 20 years. Another way to measure the size of the worldwide tourism industry is to compare it with total global exports. International arrivals represent around 6% of global exports. This increases to nearly 30% of export share within the service sector. Although Europe is the continent with the highest number of international arrivals (more than 400 million), in 2005 it had the lowest increase of non-domestic arrivals (4%). However, northern Europe had a larger increase than the average for Europe as a whole (7%) (UNWTO, 2006).

It has been argued that tourism is to some extent in the early stages of its development as an industry (Hjalager, 1999 and Wanhill, 2000). However, without exaggerating, one could state that tourism is beginning to resemble an industry similar to others. An example of this is the tendency towards increased privatisation and commercialisation of tourism in central and Eastern Europe (Williams & Baláz, 2001).

Tourism is thus rather similar to other service industries, which include a few embedded complexity issues. Firstly, consumption is part of the production and to some extent takes place simultaneously. Moreover, tourism is not only consumed in the moment, but also before and after the visit, making it a difficult process to control and anticipate for those trying to make their living from it. Secondly, the ‘tourism product’ is mostly intangible and consists of individual visitors’ experiences, which can only be prepared for, not created.

There are many elements needed in order to create the necessary pre-conditions for these experiences and thus tourism consumption to occur. At a first glance, some are more obvious, like accommodation, accessibility and attractions, but other elements are as important such as the friendliness, helpfulness and hospitality of residents. Thus, many elements are needed at a destination in order to create the pre-conditions for visitor experiences.

The multi-faceted nature of the tourism industry, leads to tourism businesses at a destination being dependent on each other to a large extent, as well as on organisations and associations from other sectors in their community; they are all pieces of the ‘touristic puzzle’. Working in constellations, as allies, in networks, projects or other groups of various sorts therefore becomes a necessity. In other words, businesses related to tourism naturally compete with each other locally but also need to co-operate in order to provide a complete ‘tourism product’; to be able to cater for larger groups of visitors; to respond to competition from other destinations and for many other reasons. An example of a situation where competition and collaboration is clearly shown is the common ‘chicken and egg’ dilemma of not receiving any visitors because the destination is or is perceived as ‘closed’ for the season but where businesses feel

---

8 Results presented for 2005 by United Nations specialised agency, the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO, 2006).
they cannot afford to stay open because there are no visitors. Businesses stay closed, visitors do not come and all-year round job opportunities are lost.

As a service based industry, tourism also requires a large pool of human resources. This is often beneficial for a community as it leads to locally based employment opportunities. However, tourism development is often led by certain key individuals who start processes and fulfil other important leading and initiating roles. Relying on a few strong people can make a destination vulnerable for example in the loss of expertise etc when these people stop being part of the process. Collaboration issues also affect the different people working in organisations and groups who, to varying degrees, are involved in tourism development processes. People with different agendas, attitudes and values are involved in tourism and they need to collaborate, and there is also a need for key people with mediating skills to manage this. As mentioned, the ‘tourism product’ includes many different elements and a wide range of groups from various sectors of society. Therefore, people involved in developing tourism contribute to development through their actions of free will but are, at the same time, determined by structures and dependent on others in order to be able to act, i.e. they are both shaping destinations and communities and being shaped by them. Thus, in order to achieve their goal of developing tourism, actors need to interact and develop relations with others. This can be as a form of collaboration or struggle depending on the nature of the interaction, or in some cases absence of the same.

In our modern world the structures of industry are changing and work and leisure, ‘real life’ and ‘authenticity’, are more frequently becoming intertwined. This is acknowledged by MacCannell who bases his thoughts on Goffman’s theories of ‘back stage’ and ‘front stage’ (MacCannell, 1999). This creates a very special environment for those who are working within the so called ‘experience industry’. The role-play is not just a part of their ordinary social life but also a characteristic of their work, embedded within their professional life. Amongst those working within tourism it is probably this group who are placed in one of the most complicated situations. A musician can record his or her album in the studio and an actor can literally go ‘off stage’. The smallest tourism enterprises consisting of one or two people, for example running a bed & breakfast, have very little time and opportunities for using the ‘back region’. The boundaries between front stage and back stage become blurred, thus making life for most tourism businesses quite difficult.

Tourism is an industry that might create positive visitor experiences of the kind that lead to return visits; tax income; positive feedback and work enjoyment for those working in the industry; investments in the community for the benefit of residents and so on. At the same time, tourism is a phenomenon, which might

---

7 This is a name sometimes given tourism and other kind of industries, which offer entertainment and experiences such as restaurants, music, theatre (Pine & Gilmore, 1999).
have detrimental effects for local communities. It is likely however, that these effects can be prevented if greater knowledge is obtained regarding tourism destinations and their development. In other words, we need to understand the complexity of local and regional tourist destination development in terms of social and cultural factors, which is the overall aim of the thesis.

**Aim and objectives**

The following question formed the starting point for my research on which this thesis is based on: what are the crucial social and cultural factors that facilitate or prevent local and regional development of tourist destinations? To answer this question, the overall purpose of this thesis is explorative as I am trying to identify important social and cultural factors for tourism development.

In other words, I see development of tourism as a complex process of social and cultural dilemmas and paradoxes. In order to untangle this web this thesis is also based on some perspectives. This includes a descriptive perspective as I exemplify discussions by telling the stories of destinations, groups and individuals involved in destination development. The thesis is also comparative as cases and analytical levels are related to each other. Furthermore, in order to deal with the complexity of tourism it is not enough to identify social and cultural factors but also to understand them. In other words, I aim to gain knowledge of how and why these factors influence tourism and community development.

The overall aim of this thesis is thus to:

- understand the complexity of local and regional tourist destination development.

In order to fulfil this overall aim, analysis has been conducted at three different levels: destinations, groups and individuals. Each of these levels has a corresponding specific objective. These are to:

- understand crucial elements of places as destinations and how they develop;
- investigate the structure of, and processes within groups and networks important for destination development;
- explore the crucial roles, resources and attitudes of key people for destination development.

In order to achieve the overall aim of this thesis and meet the above objectives, results from the three empirical studies mentioned, will be drawn upon.
Disposition

So far, I have been trying to show some of the dilemmas and paradoxes of tourism destination development and related features of our contemporary global society. If however, the world with its tourism is so complex, how can we possibly study this? I would argue that it resembles painting a picture with many layers – the art of complexity.

As said, this is a picture with an overall explorative purpose alongside descriptive, comparative and understanding perspectives, which have involved the study of tourism as a phenomenon and an industry from a socio-cultural perspective, taking into account other aspects influencing development, in particular political, geographical and economical factors.

In order to fulfil the overall aim of the thesis, I focus on the local and regional as socio-spatial dimensions, with an acknowledgement that these are connected to global patterns. Part of the complexity of tourism is that tourists are part of the production. However, I have not focused on the meetings of production and consumption, but on those working at destinations creating pre-conditions for tourism experiences. Thus, my focus lies on groups and networks and key individuals involved in tourism development and the destinations and communities they are part of, not on visitors to these places. Moreover, residents not directly involved in tourism related activities have only been included implicitly. Theoretical discussions are illustrated by examples from an empirical base of the three case studies mentioned above. The complexity of tourism also demands consideration of context, groups, organisations and individuals. For this reason, the analyses in this thesis are related to three different levels: places, projects and people. Theoretical concepts and empirical material have been discussed and cases compared according to these three analytical levels. These levels are linked by the social and cultural factors found on each level and again by being part of a larger mechanism, learning processes. I have also divided the analyses by structure or situations and by processes or development, in order to capture both the static and dynamic nature of tourism development.

I have sought to reflect the above ideas through the disposition of this thesis, and similarly in my research approach (outlined in the next chapter). This involves a research process similar to that of the adaptive approach, which involves parallel processes using theories and empirical studies. The second chapter also includes description and discussion of the methods employed in the research projects. The thesis has been divided into three levels of comparative analysis and an overview of this and the related theoretical concepts is provided in the following chapter. These concepts, empirical examples and analyses are then discussed in further detail in the subsequent five chapters before I then return to the overall picture in the final chapter. The third and fourth chapters examine ‘places’ in terms of destinations and
communities, the first level of the first study; the fifth and sixth chapters then lead on to the level of ‘projects’ in terms of groups and networks, which was the focus of my next two cases. The seventh chapter discusses ‘people’ in terms of enterprising people, which was partly the focus of the third study and more indirectly also a focus of the first study. At each of the levels, theoretical concepts relating to each dimension are discussed, illustrated by empirical examples from the three studies, and then analysed further.

The third chapter discusses destinations from a structural perspective, beginning with an initial definition of the concept of destinations before presenting six cases from Northern Sweden and Scotland. An analysis of the cultural and social characteristics of these places, incorporating touristic activities is conducted. An alternative categorisation of places according to socio-cultural and tourism dimensions, is presented, followed by a discussion regarding important social and cultural factors such as historical heritage and socio-cultural context.

The fourth chapter starts by discussing the complexity of development, and in particular that of destinations, from a process perspective. Models are also discussed with a focus on a predominantly geographical life cycle model and how this can be modified to suit a sociological study of destination development, with less focus on spatial and physical development and more on learning. An alternative model is also presented and applied to the six cases mentioned above, in order to depict differences and similarities between them and their development as destinations.

The fifth chapter discusses the importance of groups, such as projects and networks, as a crucial foundation for destination development, from a structural perspective. Two cases, a regional industrial centre for tourism businesses in Northern Sweden and a network for development tourism and a local community in Scotland, are presented. Following this, the concepts of networks are discussed further and these thoughts are then applied to the two cases by means of a comparative analysis.

The sixth chapter continues to discuss groups, but from a process perspective involving interaction, networking and relations rather than from a structural standpoint. The chapter goes on to analyse the two cases from the previous chapter in terms of important processes such as the involvement of key actors, networking and the dilemma of groups with dual development goals.

The seventh chapter analyses the importance of people for tourism development, in terms of so-called enterprising people and their roles and resources used in the development process. This is accompanied by analyses of attitudes towards tourism development in general and towards interaction in terms of co-operation and competition.
The eighth and concluding chapter summarises the main social and cultural factors that have emerged through my research. A framework called ‘Learning Destinations’ is introduced that demonstrates how these factors manifest themselves at each of the three levels discussed in this thesis. Finally, a few reflections are made regarding the feasibility of planning for development involving creativity and innovation and the need for further research.
THE RESEARCH APPROACH

Introduction

As stated in the introductory chapter, the main aim of the research behind this thesis has been to identify social and cultural factors and to understand their implications for tourism and community development. Furthermore, this thesis is mainly explorative. In other words, the ambition of the thesis is not to test, measure or evaluate, but rather to discover, interpret and reflect in order to acquire further knowledge and understanding.

This chapter begins with a discussion of tourism as a research field. It then presents the approach used to conduct the research behind this thesis and also the notion of dividing society into different strata. This notion provides the base for the three analytical levels into which I have divided this thesis. A brief introduction of the main theoretical concepts at each level is provided, which is then followed by a discussion of the relationships between these three levels in terms of social and cultural factors and learning as a mechanism. The final sections of this chapter present and discuss the methodology and the methods involved in carrying out the research.

Tourism research

As mentioned in the previous chapter, tourism has been changing rapidly and its significance as an industry has increased. In many areas this has led to an uncontrolled expansion of tourism and the mass exploitation of places and the people who live there. This has sometimes resulted in severe negative environmental, economical, social and cultural impacts for residents as well as the global climate. These issues were mainly studied by sociologists during the tourism boom of the 1970s and 80s (so called mass tourism) (e.g. Cohen, 1972, 1978; Britton, 1982; de Kadt, 1992; Lanfant, 1995 and Smith, 1989).

More recent research about tourism and its development has to a large extent continued to focus on the negative effects of tourism, especially ecological effects, and how tourism should be developed in order to minimise these adverse impacts. During the 1990s research into tourism development was mainly focusing on the physical, ecological and economic aspects of tourism, i.e. the planning, impacts or profits of tourism (e.g. Hall, 2000; Hall & Lew, 1998; Lickorish, 1997; Nelson, Butler & Wall, 1992 and Smith & Eadington, 1992). Research of tourism from a sociological perspective that goes beyond the, often negative, environmental and economic effects of tourism has been a relatively small field of research.
The ambition of this thesis is to look at those aspects of tourism concerned with social and cultural life. Tourism ‘…remains a complex socio-cultural, political, and economic phenomenon that is worthy of systematic sociological investigation’ (Apostolopoulos et al, 1996: preface). I would therefore argue that in order to gain knowledge of how to develop tourism, in a way that secures long-term benefits to the community as well as for visitors, it is necessary to study tourism as both a phenomenon and an industry.

Although recent tourism research in other disciplines has increasingly incorporated a social perspective (e.g. Ednarsson, 2005; Elbe, 2002; Heldt, 2005; Müller, 1999, 2005; Pettersson, 2004 and Shaw & Williams, 2004), tourism continues to be a relatively unexplored area by sociologists in Scandinavia. There are, for example, only three sociological tourism doctoral theses regarding tourism in Sweden (Andersson Cederholm, 1999; Elsrud, 2004 and Karlsson, 1994). More recent sociological research into tourism, has to a large degree viewed tourists from a socio-psychological perspective (why people travel, etc.) and to a lesser extent on tourism development processes at destinations (e.g. Andersson Cederholm, 1999; Elsrud, 2004, Page et al, 1999 and Urry, 1990 and 1995). Sociological studies increase our understanding of the more profound aspects of tourism and thus our society, i.e. values, norms and beliefs as well as the history and culture these are set in. The importance of such studies has been pointed out by others attempting to understand our contemporary society by studying tourism as a phenomenon (e.g. Aronsson, 1997; Karlsson & Lönnbring, 2003; Shaw & Williams, 2004 and Urry, 2000, 2003).

**Research process**

The explorative approach of this thesis and the nature of my research field make it difficult to find one theory that predicts all the important aspects. Social and cultural factors have therefore been derived from empirical material combined with thoughts from a variety of previous research. Although not an explicit intention from the outset, I realised after my three studies that the manner in which I was undertaking the research in many ways resembled the so-called ‘adaptive approach’. This way of conducting research has been labelled in various ways: Ryan (1995) calls it ‘functional’; Alvesson & Sköldberg (1994) call it ‘abduction’ and Layder (1998) writes about ‘the adaptive theory approach’. This research process is a mix of deductive and inductive approaches, which gives a dialectic relation between theory and practice. Here the creation of theories and studies of ‘reality’ is conducted in parallel processes. When new information or data has been collected, it is used to build and refine a theoretical framework, which in turn gives rise to new questions, from which a new empirical study is aimed at answering and so on (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 1994 and Ryan, 1995). In other words, ‘adaptive theory both shapes, and is shaped by the empirical data that emerges from research. It allows the
dual influence of extant theory (theoretical models) as well as those that unfold from (and are enfolded in) the research’ (Layder, 1998:133). On reflection, I would argue that the adaptive approach is well suited for tourism research in that it, among other things, ‘...assumes that the social world is complex, multi-faceted (layered) and densely compacted’ (ibid.). Moreover, my research approach is also similar to and has been inspired by the ‘hermeneutic circle’ or ‘spiral’. This process involves research that starts with some initial notions that change during empirical studies and which in turn lead to a deeper understanding that enables further interpretations and analysis (e.g. Helenius, 1990 and Kvale, 1997). I have tried to illustrate my research process, if somewhat simplified, in the figure below.

![Research Process Diagram]

Fig 1: The research process of the thesis (Author’s own)

The figure above is an attempt to illustrate the research process of this thesis. As previously mentioned, the main body of work involved three empirical studies, which in turn relate to certain theoretical themes. I have tried to reflect on empirical findings, theoretical literature and previous research throughout the research period. The process started with the embryo of a theoretical framework, based on a few important key concepts, and as empirical material was gathered this framework was refined through a dialectic process, represented by the ‘zig-zag’ line in the above figure. This was then followed by a process of abstraction by reflection and conclusions similar to that of a ‘hermeneutic spiral’, illustrated by the three ‘sweeping’ arrows in the figure. An analytical approach emerged with three different levels (places, projects and people) corresponding to the theoretical themes and to some extent the empirical studies, as shown by the three short arrows.
In other words, my research started with an aim of studying destinations and the notion that interaction, in particular co-operation, is one of the most crucial factors for tourism development on a local and regional level. This had already been shown to a certain degree in other research within the tourism industry and the public sector. This was the focus of the first study of five destinations in Northern Sweden (‘Separate worlds’). I then discovered that in order to gain a deeper understanding of destination development, further studies of groups and networks were needed. This led to the second study of a planned network in Västerbotten (‘Mission Impossible?’) and additions to the theoretical framework. The idea of the third study (‘LIFT and Leith’), came from a need to focus more on the key individuals involved in tourism development and in a different context from that of Northern Sweden. Carrying out the study in Scotland allowed for interesting comparisons to be made. When reflecting on these three studies, new thoughts and patterns of similarities and differences emerged. Subsequently, additional elements have been discovered through the course of the empirical studies, and different theories and concepts have then been used to interpret and understand the patterns emerging from the material. These theoretical insights have in turn helped me to proceed with the next study and undertake further analyses.

So, what started with the idea of one very important factor, developed into a framework including several social and cultural empirical factors and the equivalent theoretical concepts necessary to understand them. During the course of the research, it also emerged that more fruitful analyses and greater knowledge would be gained if the cases, on various levels, were considered and discussed in relation to each other. This in turn led to the notion of regarding learning as a social mechanism spurring development but being influenced by social and cultural factors.

The analyses of the empirical material have been divided into different levels which for the most part apply to the accompanying theories and concepts. These levels are discussed in the following section but expanded on in greater detail in the following five chapters. The reason for this is to facilitate reading, establish clearer connections between the theoretical concepts and the empirical examples, but also to reflect my research process.

**Stratified reality**

Before introducing the analytical levels of this thesis, I would like to touch briefly upon my perspective of our society; a perspective, which, considering the purpose of the thesis, I believe is fruitful for studying the complexity of tourism. ‘Level ontology’, ‘stratified reality’ (Brante, 2001) and the ‘theory of social domains’ (Layder, 1997) are all names for a significant ‘project’ of modern sociology, i.e. the aim to more closely relate the micro and macro spheres of social life. In other words, this implies an ambition to dissociate
from the classic divide of either focusing on ‘structure’ or ‘actor’. Brante and Layder are two of the authors whose theories come closest to the notions on which my research is based upon. In particular the notion of a ‘stratified reality’ where the general object of study of sociology is divided into different levels. In the case of Brante, five levels are applied:

- **International level.** Relations between components such as nations, transnational companies and organizations, often viewed in a global perspective.
- **Inter-institutional level.** (In practice often the national level). Relations between components such as institutions and organizations, often employing theories of historical and social development in general.
- **Institutional level.** Relations between components such as formal and informal status positions, social roles, position in networks, in everything from companies and public hierarchies to groups and families.
- **Inter-individual level.** Relations between individuals in direct or face-to-face interaction.
- **Individual level.** Relations between intra-individual components, and how such structures form the ground for individual autonomy and self-creating activities. (Brante, 2001:178ff)

At each level, this division focuses on social relations, but other dimensions may be added to this division, e.g. a cultural dimension. It is important to recognise that it is somewhat difficult to apply this particular division of social institutions to incorporate a more geographical concept like place. However, I would argue that the way places are studied in this thesis, in terms of tourist destinations and communities, includes a social dimension.

In line with the ideas above, the following section includes a presentation and discussion of my division of the studies into three levels, which I distinguish as ‘places’, ‘projects’ and ‘people’. In other words, the theoretical concepts, the empirical material and analyses thereof have all been divided according to these three levels.

---

8 Several social scientists have made similar separations. Some more recent, such as Habermas have written about ‘system-world’ and ‘life-world’ (Habermas, 1995); Giddens use structure and agent (Giddens, 1990) and earlier such as Durkheim distinguished between society and the individual (Durkheim, 1984), to mention a few.

9 A somewhat similar division of levels has been created by Layder (1997) in his ‘theory of social domains’ but this is not used in this thesis as it is less applicable on the analytical levels discussed in the next section.

10 See also pages 55-58.
Analytical levels

Places – communities and destinations

This level, when compared to the theoretical strata mentioned above, includes both the 'international' and 'inter-institutional' levels. It not only incorporates the global and national spheres but, for the purposes of this thesis, also the regional and local spheres in their connection to the global; thus following the thoughts of those who argue for a connection to be made between these levels (e.g. Urry, 1995). I also find it useful to take into account the contextual level when discussing the development of society (Urry, 2000) and I am intrigued by the classic question of whether there is such a thing as society or if we are merely isolated individuals. The notion here is that we must move away from viewing the nation-state as representing societies and instead study globalisation as a force that is changing our world and to some extent lessening the power of the nation-states (Meyer, 1999).

The empirical examples discussed at this level include the five places from the first study in Northern Sweden (Kiruna, Skellefteå/’Guldriket’, Åre, Sundsvall and Tornedalen) and Leith, in Scotland, from the third study.11

Contextual theoretical framework

Destination is one of the core concepts of this thesis and presents itself as a natural starting-point for discussing the contextual theoretical framework. One of the most common ways of defining a destination is to describe it as a system within a geographical area containing a number of components such as attractions, accommodation, transports and other service and infrastructure (e.g. Butler, 1997; Gunn, 1993; Lickorish, 1997; Pearce, 1991; Twining-Ward & Twining-Ward, 1996; UNWTO, 1995 and Wanhill, 1996). In addition, it is normally regarded as an area that needs to be accessible, i.e. possible to reach both physically and mentally (and preferably easily and affordably).

The type of traditional definitions referred to above (i.e. seeing destinations as a system) tend to be static and without any dynamic content to make problems visible or fruitful analyses possible. Instead of trying to ‘squeeze’ the concept of destinations into a uniform definition, I find it more worthwhile to view this concept in a way that makes problems visible and analyses relevant. Thus, for the purpose of this thesis, places are not simply viewed as geographical entities, but as communities with a social, economic, political and cultural past, present and future.

11 A detailed discussion about the studies and the methodology will be made in the last sections of this chapter and the places are presented in the chapters ‘Places as destinations’ and ‘Destination development processes’.
In other words, I would also argue that the places studied are both tourist destinations and social communities, which exist in a local, regional and global context. In order to understand them and their development it is necessary to acknowledge the continuous changes in our world that affect tourism development. The development concept in this thesis is therefore based on the notion of ‘global complexity’, where the world is seen as a rather chaotic place where events are often unpredictable and irreversible, and where small actions may have large effects (Urry, 2003). Tourism represents a significant part of global development processes as it contributes to the creation of social complex systems, e.g. of places where people travel to and mobility systems in between these places. Thus development is not defined in terms of increased number of tourists or the like, but rather as a complex process of change taking into account co-operation and competition, order and chaos, successes and failures, that cross different disciplines and sectors. One way this complexity is dealt with in our society is through the creation of partnerships, networks, collaboration groups etc. I have attempted to tackle this complexity by amongst other things viewing places as both communities and destinations and by acknowledging that development or changes in one will affect the other and vice versa. However, another aspect of this complexity is that development is different for various places and destinations. Development in this thesis is mainly regarded as a positive force, but it is also acknowledged that it does not usually involve a steady, linear progression, but is rather a process with ups and downs, usually combined with intended and unpredictable events (e.g. Putnam, 2000).

Projects – groups and networks

When compared to the theoretical levels mentioned above, this level contains both the ‘institutional’ level and to some extent the ‘inter-individual’ level, but in addition includes forms of interaction other than face-to-face contact that occurs in the case in networks, organisations etc. Development of places is one of the core themes in this thesis and its examination provides the context in which local and regional development of tourism occurs. However, to reveal actual development processes, and to gain a fuller understanding of these, one needs to study the situations, arenas or forums that make development possible. Within this level, entitled ‘projects’ for the purposes of this thesis, the tourism industry and its development is made up of actors. In this thesis, these are considered to be the different people working within organisations, groups and networks involved to varying degrees in development processes. In order to develop tourism it is necessary for these actors to interact with others. This can be viewed as a form of collaboration or struggle depending on the nature of the interaction, or the absence of the same. Interaction often takes place in the form of a ‘project’ usually based around a group, organisation, network or other ‘arena’. This level is therefore called ‘projects’ to highlight the fact that in our present time this is a common label for planning for and acting towards
development. Projects often have implications in terms of both timescales and the sustainability of development.

The empirical examples discussed at this level include the ‘Industrial Development Centre for Tourism’, a project from the second study in the county of Västerbotten in Northern Sweden, and the ‘Leith Initiatives for Tourism’ network, in Leith, Scotland, included in the third study. 12

**Group related theoretical framework**

The starting-point for the discussion of the structural dimension of this level is the concept of projects. Today, development involves transitions from traditional production industries to societies increasingly based on communication, consumption, services and experiences (e.g. Andersson, 2002; Pine & Gilmore, 1999 and Shaw & Williams, 2004). Tourism is part of this movement and is regarded as one of the emerging ‘new industries’. Groups involved in various projects have become good indicators of this transition and are a means by which the pace of this change can be increased. Projects by their nature involve groups of people, often in associations or networks, working together for a common goal over a certain period of time. This has become an organisational form typical of our times, where a ‘social order’ or culture is created through the course of the project, rather than relying on established organisational structures (Hosking & Morely, 1991). Projects are quite common within tourism related development, in the Western world to some extent due to the type of funding available, such as EU structural funds.

The other core concept of this level is networks. Networks can be seen as specific arenas for interaction and projects. Several studies have shown the importance of social relations and networks, particularly when it comes to destination development (e.g. Elbe, 2002; Tinsley, 2004 and von Friedrichs Grängsjö, 2003). Some of the main benefits found in networks for tourism development centre around: learning and exchange, business activity and the community (Lynch, Halcro, Johns & Buick, 2000). One way of gaining further understanding of different types of networks is to divide them according to their degree of formality. In this thesis networks are thus defined as a set of relationships between individuals acting in an organisational and/or private capacity to achieve a particular purpose and are divided into three types: formal, semi-formal and informal (Gibson et al, 2005). In addition, as networks are a characteristic of globalisation, they also have a socio-spatial dimension and can therefore be viewed in terms of six types of networks of social interaction: local, national, international, transnational and global (Mann, 2000) and regional.

---

12 A detailed discussion about the studies and the methodology will be made in the last sections of this chapter and the projects are presented in the chapters ‘The importance of projects’ and ‘Processes in projects’.
In order to understand projects and networks and thus destination development I would argue that is not enough to study the structure of projects and networks, but that it is also necessary to examine the processes of interaction within these groups. This thesis therefore uses a process perspective (Hosking & Morley, 1991) where interaction is seen as important and where networking is regarded as a certain kind of interaction. This is a kind of ‘collective behaviour’, i.e. behaviour, actions and relations that are socially meaningful for a group, which reflect social meanings and also create new ones (Drury & Reicher, 2000). This is a form of interaction, which involves a ‘negotiated order’ that can take the form of consensus, conflict or anything in between (Dingwall & Strong, 1997).

People – enterprising people

This level is similar to the theoretical ‘individual’ level mentioned above. Besides studying and gaining an understanding of ‘places’ and ‘projects’, an important theme of this thesis is that of key actors, i.e. the people that turn development ideas, visions, strategies or plans into visible actions. Furthermore, development of destinations requires, and sometimes is, the development of people and vice versa. The theoretical framework and concepts presented above have argued that projects and networks are crucial in gaining a better understanding of the structure and process of tourism destination development. It has also been implied, however, that the different types of groups vital for destination development consist of people and hence they are also focused on at their own level.

The empirical examples discussed at this level examine key people involved in tourism development at the five places from the first study in Northern Sweden (Kiruna, Skellefteå/‘Guldriket’, Åre, Sundsvall and Tornedalen) and also from Leith, Scotland, in the third study.

Theoretical framework on an individual level

Individuals particularly important for tourism development are referred to as ‘enterprising people’ in this thesis, and the roles they fulfil, the tools and resources they use in processes of development and attitudes towards tourism development and interaction are all discussed. Several studies have noted the importance of certain actively involved people for the development of tourism and communities (e.g. Bredvold, 1999; Karlsson & Lönbring, 1998, 1999; Page et al, 1999 and Shaw & Williams, 1997). Enterprising people in this thesis are people who are creative, bold, dynamic, innovative, initiating and resourceful.

---

13 See page 17.
14 A detailed discussion about the studies and the methodology will be made in the last sections of this chapter and the people are presented in the chapter ‘Enterprising people’.
These are similar to ‘entrepreneurial people’ who are committed, often heavily involved in activities, and driven by much enthusiasm (Philips, 1988). The way the concept of ‘enterprising people’ is used in this thesis is however wider than the concept of ‘entrepreneurs’ (e.g. Kasarda & Sexton, 1992 and Swedberg, 1994), in that it includes more than people starting up private business ventures. Enterprising people might be found in different sectors of society, i.e. public, voluntary and private. The concept of enterprising people also includes elements from ‘identipreneurs’ (Brulin & Nilson, 1997) and ‘social entrepreneurs’ (Johannisson, 1992), i.e. it involves local and regional identity, culture and different sectors of society.

**Relationships between levels**

In order to fulfil the overall aim of this thesis, analyses will be conducted at the three above mentioned levels of society in general but particularly towards tourism as a phenomenon and an industry. Considering the complexity of tourism development, there are a wealth of cultural and social factors connected to this, but naturally not all of these have been included in this thesis. The focus lies on those factors I would argue are most prominent. These are found on all three levels but manifest themselves in different ways on each level. The following section discusses these factors in terms of the relationships between the different levels.

I would argue that the social and cultural factors discussed throughout this thesis are interesting, but if they are not connected in any way they will continue to be just that – interesting factors on separate levels. In the theoretical framework above, the levels have been divided, separated and simplified for analytical reasons. In reality, these levels are far less distinguishable from each other. Yet, although the reality is more complex, dividing empirical examples and the analyses thereof is a way of making it possible to study and understand this complexity. In other words, the different levels are to some extent related to each other and one level might be used to explain and understand social events in another. One can compare this to a lawn, a tuft and a single grass. There would not be a lawn without the individual grass, but on the other hand, the grass stands a better chance of surviving and thriving if it is part of a tuft and the tuft part of a lawn. In the study of tourism, there are general sociological patterns, which I would argue are useful for other fields of research. In other words, by understanding tourism, we also learn about elements in contemporary society, such as development and learning processes, community development, interaction in groups and networks, characteristics of enterprising people and so on. Therefore, we need to find ways of relating the dimensions to each other, i.e. find factors that show how these levels are intertwined and mutually dependent but also how they differ at each level. The
way this is done in this thesis is by focusing on the cultural and social factors influencing tourism and to some extent community development.15

Cultural and social factors are in turn seen as part of a larger scheme; i.e. a mechanism that is fundamental for development. Mechanisms are here understood as metaphors for the fundamental processes that make things happen (Danemark, Ekström, Jakobsen and Karlsson, 1997). The will and need to learn has emerged through my studies as the crucial mechanism required in order to understand the development of tourism and thus communities in general. Learning is seen as a process that includes both preventing and facilitating social and cultural factors.

These factors in terms of culture and social relations and the way the concept of learning is used in this thesis will briefly be discussed below. The factors then form the base for the following five chapters and is related to learning, which is the main theme of the concluding chapter.

Culture

One type of factor linking the levels discussed above is culture, or ‘cultural schema’ (Brante, 2001). Culture, in this thesis, is on one hand seen as the values, norms, and beliefs that people have (e.g. Appiduraj, 1990; Ehn & Löfgren, 2001 and Smith, 1990). This dimension is fundamental and intangible. On the other hand, culture is also the various expressions of norms, values and beliefs and involves elements that are more tangible, e.g. signs, theatre, clothes and so on. In order to gain a full understanding of the relationship between culture and society, I would argue that one must consider both aspects. In other words, they exist in a dialectic relationship, as culture is both a ‘model of and a model for life’, both ‘glass and template’ (Geertz, 1993 and Griswold, 1994).

The two main parts of culture emerging through this thesis are however, history and rationales. A place’s heritage constitutes the base for the type of tourism ‘produced’, and historical circumstances such as the traditions of business life, the degree of transition of people and its urban and rural setting form its current situation. Moreover, traditions are reflected in how development groups are formed, the way they work and on an individual level in terms of the type of people engaged in the development process and the influx of new residents. In other words, it is argued that the past influences the present. History and traditions are also connected to rationales involved in the development of tourism. Rationales are cognitive in that we understand reality through them. At the individual level, attitudes and values form the base for people’s actions.

15 The factors discussed in this thesis are similar to what are called mechanisms by for example Brante (2001) and Layder (1987) and invisible or ‘non-obvious’ phenomena by Collins, 1992. The difference is that the factors discussed in this thesis more resemble elements that influence development, and are part of a larger mechanism.
These turn into norms if shared by enterprising people or the majority of a group. Norms in their turn form the base for strategies taken towards development. If powerful or old enough, norms also become institutionalised and can be depicted in laws, regulations and so forth at the contextual level, i.e. a collective consciousness. Studying this means discovering the community or culture people are part of and how shared knowledge evolves within it (Ehn & Löfgren, 2001). These thoughts are also based on Durkheim’s ideas of culture as a collective representation or production where culture can be understood by studying the interactions among people and their expressive forms of representation (Collins, 1992 and Griswold, 1994). There is a risk, however, when using this perspective to overly focus on harmony, consensus and other unifying patterns. An alternative to using this functionalistic approach is to be inspired by more recent movements that emphasise the complexity, dilemmas and conflicts of social life (Ehn & Löfgren, 2001). The challenge lies in finding a fruitful synergy in the paradox of finding meaningful patterns of homogeneity and at the same time recognising that cultural ‘communities’ are becoming more and more fragmented, differentiated and complex.16

Social relations

Another particularly important factor in this thesis is social relations (Brante, 2001 and Layder, 1997). In my research, these have mainly emerged in terms of interaction and boundaries. Interaction occurs simultaneously on all levels and is a necessity for development processes. In some ways, co-operation might therefore be seen as one of the cornerstones of all societies. One could even go so far as saying that our society is based on invisible social contracts of co-operation. This requires a system built on trust, and takes time to develop as we base our trust on experiences of the previous behaviour of others (Granovetter, 1985).

People who are joined together in a society gain important things they cannot acquire alone, and hence it is a rational choice to form a society. … People can work together not because they rationally decide there are benefits from doing so, but because they have a feeling they can trust others to live up to agreements. Society works precisely because people don’t have to rationally decide what benefits they might get and what losses they might incur. People do not have to think about these things and that is what makes society possible. (Collins, 1992:9-12)

Inter-personal relationships can however also create social dilemmas, so called ‘social traps’ and ‘fences’. The former are situations where people’s behaviour with short-term positive consequences causes long-term negative consequences for the group. The latter are behaviours that lead to long-term positive consequences for the group but result in short-term negative consequences for

16 See also pages 36-38 for a discussion regarding comparative analyses.
the individual (Joireman, Lasane, Bennet, Richards & Solaimani, 2001 and Sjöstrand, 1995).

Boundaries are expressions or results of interactions at the same time as they set some of the conditions for interaction. The studies and analyses at each of the three levels in this thesis, have indirectly been based on the creation of theoretical and analytical boundaries, i.e. creating definitions and demarcations in order to be able to conduct the research. A similar positioning process occurs in reality when we define ourselves to others (Mead, 1968). On the individual level, enterprising people automatically include certain other people through their influential roles in networks and projects. By thus making some people relevant, they indirectly declare other people as irrelevant, or at least less relevant. In creating such imaginary boundaries, even if it is unintended, conflict situations sometimes occur and will no doubt affect enterprising people in their work (Bauman, 1992; Karlsson, 2005; Putnam, 2000 and Sjöstrand, 2004). Boundaries are also found at the contextual level of defining regions for political or marketing reasons and at the group level in terms of different sectors such as the private, public and voluntary.

Learning processes

I find the concept of ‘learning’ suitable as it indicates a dynamic process and is arguably one of the most crucial dimensions underlying development processes (Harrison, 2002). Learning has emerged though my studies as a mechanism, which stimulates development and which in turn is influenced by cultural and social factors similar to those discussed above. By this, I mean that learning is a mechanism that needs to be ‘activated’ if development is to occur. Claiming that social and cultural factors influence learning, which in turns ‘triggers’ development, implies a certain element of causality. However, this reasoning is simplified in order to be able to explain the notion. In reality the process and relations between social and cultural factors, learning and development is more of a dialectic nature. Learning can therefore also be seen to act as a ‘filter’, which social and cultural factors have to pass through and which decides how these factors affect development.

Although learning takes place on all levels, the framework for learning presented in the concluding chapter focuses on collective learning processes that go beyond each individual and group and thus include an element of continuity as well as long-term perspectives. This might also be called dialogue learning, where dialogue refers to a way of expressing, developing and making use of collective thinking. This dialogue enables people to develop a common way of thinking as well as co-operative actions (Beeby & Booth, 2000).

17 The model of ‘Destination Learning Development’, presented in the chapter ‘Destination development processes’, is also based on these thoughts but does not explicitly include groups and individuals (see pages 67-73).
Innovations are also embedded in the learning processes of developing destinations. Studies of innovations and collective learning have found that ‘SMEs are better able to innovate when they are part of clusters because it is through the networking processes and the management of externalities (key elements in clustering) that they develop new products, processes and services’ (Mitra, 2000:228). Regional embeddedness is thus seen as a determinant of learning which means that the region (or destination in this case) acts as a learning organisation or learning network. Therefore, businesses and regions, even within tourism, benefit if ‘related industries’ build relationships, e.g. as in ‘dynamic regions’ discussed previously (Shaw & Williams, 2004). What have been seen to give regions a ‘competitive advantage’ are factors such as the ‘ability to identify, accumulate, utilise and recycle learning resources embedded in the region’ (Mitra, 2000:230). In other words, the success of the development in a region, and its ability to face competition from other regions, is found to be based on socio-cultural factors such as trust, openness, reciprocity and voluntarism (ibid.). Vygotskij’s ideas from the educational field echo this in that the ideal situation for learning is a meeting between partners based on a dialogue (Bråten, 1998).

The standpoints discussed so far are also connected to my methodological approach, which is presented and discussed below.

### Methodology

A central feature of qualitative research is the consideration of, and focus upon, an open context of great variety. Another important feature is the ambition to start from the subject of study and their perspectives, instead of the researcher alone deciding categories and dimensions to focus upon. Furthermore, research following the adaptive approach is in many ways similar to qualitative research as it is based on interpretation and reflection. As said, this means that the researcher is continuously interpreting data and reflecting over the theoretical as well as the empirical parts of their research (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 1994), in a manner that is exemplified in the beginning of this chapter. As was noted above, the research approach of this thesis has been somewhat similar to the adaptive approach, in that I have ‘travelled’ between the empirical studies and theoretical ideas, which have influenced the next study and the theoretical concepts employed therein, and so on, in a process of continual intellectual development providing further knowledge and insights. This was not explicit from the outset but after reflection, it dawned upon me that my research had been conducted in this way and the structure of this thesis is aimed at reflecting this process.

---

18 This also has some resemblance with that of learning organisations (e.g. Hall, 1990; Kline & Saunders, 1995 and Senge, 1990). Similar thoughts may also be found in the theories about entrepreneurship as a collective phenomenon that have been found in creative regions (e.g. Hjalager, 1999; Johannisson, 1997 and Putnam, 1993).
I would like to argue that talking about research involving interpretation and reflection is more fruitful than simply providing it with labels such as ‘positivism’ and ‘hermeneutics’ or ‘qualitative’ and ‘quantitative’. There have however been many attempts to divide research into such categories (e.g. Ryan, 1995). Rather than making divisions between quantitative and qualitative methods, one can distinguish between ‘high-structured’ and ‘low-structured’ methods. Examples of high-structured methods include: clinical observations, standardised questions in interviews and fixed-alternative items in surveys. Some low-structured methods are: participant observations, dialogue in interviews and open-ended items in surveys (Wigblad, 1997). There are two dimensions to consider when deciding which structure the method should have. Firstly, the researcher must ask him or herself if the phenomena being studied is of a high complexity and/or unknown, or, whether it is of a low complexity and/or well-known. The other question to ask oneself is whether the access to data is direct (primary) or indirect (secondary). If the researcher is able to gain primary data by taking part in a course of events, the method is direct. Here the researcher gains more knowledge and becomes more and more initiated as the work progresses. The method is indirect if the researcher works with secondary data, for example by evaluating the studies of other researchers (ibid.).

The field of study for the research presented in this thesis is the development of tourism destinations; the importance of groups and networks and the actors involved and their attitudes and interactions. This is a complex field consisting of several dimensions, groups with different interests and so forth. Moreover, the study of tourism within sociology is relatively young as a research field and parts of the phenomena are relatively unknown. Therefore, I have mainly used low-structured methods. Furthermore, the data and information collected in my research has been mostly direct (primary), obtained through group discussions, participant observation and interviews, although to some extent also indirect (secondary), in terms of the various documents regarding the destinations and groups studied.

Case studies

This thesis is based upon multiple case studies. Case studies are normally most appropriate in explorative studies such as this, which try to answer questions of ‘how’ and ‘why’. Unlike studies, which seek to be representative, the cases within this method are not chosen by random sampling. They are instead selected on the basis of the contribution they are likely to make to the purposes of the study (Yin, 1994). The design of case studies involves an inquiry into ‘a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context’, which is especially useful ‘when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident’ (Yin, 1994:13). I would argue that this type of inquiry suits my research

---

19 An alternative way is presented by Wigblad (1997) who divides research into categories according to the logic researchers are following: causal or holistic.
as tourism and its development at destinations is a modern phenomenon, which occurs in a context, i.e. places and their historical and social aspects, projects groups and people involved in tourism activities. Equally, the barriers between the phenomenon and the context are blurred as visitors, tourism businesses and residents are all part of the experience and also involved in setting the scene.

In other words, cases can be used in order to connect the theoretical and the empirical in a dialectic relationship in search for deeper understanding (Ragin & Becker, 2005:225), and it is with this in mind that I tackled my cases. Cases can be divided along two dichotomies; as empirical units or theoretical constructs and as specific or generic categories. This provides four starting points, which can be used to begin to answer the question of what a case is a case of. Empirical and specific cases are ‘found’; empirical general cases are ‘objects’; mainly theoretical and specific cases are ‘made’ and theoretical general cases are ‘conventions’ (Ragin & Becker, 2005:9). My cases on the contextual level, i.e. the six destinations, are to some extent ‘objects’, in that I use existing political and administrative boundaries such as municipality and county borders to define the places geographically. However, the two cases on the group level, i.e. the two networks studied, were mostly ‘found’, as I identified and established them as cases during my research process and it was not always clear where the boundaries of these cases lay. In addition, both destinations and networks as cases were to some extent ‘made’. They existed as the theoretical concepts of ‘destinations’ and ‘networks’, but I did not know whether they would turn out to be empirically useful cases or not from the outset of the research.20

My cases were divided over three studies. The first study included studies of five destinations but also to some extent the key people involved in tourism. The second study focused on a project planning a development centre for tourism, and the third study examined a network for developing tourism. The third study was both a case of a network but also of key enterprising people and their destination and thus used all three analytical levels.

A brief presentation of the three studies and the methods employed in each study are outlined below. The cases included in the studies are discussed in more detail in subsequent chapters but a detailed discussion of the different methods is provided in the next section of this chapter.21

Separate Worlds – The first study examined five places in Northern Sweden, which emerged as interesting cases after an initial review of several potential candidates. The five places share some common characteristics, e.g. they are all situated in the far north, which has implications for the development of tourism due to relatively sparse populations, long distances, climate etc. The final

20 For simplicity’s sake, the destinations in this thesis have to some extent been selected on a geographical basis in order to find the appropriate factual information and be able to discuss the relationship between private enterprises and local public organisations.
21 For maps of the places studied, see appendix 1.
selection of cases were categorised using two main factors for the development of tourism: the type of tourism product offered and the size of the towns and villages. In terms of the tourism product, the places were grouped into two categories: places that market and promote a small number of larger attractions and places with a more diversified market that promote a larger number of attractions but without presenting anything in particular as the main attraction. The notion here was that the development of tourism, and the organising of it, varies according to the nature of the tourism product. The places were also divided into two categories depending on the size of the destination: ‘urban areas’, here defined as communities with more than 5,000 inhabitants per 1,000 km² and ‘rural areas’, here defined as communities with less than 5,000 inhabitants per 1,000 km². This division was based on the notion that the size or the density of a community is connected to, for example, the amount of services it has, its accessibility, or the number of people involved in tourism etc. This in turn is connected to the possibilities of interaction between actors within tourism. The initial study design included four places, namely: Kiruna, Skellefteå/’Guldriket’, Åre and Sundsvall. Tornedalen was then added as an additional fifth case. The reason for this was that it is a very interesting place where several different local destinations are part of a larger regional destination, situated on both sides of the Swedish and Finnish border. In line with recommendations from among others, Kreuger (1994), these case studies included group discussions with two groups at each place, divided into people involved in tourism related activities from the public and voluntary sectors, and those from the private sector. Additional face-to-face and telephone interviews as well as studies of written material were also made.

The data collected in the first study was divided into two main themes, tourism development and co-operation. These two themes were based on the initial theoretical notions that served as a starting point for the thesis. In order to capture both the static and dynamic nature of destinations, questions were asked regarding past, present and future development, including both positive and negative changes. I was also inspired by the idea of dividing tourism development into different phases and asked for the participants’ views on development phases for their destinations. Questions were also asked regarding the division of responsibilities for, and the factors enabling and preventing, tourism development in order to tap into views regarding free will and determinism. The data gathered regarding co-operation and competition was aimed at understanding the attitudes towards interactions of different kinds and acquiring a more detailed knowledge about the nature of collaboration. The data collected through group discussions and interviews to find out the views of people involved in tourism development processes was complemented with strategy plans and other various documents from the destinations.

Mission Impossible? – The second study examined a project in Västerbotten County in Northern Sweden. After I reflected on the first study, it became clear that in order to gain further understanding about development processes, both
within tourism and in communities in general, I needed to study a case on another level. In Northern Sweden, a significant amount of financial support has been given to development projects of various descriptions and to an extent they have been relied on as essential catalysts for change. It was therefore decided that a development project should be the focus of the second study and contacts were established with the aforementioned project. The project manager proposed a survey of tourism businesses in the area, which my colleagues and I were involved in designing. The survey was initially designed in such a way to maximise its usefulness to both the project and our research, but unfortunately, due to disagreements within the project group, was not carried out in accordance with the original idea. However, the project was still considered interesting enough to pursue. This case study was conducted by observing the processes at meetings and by examining written material. The source material included: earlier studies of regional development in general; material specific to the region in particular as well as written material from IDC Tourism and other similar organisations and projects. Besides studying several written documents, participant observation was also used as a key data source, in line with the recommendations of Silverman (1994). Notes were taken according to the context in which the observations were made, i.e. the kind of event participated in, what occurred and initial interpretations of this occurrence. Moreover, I had individual meetings with the project manager and was in regular contact with him, and to a lesser extent other key people in the project, throughout the study.

The data collected in the second study was aimed at examining the structure of the project in terms of the system it was part of and the organisations and key people involved. I also tried to find out what roles or functions the different actors had within this structure. Interactions at a group level were of particular interest and studied in terms of the types of collaboration visible and their purpose. In order to capture these purposes, the actors’ views in terms of beliefs, hopes and fears for the project were included. This data was gathered through participant observations at meetings during seven months of the project and through discussions with the key people involved. The idea of studying groups in terms of their structure as well as the processes they go through was based on literature and previous research.

Leith and LIFT – In the third study I looked at a place, a network and key people. The study included Leith, a waterfront area and former town, now within Edinburgh in Scotland and ‘Leith Initiatives for Tourism’ (LIFT), a group working for tourism and community development in the area. The second study had provided some knowledge about tourism development processes on a group level but after reflection I felt that in order to obtain further insights, a study of another project or network and the individuals involved was required. At this point, a comparative study with another country became possible through contacts with British research colleagues. A number of suitable groups were suggested, but one of them had been studied previously
and after being introduced to LIFT, who had been established for nearly two years at the time of the study, the opportunity arose to study them further. This final study within my research project, was conducted using the following empirical material: written material including documents relating to LIFT, articles in newspapers about LIFT or development in Leith, and statements and plans regarding tourism and development in Edinburgh; participant observations at LIFT meetings and local community council meetings; face-to-face interviews with key people, the latter method employing the recommendations of, among others, Kvale (1997) and Silverman (1994). In addition, a survey was carried out among the active participants involved in the network in different ways. Its use in this thesis is discussed in the interview section below.

The type of data collected in the third study was similar to that gathered in the second study. The structure of the network was examined in terms of the organisations and people involved and the system the group was part of. I identified this structure, as well as the process of development this network went through, at participant observations conducted over six months. This study was also similar to the first study in that I focused on views of tourism development in general and co-operation and competition. These topics were first discussed through individual interviews and followed by views on the network and in particular its purpose, potential, problems and future development.

Methods

In my studies, I have used the following main methods: group discussions, interviews and participant observations. These methods have a number of things in common: the researcher listens to what people are saying about the subject and then carries out an interpretation of the statements they have heard. However, the amount and type of information that the researcher receives varies according to each method. These methods are now discussed in order of complexity, starting with the most complex one.

Group discussions

One could argue that as a method group discussions involve a mix of observations and interviews. Group discussions are sometimes called ‘focus groups’ because, as the name implies, they involve focused discussions in which groups of people participate. The amount and type of information gathered is extensive due to the number of people and the amount of discussion studied. The dynamics of focus groups also allows the researcher to study the interaction between people, similar to the observations that can be made during participant observation. However, with focus groups the researcher also has
access to, and can verbally monitor, expressed opinions, attitudes, experiences, values etc (e.g. the researcher must try to ensure that all participants’ views are heard). On the other hand, this method is rather difficult to both conduct and use for analyses. This is due to, among other things, the large amount of time and money it costs, the willingness or unwillingness of people to participate and the complexity and richness of the material (Berg, 1998 and Bryman, 1999). It is usually recommended that the researcher acts as a moderator, sets the rules for the discussion and then guides it. Due to the complexity of this method however, the researcher needs to observe, listen and at the same time moderate the discussion (Krueger, 1994). Usually, focus groups consist of people who do not know each other prior to the event. Furthermore, it is recommended that the groups should be homogenous in some sense and involve between six to nine participants. The participants are most often contacted by telephone and then sent a written invitation and a small incentive is given at the session.

The focus groups in my research project where conducted at each of the five Swedish places included in the first study, with both commercial actors (private businesses) and non-commercial actors (public and voluntary organisations). Discussion focused on two themes: tourism development and co-operation. Key questions within each theme were prepared and asked the group at each session in order to guide the discussion. One of the insights from this experience was that if the themes were discussed in a chronological way, it seemed much easier for the participants to grasp and the discussion followed a more natural logic.\footnote{The discussion guide is included in appendix 2.} In this study, no incentive in terms of money or other gifts were given to the participants, although they were offered refreshments. Each of the five places included in the study were visited and focus group discussions were conducted at centrally located facilities. As mentioned, people participating in a focus group do not usually know each other, but in this particular study this was not always the case. Given the relatively small number of people involved in tourism in these rural areas, it would have been almost impossible to try to gather key actors within tourism that did not know each other. As has been mentioned, the studies in this thesis include people involved in tourism at destinations and therefore the study was limited to involve the actors actively involved in tourism and situated at the places studied. Thus, tourists and residents not involved in tourism related activities were not included. The actors were divided into two groups according to the basic characteristics of the organisations they represented: commercial and non-commercial organisations. The non-commercial group consisted of both public and voluntary organisations. Within the commercial actors, the focus was on private tourism businesses, i.e. those with their core business in tourism, for example hotels and other types of accommodation, activity organisers, restaurants etc. People working in shops, petrol stations and photographers and other types of professions related to tourism, were invited but chose to decline. All the public organisations and voluntary associations included were involved.
in tourism issues and included tourist information centres, tourism organisations, county councils, local heritage trusts and so on. Additional telephone interviews were also made with a number of key people unable or unwilling to attend the focus groups. Some ten focus groups and nine interviews were conducted, in total 70 key people involved in tourism development in various ways participated in the first study.

Interviews

The amount of information one can access in qualitative research interviews is rather large (or deep, depending on the purpose of the study) per person interviewed. The type of information one gets from interviewing is focused mainly around the thoughts of a person, i.e. their attitudes, values, experiences and so on (Bryman, 1999; Kvale, 1997 and Rubin & Rubin, 1995). There are of course different types of interviews. A common categorisation used, is to divide them into structured, semi-structured or un-structured. The structured interview is sometimes also called formal or standardised, since it is based on a set of rather specific, fixed questions. The researcher usually has a fairly good idea about what is going to be uncovered during the course of the interview. The un-structured interview, however, does not include any fixed questions. On the contrary, the questions are developed, generated from, and adapted to the given situation and the purpose of the study. The semi-structured interview is a mix of the two, where the researcher begins with a number of topics and/or set questions that are asked in a certain order. However, the design allows the researcher to change the order; ask more questions; make explanations and so on (Berg, 1998). Another way of describing this latter type of interview is as a ‘focused’ qualitative research interview. Again, this neither uses standardised questions, nor is it completely open. Instead this type of interview is based or focused on certain themes, where both the interviewer and the person being interviewed talk about matters that are of interest to them both (Kvale, 1997).

The types of interviews I conducted in the third study of this research project had the character of focused or semi-structured interviews, and evolved from a core set of questions within the themes of tourism development and interaction between people; fields of common interest for the people interviewed and myself. The reason for this was that my purpose was explorative and I did not want to steer the interview too much and miss opportunities for important themes to emerge.23

When conducting interviews, it is important to carefully choose whom to interview (there are different ways to select the interviewees, for example strategic sampling or snowball sampling) and to conduct each interview in the same manner. Furthermore, the researcher’s ability to make the interviewed person feel confident to speak his or her mind, will affect the results and

23 The themes for the interviews with core questions are outlined in appendix 6.
information gathered during the interview. This is achieved by clearly explaining the purpose of the interview, conducting the interview in a setting of the interviewees choice, and so on. For the interview to be useful it is also important to consider the way the questions are asked; follow-up questions should be asked and the interview should remain focused and preferably be recorded (Silverman, 1994).

The 14 people I interviewed in the third study were chosen partly by a process similar to that of so called ‘snowball sampling’ and partly based on observations at meetings etc. The initiators of the network were interviewed first and they then suggested some key people, which also coincided with suggestions from other interviewees, for further interviews. As mentioned, tourism development involves different sectors, and therefore it was important to include representatives from the different sectors involved in the network, i.e. owners and managers of businesses (one hotel, two restaurants, two guide businesses and two training businesses), public representatives for tourism at a local level (city council and tourist board) and other key volunteers in the local community (local community council and a trust). In order to strike a balance between the time people were willing to give and the amount of information gained, the interviews lasted between 1.5-2 hours and were taped and transcribed. For the benefit of the interviewees, the interviews were conducted in the location of their choice, usually in their offices or homes, in order to make them feel comfortable and relaxed.

Finally, in qualitative research involving reflection and interpretation, researchers themselves are the instrument. This is summed up in the following seven important characteristics of an interviewer, which I have tried to live up to. These are: be knowledgeable in your subject; be structured and focused in the interview situation; be clear when asking questions; be friendly towards the interview person; be sensitive towards the atmosphere in the interview; be open towards bringing in new aspects in the interview; be directing and keep the control; be critical towards and test the information; remember different aspects throughout the interview and interpret in order to clarify and analyse (Kvale, 1997:138ff). Trying to embrace these characteristics has been very important in my research since the majority of the interviews were undertaken in another country and not in my native language. This increased the risks for misunderstandings and misinterpretations, but which I have tried to minimize through discussion with colleagues, and by comparing the information obtained against additional written material. Having subsequently lived for four years in Scotland I have also recently analysed the interviews again, this time with a better understanding of British culture and improved English skills.

In addition to the qualitative focus interviews, I conducted a survey in the third study using a structured questionnaire. There were insufficient resources to interview the around 70 active network members individually, but I still wanted to discover any general patterns of attitudes regarding tourism development and
interaction. The questionnaire was based on the findings from the two previous studies and sent out by post to the 72 core members of LIFT. There were 32 responses in total; 23 respondents from private businesses and nine respondents from public or voluntary organisations. It is important to bear in mind that this was not a statistical survey, but an attempt to gather the attitudes of different individuals in the network. The majority of the results from this survey were reported back to LIFT at a meeting but two parts of the questionnaire are referred to explicitly in this thesis. Firstly, the answers to an open-ended question in which the respondents were asked to define tourism development in their own words, were analysed. Secondly, a pattern emerged regarding the respondents’ attitudes towards interaction. The members were asked to agree or disagree with statements regarding co-operation and competition by marking a point on a line representing an imaginary scale.

Participant observations

The amount of information gained from participant observation can be considerable, and the type of information of course differs depending on the subject being studied. For example, when studying individuals and groups, one can gain information about behaviour routines; patterns of behaviour and movements; non-verbal communication; meetings in contexts and so on. Participant observation is called participant because the researcher is to some extent present in the specific situation (Silverman, 1994). I have taken into account the importance of conducting observations based on questions to myself, making structured notes and categorising what is said and done as well as the environment in which the observation is being made (ibid.). There are several rules of thumb for conducting participant observations. Firstly, one should not observe in a completely unstructured way. It is considered better to have an initial perspective, some concepts, a focus or similar. Secondly, it is important to take field notes during the observation or directly afterwards. One must be systematic and concrete in the categorisation of the data. Thirdly, to observe means to both look and listen, not only to the participants but also taking notice of the context. Fourthly, it is important to make connections between the collection of information, the testing of hypotheses (if they exist) and the creation of theories. Finally, researchers must be aware of the ethical aspects of their observations. It is important, for example, to consider the extent to which the presence of the researcher changes the situation, and if it does, how the people that are being observed alter their behaviour (Bryman, 1999; Hughes & Månsson, 1988 and Silverman, 1994).

24 The list of people was obtained from the initiators of the network and the findings were presented to LIFT at the last meeting I attended.
25 The questionnaire is appended in appendix 7.
26 See pages 134-142.
27 For a template of how observation notes were taken and core themes, see appendices 4 and 5.
The observations I made in the second study were made at the formal and informal meetings among actors involved in development processes at destinations. Participant observations were carried out during seven months at meetings within the project group; the interim board; the annual meeting of Stiftelsen Lapplands Turism (SLT);²⁸ Kick Off for IDC Tourism; a meeting at ‘IDC Hultsfred’ and one at the Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications (MIEC). The information sought by using this method mainly focused on the various expressions of attitudes, values and opinions. During these observations, the context, particular events and initial interpretations were noted down. The questions I asked myself were aimed at discovering and understanding the key people involved; the structure of the project; the roles and functions of people involved; interactions between them and their attitudes in terms of hopes and fears for the project. The same procedure was employed at participant observations in Leith, where the same template for taking notes was used and the questions asked were the same, although applied to the context of Leith and LIFT. Over six months I observed six monthly meetings held in the network, all board meetings held in between the general meetings and two local community council meetings. In both studies, I made it clear from the beginning that I would only be an observer at the meetings, in other words, I would position myself in the back of the room and not interfere with the ongoing discussion, and only observe such meetings that could have taken place without my participation. The exception was the final LIFT meeting I attended, where I took an active role in part of the meeting and presented the findings from the survey mentioned above.

Comparative analysis

I studied each of the places and projects in my research separately due to the fact that they are, in many ways, unique. However, I would argue that there are certain general issues embedded in the social and cultural dimensions of developing tourism and communities that therefore makes it possible to compare the cases. I have also used the different analytical levels discussed previously in this chapter as a way of making comparisons.

The thoughts outlined previously in this chapter lend themselves naturally to comparative analyses. The reasons for this are several. Firstly, besides the meeting between tourists and local residents, the very nature of tourism and the creation of ‘tourist products’ requires the involvement of different actors and sometimes even several destinations. An example of this is the Tornedalen region where Sweden and Finland have joined forces in order to develop this area. Moreover, the actors at a resort or destination can also be seen as a heterogeneous group. As well as the meeting between guest and host, there is also an interaction among the actors at the destination, which does not

²⁸ ‘The Foundation for Lapland Tourism’.
necessarily include the visitor. Even though people living and working in the community (destination) are part of the same culture, they have different attitudes and values regarding tourism as well as separate strategies with which to handle it - hence there are different reasons for being involved in tourism or wanting to see it develop. The meetings and interactions that take place between these different actors at the destination are mostly beneficial to all parties, i.e. they give rise to new solutions to problems, create employment, generate income etc. On the other hand, interaction can also lead to problems if actors fail to communicate, understand or co-operate with one another when necessary, or if they are not working towards some common goals. Problems can vary from conflicts regarding land use, attracting types of tourists that do not ‘agree’ with each other, detrimental conflicts on a personal level and so on. The structure of these interactions within the destination of course varies, in both time and space, and will appear differently depending on the influence of different actors. Hence, the development of tourism will vary. Finally, in order to depict the cultures that the actors are part of, I would argue that it is important to take into account socio-cultural settings when studying and trying to gain a greater understanding of local tourism development.

When carrying out comparative analyses, one can chose either to compare cases that are as similar as possible or cases that differ from each other. I have chosen to compare cases and places, whose differences at a first glance are more evident than their similarities. The main reason for doing this is to detect patterns and problems that go beyond cultures, boundaries and industries. Another reason is an ambition to conduct studies that are more than mere isolated case studies, where one might be able to relate the findings to other empirical studies and theories.

An alternative approach would have been to compare very similar cases, which might have given an insight into one particular type of destination or destinations in a particular setting, for example small islands (e.g. Baum, 1999). However, I have been more interested in gaining an understanding of different types of destinations and the patterns that might be discovered despite their differences. There are, however, similarities between the places included in this study. They are all geographically located in peripheral parts of Northern Europe with a ‘Scandinavian culture’ or strongly influenced by this culture. Compared to central Europe, these are not regions with much transient travel. Another common trait among the places included in the studies is that they have all experienced a decline in traditional industries such as mining, forestry, farming, ship-building and other heavy industries. In each case, this had led to the development of tourism at these places. For some (like Åre) this happened half a century ago, others have started this development during recent decades (e.g. Tornedalen, Kiruna, Sundsvall) and others are still in the very beginnings with more visions than actual activities (e.g. Skellefteå and Leith).
Furthermore, the majority of the actors involved in tourism in these places regard it as a promising industry and one that is often connected to local community development. In other words, the places included in this research are all investing in and trying to develop tourism, albeit to varying degrees, which I have tried to bear in mind in the comparisons. This might have lead to people and projects at these places being more prone to positive attitudes towards tourism and collaboration. An alternative comparison would have been to include places where there was no investment in tourism but where visitors were attracted for its ‘unexplored’ charm. This would however have been a different study, as the focus would then have been ‘unplanned’ development, how to cope with ‘unwanted’ tourists, conflicts between local residents and visitors and so on. However, as the purpose of this thesis has been to understand the complexity of tourism development, I have found it important to include groups and people actually involved in tourism development and places where this development process is visible.

Following the logic of the theoretical framework mentioned above, comparative analysis in my research is conducted at three levels: context, groups and individuals. Hence, the following comparative analysis is carried out at three levels:

- places are compared to each other according to historical, cultural and social aspects of the community; stages in their development as destinations and characteristics;
- projects are compared when it comes to way of working and type of organisation in terms of structure and processes; and
- people are compared in terms of the attitudes, roles and resources used among key people involved in development processes at destinations.

In the next section, I try to explain how I have dealt with and analysed the data at each of the levels.

**Analysing data**

**Places**

At the place level, documents such as leaflets, brochures, plans and strategies, websites, statistics and previous research and literature have been used in combination with site visits. I wanted to paint a picture of each of the places. In this picture, a few key characteristics were chosen according to their contribution to the understanding of the places studied. The key elements related to history, culture and social aspects and included: geographical and demographic facts such as size, population, education levels, historical background, cultural influences, business life (past and present) and tourism related history and situation.
A picture may be beautiful and interesting but it will always be a static image. To reveal the development of these places and make their pictures a series of moving images, a process perspective was used to include a dynamic element in the analysis. At this stage, in addition to the information gathered through documents, the discussions in the focus groups were also used to gain knowledge about the development of the places as tourist destinations. One of the reasons for using both types of data was to have several sources and to be able to compare the views of people involved in tourism with the actions taken and how these were manifested in marketing documents.

Here, an existing model for illustrating tourism development was modified and used. Documents relating to tourism such as tourism plans, brochures, websites, etc were analysed, as was data from the focus groups and additional interviews related to the stages of development. Three main categories or phases were identified and the destinations, or certain areas within them, were categorised according to three development phases. In addition to the length of time tourism had existed at the place, various criteria were used as signs of learning processes having taken place: change of perspectives, collaboration and networking between similar and different groups, existence of plans, strategies and division of responsibilities and local involvement to enhance local development in combination with tourism development. The most defining characteristics of Destination Learning Development (as I call the model), were relations and communication, both internal (within the local destination) and external (with partners outside the destination), and the degree of flexibility. More interaction and more structured relations and communication placed the destination in the ‘developed’ phases of the model. Performing this analysis invariably involved a comparison of the places as tourist destinations. It is important to note that these destinations were seen as similar enough to compare and when placed in different phases they were considered in relation to each other. If compared in another study, they might have been placed in other phases.

Projects

At this level, I used documents relating to the two group cases studied; mostly internal papers but also other existing documentation or articles about them. In addition, participant observations, interviews and informal discussions were used. As in the analysis of the places, the group level analysis included a chance to compare actions with views, i.e. the presentation of these groups to me as an ‘investigator’, among themselves and to others. Similar to the destinations, there was a wealth of data concerning the two groups. Also, like the analysis described above, I began my understanding of these two cases by telling their story. Through primarily the use of documents, I tried to summarise the background and reasons for the groups’ formation, especially in terms of their

29 See appendix 2 and 3.
‘history’ and the context in which they were established. In the comparative analysis of the two cases their structure and ways of working emerged as the main differences that could shed some light on the development of these two groups and their contribution to the local tourism development.

After initial reflection, the data was analysed again, with the specific purpose of understanding the groups’ structure as networks. I found ideas about degrees of formality and socio-spatial dimensions useful and relevant to the two networks whose aims included development of the community as well as tourism. In both cases, gender related patterns also emerged through the analysis as something that influenced their structure and way of working.

Similar to the analysis of the data on the destination level, I also included a process dimension in the analysis of the two groups. After attempting to understand their structure, I felt it was important to gain an insight into the relational processes of the groups and the interaction between the people and parties involved. In other words, after having analysed their networks, I turned to their networking. Primarily using observations, and to a lesser extent interviews and documents, I mapped out the actors involved and their relationships and interactions. In one sense this analysis enhanced the picture of the two groups as being quite different, each with their different strategies. However, by analysing the purpose of the two groups, their structure and relations, a pattern of similarities was reinforced in terms of what I call ‘mixed organisations’. These groups involve certain difficulties and at the same time they both are important for tourism development.

People

At this level, I have mainly used data from the third study; interviews, questionnaire responses, observations and to some extent data from the discussion groups conducted in the first study. As was mentioned previously, this thesis began with studies of destinations and subsequently development groups. When conducting these studies and analysing the data, I kept coming back to the people actively involved in tourism related development and their importance for this process.

The patterns that emerged from the interviews, group discussions and observations, reinforced individuals’ as being key for tourism development. Furthermore, the people involved seemed to have some traits in common and this led to my concept, based on ideas of entrepreneurship, of ‘enterprising people’. Their ability to create links between private and public sectors was a particularly prominent common trait. After analysing the data further, different roles emerged as these people talked about their involvement. I therefore felt it was not enough to merely state that these people are important for development processes, but that it was also important to find out in what way
they make a difference, i.e. in terms of their roles. Three roles emerged as crucial for active networking in particular and the destinations in general.

In order to understand how enterprising people fulfil their roles, I returned to analyse the data again to find the tools and resources used. This time the analysis was facilitated by ideas of social and cultural capital. This type of capital was identified as a resource and networks emerged as the main tool enterprising people used to gain important resources.

At this point, I felt it was necessary to include a context or culture that the enterprising people operate in, in order to understand them better. This was done by analysing the data relating to attitudes towards tourism development in general and co-operation and competition in particular. It had been a notion from the beginning of my research that this would be important for the understanding of destination development, and questions relating to these areas had therefore been included in the studies. It was not until the enterprising people had entered the stage and been analysed, that I realised that attitudes would contribute to the understanding of individuals involved in development processes as well as development itself. The open-ended answers to the questionnaire in the third study were grouped according to the main theme in each answer and two main groups were identified. In addition, the data from the first study was reviewed and I found that tourism development was discussed in four main ways, ranging from an individual or local level to a structural or global level. Data from the first study, along with a theoretical framework of interaction was used to gain further knowledge about co-operation and competition. The group discussions were divided into different dimensions of interaction in terms of ‘with whom’, ‘in what way’ and so on. The complexity of co-operation and competition was confirmed by the answers in the questionnaire from the third study, where it emerged that both co-operation and competition are regarded as being important and even preferred.

In the final section of this chapter, I make some methodological reflections.

Methodological reflections

The discussion regarding validity and reliability, or other concepts for determining the quality of research, is forever ongoing in the academic field (e.g. Chalmers, 1999; Kjørup, 1999; Kvale, 1997 and Silverman, 1994). To give this debate justice is beyond the scope of this thesis, but I will briefly discuss my views on this matter. This thesis has not been based on a search for a correct ‘truth’, but on the other hand, I have not abandoned the concepts of validity and reliability as other researchers objecting to positivism have done (e.g. Hughes & Månsson, 1988 and Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I would argue that it is important to seek to achieve a high degree of reliability and validity, but also to be able to make certain generalisations. Otherwise, research will not be
taken seriously and will be of no use to our society. These concepts of validity and reliability need to be used in a manner that is suitable for qualitative research based on reflections and interpretations (Kvale, 1997). Unlike statistical generalisations used in research involving quantifiable data, the aim of this type of research has been to make some initial analytical generalisations. This involves generalising the results of the studies to develop a wider theory (e.g. Yin, 1994). As already stated, the ambition of this thesis has been to undertake fruitful comparative analysis, rather than simply presenting the studies case by case, in order that the findings can be related to parts of society other than tourism.

I have aimed for reliability by studying various recommendations applying to different methods and then reflecting upon them together with colleagues; further reflecting on the information gathered; and then by taking these into account in the next stage of the research. This has required an openness in the research process, the approaches taken and the justification behind various theories and methods. Reliability has been re-inforced through activities such as appending discussion guides and questionnaires used; discussions with colleagues within sociology as well as other academic disciplines; undertaking methodological courses and by being further scrutinised at conferences and seminars and in journals. Furthermore, I have sought for validity by attempting to conduct my research according to good ‘craftsmanship’ (Kvale, 1997). This has involved checking information by comparing written material with verbal accounts; minutes from previous meetings with recollections; including people from private, public and voluntary sectors as well as aiming to include both small and large businesses and organisations in order to gain understanding about diversity in views and perspectives. This process has also involved making decisions about which key people to interview and invite to discussions, decisions based on several sources. There has been a risk of overestimating the degree of activity at the destinations, as those interested in taking part in such research and attending meetings etc, are often likely to be more active and positive in general. From the very start I was aware of this and therefore specifically tried to interview key people who, although invited, did not turn up at group discussions or network meetings, and by specifically asking for positive and negative aspects of topics in interviews and discussions.

Conducting research through case studies means the researcher has to ‘get close’ enough to the case in order to gain knowledge and understanding and access to material and information, whilst at the same time keeping a ‘scientific distance’ to be able to reflect and make analyses. This is of course a delicate matter and I have tried to continually reflect on my role as a researcher and always tried to be very clear in communicating this role to the people I have met. Other ways of maintaining this professional role include: focused discussions, observations and interviews; several discussions with research colleagues and the absence of any previous connections or too much involvement from my side with the places studied.
Another important aspect of striving towards the practice of trustworthy research, has been to use different types of methods, as recommended by for example Yin (1994). The different nature of the three studies meant that different methods were more suitable in different situations. Moreover, using different methods gave me the opportunity to triangulate and see different aspects of the research problem. The different methods have also given me an opportunity to compare and reflect upon their suitability for this kind of research. I have found that listening to and observing group discussions; talking to people individually and studying written material, has delivered a good combination of various types of information and knowledge in these case studies. The problem has frequently been that the wealth of data has almost been too great, particularly in the case of the focus groups, which were the most difficult to conduct and analyse due to the complexity of the information gathered. The complexity of the subject of this research added to this challenge. On the other hand I would argue that one should not underestimate the importance for people to meet and have ‘excuses’ to discuss matters that are important for them, a point that was expressed several times by the participants.
PLACES AS DESTINATIONS

Introduction

Gran Canaria, Provence, Sydney and the Galapagos Islands are all places that people travel to on holiday, in other words they are destinations for tourists. Places like these face many different dilemmas in their roles as tourist destinations. There are environmental issues to consider, such as the impact of many visitors on nature and wildlife in terms of increased pollution, noise and human presence. Decisions also have to be made regarding economic development: Who owns the resources of the place? Are there enough people to employ? Will these jobs last throughout the year or will they be seasonal? These environmental and economic elements are only some of the pre-conditions that need to be fulfilled before a place can call itself, is perceived to be, or can develop as, a destination. There are also social and cultural conditions to be considered. These places will also have to deal with social issues such as the effects of visitors on the communities, co-operation and competition between people and their businesses, and changes in values and attitudes among residents.

This is the first of two chapters that discusses and analyses the research studies on a ‘destination level’. It begins with an introduction to what a destination is and the various ways of viewing destinations, and is followed by a presentation of the six places I studied. In order to understand them as communities and as tourist destinations, I considered it important to begin the study of these places by exploring their past and present social and cultural situation. To begin to tackle the complexity of places, communities and destinations, I suggest a division of places into four different categories according to the degree of tourism activity and infrastructure, as well as authenticity. Finally, the analysis of these places includes crucial factors that might help the understanding of how places become tourist destinations, in terms of historical heritage and socio-cultural context.

Destinations

What is a destination? As mentioned in the previous chapter, many definitions are based on a functional perspective and refer to a geographical place. A destination is thus an area that needs something to attract tourists. These are often tangible, physical things like scenery and nature, buildings, shopping centres, or other natural or manmade attractions. Besides this, the area also needs to ‘exist’ in the potential visitors’ minds, i.e. people outside the area need to know about it, and this infers that it needs to promote itself. Tourists that know about the area might want to visit it to see and experience something. In

30 See pages 13-14.
order to do that, they need to physically get there. Thus, the area must be accessible, in other words, it must be physically and mentally possible (and, in most cases, easy and affordable) to travel to it. This is the most common way of defining destinations; as systems containing a number of components such as attractions, accommodations, transports and other service and infrastructure (e.g. Butler, 1997; Gunn, 1993; Lickorish, 1997; Pearce, 1991; Twining-Ward & Twining-Ward, 1996; UNWTO, 1995 and Wanhill, 1996).

I would argue that this traditional view of destinations includes three main dilemmas. Firstly, it implies that destinations are static systems and does not take into account the dynamic aspects of destinations. I would argue, that tourist destinations are both ‘objectively real’ (with attractions, facilities, transports, etc) but also ‘socially constructed’ (by images, identities, levels of satisfaction, etc). This way of defining destinations implies that they consist of a number of actors that ‘create’ the destination based on their own interests. Actors are here seen as the people, groups, businesses, organisations and associations that in various ways are involved in development of tourism at destinations. I have tried to address this problem by studying the development of destinations and the processes involved, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

Secondly, destinations can be divided into two main parts, as images in the minds of tourists, and as places which people visit. This thesis focuses on the latter, the so-called ‘supply side’ of tourism (Page, Forer & Lawton, 1999), or production perspective (Rosenberg, 1999). A fair amount of research has been undertaken involving tourism from the ‘demand’ side (i.e. studying tourists) whereas the other side of the coin, the ‘supply side’, remains relatively ‘undiscovered’ (Page et al, 1999). Destinations in this thesis are explored from a production or supply viewpoint, where the social and cultural aspects at destinations and their residents are in focus, not the visitors or tourists per se.

Thirdly, the aforementioned traditional definition does not explicitly acknowledge tourist destinations’ connections to the communities they are part of. Instead, they are to a large extent treated as autonomous entities set apart from their context. I would argue that they are both places and communities and therefore need to be studied from a ‘touristic’ perspective and a social perspective. Both are needed in order to understand tourism development at destinations as they are both intertwined. The majority of tourism experiences occur at distinct places and within the social communities that exists at these places. In other words tourist destination development is embedded in these two dimensions, place and community, and both therefore need to be taken into account. In this and the next chapter I aim to show how these two dimensions are linked. For the purpose of this thesis, places are thus not viewed as predominantly geographical entities, as tends to be the case in the traditional views mentioned above, but as communities with a social, economic, political and cultural past, present and future.
Places

Six places are discussed and analysed in this chapter and the following chapter. These places were studied as places and tourist destinations in the first and third studies within my research project. The places are:

- **Kiruna**, with a focus on the village Jukkasjärvi;
- **Tornedalen**, with a focus on Haparanda, Övertorneå and Pajala;
- **Skellefteå**, with a focus on ‘Guldriket’ (‘The Golden Kingdom’), a theme destination;
- **Åre**, with a focus on Åre valley;
- **Sundsvall**, with a focus on the city of Sundsvall in relation to its neighbouring town Timrå;
- **Leith**, which is a waterfront area and former town, now within Edinburgh.

Each of these places are presented in the section below, and followed by a discussion regarding the cultural and social aspects involved in these places becoming tourist destinations.

**Kiruna/Jukkasjärvi**

Kiruna is the northernmost and largest municipality in Sweden and in spatial terms is half the size of Switzerland, about 20,000 km². It is situated in the county of Norrbotten and borders to both Norway and Finland. One of the key landscape features of this county is Kebnekaise, at 2,117m the highest mountain in Sweden. There are about 23,300 inhabitants in the municipality of which approximately 80% live in the town of Kiruna. The number of residents reached its peak in the mid 1970s but has been declining ever since. The average age in the municipality is rather high but the average level of education is also high compared to the other study areas in northern Sweden reflecting investments in education and research. Despite this, only 25% of the population in Kiruna municipality between 25-64 years old have graduate or post-graduate education compared to 33%, which is the Swedish average. The male population is larger than the female due to the dominance of the mining industry and other technical industries (www.scb.se).

The earliest signs of human habitation in this area date back to 5,000 BC. The first people to live here were hunter-gatherers who lived off hunting and fishing. Thereafter, came the Sámi people, who still live here today and whose culture is a pervading characteristic of the modern community. The Sámi people primarily make their living from reindeer herding. A wave of

---

31 See pages 26-36 for the methodology and the methods used in the studies and appendix 1 for maps of where the places are located.

32 This has been limited to ‘Åre Five Villages’ (‘Åre Fem Byar’): Åre Björnen, Åre By, Tegefjäll, Duved and Edsåsdalen. These five places situated alongside Åre Lake are marketed as one destination.
immigration followed when settlers came here in the beginning of the 17th century. The first mine was opened in 1647 and developed into an industry, which has left its mark on the daily life of Kiruna ever since. The first church was also built in the 17th century, in the village of Jukkasjärvi; situated 17 kilometres outside Kiruna by the Torne river. The town of Kiruna is however much younger and celebrated its 100 year jubilee in 2000. Like a vast social experiment, this town was developed from a village located around the railway station and planned as an ideal town according to an American model of that time. Today the area has a mix of Sámi people, Swedish people and people from Tornedalen (see below) with their Finnish-influenced culture (www.kommun.kiruna.se).

Just as the cultural mix of Kiruna is based on three parts, so is its business life. Mines laid the foundation for the industrial business sector of Kiruna. It is true to say that this focus on mining has been necessary for the existence of the municipality but it has also led to significant dependency on a single industry. During recent decades, this dependence has been complemented by two other industries. One related to environmental and space research, the other to businesses within the service industry, with tourism as an important part (ibid.).

Tourism is an important industry for Kiruna in general and for Jukkasjärvi in particular, a crucial destination within the region. The northern location of Kiruna is what attracts tourists here, with its extreme climate of darkness, snow and northern lights during the winter and midnight sun during the summer. Tourism really started at the turn of the 19th century when STF33 built their first tourist centre in the mountains. Since then, mountain tourism has developed and more facilities have been built. Nowadays, the main attraction in this area is however the ‘ICEHOTEL’, a hotel built of ice and snow and located in Jukkasjärvi. This facility, built for the first time about 20 years ago, has become an attraction in itself and has gained international status.

**Tornedalen**

This area is situated in the eastern part of the county of Norrbotten and includes four Swedish municipalities: Kiruna, Pajala, Övertorneå and Haparanda and six Finnish municipalities. This study focuses on the Swedish side of this valley, excluding Kiruna municipality, which is a much smaller part of this area. The other three municipalities cover areas of ca 900, 2,400 and 7,900 km². This valley includes the area around a large river, ca 500 km long, which today forms the border between Finland and Sweden, but before 1810 united the people on both sides; the river being an important means of communication for travelling and commerce (www.tornio.fi).

33 The Swedish Touring Club, a voluntary association founded in 1885.
Today, Haparanda, Övertorneå and Pajala municipalities have populations of ca 10,200, 5,200 and 6,900 people respectively, a total of ca 22,400 people. The number of residents in Övertorneå and Pajala has decreased by a half since 1950, while the figures for Haparanda have been increasing since the 1970s (www.scb.se). The age structure of the residents is similar in the three municipalities; all have a higher proportion of elderly people and a lower proportion of younger residents compared to the rest of Sweden. Moreover, all three municipalities have relatively few residents with higher education, 18% in Haparanda, 20% in Pajala and 22% in Övertorneå between the ages of 25-64 (www.isa.se).

The Finnish culture is predominant in the Swedish part of Tornedalen. This goes back to the fact that for 800 years Finland was part of Sweden, up until 1810 when, after the war against Russia, a border was drawn in the river, henceforth dividing Tornedalen and its people (www.bd.lst.se). There were then about 19,000 people living in the area and the Finnish speaking group of ca 8,000 residents west of the river became Swedish citizens and those on the east of the river became Finnish citizens (www.pajala.se). The strong influence of Finnish culture on the Swedish side of the river is also related to immigration from the east during the 13th century. There have been settlements and villages in Tornedalen since the Middle Ages, at which time Torneå, the ‘twin city’ of Haparanda, was one of the busiest market towns of Nordkalotten. Other places along the river have a long history of market towns as well and hold large annual markets. Kengis market in Pajala municipality is one such example. The region has retained its own culture through commerce across the border, and due to the ties between friends and relatives. People in this area even have their own language, ‘meän kieli’, a mix of Finnish and Swedish. The region was split into several smaller areas until the beginning of 1970s when these were merged into three larger municipalities (www.haparanda.se).

Haparanda has a long merchant tradition, which can be seen in the business life today dominated as it is by private companies within IT, commerce and transport (ibid.). People in Övertorneå have made a living of farming and forestry with salmon fishing as a secondary industry. Today, the main industries are based on the processing of products from traditional industries, such as vegetables and roots but also a special kind of wood gathered from slow-growing trees. Other industries include engineering and transport (www.overtornea.se). Pajala has a long tradition as an industrial community going back to 1646 when the first iron ore works in Kengis was founded, and which remained in business for two hundred years. Other important industries were forestry and farming in which many residents worked until the 1960s. The business life of the municipality is nowadays dominated by many small businesses, mainly within IT and electronics, carpentry and within the public service sector (www.pajala.se). There is a difference here between the Swedish

34 The areas in Finland, Norway and Sweden, above the artic circle.
and the Finnish side of Tornedalen, as the latter has not been dependent on a major employer such as the mining industry in Kiruna, and has attracted people from Tornedalen on the Swedish side (Frisk, 1998).

Due to its geographical location, and with the river facilitating transport, Tornedalen has for a long time been a crossroads in the Northern part of Scandinavia and a place where people meet. Since forestry and farming have declined as industries, tourism has become an important way of making a living in this area. The summer season is busiest on the Swedish side of the river, whilst it is the winter which is the peak season on the Finnish side. Tourism in the part of Tornedalen included in this thesis is mainly based around culture and nature. This involves a mix of Finnish and Swedish cultures, saunas, language, regional food and nature-based activities such as hunting and fishing. Since salmon recently returned to the river, greater investments in fishing tourism have been made (www.overtornea.se and www.pajala.se).

Skellefteå / ‘Guldriket’

Skellefteå municipality is situated by the coast in the county of Västerbotten and is 7,200 km² in size. It has ca 71,800 inhabitants of which about half live in the town of Skellefteå. The number of residents increased from the 1970s but has been declining over the last 10 years (www.skelleftea.se and www.scb.se). ‘Guldriket’ or the ‘Golden Kingdom’ is a constructed destination based on a theme, and includes parts of three other neighbouring municipalities of Lycksele, Malå and Norsjö. Lycksele is about 5,600 km² with ca 12,800 residents (www.lyckselefakta.se). Malå is situated north of Lycksele and ca 1,600 km² in size with about 3,500 inhabitants (www.mala.se). Norsjö is located east of Malå, next to Skellefteå and is ca 1,800 km² with about 4,500 residents (www.norsjo.se).

The three latter municipalities share some common traits. They have one central town in each municipality where the majority of inhabitants live and in each municipality the number of residents has been declining since 1950. The age dispersion in the four municipalities is rather similar with the largest proportion of residents being within the age groups of 25-44 and 45-64 years. The average age in Skellefteå and Lycksele is slightly lower with a larger proportion between the ages 7-17 years. The average level of education is relatively low compared to the rest of Sweden, although at 31% Skellefteå has more residents between 25-64 with a higher education than the other three

35 ‘Guldriket’ or the ‘Golden Kingdom is a project sprung from ideas that started in the late 1980s. The idea was to create a ‘theme destination’ based on the cultural resources and the industrial history of the mining area of Västerbotten. The main attractions of this ‘theme destination’ are: Adak, a renovated mining community cinema from the 1940’s, which conducts an annual film festival; Boliden, one of the world’s largest gold mines, with a museum and visitor centre; Kristineberg, a mine offering tours, including a unique underground church; Malå Geomuseum, a newly built geological museum; Rönnskär, a folk museum of the daily life of gold miners; Varuträsk, a mineral park of international status and Örträsk, the world’s longest cable car journey (www.guldriket.com).
The region around Skellefteå has been populated for thousands of years, with ancient remains dating back to 6,000 BC. During the 15th century and onwards, pioneers moved to Northern Västerbotten, where Skellefteå and ‘Guldriket’ are situated, something that can be seen in old remains and ‘church villages’. However, it was during the second half of the 19th century that the area started its ‘modern’ development. Skellefteå town was founded on the old market place next to Skellefteå church. The town got off to a slow start and it was not until the beginning of the 20th century that it eventually received a boost thanks to a newly built power station. The history of the area is heavily influenced by its industrial history, in which water, mines and forest play a significant part. The name ‘Guldriket’ is inspired by the finds of gold made in a place within the area called Boliden, in 1925. This spurred development even further, and today Boliden mine is still the largest business in the area (Kom igen!, 1999; www.skelleftea.se and www.norsjo.se).

Skellefteå and ‘Guldriket’ are located in the so-called ‘Skellefteå field’, one of the richest mineral areas in the world with two of the largest gold deposits in Europe located here (www.guldriket.com). Apart from mining, people mainly make their living from forestry, farming, fishing and reindeer herding. Forestry has grown into a modern industry and still employs a large number of people. There is also some engineering industry within the area. Skellefteå has more commerce and a larger health sector than the other municipalities. The tourism sector as an employer has gained importance during recent years (www.mala.se; www.skelleftea.se and www.norsjo.se).

This area of Västerbotten does not have a long tradition of tourism. The exception being the town Lycksele, which due to its central location has been a meeting place for people in the area, in particular the Sámi people from the southern part of the Sámi region. This tradition has been kept alive and a large conference and entertainment facility, Hotell Lappland, has recently been built, which is also one of the largest tourism businesses in the county (www.lyckselefakta.se). During the last decade, investments in corporate tourism in terms of conferences have also been made in Skellefteå. One important part and good example of this is Expolaris, one of the largest convention centres in Northern Sweden, and situated in Skellefteå town. Some tourism based on fishing, canoeing and ski-ing exists as well, but it is mining and other geological activities that distinguish this area from many others in Northern Sweden. ‘Guldriket’ is one example of how people have tried to develop their assets and turn them into tourist attractions.
Åre

Åre municipality is situated in the western part of the county of Jämtland and borders Norway. It has an area of ca 7,300 km² most of which is comprised of mountains, which give this area its identity. Unlike some of the other municipalities Åre has no central town, but instead six towns similar in terms of size and a handful of smaller villages. The administrative centre, where most of the public services are located, is called Järpen. The village of Åre, together with four other villages, form the area’s ‘touristic centre’, which is called ‘Åre Five Villages’. It is one of the largest winter sport destinations in Scandinavia.

Today the municipality has around 9,800 inhabitants; a decline from 12,500 in 1950s but up from 9,000 in the middle of the 1970s, and it is enjoying a continuing upwards trend. The dispersion of population according to age is similar to the Swedish average, with the largest population group concentrated between the ages of 24-44 and 45-64 years. However, Åre municipality has a slightly smaller proportion of highly educated residents than the national average (30% among 25-64 years old). Statistics for the number of residents and their ages are, however, somewhat misleading due to the large number of young people temporarily employed during the peak tourist season but registered as living in their ‘home municipalities’. There are no exact figures for the amount of the seasonal staff but this is estimated to be between 1,000 – 1,200 people per season, most of them in the age group of 18-24 years (www.are.se and www.scb.se).

As in the area around Skellefteå, there have been people living in Jämtland county for about 8,000 years. The Viking era laid the first foundations for today’s farming countryside, and even in remote mountain regions like Åre, Viking graves have been found. This is explained by the regular contact the area had with populated areas of Norway. This western cultural influence, especially in the mountain regions, has continued through the centuries and is related to the area’s geographical proximity to Norway but also a shared history. Since the Middle Ages the county of Jämtland has had a turbulent history with a number of wars and several rulers. Jämtland has been independent and has belonged to Norway and Denmark, but since 1645 Jämtland and the neighbouring county of Härjedalen have been part of Sweden (www.z.lst.se).

The first traces of Sámi people date back to the 14th century but historians suggest they could have been living here long before that. The Sámi people in Jämtland have mainly continued with traditional reindeer herding and today it is one of the most prosperous businesses in the county’s rural mountain area. The development of the county received a big boost during the 18th century as a result of the arrival of pioneers and increased commerce with Norway and Southern Sweden. After this, people from other neighbouring counties and Finland moved here to work in the booming forestry industry. Another important factor in the development of this county was the railway, which
arrived at the end of the 19th century. The railway ran through the county, through Åre and on to Norway. This made Åre, among other places, more accessible and led to an early development of tourism in the area (www.z.lst.se).

Besides reindeer herding, people in Åre have largely made their living from forestry and farming, in combination with hunting and fishing. Today, these industries are still important parts of the economic life of the region. There are also a number of small industrial businesses and several IT companies that have established themselves in the area. However, the main business in Åre is tourism, which has developed into an industry, with ski-ing and accommodation facilities at its core. In addition to this, there are many businesses with activities related to tourism, such as restaurants, incentive businesses, retail stores, renting of equipment and other kinds of services (www.are.se).

As implied above, the foundations of Åre’s tourism industry were laid when the railway came to the region and the village obtained a station. This made the mountains accessible to the first tourists sometimes called ‘air guests’ or ‘flower gentlemen’, a reference to visitors seeking ‘fresh air’ and visiting the early ‘health farms’ established east of Åre. Other early tourists included the British aristocracy who arrived in the late 19th century to hunt and fish (Sillanpää, 2002). The Swedish Touring Club (STF) also played a major part in the development of tourism in the valley around Åre due to their interest in ‘Åreskutan’, the highest mountain in the area (Nilsson, 1999). When the first ski lift, ‘Bergbanan’, was built in 1910, ski-ing tourism received a big boost, and then a further push when Åre hosted the World Championships in alpine skiing for the first time in 1954. Ever since, Åre has enjoyed more or less focused investment in its tourism industry, leading to the construction of Sweden’s only cable car ski-lift and other facilities. Tourism in the Åre valley is mainly marketed through the concept of ‘Åre Five Villages’, five areas which all focus on ski tourism but offer somewhat different approaches and activities. Even though Åre’s peak season is the winter, there is some tourism here during the summer with activities such as hiking, mountainbiking, white-water rafting etc (www.are.op.se).

Sundsvall

Sundsvall and Timrå are two towns located close to each other, and surrounding a bay, on the east coast of Northern Sweden. The towns are situated in Sundsvall’s and Timrå municipality respectively in the county Västernorrland. Together with the surrounding area, they form one of the largest centres in Northern Sweden in terms of residents and industrial businesses. The main features in this county are the three large rivers, the forest landscape in between them and a spectacular coast line, the so-called ‘Höga

36 ‘Luftgäster’ and ‘blomsterherrar’.
Kusten’ with high, steep cliffs. Sundsvall's and Timrå municipality cover an area of 3,200 km² and 800 km² respectively (www.sundsvall.se and www.timra.se).

Sundsvall municipality has around 93,700 inhabitants, of which 70% live in the town of Sundsvall. There are approximately 17,900 residents in Timrå municipality with around 55% living in Timrå town. The dispersion of the average age of the residents in both the municipalities is, like Åre, similar to the national average, but with slightly fewer younger residents and slightly more elderly residents than Sweden as a whole. The population in this area has been increasing ever since 1950. The proportion of residents between 25-64 with higher education is on a par with the national average in Sundsvall at 34%, but lower in Timrå at 22% (www.scb.se; www.sundsvall.se and www.timra.se).

Like the other areas in Northern Sweden included in this thesis, people have lived in the areas around Sundsvall and Timrå for several thousand years. It has been a landscape based on farming ever since the Middle Ages. The main resource has however been the forest, which has made its mark on the development of the area in many ways. An iron works were for example built in the 17th century, which is also when Sundsvall town was founded. Certain woods were used in the process of smelting iron ore and brought via the rivers to the coast, where several towns were founded due to the ship-making industry. Moreover, several saw mills were established in the 19th century and Sundsvall became ‘the town of the rich mill owners’. In 1888 however, there was a big fire in Sundsvall after which a new ‘stone town’ was built, influenced by design in central and southern Europe. Timber continued to be an important resource into the 20th century, both for the industrial heart of Sundsvall but also surroundings areas. Nowadays the main businesses still include large companies within the forest industry as well other industries within the technical and environmental sectors. There is also a rather large public sector and some developing branches such as IT, communication, education, retail, music and corporate tourism (www.sundsvall.se).

Tourism has never been an important business in Sundsvall. Visitors during the second half of the 20th century were mainly people passing through on their way to, or from, Northern Sweden. However, so called incentive tours (i.e. activity-based tourism for groups) and the music business are developing and are potential resources to base tourism on. Another part of the tourism business is corporate travel, related to the large number of companies in Sundsvall. This has led to investments in conferences and the activities associated with them. For example there is an organisation for different incentive firms called ‘experience organisers’. Apart from corporate visitors, the city of Sundsvall, with its shopping and different cultural events, is itself the main attraction in the area, attracting people from the surrounding area to locations such as the shopping centre with its IKEA and over 4 million visitors every year (Sundsvall 1999/2000). Tourism in Timrå is mainly based on nature tourism in terms of fishing, hiking and canoeing (www.timra.se).
Leith

Leith is part of the waterfront area that marks the northern boundaries of Edinburgh. Edinburgh is the administrative capital of Scotland with a population of nearly 450,000 people, of which nearly 30,000 live in Leith. Edinburgh is situated in the historic county of Lothian where 15% of Scotland’s population live, although the area covers no more than 2% of Scotland’s land area (www.scottish-enterprise.com). Leith has a somewhat higher percentage of younger adults (i.e. in the age group of 25-44 years) compared to the rest of Edinburgh, which in its turn has a higher proportion of people within the key working age group of 15-44 years, compared to the rest of Scotland. The population in this region has been steadily increasing and is estimated to increase further still over the coming years, despite the fact that Scotland’s total population has been and is projected to remain fairly stagnant. The growth in Edinburgh and Lothians as well as Leith is mostly due to a net immigration. Edinburgh has an area of ca 160 km² and Leith about 10 km² (www.edinburgh.gov.uk).

Leith is situated 3 km from the city centre of Edinburgh and has a history of its own. Before the City of Edinburgh was built, there were early Celtic settlements on the banks where the river Water of Leith runs into the Forth, the main estuary in South East Scotland. Leith has been an important port and gateway to Scotland as far back as the late 13th century, but in the beginning of the 18th century the river Clyde in Glasgow became Scotland’s most significant port due to its deeper waters and increasing trade with North America. Other signs of Leith’s prominent place in Scottish history are the founding of one of the first schools in Scotland in 1560 and the writing of the first rules of golf in 1774. Ship-building, alongside trade, was a major industry in Leith until the last shipyard closed in 1983.

Leith is still the fifth biggest port in UK with both cargo shipping and an increasing number of cruise ships. Besides the port, there are also ‘new’ industries and businesses, such as graphic design, computer software, retailing, restaurants and galleries. A new large shopping centre has recently opened where one of the old docks used to be. This and the berthed Royal Yacht Britannia are now the main attractions of Leith.

The industrial revolution led to a rapid expansion of Leith and many people came to look for work in the small community. This caused social problems like overcrowding and poverty. Being a workers’ community, Leith has had its share of social problems, even during the 20th century to the present day. Until very recently parts of Leith experienced very high unemployment, and the area was given few resources and considered a low public priority.

---

37 There are different ways of defining the boundaries of Leith, but in this study the postcode area EH6 have been used, which roughly corresponds to the wards Harbour, Leith Links, Lorne and Newhaven. See appendix 1.
In the last decade, however, things have begun to take a new turn. The most recent period of development has started and new houses and offices have been built. This development has involved the restoration of buildings, cleaning up of the Water of Leith and attempts to address transport problems. Leith is now also part of a wider waterfront re-generation scheme and is gaining a reputation as an interesting tourist destination.

**Places becoming destinations**

**Socio-cultural and tourism dimensions**

How do places become destinations; in other words, how do they thrive as places where people want to work and live, as well as visit for leisure purposes? I would argue that in order to come closer to answering these questions, two dimensions need to be considered: the social and the ‘touristic’. As has been mentioned previously, tourism is by its nature connected to geographic places where tourism activities and infrastructure have developed. However, in order to understand the development of destinations, we also need to study their past and present from a cultural and social perspective. This is similar to studying so-called ‘industrial districts’, where the factors that influence development most are both cultural and social, and to a large extent specific for each individual place (Sjöstrand, 2004). The socio-cultural and tourism aspects of places can be compared and related to each other in order to distinguish the differences between ideal types of place.

Within the ‘touristic’ dimension, I would argue that it is useful to focus on the degree of tourism infrastructure and activities that occur at a place. By this I mean infrastructure built up mainly for visitors, e.g. specialised transport, tourist information services, souvenir shops, sights of interest, accommodation, eating facilities and so on. This dimension also includes activities primarily organised to attract visitors such as sightseeing, guided tours, fairs, exhibitions, courses and other leisure activities and events within sport, culture and nature. This dimension can also be related to degrees of commercialism, where a larger extent of tourism activities and infrastructure involves a larger element of commercialism.

One of the parts I find interesting in the socio-cultural dimension is the level of authenticity, particularly in terms of community involvement at places. There has been an extensive debate concerning authenticity in recent decades. It is not, however, within the scope of this thesis to reiterate this debate and it will therefore only be discussed briefly.\(^{38}\) The term is considered to have been

---

\(^{38}\) The discussion has also included the extent of perception’s impact on the definition of authenticity (Cohen, 1979 and Pearce & Moscardo, 1986); the commodification of culture (Akis, Peristianis & Warner, 1996; Brown, 2000; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Dogan, 1989 and Hughes, 1995); the representations of culture as ‘staged authentic’ experiences (Boniface, 1995; Burns & Holden, 1995;
introduced by MacCannell who claimed that all tourists have a desire to experience the ‘authentic’, i.e. what is perceived as ‘real’, ‘true’ or ‘genuine’ (MacCannell, 1973, 1999). As mentioned previously, authenticity can be regarded in terms of the so-called ‘front’ and ‘back stage’, where the latter represents authentic situations or settings (MacCannell, 1999 and Richards, 1997). The way I use the concept of authenticity is based on the ideas of MacCannell, which means that in those places with a lower degree of authenticity, tourism is ‘staged’ and reduced to a setting with clear boundaries between the front and back stages. Places with a high degree of authenticity will thus have less distinction between the two and a more visible connection to the community culture. This dimension is also similar to ideas about ‘Gesellschaft’ and ‘Gemeinschaft’ (Asplund, 1991). Familiar, private and exclusive social life mostly belongs to Gemeinschaft, whilst Gesellschaft represents public life. Gemeinschaft is a lasting and ‘true’ form of social life and Gesellschaft is transient and illusory. Gemeinschaft can thus be seen as a living organism, a natural and unplanned social entity. Gesellschaft on the other hand is mechanical, planned and artificial (ibid.). Following these lines, Gesellschaft characterises places in the ‘locality’ category, whilst Gemeinschaft is found more among places in the ‘community’ category.

The matrix below is an attempt to illustrate an alternative way of dividing places according to the two dimensions discussed above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-cultural dimension</th>
<th>Tourism infrastructure/activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>Destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localities</td>
<td>Attractions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 2: Ideal types of tourism places (Author’s own)

Communities in this respect would be defined as places with a low level of tourism infrastructure and activities, but have a vibrant community with a social life based on strong connections to the local history and culture. There would also be relatively little current interest or incentive to invest in developing tourism.

Localities in this sense are places with a low level of authenticity in socio-cultural terms, and where tourism activities are relatively few. These are predominantly built up areas often created rather recently such as industrial areas, business parks etc.

Attractions are in this context places with a high level of tourism infrastructure and activity but relatively little connection to local cultural and social life. This type of place is found all over the world in the form of so-called ‘theme parks’ and isolated resorts.

Destinations are then places with both high levels of authenticity, i.e. community involvement and socio-cultural connections as well as tourism infrastructure and activities. This category also includes an explicit intention to further develop tourism in the area.

These categories should be seen as ideal types and therefore not mutually exclusive. Indeed, embedded in the complexity of destinations is that they include parts of the other three categories; destinations are also partly communities, localities and attractions. Furthermore, there are differences within destinations in the degree of tourism infrastructure and even authenticity.40 One example is Kiruna, where the whole municipality might be called a community, but within this area or region there are other smaller destinations such as Kiruna town and its surroundings. In addition, part of the year there is a very prominent attraction at this place in terms of the ICEHOTEL. Such a powerful attraction at a place will no doubt spur tourism development and thus make the place a destination for travellers. However, most created attractions can be copied and built elsewhere. An ICEHOTEL is being built in Québec, Canada; there is now a Disneyland outside Paris; a Legoland near to London and the mayor of Madison, Alabama is planning to build a complete replica of the Old Town in Stockholm to create ‘that European feeling’.

These trends detract from the ‘pull’ of the places where these attractions were originally created, but for some markets the increased accessibility outweighs the lack of connection to the local place. Places in the destination category above have a more complex web of attractions to offer visitors, which is connected to the local social life, culture, nature and history. This gives them an advantage; their ‘tourist product’ is not so easily re-created elsewhere and thus visitors must travel to the place to experience it. This is similar to industrial districts where certain atmospheres and cultures have been found to be tied to specific places (Sjöstrand, 2004).

40 The differences between the cases in terms of tourism development will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.
On the other hand, the destinations included in this thesis are located in the periphery of Europe and are relatively difficult for mass markets to access (e.g. Baum, 1998 and Nilsson, 2000). The location of these destinations in Northern Europe, means that they are most likely to be perceived by the rest of the world’s population as having cold, wet (in the case of Scotland) and dark (in the case of Northern Sweden) climates. This is not very far from the reality; the challenge for these destinations is to see this as an opportunity to be unique and to turn the weather conditions into business opportunities – something that has been achieved in Kiruna. Moreover, these destinations are unlikely to become ‘transient’ destinations that people travel through to get to somewhere else and are therefore less likely to be in the frame of the potential visitors’ mind. However, as accessibility increases and distances are perceived as being reduced in our complex world, this might work in the favour of relatively peripheral destinations. The increasing use and possibilities of information technology further enhance this ‘mental accessibility’. In other words, the Internet and mobile technology makes it possible for destinations in Northern Europe to market themselves globally, and thus increase awareness among previously rather unobtainable potential tourists.

For the purpose of this thesis, the socio-cultural dimension of destinations will continue to be discussed in the next section, a discussion which is divided into two factors: historical heritage and socio-cultural context.

**Historical heritage**

The historical heritage sets some crucial pre-conditions for tourism. Reflecting on the cases presented above, several connections between heritage and tourism can be depicted. Their long settlement histories is a common denominator of these destinations. Moreover, they all have a long past as meeting and trading places; Leith and Sundsvall as harbour towns have seen people from many countries come and go; Skellefteå, Lycksele, Jukkasjärvi and parts of Tornedalen have served as Nordic market places for centuries and Åre has long been a natural place for early visitors such as pilgrims and tradesmen to stop on their way to or from Norway. Through tourism businesses, tourism products are connected to the history of the places I have studied. Long historical roots are shown in rich local culture, which in various ways are included in, and to some extent form the basis of, the tourist products that these places offer. Sámi culture and art are a vital part of the tourism industry in Jukkasjärvi and Kiruna; the maritime atmosphere of Leith has been kept alive; the Finnish culture of saunas etc is part of the ‘package’ in Tornedalen and the mining industry around Skellefteå has been resurrected in the form of ‘Guldriket’. The local heritage in Sundsvall and Åre are not the primary ingredients in their tourism industry, here the focus is mainly on relatively recent activities such as ski-ing and conferences, but local culture is also part of their ‘tourism mix’ in terms of local arts and craft and food.
Socio-cultural context

There is also a socio-cultural context affecting tourism in all of the cases I have studied. Such contexts are also prominent features in theories of ‘dynamic regions’. These studies suggest that thriving places are set within dynamic regions with a history and culture characterised by entrepreneurship (e.g. Hjalager, 1999; Putnam, 1993, 2000 and Sjöstrand, 2004). Two of the identified characteristics of successful regions involve learning and co-operation. These are ‘flexible company boundaries’ and ‘co-operative competition’ (Hjalager, 1999). This requires, however, norms that allow for openness, flexibility, learning and collaboration and that are not too institutionalised and set in their ways. Moreover, I would argue that creating a culture characterised by these values, is dependent on a collective consciousness, including the notion of being in charge of one’s own destiny. Such norms in turn require a group of enterprises and a varied enough pool of human resources, in terms of age structure and education levels.

Turning to our cases, Leith, Åre and Tornedalen have a relatively large pool of small and medium enterprises, whilst the mining and forestry areas of Kiruna, Skellefteå and Sundsvall less so. The establishment of new businesses in these latter places are however signs of entrepreneurial spirit, e.g. tourism businesses collaborating with the ICEHOTEL; the transformation of mining facilities around Skellefteå into attractions and businesses in Sundsvall offering incentive trips to corporate visitors.

The age structure of the places presented above includes a relatively large proportion of older people, with the exception of Leith due to regeneration of residential areas (a smaller version of the development in the Docklands in London) and the influx of younger residents. Levels of education are also lower than national averages, with the exception of Kiruna due to the location of some relatively large science centres in the area. One could argue that this connection to older residents, reflects the fact that to a varying degree they are engaged as resources and in many cases have become volunteers with a wealth of historical knowledge and experiences. For example, the old miners’ cinema, an attraction in ‘Guldriket’, is run by enthusiastic pensioners and the old mine in Åre is also managed by older residents who are members of the local heritage association.

The Northern parts of Finland, Norway, Scotland and Sweden along with inner parts of Spain, are the only regions with large sparsely populated areas in Europe. In the Northern half of Sweden for example, virtually every municipality has experienced a trend of high negative migration over the last ten years. Accessibility by road from the central parts of Europe is also worst in Finland, Norway, Sweden and Scotland, on a par with Greece and the Baltic States (Gløersen, Dubois, Cupus & Schürmann, 2005). An ageing population in combination with low levels of education and negative trends in migration for
both Northern Sweden and Scotland creates a diminishing pool of human resources, and fewer means to develop these places. The places discussed in this thesis have become destinations in so far as they have invested, albeit to varying extents, in the tourism industry. Tourism provides opportunities for people with lower levels of education and those searching more practical professions, such as hotel, restaurant and bar staff, guides, shop assistants and so on. From a short-term perspective, one could argue that, as a sector, tourism is suitable for these places. However, in order to grow as destinations and expand the industry, there needs to be a continuous reliable workforce available, with a mix of people that might spur creativity and challenge institutionalised systems and structures. One way of responding to this is to attract new and/or young people on a long-term basis and encourage those born in the area to stay or come back after education. This can be done by building on attractive amenities and resources (Müller, 2005). As an established destination, Åre provides an alternative to urban life with opportunities of outdoor recreation and work. Kiruna has specialised in the particular fields of environmental and space research and development, which is now being connected to tourism in various ways, for example in terms of guided tours of the space centre and participation in the launching of weather balloons. Even in Leith, with a less developed tourism industry, there are growing work opportunities for local young people in the many restaurants and bars in the area.

Summary and conclusions

The concept of destination refers to a geographic local place or region where dynamic social processes of tourism development are taking place. Destinations in this thesis are studied from a social and cultural perspective and are thought to be more than static systems of attractions, accommodations, transports and other services. The focus of these studies of destinations is not the visitors but the people living and working at these places and the projects they are part of, as well as the context, i.e. the destination itself.

In this thesis, the stories of six places are told in terms of their economic, social and touristic situations. The six studied places are: Kiruna/Jukkasjärvi, Tornedalen, Skellefteå/‘Guldriket’, Åre and Sundsvall in Sweden and Edinburgh/Leith in Scotland. These destinations are also presented in terms of their similarities and differences as destinations. These and their different stages of destination development will be elaborated on in the following chapter.

The study of the development of destination includes both a socio-cultural and a tourism dimension. If using these two dimensions, places can be divided into four categories (communities, localities, attractions and destinations) according to their degree of commercial tourism, infrastructure/activities and level of authenticity, in terms of connection to the community. In this division,
destinations are characterised by a high level of tourism infrastructure along with strong connections to the local community.

Continuing along the line that it is important to acknowledge destinations’ connection to communities, in this chapter I argue for the importance of including historical heritage and socio-cultural context in the study of destinations. Historical heritage form vital pre-conditions for tourism at a place, in terms of their history of receiving visitors and connection to local culture such as crafts, art, food and so on. In addition, socio-cultural factors are also influencing destinations and creating a context for tourism. Destinations are here seen as somewhat similar to dynamic regions, characterised by learning and co-operation. This requires institutionalised, yet flexible norms, a collective consciousness, sufficiently entrepreneurial groups and a heterogeneous pool of human resources in terms of age structure and education levels.

In this chapter, it is implied that changes take place in these communities, that also are destinations, and that they are often faced with dilemmas. Tourist attractions change and so does the social construction of them (MacCannell, 1999). This is the case for destinations as well and I would argue that it is therefore important to study processes of change in order to gain a better understanding of places becoming and developing as destinations. Closely related to the way places develop as tourist destinations are the learning processes taking place during the various stages of change. It is likely that in our rapidly changing world, these processes will become more complex and therefore more difficult for people and communities to manage. The following chapter will analyse the complexity of destinations in terms of development processes in order to gain a better understanding of what is involved in places becoming and developing as destinations.
DESTINATION DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES

Introduction

Tourism development takes place simultaneously throughout the world. The examples of tourism development are complex and varied, which makes it difficult to find a way of obtaining an understanding of how these places develop into destinations and of the processes of change that occur.\textsuperscript{41} One way of tackling this is to study places in a relatively similar context, e.g. cases in the Northern European hemisphere. The connection between the global and the local in our complex world, as mentioned in the introductory chapter, illustrates the value of studying a few cases in one part of the world as they in some way share and are part of the same complex global web.

This chapter continues to look at the destination cases, this time in terms of their development as destinations. It begins with a theoretical discussion regarding the complexity of development in relation to tourism. The purpose of this chapter is to explore and understand the dynamic nature of tourism development and how destinations change. I do this by presenting an embryo of a model of destination development, ‘Destination Learning Development’, which is then applied to my cases. Using this model, the cases are discussed in terms of their differences and similarities as destinations, as well as their development, to illustrate how different destinations can be found in various phases of development processes.

The complexity of development

In this thesis, I have argued that we live in an increasingly complex world where the local and regional aspects of people’s lives are becoming ever more important. Many industries are moving their production out of the Western countries thus reducing jobs and business opportunities in those societies. Tourism on the other hand has been seen as an industry and phenomenon, which is leading people to places. Therefore, one way local and regional communities benefit from globalisation is through increased accessibility and demand for uniqueness. The previous chapter attempted to demonstrate this by discussing how tourism is in many instances connected to geographical locations and their unique cultural and social mix. Indeed, the growth of the tourism industry has resulted in tourism being put forward as a tool for local and regional development; even survival. Before we turn to discussions

\textsuperscript{41} Some examples are: Kiwitrails, destination development of the East Cape region of New Zealand through new technologies (Milne, 2005); growth by social and intellectual capital at the Igalo Centre, Montenegro (Syvertsen, 2005); possibilities of becoming a world heritage site in Bagamoyo, Tanzania (Furunes & Mykletun, 2005).
regarding tourism development, however, development on a global scale needs to be addressed.

Several theories and studies on globalisation have been written in recent decades (e.g. Appiduraj, 1990; Giddens, 1990; Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, & Perraton, 1999; Mann, 1986, 2000; Meyer, 1999 and Smith 1990). Moreover, there are several ways of dividing globalisation and related theories (e.g. Held et al, 1999 and Urry, 2003). I find the approach of ‘global complexity’ (Urry, 2003) most suitable as it stresses the systematic and dynamic nature of globalisation, which to a large extent is necessary for understanding tourism development. The ‘global complexity’ approach asserts that global systems do not strive towards perfect balance or order, and therefore includes notions of the world being on the ‘edge of chaos’. Many events in our globalised world are unpredictable, irreversible and small actions may have large effects (ibid.). Social global complexity is also to some extent produced by a dialectic relationship between, and a combination of, so-called ‘mobility and moorings’. In other words, there are movements criss-crossing the globe, such as information, currency, energy, diseases, languages, and money, not to mention people. The increase in mobility is however dependent on places of immobility, or ‘moorings’, i.e. machines facilitating movements, such as ticket machines, pylons, web serves and sites, computers, car parks and so on. In addition, there need to be places to harbour people in their temporary immobility, such as railway stations, airport terminals, bus stops, motels etc (ibid.).

I would argue that tourism is a significant part of creating these socially complex systems. Destinations are moorings connected by visitors’ mobility. It is likely that places of rest and immobility will become even more important for people in our increasingly mobile society; in particular places where we travel to for a purpose and a desire to stay at, not just merely pausing as is the case at airport terminals, railway stations etc. Furthermore, the vast majority of tourists today are people from developed countries and a vital aspect of these advanced industrial societies is the change in people's life expectations. Since a very large proportion of today’s Western population has been raised under conditions of exceptional economic security, they tend to be in less need of basic security and in greater need of ‘higher’ fulfilment. Combined with the current shift towards individual autonomy, this has led to people placing greater emphasis on self-expression, aesthetic satisfaction and the quality of life (Inglehart, 1990), expressed by for example the increase in spas, retreats and other similar facilities.

The complexity of contemporary development also entails an increasing mix of disciplines (as seen in current academic research), areas, fields and sectors. In terms of tourism, I propose viewing places as both communities and destinations as a way of dealing with this complexity. An example of this mixing
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42 Also called ‘liquids’, ‘flows’ or ‘fluids’ (Urry, 2003).
is the increase in collaboration that has occurred in recent decades, often across boundaries and spheres. Tourism and many other areas have seen an ‘explosion’ of partnerships, networks, collaborations, alliances, teams and other forms of co-operation involving people coming together for various reasons. Public-private partnerships are on the agenda of most regions, towns and cities. When major events are planned the organisers present their ‘partners’, not sponsors, e.g. World Championships in Athletics Helsinki 2005; Stockholm Open 2005; European Athletics Championships in Gothenburg 2006; Fifa World Cup Germany 2006 and Olympics in Beijing 2008 (www.helsinki2005.fi; www.stockholmopen.se; www.goteborg.com; fifaworldcup.yahoo.com and www.beijing-2008.org). This is also expressed by the organisation for tourism organisations in European cities, which states: ‘The only capital European Cities Tourism has is the experience and commitment of its members, brought together in the association to develop tourism in all our cities’, which is part of the mission statement for European Cities Tourism (European Cities Tourism, 2003). Another example is the North Calotte Council, which is one of eight cross-border organisations in the Nordic countries (www.nordkalottradet.nu and Nordiska Ministerrådet, 2004).43

There are numerous examples, all of which have interesting implications for future destination development at a local level; the implication being that it is becoming more ‘socially and politically acceptable’ to openly discuss and seek ways of collaboration across sectors and disciplines. There are even incentives in place to do so, witnessed in the requirements placed on public-private partnerships or similar organisations when applying for funding through the EU’s structural funds (e.g. Interreg projects, which need to involve two or more countries). In other words, ‘specific reciprocity’ (I’ll help you if you help me) is thus complemented by a more outspoken norm of ‘generalised reciprocity’ (‘I’ll do this for you without expecting anything specific back from you, in the confident expectation that someone else will do something for me down the road’) (Putnam, 2000:20ff). I would argue that this is a significant change that could benefit local destination development. These systems and changes of perspective facilitate collaboration and enable co-operation to be made explicit and receive funding, which in turn creates a base for future development. This process might also contribute to ‘the strive of increased professionalism’ (Svensson, 1991) and strengthen of the identity of places, and images of destinations, by encouraging collaboration, which is needed in order to secure funding, which in turns builds up a long-term trust.

43 The North Calotte (Nordkalottrådet) includes the area in Finland, Norway and Sweden above the artic circle. This council is a partnership between public organisations and private businesses, in the fields of environment, culture, media, businesses and tourism. The other seven cross-border organisations are: Østfold-Bohuslän-Dalsland, Skagerrådskabelts Samarbejdsråd, Midtnorden Komiteen, Kvarkenrådet, ARKO Samarbejdet, NORA and Öresundskomiteen (www.nordkalottradet.nu).
Development of destinations

Implicit in the stories of the places in the previous chapter is the development of their social, economic, political spheres at the same time as their development as tourist destinations. I have argued that tourism and communities go hand in hand, and that development in one will affect the other. For example, direct buses from Edinburgh city centre to the main attractions in Leith also provides residents with faster transport to a recently built shopping centre. Investment in music for young Sundsvall residents will most likely eventually strengthen the image of the town and attract visitors to concerts and events. In addition, tourism development indirectly affects local development in terms of increased tax incomes, which might be used for improved infrastructure, health services, schools etc.

The concept of development is often ‘charged’ with values and connotations of an evolution that is positive. This is not however always the case. In the notion of global complexity lies the idea that development in general is becoming more unpredictable and therefore also involves periods of decline in employment, increases in poverty, crime and drug usage and so on. Development processes at destinations can also take sudden, unforeseen turns as in the case of the tsunami that hit South-east Asia on December 26th 2004 and the hurricane season in America and the Caribbean in the autumn of 2005. On a personal level, this had devastating effects for residents in these areas as well as for tourists spending time there. These effects were immediate and tragic from a human perspective. The effects for the affected countries will also have long-term consequences for the tourist destinations. Much of the infrastructure for tourism has disappeared and their image as holiday destinations has been damaged, which is likely to lead to a decline in incoming visitors and loss of jobs for residents. Indeed, after the tsunami in 2004, the tourist authorities of Thailand for example, declined monetary help from other countries but appealed to tourists to return, an acknowledgement that the tourism industry is an important long-term part of their economy. Furthermore, tourism has been used as a tool for taking political standpoints, as in the case of Burma where a tourism development project launched by the regime was boycotted by travel agents from several countries as a protest against the ruling authority (Philp & Mercer, 1999). There are other recent examples, most notably the attack on the World Trade Center in New York on 11 September 2001, but also in Egypt, Bali, Turkey, as well as other places, where tourist destinations have been the target of violent terrorist acts. Development is thus very different for various places and destinations.

The degree of unforeseen events makes it more relevant to view development as a process rather than to see it as a steady, linear progression. Processes include both increases and decreases and a combination of intended change and unpredictable events. An example of this would be the change in the North American community over the last century, which has been described as going
through a collapse and revival; a process of growth and decline as a civic community (Putnam, 2000).

**Destination development models**

One way of comparing places as tourist destinations is to compare how much they have developed. To undertake this comparison, one needs a tool and an example of such a tool is a model of destination development. Several such models that focus on tourism development have been created in recent years. Most of them can be found in human geography (e.g. Butler, 1980, Gormsen, 1981 and Miossec, 1976, all in Pearce, 1991), and all are development models of tourist areas with a clear focus on spatial development, or enlargement, in combination with an increased number of tourists. Others have a more sociological approach such as MacCannell (1999) when he argues that sights or attractions go through different stages in their process of distinguishing themselves as attractions that are worth seeing and experiencing (MacCannell, 1999).

One of the most well-known types of development model is based on the product life cycle and the assumption that the 'life' of any given product has a beginning, middle and an end; in other words, development, growth, maturity and decline. This type of model has mainly been used in manufacturing sectors and in particular in relation to marketing activities. There are, however, a few problems involved when applying the product cycle model to tourism, as the development of destinations can take many different forms apart from the classic bell-shaped curve. In event tourism for example, the peak and indeed the decline is reached much quicker; when an attraction or destination has been extensively marketed in various media, the peak might also be reached quickly but the decline phase is likely to be longer. Other destinations can go through many short phases of continuous transformation and so on (Shaw & Williams, 2004). An attempt to address these problems was made by Butler, who created a model of the hypothetical evolution of a tourist area that is one of the most frequently used and referred to models of its kind. He drew conclusions from the work of several tourism researchers in the 1970s and recognised six stages in the 'life cycle' of a destination. These were: exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation and rejuvenation and/or decline (Pearce, 1991).
These stages are mainly defined according to the length of time tourism has existed in an area as well as the number of tourists that visit the area. Butler argues that the more developed a tourist area is, the less involvement and influence the local actors have and that capital, and thus power, over time moves from local to external sources. Relationships between local residents and visitors will also get worse as the number of visitors grows. Other spatial studies have however shown that local and regional influence increases as the tourist area develops. Furthermore, this model assumes that the critical stages in terms of carrying capacity, occurs in the phases of consolidation and stagnation (Pearce, 1991 and Shaw & Williams, 2004).44

This model has spurred many debates and critiques, which to a large extent have identified similar problems to those associated with the product cycle mentioned above. One critique stresses the difficulty of defining a tourist area and indeed tourism itself. Moreover, it has been pointed out that tourist areas might not go through all the development stages and that their market segments can be at different stages of the evolution. The two critical stages have also been seen as being too loosely defined to easily apply to real cases (Shaw & Williams, 2004). To a large extent, I agree with this criticism and therefore present a moderation of the model in the following section.

**Destination Learning Development**

I would argue that it is not enough to only concentrate on, as Butler has done for example, the fact that there are too many tourists in too small a place during
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44 'Carrying capacity' is a commonly used term in tourism, which is the estimation of the number of visitors a destination can receive without severe detrimental ecological and social effects.
too a short period of time, and that the residents themselves do not benefit enough from tourism. Although these are important factors, the planning for and development of tourism based only on facts like these, will most likely be beneficial, but only from a short-term perspective.

As has been argued in this thesis, in order to achieve long-term tourism development that is beneficial to everyone involved, one needs to study tourism as a phenomenon and an industry from a socio-cultural perspective as well. Therefore, I mean that Butler’s model and similar ones are insufficient and lack several dimensions necessary for them to be useful as destination development models. First of all, they do not take the socio-cultural context of an area into account more than in terms of how long tourism has existed there. Secondly, the way the concept of destination development is used in this thesis implies more than tourism development in terms of increased number of tourists, which the models above use as their main criteria for tourism development. There are other ways of viewing tourism development, for example in economic terms rather than just looking at an increased number of tourists, one could consider whether tourists are generating more income or the efficient use of resources in order to lower costs. Thirdly, models such as Butler’s were based on studies of mass tourism in the 1970s and as the tourism industry, including tourists themselves, have changed, the model needs ‘upgrading’.

In order to start creating an alternative contemporary tool for analysis, which describes the different stages of development at destinations, a way of combining the length of time the places have existed as tourist destinations and the learning processes involved is needed. However, as implied in the discussion about development above, time is a given factor in any analysis of the changes occurring. What is often not made explicit, are the socio-cultural factors behind development, such as those discussed in the previous chapter, and the learning processes that take the past into the present and have implications for the future.

Thus, I propose using a tool based on the models discussed above but with a wider, more holistic approach. I call it ‘Destination Learning Development’ and it implies a development of the destination which takes into account crucial factors such as: relationships at the destination; changes of perspective; collaboration and networking between similar as well as different organisations and groups; the existence of plans, strategies, division of responsibilities etc; and local involvement to enhance local development in combination with tourism development. In other words the development is ‘a strive towards increased professionalism’ (Svensson, 1991) as mentioned above, which includes the above factors relating to increased levels of quality, skills and knowledge.
But how can one claim that destinations learn? Is this just Butler all over again, suggesting that an ‘impersonal’ entity or unity, or a ‘loosely’ defined concept such as destinations, can learn. Yes, and no. I argue that we can talk about ‘collective’ learning within organisations, places and destinations. This provides insights and understandings that go beyond individual persons and projects; that develop over time and creates knowledge that stays even when people move on elsewhere. Some of this might be so-called ‘tacit’ knowledge, like that which is often passed on through generations of, for example, carpenters, musicians, farmers and indeed people involved in the tourism industry (e.g. Petersen, 2001). There are, however, other more explicit and formally structured ways of learning.

I have reduced the six stages included in Butler’s model to three phases in the alternative model presented in this thesis. The reason for this being that the cases are not evaluated through quantitative measurements of the state they were in at the time of the study, but rather used as examples of local and regional tourism development where certain important social and cultural factors have been found. Furthermore, I found three phases sufficient to illustrate the dynamic element of destinations and their development. What is called ‘exploration’ and ‘involvement’ in the Life Cycle Model, I call the ‘starting phase’; where either interaction within the destination, or outgoing communication to the market, or a limited amount of both, have commenced. Next, what has previously been called ‘development’ and consolidation’ is here entitled the ‘maturing phase’. Like a fine wine, this is where development gets its ‘body’ and relations and communication, both ‘internally’ and ‘externally’, takes a more structured form. This is once trust between actors has been built up; continuity can be depicted in plans and activities and similar signs of a ‘planned change’ can be seen. Thirdly, ‘stagnation’ and ‘rejuvenation/decline’ is, in the alternative model, called the ‘ageing phase’, where interaction and communication are set in their forms; have become institutionalised and are in the process, or risk of, returning to any of the previous stages. The phases and their characteristics are summarised in the table below.

Table 1: **Destination Learning Development** (Author’s own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages in the Life Cycle Model</th>
<th>Phases of Destination Learning Development</th>
<th>Characteristics of Destination Learning Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>Starting</td>
<td>Forming internal relations and/or external communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Maturing</td>
<td>Relations and communication develop internally and externally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Ageing</td>
<td>Relations and communication set in their form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69
I have divided the destinations included in this study according to the phases above. As indicated previously, it is worth pointing out that destinations can also be divided into parts where different parts of the destination are in different phases of their development. This implies that critical moments and issues do not only arise in the stagnation phase nor only concern carrying capacity, which is not recognised in Butler’s model. For each destination, a number of factors have been identified as examples of the critical issues facing that particular destination in a certain phase.

Before the model is applied to the cases studied, I will attempt another way of explaining the thoughts behind the model. To continue on the food and wine metaphor, I would like to draw an analogy between destination development and the processes of preparing and cooking food, and undertaking this as a business.

First of all, imagine the process of preparing a meal for a few friends at home. This is similar to the starting phase in the destination learning development. It involves searching for the right ingredients; whilst not being sure of what the guests would like, they might even be allergic to something. The dish or type of food that is going to be cooked and served is new and our hostess is therefore unsure about the preparation process in terms of timing, cost, the number of helping hands needed etc. The setting also needs to be considered; how to make it a nice atmosphere. The other elements of a successful dinner are also unfamiliar, such as beverages of the right type, temperature etc; taking care of guests when they arrive, as well as during and after the meal.

The problems at this starting phase are mostly based on a low level of knowledge, experience, routines and a lack of any overview of the resources required. This leads to a situation where ad hoc solutions and spontaneous improvisation and an element of pure luck is needed. Moreover, our inexperienced hostess does not have the physical equipment, i.e. the right type or quantity of kitchen utensils and appliances to prepare more time-consuming, complicated or sophisticated food.

The learning process in this phase could involve carrying out an inventory; i.e. going through the cupboards to find out what could be used to make a meal. It would most likely also benefit from some consideration of who is good at doing what: making sauces, frying, baking, organising, setting etc. Careful planning ahead and setting realistic aims becomes vital; better to do one dish really well than prepare a catastrophic five-course meal. Afterwards, the hostess could reflect on how the dinner went and try to answer questions like: Who liked what? What could have been done better? How might the recipes be improved? Is a cooking class needed or is it enough to watch food programmes on TV and read up on the Internet? Perhaps advice from other more skilled and experienced people is preferable? What do I enjoy cooking and serving?
Let us say that this and other dinner parties went very well (despite the debacle with the blue soup and bloody steaks to the vegetarian couple!) and our hostess decides to try to make a living out of her acquired skills. She opens a small restaurant in the local village, which becomes a success after some hard-working years. Going back to the model of destination learning development, this would be the maturing phase. Financial resources mean more utensils and other equipment become available that make the process quicker and easier, and allow other types and quantities of food to be prepared. Employees also mean more human resources to delegate tasks to; other chefs contribute with complementing experience and knowledge. The chance of handling unforeseen circumstances increases, which makes the enterprise less vulnerable.

The problems in this phase are of a different character to those in the starting phase. Our hostess has not only turned into a chef, but also an owner manager with more responsibilities over people, quality, reputation, facilities, legalities and so on. The expectations have been raised and she needs to deliver over and over again. There is still a need for a great personal involvement; the pace is high and resources still too few to achieve any distance from the activities and reflect on the situation. New knowledge such as marketing, finances etc is needed. Low margins force the restaurant to stay open all days of the week, but there are too few visiting customers and local residents need constant persuading to eat out. Both visitors and residents regard the village as ‘closed’ on certain days of the week and do not eat out on these days.

As a learning process in this phase, the owner needs to ask herself: can some of the administrative, financial and marketing tasks be outsourced to other businesses with better skills? The importance of setting quality standards and developing routines, thus ensuring continuously satisfied customers, must be acknowledged. The owner and other members of key staff probably need to take regular days off to think, not do. The team needs to find out whether training courses other than cookery lessons are needed, perhaps in management for example. It is possible to subscribe to trade newsletters and other information sources to keep up to date with rules, regulations, trends etc. The owner might join local groups with common interests in order to gain inspiration, collaboration partners etc. The product and service on offer might be improved by some ‘industrial espionage’ in the form of trips to competitors; ‘mystery shopping’ by food critics and feedback from customers. The personal touch could be maintained by the use of local products, theme nights, seasonal variation or the development of niche markets, which also would motivate the staff. Standard marketing could be complemented by special invites and activities for residents with the aim of turning them into ‘ambassadors’. The problem of the ‘open hours’ dilemma might be solved by agreeing with other establishments to stay open different nights of the week during low season.

In this story, our imaginary restaurant had a few successful decades where the owner was able to open several other restaurants in the area, of which two were
given awards on various occasions. The enterprise and indeed its concept is now in the ageing phase. This has led to a period of consolidation where the restaurant is now a well established business and a brand with a strong reputation. The owner has become a respected member of trade groups and associations and regularly gives support to community activities. Over the years star chefs have come and gone; a core of loyal staff has built up expertise and tacit knowledge and routines have been developed for all occasions and situations. The majority of customers are returning customers who expect all year round opening hours and seasonal variations on the menu. Good food can be produced for good value as large quantities of products are bought cheaper.

The problems in this phase are that routines have made the business somewhat inflexible, and spontaneous moments are far and few between. Guests become numbers and the food a commodity. The owner boasts about having enough knowledge in the business; there is no need to attend any more courses or take advice from others. However, quite a few of the establishments are in need of refurbishment and replacement of equipment, staff and ideas. Although the guests get what they expect, they are never surprised and for every year that passes it seems harder to attract new customers.

The learning processes in this phase involve setting sights higher and finding new challenges. Rather than settling for being one of the largest and most influential brands at a local level, it is time for comparisons to be made with larger competitors in places farther afield. There may be possibilities to share knowledge and expertise, either locally or with other places, if the owner and staff can remain open to new ideas at these meetings. A rotation of people, management etc might be needed but without loosing crucial knowledge and skills. One way might be to develop a mentorship programme, either internally or externally. Reading trade magazines could be complemented by studying global trends with the aim of implementing a few new ideas. New elements such as entertainment or accommodation could be incorporated into the business, or the enterprise can join forces with other businesses.

Each of these phases has their own particular problems and therefore the solution or ways of learning need to be adapted to the situation at hand. Not all changes can be planned however. As mentioned previously, failure or setbacks are part of the learning process. Many creative solutions can occur by a lucky chance, whether it is inventing a drink used to prevent malaria; a bit more wine in the sauce on a merry evening or a few crazy foreign guests deciding to stay overnight in a building made of ice.

I mean that similar learning processes as those discussed above take place at destinations. In fact, literally speaking, part of what is described above already goes on at eating establishments at destinations; indeed learning processes like these occur within and between groups and individuals. However, this is not to say that they do not take place at a larger, collective level, i.e. across destinations.
as a whole. For example, this might happen if an owner of a small restaurant likes the hotel down the road and recommends it to her guests, and in return the hotel owner does the same for the restaurant. They may then agree to take this concept forward and offer commissions and joint packages. If this trial works out well, other people could become interested in joining this arrangement, e.g. someone with experiences from elsewhere with new ideas. When these processes multiply and start changing the destination, destination learning development has occurred.

It may facilitate reading to keep the above story in mind when the tool of Destination Learning Development is applied to the cases below. It is important to note however, that the destinations have been compared to each other rather than in relation to other destinations around the world. Although other destinations no doubt face similar problems, it would be difficult to compare metropolitan capitals, with millions of residents and visitors, to destinations with populations of a few thousand in Northern Europe. The destinations included in this thesis are therefore categorised in relation to each other as either starting, maturing or ageing. The destinations have also been studied at a specific time and the phase they were in that point of time. As development is constantly occurring and places are forever changing it is impossible to write a thesis based on the latest news; as soon as a thesis is printed it becomes part of the past no matter how up to date facts and figures are at the time of reporting.

**Destination Learning Development applied to the cases**

*Kiruna* municipality seems to be in different phases as a destination when it comes to touristic development. In the mountainous area of Kiruna, where organised tourism has been going on the longest in the region, the area has entered an ageing phase, where the business has been consolidated and become stabilised. This means that no fundamental development is taking place and that the activities are quite similar each year. They are therefore in a crucial phase where some changes will have to be made in order to prevent its decline as a tourist destination. The first centre for hill-walking in Sweden was, for example, founded in the western parts of this region by the Swedish Touring Club (STF) in 1902.45

At the other end of the scale of tourist development in Kiruna is the eastern part of the municipality. Tourism as an industry has been developed rather recently in this area, compared to other parts of this municipality. Eastern Kiruna seems to be in the initial stages of a starting phase where they have mapped out their own resources and started building a touristic platform, which

45 Abisko Mountain Station (Fjällstation).
they hope will engage as many people as possible (‘Turismutveckling Åtta Årstider’, 1997).

Jukkasjärvi and its surroundings is the third touristic area in the region and in development terms can be placed between the mountainous area and eastern parts of Kiruna. Since the 1980s, significant development of tourism has been going on, which really started when the idea of an igloo as a hotel became reality. It seems like this area is in the late stages of the maturing phase. In other words, they are entering an important phase where the first successful period is over and the business is being consolidated. This time is especially crucial for Jukkasjärvi since the dominating firm in the area is more or less run by the initiator and founder of the ICEHOTEL, making the development heavily dependent on this ‘iconic’ and visionary person. The following quote from one of the interviewed persons in Jukkasjärvi is a sign of the connections between tourism development and learning. When asked about what tourism development is, this person answered:

10 years ago, I’d probably have said that it’s about developing products, developing for the guests. Today, I think it’s about giving those who work within tourism better conditions, like for example communications, sales organisation, marketing, transport. We don’t have any guests in the areas next to us, that must be the base…more a development that goes beyond one’s own company. It depends on how long you’ve been doing this for…. (Interview with private enterprise, Jukkasjärvi)

Like Kiruna, there are several things, which indicate that Tornedalen as a destination is also divided into different development phases. However Tornedalen, when compared to Kiruna, seems to be in an earlier stage of its development. In Kiruna, there are three distinct areas at different phases of development. Despite the differences between them, they are all represented in a collaboration association for the tourism industry. A similar organisation has been under construction in Tornedalen too, but it has had difficulties and its future was, at the time of this study, most uncertain. The action plan for the organisation shows some characteristics of the tourism development today present in Tornedalen. It points towards an unevenness in levels of competence and experience as well as in the types of tourism business. This implies a variety of needs for development within the region. Some businesses stress the importance of strengthening the profile or image of Tornedalen whilst others want to create strong networks, to help develop competences etc (Handlingsplan för Tornedalen, 1997).

The divides within Tornedalen as a destination, are also shown through the interviews conducted in this project. A quote from one person, who has been working with the development of Tornedalen for 25 years, provides an example of this:
Tornedalen is no longer an obvious destination. Tornedalen Turism\textsuperscript{46} doesn’t work any more; there aren’t any networks for the businesses any more. That’s why you can’t see Tornedalen as a destination. It’s not a clear destination, just a few ‘islands’ that are doing alright, i.e. a handful of businesses like for example Kukkolaforsen who are in a positive development phase. The others haven’t risen from the ground yet, they’re still on the same old spot. (Interview with representative from public organisation, Tornedalen)

Another example, which confirms the above discussion, can be found in the following statement from one of the participants of the focus groups:

\textit{You can’t use one definition for Tornedalen as whole. Different parts are in different phases with some nodes or centres, of which Kukkolaforsen is one of them, this thanks to a true innovative thinking among the entrepreneurs.} (Focus group Tornedalen – private enterprises)

Despite these people’s difficulties to see Tornedalen as a destination, it seems as though, with the exception of some stronger nodes, it is somewhere in the maturing phase. One of these stronger nodes is Kukkolaforsen, mentioned above; a conference facility that has become an established ‘flag ship’ for Tornedalen. There are however parts of the tourist destination Tornedalen, which are in the starting phase. There seem to be quite a few opportunities and resources for the residents to seize upon. One example would be the investments being made within IT and tourism. Another promising project is ‘Development of Tornedalen’,\textsuperscript{47} which implies an increased awareness of, and investment in, tourism development. The agencies behind the project are committing themselves to the organisation of seminars and have also stressed the importance of more tourism research. This indicates a somewhat holistic approach as tourism is also being seen as part of the wider development in Tornedalen, together with industries such as forestry, food etc (www.tornedalen.org). In summation, the key actors in Tornedalen seem to have made the decision that tourism will be developed but have not fully implemented these thoughts yet.

\textit{Skellefteå/Guldriket} seems to be in the starting phase of tourism related development. When compared to Tornedalen for example, tourism has not been evolved to the same extent or for as long. This is most likely due to the fact that tourism is a rather recent complement to the traditional mining and manufacturing industries in the area. As said, mining has to a large extent made its mark on this region and in this context is both an opportunity as well as an obstacle.

\textsuperscript{46} The name of the organisation for the tourism industry in Tornedalen at the time of the study.
\textsuperscript{47} ‘Tornedalens Utveckling’.
Potential lies in the development of a niche market based on mining and other industrial history, since these are common traits for the area. A rather unique mix of mines and other geological resources are found here, both as a large ‘open air museum’ and as a modern industry. One of the problems with the history of this particular area is that it has probably created patterns, habits and values that may be difficult, or take a long time, to break. This makes the pre-conditions for tourism development in this area somewhat different. Another difficulty this region faces is how to combine the relatively large urban area and its investment in congress with the surrounding rural area and its small, voluntary organisations who, for example, want to develop ‘Guldriket’. There are of course possibilities to combine the two, for example to offer excursions to the attractions of ‘Guldriket’ as activities at conferences. At the time of the study it appeared that some crucial decisions were necessary regarding whether to invest in tourism or not.

As a network, ‘Guldriket’ has developed rapidly over the past five years. At the end of the 1990s, the actors were still in a semi-formal group with a rather basic website giving general information about their various attractions, which were fewer than today. Since then, the network has become more formalised and an association has been created; an EU-project has started up and financial and other support has been provided by other public organisations. ‘Guldriket’ has also produced a more detailed website with booking services; package trips; virtual tours; ordering of brochures and so on. There has been increased marketing through, for example, local and regional radio. The number of attractions and other businesses involved in ‘Guldriket’ has doubled in five years and there are now activities all year round, although summer remains the peak season. There is also an Intranet for members and an open invitation for potential members to join.

As already mentioned, Åre has never been an isolated mountain region, indeed people have been travelling through the Åre valley for several centuries and for many different purposes. The latter include purposes as varied as commerce with Norway, pilgrim journeys to Trondheim on the Norwegian coast and war raids. From having been a valley that people travelled through, Åre has now become a place that people are travelling to. These are now called tourists and the place is called a destination. In other words, tourism in this area has developed to become an industry, to some extent with strategic goals and visions that provide a base for development.

As with the other destinations, it is difficult to place Åre valley, its network of five villages and surrounding villages, in one single development phase. There are differences in age and the times in which they became tourist destinations. This considered, it still seems as though Åre valley has gone through a series of
phases during a short period of time. In short, tourism in this area entered a maturing phase in the 1980s when the business gradually evolved into several facilities. Thereafter came a period of decline due to financial crisis after too many new houses were built, combined with winters with very little snow. Nowadays, the area seems to be in the later stages of an ageing phase with ‘renewal’ of the destination being driven by a large company who own and control major parts of the area’s facilities, and who have ‘streamlined’ what the destination has to offer (Nilsson, 1999). The economies of scale of a large company have created more resources to reinvest in tourism development. Compared to other destinations in this thesis, there has been tourism in Åre for quite some time. Their big challenge, and largest question mark, centres around the organisation of future development. This is important in the case of Åre since large organisations tend to be ‘heavy’ and tend to lack the dynamics needed to stimulate creativity and development.

Over the past few years there have been some activities in Åre aimed at overcoming seasonal peaks, e.g. organising ‘out of season’ events such as mountainbike competitions. The most recent and striking example of this, and a sign of tourism development in Åre, is the building of a new multi-use facility. ‘Holiday Club Åre’ was built by the shores of the lake and opened in 2004. This facility can take up to 2,000 people and includes an indoor swimming pool, saunas, bowling, a hotel, restaurants, apartments and so on (Information leaflet from Åre municipality).

Sundsval has several similarities with Skellefteå. They are both regions by the coast and areas that to a large extent have been dependent on manufacturing industry. The culture of the industrial communities in both these areas, has hampered both entrepreneurship and touristic development, according to participants in the focus groups. Another shared view was that it is both good and bad that Sundsvall is a relatively large town. It has created some conflicts between the town and its countryside, and conflicts between coastal and inland areas, as well as between different towns in the region were also mentioned.

Sundsval can be said to be in the initial stages of the starting phase of tourism development, where it is important to work with the basic pre-conditions to become a destination like, for example, establishing a clearer identity for the area and viewing tourism as an industry. Some voices from the focus groups exemplify this:

*We have an unclear identity in this county. There are islands with an identity like for example Sundsvall and Örnsköldsvik but not Medelpad50 as an area. Västernorrland as a concept is also unclear.*

*It is a difficult balance in tourism terms. We are two provinces51 but one county.*

---

50 Medelpad is one of the two provinces, which together form the county Västernorrland.
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Tourism here is an embryo.

We must become proud of our region. (Focus group participants Sundsvall)

There are other signs that imply that tourism is not yet a prioritised area in Sundsvall. An example of this is the action plan for growth and employment that was approved by the local council in 1999. In this plan, there are three main features: ‘a municipality for children and youths’, ‘a town of knowledge’ and ‘Sundsvall-spirit’ (www.sundsvall.se). The activities described in the plan are divided into four areas: knowledge, business, welfare and the surrounding society. At the time of this study tourism was not yet an area considered for major investment.

Despite the problems that are mentioned above, Sundsvall shows some opportunities of developing a tourism industry. Kiruna and to some extent Skellefteå have demonstrated that it is possible to combine a heavy industrial economy, and other activities that appears to be separated from tourism, with tourism development. The ideas behind ‘space tourism’ in Kiruna and the use of the mining industry in Skellefteå provide examples of this. One much-needed big attraction for Sundsvall is the recently opened Casino Cosmopol. In 1999 the Swedish government decided to allow international casinos in four cities: Göteborg, Malmö, Stockholm and Sundsvall. Thus, Sweden’s first international casino opened in Sundsvall in July 2001. This is now one of the cornerstones of the town’s entertainment arena and various packages including a visit to the casino are offered (www.casinocosmopol.se and www.sundsvallturism.com).

Scotland as a whole has had visitors or tourists since the mid-18th century. The early visitors during the 18th century were mainly interested in nature or culture tourism with sportsmen going hunting in the Highlands and intellectuals going to Edinburgh and to some extent Glasgow for ‘Enlightenment’, i.e. the latest news within science, geology, natural history and political economy. It was however during the industrial revolution in the 19th century that tourism really took off. The interest in Scotland during its development as a destination has to a large extent spurred by the written word such as imaginative literature, travel books and guide books and the images built up by influential people, such as Queen Victoria (MacLellan & Smith, 1998).

Scottish tourism witnessed a decline from the mid-1980s to the mid-1990s. This led to investigations and analyses including strategic plans, followed by more systematic and communicated marketing with clearer goals and activities. The former Scottish Tourist Board detected some problematic key areas: facilities and food not meeting market needs; varying standards in facilities; fragmented

51 ‘Landskap’ in Swedish.
and inefficient marketing and, on average, poorly skilled people in the industry (MacLellan & Smith, 1998:218). Tourism in Scotland has since gone through another development phase and has increased. Part of this is due to successful films in the mid-90s like ‘Braveheart’ and ‘Rob Roy’ and partly because of investments to overcome the problems above (Edinburgh Tourism Action Plan, 2000 and MacLellan & Smith, 1998).

In the beginning of the 21st century the Scottish Tourist Board was re-organised and re-named, causing a debate about Scottish tourism and some negative publicity for the Scottish Tourist Board. The organisation is now called ‘VisitScotland’ but as an organisation might be seen to have become somewhat institutionalised and to have lost some of its credibility in the industry, especially among small tourism firms.\(^5^2\)

> I suppose, what we, yeah...in an ideal world, but we don't live in an ideal world, but let's get as close as we can...in an ideal world, what there should be, if everything was joined up properly, there should be a tourism action plan and strategy for Scotland, which then feeds into one for Edinburgh and Lothians, which feeds into work for Edinburgh, which then feeds into a series of more localised plans, that's what there should be. (Interview with representative from support agency to LIFT)

When discussing tourism in Leith one needs to involve Edinburgh as a destination, since Leith to a large extent is dependent on tourism in Edinburgh. On the other hand, Edinburgh is dependent on Leith and similar areas outside the city centre. The city centre has reached its carrying capacity, especially during the peak season in the summer, and dispersal is therefore sought. The aim of Edinburgh & Lothians Tourist Board is to spread out tourists and have something to offer second and third time visitors. Leith is seen as a crucial part of that dispersal scheme.

> In other words there's no point in attracting or trying to attract more people in August, the place is full and overflowing. What we need to look at is other times of the year, when the hotels has got spare beds, there's spare seats in the restaurants, the visitor attractions are quieter, so we concentrate very much in the off season. Our other main priority is actually dispersal of Edinburgh city centre.

> ... Well, I suppose in terms of dispersal from Edinburgh city centre, if anything we tend to use in Leith is the prime place of dispersal...to...from the city centre.

> ... The second time they come back, they want to explore a wee bit more and it's very much a case of...we are suggesting Leith as a place to go and explore because it's got Britannia, it's gonna have the Ocean Terminal, it's got an infrastructure of restaurants and I suppose in some ways we sell our...we market it a wee bit as our 'bohemian quarter'. And then the third time they come, we get

---

\(^{52}\) In 2005, there has been an even stronger centralisation and the area tourist boards has been reorganised and are now incorporated into the main organisation.
them even further out, but it’s a sort of stage process. And, now…because of Britannia, we’re now at this stage, we can get some first time visitors to Edinburgh down to Leith. … So we see actually Leith as an development, Leith is pretty key to achieving our objective of dispersal of the city centre. It’s the most obvious part of Edinburgh to disperse people to, it’s the place that probably got the strongest local identity…. (Interview with representative from support agency to LIFT)

However, nothing in the observations or interviews in this study suggest that there are any joint schemes or plans made for this dispersal or that this is something that the people in Leith are aware of (or the tourists for that matter). There’s a potential there because Britannia is big enough to draw... Eh, but I think it’s predominantly...probably more second time visitors and to be honest, people are going down to see Britannia, not Leith. The fact that Britannia’s in Leith is incidental as far as people are concerned, they’re not realising they’re going to Leith. They’re going to Edinburgh and they see Britannia, it’s incidental, you know. … But again, I think, really it’s a case of at the moment, we’re probably directing people more to Britannia than to Leith itself. Because...for any destination you need a reason to go there...and blood tells, without Britannia, Leith has no reason to go there if you’re a visitor. Ok, it’s got good restaurants, if you go out there to eat but there’s no magnet attraction there other than Britannia at the moment. (Interview with representative from support agency to LIFT)

Thus, Edinburgh might be said to be going through an ageing phase involving some renewal when it comes to private tourism, where investments have begun in for example dispersal of tourists and increased learning among the employees in the tourism industry (Edinburgh Tourism Action Plan, 2000). When it comes to corporate tourism business however, the city seems to be in a maturing phase, with a large conference centre establishing itself and Edinburgh as a host of large corporate events (www.edinburgh.gov.uk; EICC Annual Report and Accounts, 2000). There has also been a recent formation of a partnership for events (Eventful Edinburgh) and the city wants to promote itself as a festival destination (Barbier, 2005).

Leith as a tourist destination however, might be said to be in the initial stages of a starting phase of its touristic development with some basic activities having begun during the past few years. This includes for example setting up a network for developing tourism (LIFT); creating a website for Leith; being included on Edinburgh tourist maps; arranging festivals and the arrival of two major attractions located in Leith (Royal Yacht Britannia and the shopping centre Ocean Terminal). However, as a tourist destination, Leith still has its shortcomings, e.g. lack of signs and information, lack of basic services, low skills in and about the tourist industry. Leith’s reputation and the perception of Leith as a tourist destination is also something that is not yet developed. This is
shown by the low level of knowledge and awareness of Leith among the staff at tourist information offices in Edinburgh (www.edinburgh-waterfront.com and miscellaneous documents).

They know the general history and the background and I mean, the way…I suppose, if they don’t know it they’ll have the resource information there. Now, there are fingertips, we’ve got very detailed reference material on all aspects of Edinburgh and Lothians so if somebody was coming in and asking about Leith, if they don’t know it, they’ll have the reference material…they should have the reference material there, to find it. Eh…they won’t know it, necessarily of the top of their heads but seriously we cover…we cover hell of a big area and a hell of a lot of places and nobody can know everything about everything. But they’ll know the basic…they’ll know the background of the history of Leith and so forth. Most of them, at some stage they’ll be taken down there and shown around it and such like as part of an introduction course and such like. But they won’t know the detail of it. (Interview with representative from support agency to LIFT)

Due to some rather recent high-profile investments and events, such as the MTV Music Awards in 2003, the area is rapidly gaining a reputation as a tourist destination of its own. The risk the destination faces is to be blinded by the opportunity of ‘easy’ money from new high rise buildings and to fail to take into account local people and the area’s history and identity as a port.

The development of the cases in terms of destination learning is summarised in the table below.

Table 2: Destination Learning Development applied on the cases (Author’s own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development phases</th>
<th>Learning characteristics</th>
<th>Example of activities</th>
<th>Destinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Starting | Forming internal relations and/or external communications | • Plans, strategies, visions etc  
• Development projects  
• Creation of websites combined with local marketing | Leith  
Sundsvall  
Kiruna East  
Parts of Tornedalen  
Skellefteå/‘Guldriket’  
Kiruna/Jukkasjärvi  
Parts of Tornedalen |
| Maturing | Relations and communications develop internally and externally | • Established product including packages  
• Identified and target markets  
• Informal and an increasingly large amount of formal collaboration | Kiruna Mountains  
Åre |
| Ageing | Relations and communications set in their form | • One or a few dominant businesses influencing most activities  
• Large investments to break new markets, create new attractions or extend seasons | |
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Quite a few of the destinations studied, or parts of them, have been categorised in the starting phase: Leith, Sundsvall, eastern parts of Kiruna, parts of Tornedalen and Skellefteå/‘Guldriket’. This phase involves forming internal relations and/or external communication. Examples of activities are: the preparation of plans, strategies, visions etc; development projects and the creation of websites combined with local marketing.

Jukkasjärvi and its vicinity, and parts of Tornedalen, are in the maturing phase. This is where relations and communication have developed both within the destination and to places and markets outside of the destination. Typical activities during this phase are: an established product including packages; identified and targeted markets and informal and an increasingly large amount of formal collaboration.

The mountainous region of Kiruna municipality and Åre are in the so called ageing phase. Relations and communication during this phase are more set in their forms and examples of activities undertaken are: one or a few dominant businesses influencing most activities; large investments to break new markets and the creation of new attractions or attempts to extend seasons.

One might ask however: What is the point of using models when, as argued previously in this thesis, complexity includes irreversible and unpredictable changes? Everything that has been built up at a maturing destination can quickly be destroyed by natural catastrophes, terrorism, corruption or other significant environmental, economical, political or social changes. I would argue that analytical tools, such as the model discussed, which take socio-cultural processes into account, might be a way of understanding and dealing with a complex world. By gaining more knowledge about the past, we are more able to understand the present and better prepared to expect the unexpected in the future. The tool also enables a certain degree of comparison to otherwise unique and complex places. In the next section of this chapter, differences and similarities of destinations in various phases of development will be discussed further.

**Destination differences and similarities**

As has been mentioned above, development at different phases in this analysis implies a certain degree of (in)flexibility. There is a higher degree of flexibility in the starting phase, which spurs creativity but also leads to ad hoc organisation. In the ageing phase, on the other hand, there is less room for spontaneous improvements, but routines and structures are in place to manage the destination. This pattern of flexibility is reflected in the critical issues at each phase; some examples are summarised in the table below.
### Table 3: Destination differences and similarities – a summary (Author’s own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main learning phase</th>
<th>Case-study Setting</th>
<th>Industry traditions</th>
<th>Critical issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting</td>
<td>Leith Urban</td>
<td>Ship-making/trade</td>
<td>-Lack of information and basic service&lt;br&gt;-Not perceived as tourist destination&lt;br&gt;-Low levels of skills and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting</td>
<td>Skellefteå/ ‘Guldriket’ Urban Forestry/mining</td>
<td>-Combination of urban and rural tourism&lt;br&gt;-Changeover from trad. industry to modern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting</td>
<td>Sundsvall Urban Forestry/ore works</td>
<td>-Priority of tourism as an industry&lt;br&gt;-Lack of community identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturing</td>
<td>Tornedalen Rural Multi-sector/trade</td>
<td>-Lack of networks&lt;br&gt;-Varying degree of knowledge and experiences of tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturing</td>
<td>Jukkasjärvi Rural Multi-sector/trade</td>
<td>-Dominating firm&lt;br&gt;-Conflicts about land resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageing</td>
<td>Åre Rural          Multi-sector/trade</td>
<td>-Large dominating consortium&lt;br&gt;-Level and type of organising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical issues for destinations in the starting phase are mostly connected to the status, the state of the tourism industry and problems connected to the transition from traditional to modern industry. The critical issues for destinations in maturing and ageing phases refer to the organisation of tourism in terms of networks, enterprises involved, consortiums established and so on. The notion in this thesis is that the more established the destination, the more rigid it becomes. If we see a destination as a group, Sartre’s ideas can be applied, i.e. a group can perish through either splintering or becoming too rigid. This is a fine balance as rigidity also helps to provide the group with more stability and gives it the ability to act as a unit. The struggle against a split within the group can however trigger a group process where a concentration of energy is directed inwards in order to find ways of preserving the group (Jensen & Vestergaard, 1979). This in turn can lead to a reduction in the levels of creativity and innovation suitable in a changing world. Two patterns relating to this that have emerged through these case studies are discussed below.
Urban and rural settings

Firstly, there seem to be a connection between the development of these places as destinations and their social context in terms of urban and rural setting. The three most urban areas in this thesis are also those in the starting phase of their development as destinations: Leith, Skellefteå and Sundsvall. The three places with a more rural context are in more advanced phases of development: Jukkasjärvi, Tornedalen and Åre. Part of this difference can be explained by the historical development of tourism in Scotland and Sweden. During parts of the 19th century and most of the 20th century, tourism in these parts of Europe has to a large degree involved affluent city dwellers travelling to the countryside for recreational purposes and fresh air (e.g. Nilsson, 1999 and Sillanpää, 2002). With the introduction of the car and charter tourism, the types of people able to travel has changed during the last century; people with different social means have had the opportunity to become tourists. The trend however, of mostly urban residents going to rural areas has been resistant. This might involve camping and hiking in the Scottish Highlands; going to summer houses in the archipelagos of Sweden or participating in winter sports in the Swedish mountains.

Rural destinations are, however, facing increasingly fierce competition from more urban destinations. The growth in city tourism can be depicted in various sectors: conferences on urban tourism (e.g. Travel and Tourism Research Association conference in Glasgow 2003); forming of tourist organisations for city tourism (European Cities Tourism and European Federation of Conference Towns); collaboration on city cards (European Cities Tourism, 2003) and so on. This growth in so-called city tourism has involved an increase in short breaks to urban areas with an extensive range of cultural experiences, shopping, restaurants, attractions and cultural experiences (Nordin, 2005).

The increase in tourism to urban areas has also been spurred by the growth of low cost airlines. As has been mentioned earlier, globalisation has lead to increased physical and psychological accessibility. This development is both a threat and an opportunity for more rural destinations. The competition from destinations further away increases as they become easier to reach. On the other hand, this change can open up new markets and potentials for the development of rural destinations. Increased accessibility is not likely, however, to be sufficient in this development. One could argue that interaction will come to play an important part. Previously, rural areas have exceeded in strategic collaboration by necessity and this type of interaction will become even more important in light of development trends in city tourism. Urban settings alone do not automatically equate to a history of fruitful collaboration, as seen in the cases of Leith, Skellefteå and Sundsvall. However, as city tourism develops, collaboration will follow and at the same time contribute to this process.

53 When urban and rural is discussed it refers to the type of communities in relation to each other.
Business life and degree of transition

Urban and rural differences are also connected to the tradition of receiving guests. How long the tourism industry has existed is a factor included in previously criticised models such as Butler’s. However, although time in terms of tradition seems to be an important pre-condition for tourism, it is also connected to the historical situations affecting the social and cultural present. One of these historical situations involves the type of business life and traditions of the area.

In this thesis, those destinations with traditionally dominating industries are in the starting phase, whilst those with a more historically diverse business situation have become maturing or ageing tourist destinations. Leith has had its shipping and ship-building industry, which has been steadily declining over the last century, with the last shipyard closing in the 1980s. The mining and forestry industries in the regions of Skellefteå and forestry and ore works of Sundsvall have also been reduced heavily over the last 50 years. Although people in Jukkasjärvi, Tornedalen and Åre have to some extent been making a living out of forestry and mining, this has been complemented by a multitude of other businesses, including trade.

Participants in Tornedalen, for example, acknowledged that even though their tourism sector was developing well in parts of the region, the relative proximity to a large employer like the mine in Kiruna had created a culture where some people did not have strong incentives to start businesses. They compared themselves to the Finnish side, which has developed faster and lacked large public employers. This is most likely due to the lack of traditional dependency on one large employer in the Finnish part of Tornedalen. Apart from ‘luring’ the residents into a false sense of security, the dependence of one dominant industry also makes the community more vulnerable to global changes. In an increasingly complex world where changes are likely to be quick and unpredictable, this vulnerability becomes even more evident.

I would argue that the increase in city tourism is part of the transition from a production society to one based on consumption, experiences, information and networks. The destination that has a tradition of a variety of ways of making a living, in particular trade, is likely to have a culture that is more adaptable, flexible and thus better prepared for, or resilient to, changes. Thus, a destination with a business life characterised by trade, is likely to have had a smoother transition process. This is also seen in the studies of so-called ‘dynamic regions’ as mentioned above (see Hjalager, 1999 and Putnam, 1993, 2000). Although it is beyond the scope of this thesis to establish whether these places are dynamic regions, the signs point towards destinations in the maturing and ageing phases having a larger degree of such characteristics.
Change within ideal types

Finally, I would like to return for a moment to the ideas discussed in the previous chapter regarding ideal types and an alternative division of places into categories relating to tourism. Could the cases studied within the scope of this thesis all be categorised as destinations? This is a complex question, which is difficult to answer if using a dynamic process perspective on tourism development. As has been discussed previously in this thesis, places are not seen as static and neither are destinations, communities or localities. I would argue that places can ‘move’ between the ideal types presented in processes of transition. Communities can become destinations and, even if not as common, destinations might become communities (e.g. through war, catastrophes, population decline, significant changes in market demand etc), and then destinations again when the situation changes once more. This has been the experience of Dubrovnik and other ‘re-established’ tourist destinations in Croatia. Localities can become attractions through the building of a unique feature and the reverse might occur if the attraction is destroyed or loses its appeal. Two examples of localities becoming attractions would be the Öresund bridge between Denmark and Sweden opened in 2000 and the ‘Angel of the North’, a 20 meter tall iron statue, finished in 1998, next to the motorway outside Newcastle. Localities might also become destinations with the help of attractions and development of a new culture over time; a transition that one might argue is taking place in Las Vegas.

The places included in this thesis, however, are by their nature not mere localities or attractions, as it would have been neither in line with my purpose nor interesting to study them if this was the case. As discussed in the previous chapter, there is no doubt that these cases include elements of this, as in the example of the ICEHOTEL in Jukkasjärvi, the yacht Britannia in Leith or the mountain Åreskutan in Åre. As said, it is difficult to decisively put these places in one category as the latter are ideal types and the places in reality are more complex. I would suggest that although the three places I put in the ageing or maturing phases (Åre, Jukkasjärvi and Tornedalen) can be categorised as ‘destinations’, according to the alternative division presented in the previous chapter, there are differences between them. The three cases discussed in this chapter and placed in the starting development phase (Sundsvall, Skellefteå/‘Guldriket’ and Leith), I would categorise more as ‘communities’ at the time of the study, due to their somewhat less developed tourism infrastructure but higher degree of connection to the local community. The common denominator of all these places is however, I would argue, that one can detect an ambition to become ‘destinations’ in the sense of becoming places with a high degree of commercial tourism related activities and infrastructure, in combination with a high degree of socio-cultural connection to their community, maintaining the spirit of Gemeinschaft.

54 See also pages 55-58.
Summary and conclusions

In order to understand the complexity of tourist destination development, global changes need to be addressed. The theory of ‘global complexity’ is therefore fruitful as it connects the global with the local and acknowledges unpredictable and irreversible events in our world. There is however the dilemma of analysing and understanding destinations in general at the same time as acknowledging their uniqueness. Possible solutions to this dilemma therefore involve studying development based on the notion of complex processes, i.e. seen as being very different for various places and destinations.

Traditional destination development models have been criticised and I would argue that their greatest weakness is their lack of socio-cultural perspective. An alternative contemporary analytical tool based on learning processes includes factors such as: relationships at the destination; changes of perspective; collaboration and networking between similar as well as different organisations and groups; the existence of plans, strategies, division of responsibilities etc; and local involvement to enhance local development in combination with tourism development. I call this alternative model ‘Destination Learning Development’ and it includes three phases: starting, maturing and ageing, with different characteristics, issues and opportunities for learning. This model is applied to the six cases studied; the destinations were analysed in terms of the phases they belonged to at the time of the study and evidence put forward to divide the destinations into these categories. Leith, Sundsvall and Skellefteå are seen as primarily in the starting phase; Jukkasjärvi and Tornedalen as belonging to the maturing phase and Åre to the ageing phase.

By using this model, two main patterns of similarities and differences between the destinations have emerged. Destinations in the starting phase were more likely to be urban, a trend that is thought to be connected to the tradition of city dwellers travelling to more rural areas for recreation. This tradition is changing and we are seeing a growth in so-called city tourism, with an increase in interest in, and access to, urban areas. This has implications for interaction at and between destinations, as the need for more strategic collaboration increases in light of the growing local, regional and global competition.

Moreover, this development is connected to a transition from a production society to a consumption, experience and information based society. This process has most likely been smoother for the maturing and ageing destinations. They have been less dependent on a single dominating heavy industry such as ship-building, mining or forestry, and have a larger degree of diversity in businesses and trade. Tourism as a phenomenon is a way of studying degrees of transition and related problems, but as an industry tourism is also a means to an end in making transition processes possible by investing in this ‘alternative’ industry.
This chapter has shown that destinations are at different phases of their development, with differences in issues, solutions and learning processes. For the enterprising people involved in the process a challenge, but also an opportunity, to deal with this complexity is to identify other destinations that are in similar phases and learn from each other. Another way of dealing with the transition from one type of society to another as well the increasing complexity in our world is by forming groups, such as projects and networks of various sorts. The study of groups and organisations involved, the networks they are part of and the relations between them is the focus of the next two chapters.
THE IMPORTANCE OF PROJECTS

Introduction

The analyses in the previous chapter showed among other things that rural development and destination development are closely connected. The importance of tourism, politically, economically and socially, especially in rural areas, has been recognised by several researchers (e.g. Elbe, 2002; Karlsson, 1994 and Müller, 1999). Tourism as an industry will bring visitors to the destination, that spend money and thus contribute to the local and regional economy and general development (Hall, 2000). Part of the complexity of tourist destination development is that a substantial part of this development is undertaken through various groups and projects, which I would argue need to be studied in order to understand destination development.

Following a similar line as in the two previous chapters, this chapter focuses on the background, situation and structure, this time with regards to two cases on the 'project level'. The process perspective is applied in the next chapter. This chapter therefore begins by discussing projects in general and then presenting two cases in detail as examples of groups with the aim of developing tourism at destinations. The two tourism development groups are the Industrial Development Centre for Tourism in Västerbotten, Sweden and Leith Initiatives for Tourism in Leith, Scotland. Their background is presented and discussed in order to understand their nature and their importance for tourism development. Thereafter, I discuss the structure of networks, and in particular, in relation to the two cases in order to gain further insight into their differences and similarities in terms of their ways of working.

Projects and networks as signs of development

Studying projects and networks differs from earlier organisation theories, which to a large extent were based on treating organisations as closed entities or systems (e.g. Michels, 1983; Mintzberg, 1979; Parsons, 1951; Taylor, 1911 and Weber, 1997). As the world becomes more complex, as is argued here, it becomes increasingly difficult to clearly define the boundaries of organisations and groups, and their members.

Another way of understanding actors, both as individuals and groups, would therefore be to use the concept of 'projects'. The very nature of projects implies a group of people working together for a common goal during a certain amount of time. They are part of, or take, different forms, e.g. groups, associations, networks and so on. One might argue, however, that people have always worked in projects although they have not necessarily called them this and they have not been studied as such until rather recently. The concept is thus a recent
invention. Different types of organisations; ways of working and attitudes and values meet through projects and networks.

As was mentioned previously, changes to society in our time have involved a movement from a traditional industrial production society to communities based more on communication, consumption, services and experiences (e.g. Andersson, 2002; Pine & Gilmore, 1999 and Shaw & Williams, 2004). I would argue that this change is closely connected to the development of tourist destinations, as this is a ‘new’ type of industry that is emerging. Groups involved in projects of different sorts have become good indicators of this. Development and projects, networks etc can be seen as means to ‘speed up’ the shift from production societies to consumption and experience-based communities.

Projects of various sorts are particularly common in groups involved in tourism development because, as mentioned previously, this is a complex process and industry. As said, the development of ‘tourism products’ by its nature involves many different parts of, and actors at, a destination; spanning over several sectors. Thus, for tourism development projects to have an impact they need to some extent reflect this relationship, making the projects quite complex. Throughout my studies of local and regional destination development, I have noticed that much of tourism development is carried out through projects, networks and other constellations. This is also visible in the type of funding available from organisations such as the EU where grants are given on a project basis, in particular to new projects and networks. Hence, it is important to include projects and networks in the study of tourist destination development. One might argue that this is particularly important for those communities that have been heavily dependent on the traditional industries, such as forestry and shipping, and therefore find the transition to other service based industries such as tourism more difficult.

The typical organisational form for tourism development in our time, i.e. projects, networks and other organised groups, might be studied in many ways. However, in this chapter I will focus on the structure of these types of groups using the examples of the Industrial Development Centre for Tourism in Västerbotten, Sweden and Leith Initiatives for Tourism in Leith, Scotland.55 I will then discuss the content of these groups, in terms of processes, activities and relations in the next chapter.

**Industrial Development Centres**

One sign of local and regional development in Sweden is the creation of Industrial Development Centres (IDCs).56 The creation of these centres is an

---

55 See pages 26-36 for a presentation of the methodology and methods used.
56 Industriella Utvecklingscentra (IUC).
attempt to steer responsibility for development away from public organisations and over to entrepreneurs and the private sector. This is not however a recent idea, as these thoughts go back to the 1960s and 70s. Due to the economic recession of the 70s, which resulted in a shortage of jobs, many people in Sweden moved from rural areas to more urban ones. This was particularly evident in the northern parts of Sweden where some districts were literally deserted, especially by young people. In order to turn this tide, the government tried to support regional development in different ways (e.g. Olofsson, 1983; Sundin, 1982 and Söderholm, 1987).

In the mid-60s, a five-year pilot project was launched, where the government provided financial support, in terms of loans and subsidies, to businesses establishing themselves in areas of high employment. During the following twenty years, this support became permanent and the different forms of support increased (Lindmark & Lundmark, 1984).

One of the ‘tools’ to enhance regional development was the creation of companies for regional development in the regions that had faced the worst setbacks. These were promoted with the argument that they were able to engage more actively in projects and businesses than their predecessors, the development funds. Opponents to these companies argued that this function could be performed through the funds if they were given more resources. Nevertheless, the regional development companies were established and their goals were set out: to evaluate ideas for new products; to develop them from ideas to real products; to strengthen the weak points of companies and to help with finance for projects (Olofsson, 1983).

After evaluation some have concluded that the regional development companies were not particularly successful in achieving their aims and that regional policies of the 60s were being implemented into the reality of the 80s. A radically changed regional policy with an approach involving mobilising of the regional resources was therefore sought (Lindmark & Lundmark, 1984).

The decision by the Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications (MIEC) to initiate and support the creation of IDCs is one result of the shift in regional development policies that was asked for. The regulations set by the MIEC are rather general. One of the key rules is that the IDC must be a stock company and that the shareholders, i.e. the entrepreneurs, form the content of the IDC themselves. A number of IDCs were founded during the late 1990s. In most cases the informal networks of the region have been transformed into formal stock companies. This first period acted as a test to see if the model is fruitful and effective for the development of businesses at a regional and local level (Cairén, 1998). An investigation was then made public where the IDCs as the role of authorities were evaluated in an attempt to achieve increased growth (Press release, 19/06/99).
Although the regulations provide a kind of a framework, there are also quite specific regulations about ownership structure. The majority of the company must be owned by the industry, and the rules for ownership are thus:

- 1/3, at least by SMEs,\textsuperscript{57}
- 1/3, at most by large companies,
- 1/3, at most by other parties such as public actors (Cairén, 1998).

The Board of Directors should consist of six to ten members and the majority of these members must be from within the industry. The exception being that Almi\textsuperscript{58} must be offered one place on the board. Another important part of the idea behind IDCs is the principle that they receive financial support only for the first three years. After that the activity has to stand on its own feet, which means that the activity must be run on commercial lines right from the start. Moreover, the IDC must employ people with competences that match the quality standards of the industry. IDCs are also supposed to co-operate with national Research & Development units and in such a way that they become known as a resource for the development of small businesses (ibid.).

Financial support from MIEC is only given to those aspects of the activities that involve SMEs in some way. The support, and thus also the activities, of the IDCs are divided into three categories:

- \textit{Outseeking activity} – This means, for example, building up networks, meetings, seminars, information, etc.
- \textit{Product development} – This activity is carried out in the form of different projects and includes the development of already existing products and the realisation of ideas for new products.
- \textit{Spin offs} – This is the founding of new companies as a result of the work of the IDC, the selling of products, etc (ibid.).

The test period started with 11 IDCs within the engineering industry. In 1999 MIEC announced an expanded investment in IDCs (Press release, 19/06/99). A year later there were 20 IDCs associated with traditional engineering industry. These formed a so-called ‘family’ and have built up a network among themselves consisting, for example, of their own Intranet, websites, regular meetings and contact people with a co-ordinating function. During 2000 another ‘family’ of IDCs was created which included seven IDCs within the timber industry. Today there are still nearly 20 active IDCs; 13 within engineering industries and six within the timber industry (www.iuc.nu). Besides taking an active role in their own regional context, IDCs are meant to co-

\textsuperscript{57} The EC 1996 definition is used where micro or very small enterprises have fewer than 10 employees; small enterprises employ 10–49 persons and medium-sized enterprises have more than 50 but less than 250 employees (Thomas, 2000).

\textsuperscript{58} Almi is a business development unit within the Ministry of Labour.
operate among themselves. Therefore the importance of a functioning network is also stressed by MIEC. To facilitate this network, financial support is given for one co-ordinator, a part-time secretary and some administrative costs (Cairén, 1998).

The goal announced by the IDCs themselves is to stimulate industrial and regional growth through the strategic task of developing competence, products, processes and techniques (www.iuc.nu). This means that it is mainly the structure of the IDCs that is new, i.e. the fact that there are relatively simple rules and that the makeup of the IDC is decided upon between the shareholders. The main goals and tasks to be fulfilled seem, however, to be quite similar to those of the previous regional development companies discussed above. Even though the IDCs are stock companies operating on a commercial basis, they also take some responsibility for general regional development.

In the end of 1990s MIEC also announced a planned investment in a third ‘family’ of IDCs. This included industries such as music, media, entertainment and other related areas (Press release, 19/06/99). Some organisations within the music industry in Hultsfred were assigned with the task of investigating the possibilities of such a ‘family’ of IDCs and come up with a concept that would suit this kind of IDC better. Hultsfred is a small community in the south-east of Sweden where there has been a significant development in music over the past twenty years, which has led to a fairly well-established network.

The regulations were originally designed for IDCs within engineering and one of the questions the people at Hultsfred had to answer, was whether the regulations were suitable for new IDCs within the ‘experience industry’. They concluded that it would be possible for IDC Experiences to operate on the same terms as the other IDCs. Moreover, they found the three different categories to be a constructive way of working with the development of industries. ‘Out-seeking activities’ were seen as actions that would provide opportunities to get a better picture of the needs and possibilities of the industry. In a network of IDCs, these needs could be fulfilled and the possibilities could be realised. Regarding ‘product development’, their report argued that this needed to include the development of people as well. Thus it was seen as important that ‘product development’ also included ‘personal development’, for example through education. This change of concept for ‘product development’ could still lead to ‘spin offs’ (IUC Hultsfred, 2000).

59 This new group of IDCs was said by the MIEC to have sprung from something called the ‘music and experience industry’. The reason why music has been separated out from the rest of the experiences is not clear but a valid reason would be that representatives from the music business were assigned to investigate the possibilities of this new ‘family’. They are henceforth called IDC Experiences and at the time of the study the network consisted of industries such as music, cinema, theatre and food.

60 In April 2000, IUC Hultsfred (Industrial Development Centre for the Swedish Music Industry), was founded.
IDC Hultsfred was also assigned to investigate whether other places or regions in Sweden had the suitable conditions for the creation of more ‘IDC Experiences’, and to identify these places. Their answer was clearly positive and they argued for the creation of a new ‘family’ of IDCs. As the initiator of this new network, IDC Hultsfred saw themselves as the co-ordinators and driving force. During their work on this task they met with representatives from about twenty geographical areas. Some of these had had no connection to the activity within their region, others had not quite entered into the ‘experience industry’ and some had had good ideas but were in early stages of their development process. Therefore, IDC Hultsfred saw four other places as having the potential to become immediate members of an ‘IDC Experiences’ group with an extension of eight to ten IDCs within five years (ibid.).

Industrial Development Centre for Tourism

During the autumn of 1999, Stiftelsen Lapplands Turism (SLT)61 started a project with the purpose of carrying out a pilot study concerning the possibility of creating an IDC for Tourism in Västerbotten.62 The task was also to establish the idea of an IDC among as many involved key actors as possible and to create a concept in terms of plans for both the structure and content of the organisation. The idea of creating an IDC for tourism came from the need for development and organisation of the tourism industry in Västerbotten (Frisk, 2000). Investments were made without much strategic consideration and there was a lack of a strong industrial partner to the public tourism organisation.63

One project leader and three part time staff were assigned to work on this project. The project leader had previously been responsible for tourism issues at a local level in the area and had also worked within a national organisation for private businesses at a regional level. Two of the other three had also been working with tourism development, one at a nation-wide and the other at a more local level. The fourth person in the project was a tourism entrepreneur running a small firm. To assist them, an interim board was appointed, consisting of members of SLT who were mainly representatives from local councils etc in the municipalities involved.

The project got off to a slow start but eventually begun in mid-January 2000 when the above-mentioned people were appointed. Their work was divided into three parts. The first was to carry out a survey among tourism businesses in Västerbotten, with the ambition of visiting as many as possible and gaining more knowledge about their views of tourism development in Västerbotten in general and the concept of IDC Tourism in particular. The project leader was

61 ‘The Foundation for Lapland Tourism’.
62 For a map see appendix 1.
63 The information about IDC Tourism is a case study based on interviews, conversations with the key people involved, observations, meetings and miscellaneous documents regarding IDC Tourism. See also pages 26-36.
assigned to co-ordinate and lead the work with the survey. The three other people were appointed to conduct the visits. However, when discussed in the project group, there was a lot of disagreement about both the purpose and the design of the survey. Finally it was decided that a more simple investigation into interest in IDC Tourism would be carried out, with the possibility of carrying out a larger screening survey as the first task of the new IDC. Before the visits at the firms started, two of the staff quit the project due to other employment offers and for personal reasons. Therefore, the visits were undertaken by the remaining co-worker and to some extent by the project manager.

The second part of the project was to carry out some ‘research and establishment work’, to use the words of the project leader. In practice this was conducted by gathering background information about tourism and Västerbotten and lobbying for the idea of creating IDC Tourism in Västerbotten. This was a task for the project leader and he performed it by contacting key actors that could potentially be involved. The type of contact and kind of player varied. On an imaginary scale it varied from ‘acquiring information’ to ‘being involved in several discussions’. The organisations contacted were: public organisations on the national, regional and local level (e.g. MIEC, the county council and most municipalities); private organisations (such as different kinds of branch associations) and other organisations and networks (e.g. Almi, the unions, the university in Västerbotten, RTN, SUFO, IDC Hultsfred and IDC Wood in Västerbotten).

The third part consisted of writing a so-called ‘visionary document’. The project leader did this during the summer and autumn of 2000, after the first two parts of the project were almost completed. Even though this document is called a ‘visionary’ one, it is rather difficult to find any explicit visions for IDC Tourism. The main purpose however was defined as: ‘being the commercial platform for the tourism and travel industry in Västerbotten.’ This was going to be achieved by applying the following strategies:

- long-term sustainable investments,
- development of partnerships through strengthened co-operation between the industry, public actors and the voluntary sector,
- strong involvement, joint priorities and co-ordinated solutions,
- increased market- and customer orientation,
- business development with quality in mind,
- increased equality between men and women, and
- the ambitions to create ‘cluster-networks’ of firms with the purpose of doing business. (www.iucturism.org, author's translation)

---

64 The design and purpose of the survey were discussed by the interim board and at ETOUR.
65 RTN stands for Rural Tourism Net and was a transnational network in Sweden, Italy and Germany at the time of the study, focusing on the development of rural tourism.
66 Swedish Experience Enterprises Association (Sveriges Upplevelseföretags Organisation).
Thus, the strategies are divided into two categories: co-operation (in terms of creating networks, platforms, etc) and business (in terms of making money, doing business, i.e. growth by increased turnover). The three main goals were: to increase market share, to increase competence and to increase the number of job opportunities.

As mentioned above, business within IDCs is divided into three parts. In the ‘visionary document’, these are also discussed in the context of how the concept might be applied to tourism. The importance of ‘out-seeking business’ was stressed, and personal visits among the tourism businesses as well as study visits between them were put forward as especially important examples. Regarding ‘product development’, the complexity of the tourism product was noted and the importance of including personal development was argued for. The possibility of ‘spin offs’ was seen as facilitating conditions for the development of new products, since studies have shown that these new, small firms have a high degree of dynamic and new thinking (www.iucturism.org and IUC Turism i Västerbotten, 2000).

During work on the ‘visionary document’, the people involved in the project were given somewhat contradictory information. When the project began they were told that an application was to be sent in by the end of October 2000. This was to be in the form of a document explaining the concept of IDC Tourism with descriptions of the tourism situation in general and in Västerbotten in particular. Moreover, the document should also contain ‘evidence’ of the acceptance and establishment of the idea among the tourism businesses and the supporting agencies, such as the regional tourist organisation, the university, unions and other regional and local authorities. A concrete activity plan and descriptions of future financing were also to be included in the document. Therefore, this was the final task of the first leader of the project in co-operation with the reference group for the project.

Late in the project, the working group was approached by a group of tourism businesses from a mountainous part of Västerbotten who wanted to start the IDC Tourism in their area. After discussions between the two parties, the suggestion from this group of businesses was declined. The reasons given were that the IDC Tourism should be placed in the centre of Västerbotten and involve businesses from several parts of the county. Since the other IDC in Västerbotten, IDC Wood, had been located to Lycksele67 it was argued that the IDC Tourism should be located there as well, in order to enhance the co-operation between the IDCs and the co-ordination of economic and administrative matters (IUC Turism i Västerbotten, 2000).

67 A town in the centre of Västerbotten, see also pages 49-50.
Leith Initiatives for Tourism

In 1920 the town of Leith was amalgamated with the City of Edinburgh. The event has been described in the following terms: ‘Leith had no choice; she was the reluctant bride in an arranged marriage’ (Leith Leaflet). Since then, Leith has tried to keep its community spirit and at times the relationship between Leith and Edinburgh has been quite strained. To understand these differences in opinion, one has to go back to the Middle Ages and the struggle for power that took place. Edinburgh was a Royal Burgh and Leith a town without rights. The Royal Burgh of Edinburgh had trade monopolies, which meant that they could buy parts of Leith. As a consequence, no ‘Leither’ could go into foreign trade that was within the monopoly of any of the burghs. This dependency sparked a feeling of resentment and suspiciousness towards Edinburgh, which can still be depicted today. Leith’s history and its current relationship with Edinburgh is also connected to the tourism development of the area. Even though people have met at this, sometimes thriving, port for centuries, Leith cannot be said to have been a tourist destination for very long. It was only included on Edinburgh tourist maps in the beginning of the 2000s. One explanation, apart from the lack of ‘tourism infrastructure’ is the reputation of Leith as being a rather rough area; a reputation that to some extent still lingers today.

Leith was trying to improve itself. Someone somewhere had decided to give it a bit of a dust and a wash. It boasted French-style cafés and wine bars, studio flats, delicatessen. But it was still Leith, still the old port, an echo of its roaring, bustling past when Bordeaux wines would be unloaded by the gallon and sold on the streets from a horse and cart. If Leith retained nothing else, it would retain a ports’ mentality, and a ports’ traditional drinking dens. (Rankin, 1987:73)

With this past, Leith has however a tradition of welcoming people into their community and this is today used as a foundation for its tourism development. Taking a closer look at Leith a split picture evolves, and it is fair to talk about a kind of dual identity that contains both a ‘new’ and an ‘old’ Leith. It is a diverse community with two dimensions described in the following way in the Leith Strategic Framework, a five-year plan for the development of Leith produced on the initiative of the City Council.

The traditional community, based on the traditional economy, in a run down environment, with a community afraid of oblique resistant to change. The new waterfront, based on incomers living in the city’s new economy, more adapted to change and growth, and seeking to project a new image. (Leith Strategic Framework, 2001)

68 See also pages 54-55.
Another sign of the local development of Leith and the waterfront area of Edinburgh is the creation of a network for tourism development called Leith Initiatives for Tourism (LIFT). The somewhat dubious reputation of Leith slowly started to improve during the 1970s when artists moved in, and again during the 80s when the so-called ‘Leith Project’ initiated by the City Council, spurred the development of Leith further. It was not however until the last ten years that major changes, both tangible and social, have occurred with new businesses and professionals moving in.

Any organised development of tourism in this area has however been lacking. After LIFT had existed for a year, the situation was described like this:

Leith is a part of Edinburgh with a proud tradition of being separate. For a number of years, there has been talk of developing a local tourism action plan in order to highlight its interests instead of being subsumed within the larger Lothian tourism action plan. … A little over a year ago, it [LIFT] was born out of a sense of frustration by two owners of a small tourism business, a guiding/training agency, in response to a perceived lack of initiative by organisations apparently best suited to promote Leith as a tourist destination (including the local tourist board, local chamber of commerce, and local regional transport organisation). (Lynch et al, 2000)

The work in the beginning of LIFT was very much concentrated on creating a mission statement. According to several ‘members’ this took a long time and involved many discussions regarding the purpose of the network. Finally, the mission statement was agreed at the end of 1999 and included ‘the mission of being a voluntary partnership with the aim to develop Leith, both in social and tourism related terms’ (Minutes from LIFT meeting).

At the time of the study, the network did not have a formal membership but was made up of interested persons who could, in theory, come as go as they pleased. In reality there were around 110 people on LIFT’s mailing list, representing about 70 private, public and voluntary organisations of which approximately 30 were more closely tourism related businesses such as restaurants, hotels and guiding businesses. Among the people on the mailing list, around 70 people were active and there was a committed core group of about 30-40 people that were involved from the beginning of the network. Of these around 10 were members of the board of LIFT with a somewhat higher degree of responsibility and involvement in its activities. Although being a network for the development of Leith, there were few people within the network who were actually born in Leith. However, it contained a mix of and people living and working in Leith; living somewhere else but working in Leith.

---

69 The information about LIFT is a case study based on interviews and conversations with the two initiators, observations at meetings, minutes from LIFT meetings and miscellaneous documents regarding LIFT. See also pages 26-36.
and a few people from supporting organisations that neither lived nor worked in Leith.

The people involved in LIFT were fairly educated compared to the average population of Leith, although formal tourist related education within LIFT’s members was not widespread. Instead they had quite substantial working experience within the field, especially among the restaurant members. The people involved in LIFT were white, middle-class and predominantly in the age bracket of 35-55 years. The network had difficulties engaging people from the working class, youths and ethnic minorities. To some extent however, people from these groups were indirectly involved through, for example, projects with youths in Leith and the representative for the Sikh community on LIFT’s board.

Rather than working on goals, strategies, visions or other long-term abstract plans, during the first two years LIFT carried out many tangible activities, both so called networking or social, as well as marketing, activities. The latter included activities such as ‘familiarisation trips’, a ‘waterfront festival’ and various ‘social drinks and networking events’. The marketing activities included, for example, putting Leith on the tourist maps of Edinburgh; setting up a website for Leith; giving talks at various occasions and writing and producing articles for the local press.

During the first half of 2001, when this study of LIFT was conducted, the network had the following roles as the: initiator of activities with the clear purpose of networking; conductor of market activities; creator and moderator of forums for discussions between different kind of organisations and adviser in both tourism related and local community development issues.

At the time of this study, LIFT went through a turbulent time. The initial phase was over and they needed and wanted some crucial changes such as: reflection on their network; more focus; more structure (chairman, board, action plan etc) as well as some core funding in order to continue their work. In addition to this they went through some changes in their way of working when one of the initiators fell ill and had to leave the network and when another left during the second half of 2001. They also started working in groups around projects, more so than in their beginning when the group was smaller and almost everything was done together as one group.

After reviewing themselves and as part of their new, more formalised way of working, they formed plans for 2002. In the first two years, LIFT’s work was

---

70 Both as ‘internal’ events in Leith where representatives from the local businesses visit each other and learn more about each others businesses as well as ‘external’ where tour operators, tourist information staff and similar have been invited to learn more about Leith.

71 The site was www.edinburgh-waterfront.com and served for quite a few years as a gateway to the area and included information about accommodation, restaurants, events and local history and attractions in Leith.
more focused on social and networking activities in the local community than
developing tourism for visitors. This was considered in the plans and core aims
and objectives were set up for both these areas:

**Visitor development**
- Business development through marketing initiatives and events.
- Promoting the area as tourist destination.
- Promoting an urban village retail sector.
- Branding of the area – highlighting the area’s distinctive identity to
  strengthen the area as a visitor destination (heritage, maritime, cuisine,
  design, home of golf etc).
- Supporting and helping other groups and businesses in developing the area
  as a visitor destination.
- Promoting the needs and interest of visitors as a vehicle for positive change
  for the community.
- Engaging businesses and the community in tourism.
- Engaging the potential visitors, the tourism industry and government
  agencies in Leith.
- Encouraging and supporting events.
- Maximising funding opportunities for local organisations.
- Working with established and new waterfront areas to promote integration
  and partnerships.

**Business and community network for developing expertise, sharing information and capturing opportunities**
- Actively working with the area’s businesses, voluntary agencies, community
  groups etc. Encouraging business to business to community partnership.
  Development, and advising on local initiatives and community involvement.
- Developing partnerships among the mixed strands of the community and
  with other waterfront communities. Breaking down geographical and social
  divides. Fostering communication between strands of community.
- Promoting employment opportunities.
- Act as an information source for the area.
- Promoting inclusive and sustainable initiatives and development.
- Putting government policy into action.

(LIFT documents)

This is going to be achieved through the following core activities:

- Quarterly general meetings (apart from the board meetings which are held
  more often).
- Quarterly newsletter.
- Three tourism familiarisation trips.
Two networking events.
Development and maintenance of website.
Two training seminars.
Facilitate and support academic research.
Identify and develop new short and long term initiatives to fulfil aims.
Partnership activities with a number of listed organisations (20 named plus local retail and tourism businesses, local business centres and various charity organisations).

(LIFT documents)

It seems that by carrying out this review, LIFT took one step further and went through the initial phase of its development. The network got funding for a co-ordinating person for the latter half of 2001, which was a sign of recognition from, for example, the City of Edinburgh Council who funded them. It got a new board, a more formal structure and an action plan. Moreover, it seemed like trust was beginning to be built up among the participants, which was evident in, for example, the exchange of information, ideas etc. It was recognised at the time of the study that the network would become more and more divided the more it developed. New members would not have the same knowledge about LIFT as those who had been involved from the start, and this was seen as an important issue to discuss within LIFT. Other important factors for the progress of this network were seen to be greater knowledge among the members about other members; about tourism as an industry; a strategic plan; more funding and more active people.

After reviewing themselves and as part of their new, more formalised way of working, they formed some new plans for 2002. As previously mentioned, in the first two years, LIFT’s work was more focused on social and networking activities in the local community than developing tourism for visitors. In the 2002 plans, this was reviewed and core aims and objectives were set up for the areas of visitor development, and also that of developing a business and community network for developing expertise, sharing information and capturing opportunities. Objectives for visitor development included: business development; promotional activities in relation to the location, its businesses, and visitor needs; business and community engagement in tourism; visitor engagement in Leith; co-operating with and supporting organisations whose activities complement those of LIFT; and, maximising funding opportunities for local organisations. Development objectives for a business and community network included: encouragement of co-operative working and an advisory role concerning local initiatives and community involvement; fostering communication between strands of the community; promoting employment opportunities, and inclusive and sustainable initiatives and development; acting as an information source; and, implementing of government policy. These goals were to be supported by a variety of communication mechanisms, educational initiatives, and partnership activities.
During 2002 and part of 2003, debates recurred regarding the future direction of LIFT with a focus on community-commercial issues. LIFT folded during 2003 and LIFT Ltd was established with a new, more commercially focused chairperson. LIFT Ltd received funding, initially for one year, from the City of Edinburgh Council and Scottish Enterprise. The board is now made up mainly of representatives from public agencies. This has been done with the support of most of the former LIFT members. Its primary aim is the development of small tourism businesses in Leith. One of its first goals is to develop a Tourism Action Plan.

Two types of groups who share the aim of developing tourism have been presented above. One more limited in time and the other, at the time of the study, with no clear end in sight. Both of them, however, had the aim of creating relationships between businesses and people. In other words, they were trying to grow networks that would benefit their communities as well as their visitors. Groups, in terms of networks developing tourism, are discussed in more detail below.

Networks

As mentioned previously, studying groups such as IDC Tourism and LIFT is important in order to understand the social aspects of destination development. Humans are social creatures whose identities are created and changed through collective actions and other intra-group processes (Mead, 1968). This phenomenon is well established but still remains to be explained further (Drury & Reicher, 2000). Even though studies within groups can be fruitful, it is also important to study the relations between different groups. The thoughts and actions of one group form the reality that other groups face, and thus influence their understanding and behaviour, which in turn form the context for the former group (ibid.). This is for example, visible within tourism in the relationship between local residents and tourists as well as the relationship between private tourism businesses and public tourism organisations.

A sign of the movement towards ‘new’ industries is the clear desire to achieve a ‘networked economy’, and, among international and national agencies, the development of a strong tourism industry and destinations. They therefore actively promote the concept of business networks at a local destination level (e.g., Scottish Executive, 2001). Against this background, increased academic attention is being paid to tourism networks and their development. Several studies have shown the importance of social relations and networks, in particular when it comes to destination development (e.g. Elbe, 2002; Tinsley, 2004 and von Friedrichs Grängsjö, 2003). Morrison, Lynch & Johns (2002) propose a life cycle model of their development and Augustyn & Knowles (2000), and Morrison, Lynch & Johns (2004) suggest network success factors. Nevertheless, whilst recent attention has been on how to make networks
operate more successfully, earlier literature identified the generally short-lived nature of such networks (Litteljohn, Foley & Lennon, 1996 and Morrison, 1994).

Lynch et al (2000) summarised the benefits of tourism networks based upon a review of tourism literature. Of note is that the benefits are of three main types: learning and exchange, business activity, and community. No claim is made that all such benefits will arise from a network, simply that they have been identified in the literature. Whilst learning and exchange might be considered to be inter-related to business activity and community, the authors question the extent to which business activity and community benefits are inter-related and mutually compatible (Lynch et al, 2000).

There is much literature on networks but it is neither the purpose nor the aim of this thesis to deal with this all in detail. The focus will therefore be on two aspects of networks, which I have found useful in trying to understand development groups. These are the degree of formality within networks and the socio-spatial dimension of networks. They are discussed in the sections below followed by an analysis of the two cases.

**Degrees of formality**

A network can be defined as a set of relationships between individuals acting in an organisational and/or private capacity to achieve a particular purpose; such networks can be of three types: formal, semi-formal and informal.

- **Formal** – a formalised set of actors who interact in the context of identified aims, for example, a Regional Tourism Organisation. Whilst social interactions may be valued, these are subordinate to the formalised aims.

- **Semi-formal** – a formalised set of actors who interact in the context of identified aims, for example, a local business marketing consortium. Social interactions may be perceived as of equal importance to the formalised aims.

- **Informal** – a set of actors who meet mainly for social purposes but also exchange information, which has instrumental (business) value. No formal membership or clear goals exist, for example, a neighbourhood host families ‘network’ (Gibson et al, 2005:88).

The degree of formality can be visualised as different positions on an imaginary scale, where formal and informal are at opposite ends. However, as was discussed in the previous chapter networks, just as destinations, change through learning and thus ‘move up and down’ the scale as their nature changes. Moreover, these categories are not mutually exclusive and as the transition from
one form to the other is a process, it is difficult to pinpoint the exact time when the whole group has changed.

I would argue that it is important to include the degree of formality in the study of projects and networks, as this affects the activities of these types of groups; the relations to other groups and people and thus also tourism development. Whether a network is formal or informal will not alone affect its achievements and relations but I mean that it will contribute to a large extent. With the risk of generalising somewhat, a more formal network might have a better chance of lobbying and influencing politicians about the importance of facilitating tourism development. The local informal network on the other hand will most likely be more action-oriented and thus vital for the operational aspects of tourism businesses. This was the case in the examples I discuss in this chapter. IDC Tourism for example got access to the Swedish Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications to discuss tourism industry development, and was recognised as becoming a member and part of a group of networks with formalised rules, eligible for funding and so on. LIFT on the other hand, dedicated their time to prioritising activities in order to engage people to commit to their mission based on the will to ‘do something’. This drive produced actions but left little time and energy for forming a formal network during the first years, leading to a lack of funding and recognition from public authorities as a result.

The narrow distinction between formal and semi-formal networks is based upon the balance between the importance of instrumental v. social values (Gibson et al, 2005). An aspect of networks overlooked to date is that of the commercial-community interface within semi-formal networks. This is an important issue and at the heart of achieving sustainable tourism, definitions of which emphasise the mix of meeting community goals and commercial goals but not at the expense of one another (e.g. Swarbrooke, 1999).

**Socio-spatial dimensions**

Globalisation includes more mobility, which leads to more encounters (Robins, 2000) and interaction. The increase of networks of all sorts is one of the characteristics of the contemporary globalisation (Held et al, 1999 and Mann, 2000). Some of these networks can be called socio-spatial and generally speaking, there are five types of these networks of social interaction today.

2. *National networks* — … structured or (more neutrally) bounded by the nation-state.
3. *International networks* — … relations between nationally constituted networks … these include the ‘hard geopolitics’… which centre on war, peace and alliances. But they also include ‘soft geopolitics’ between states —
negotiations about more peaceable and particular matters like air transport communications, tax treaties, air pollution etc.

4. **Transnational networks** – … passing right through national boundaries being unaffected by them.

5. **Global networks** – … covers the world as a whole – or, perhaps more realistically, they cover most of it. … Thus global networks might be formed by either a single universal network or by a more segmented series of networks between which existed rather particularistic relations. (Mann, 2000:475)

These networks have gone through some changes during the last centuries. The importance of the local networks has been reduced and the national, international and transnational has come to structure more of people’s lives. I would also argue that the framework could also be extended to include regional networks.

Global networks are a rather recent phenomenon. If we relate this to the role of the nation-state, the question of which combination of networks will be of significance for future development arises. Will the role of national and international networks diminish and the local combined with the transnational emerge more clearly? An indication of the growing importance of regional networks is the funding available from the European Union for projects in European regions with different problems. This has to some extent led to a renaissance for regions whereas the role of the nation-state in some issues is diminishing. Another way of regarding the regional level is to place it in between the national and international level. This would follow the thoughts of Smith (1990), when he discusses the increasing emergence of ‘family of cultures’ or regional cultures.

IDC Tourism is an example of such a network with a clear regional approach, since these IDCs are often created in rural regions that have faced setbacks in their development. I would therefore like to question Mann’s (2000) statements about the local networks losing their importance. There are signs that points towards an increased importance of local networks, or at least that these networks are operating in a different context and connected to other levels in new ways. LIFT is an example of this. They aimed to turn local history, culture and other local resources into tourist products and experiences combined with development of the local community. Another example of a development work undertaken through local networks in combination with other local networks, forming a transnational network is ‘the waterfront communities’ project’. This is one of 58 projects within the Interreg North Sea Programme, consisting of seven countries around the North Sea working together in the areas of water, transport, risk and coastal management and tourism. The waterfront project is described as a ‘learning network of nine cities from around the North Sea who are rediscovering their waterfronts and striving to reconnect their cities with the sea’ (www.waterfrontcommunitiesproject.org).
IDC Tourism and LIFT – two different approaches

There are some similarities between the two cases presented above. Both were aimed at developing tourism via strong networks based on the relationships and connections existing in the area. However, there are also many differences in their approaches and ways of achieving this goal.

IDC Tourism was a project, with a planning phase including a pilot study that would draw up the structure of the network and engage businesses to join it. The planned network is also an example of a way for a place traditionally heavily dependent on production industry, to move towards an industry based on services and experiences. The framework for IDCs, however, was designed for traditional production industries, in particular engineering but also forestry. In other words it was an attempt to apply a structure for production businesses to companies offering services and experiences. However, the attempt to ‘squeeze’ in development of one type of industry into the clothes of another proved rather difficult. It was also suggested by both the IDC for music and the working group for IDC Tourism that some crucial changes needed to be made in the structure of IDCs for it to be suitable for the ‘experience industry’, including the opportunities of personal development in addition to product development.

LIFT was a network, which tried to connect private, public and voluntary actors and create a commercial-community interface. As with the case in Västerbotten, the network in Leith is an example of a contribution to the move away from dependency on production industries. In the case of LIFT however, it involved an attempt to create a new type of constellation for key actors for tourism development in the area. This constellation, which was more likely to suit an emerging ‘network society’, involved: tourism businesses, local council, a company owning large areas of the harbour which was about to be developed, voluntary associations interested in preserving the cultural and built heritage of Leith, the Chamber of Commerce and similar groups.

The two cases also differ in terms of formality and one might say that they started at opposite ends of the imaginary scale or line of formality. IDC Tourism might be seen as an attempt to create a formal network. An existing formal structure with clear regulations was taken on board and much work went in to the process of creating an adaptation in terms of visions, goals, strategies, conditions for membership and so on. LIFT on the other hand started as an informal network where those interested came along and formed a kind of working group that created the mission statement, engaged in initial activities and thus attracted more interested parties. After the initial years the network became semi-formal with regular meetings, a board, project groups, budget, administrator etc; a process of formalisation that has continued ever since.
Can the creation of IDCs be seen as a collective learning process? It appears that some of the previous mistakes or flaws of earlier development funds and regional development companies were taken into account when the regulations for the new IDCs were formed. Nevertheless, the relatively unsuccessful attempt, at the time of the study, to create an IDC for tourism does however question the usefulness of business networks at a regional level; particularly in counties or similar areas that are very large and diverse. Trying to create networks at this level might not always be a suitable solution, especially if it does not build on existing links and connections. The differences between potential members might be too large to overcome and a common ‘cause’ for a community to develop might be lacking. Against this background, it was probably a mistake not to proceed with the offer from the group of businesses from a mountain community in the area that approached the working group of the IDC Tourism. This local group seemed to have gone through a similar learning and development process to that of LIFT, and were perhaps ready for taking a step towards a more formal association or network. The reasons for declining them were most likely political as there were interests involved who wanted the IDC to be centrally located. Using a local, more established network as a base for an IDC seems to be one of the main reasons why an IDC for music was started up in Hultsfred, and at the time of writing it is still active.

Although having made quite a few achievements during the relatively short time LIFT existed in its semi-formal state, it was faced with other kinds of difficulties. The dependency on its initiators has clearly influenced the work of LIFT. At the time of the study there seemed to be a lack of any plans for how to pass on and use the knowledge and contacts they gained during their early years. This is somewhat of a dilemma as contacts are absolutely crucial in building a network but they are often personal. It may be noted however, that contacts are not totally connected to only one person and therefore it is important to have ideas about how to use contacts even after initiators have left the network. The study of LIFT also highlighted some disagreements and lack of focus, which affected the goals and actions taken (Gibson et al, 2005). The members of LIFT considered their dual focus of both tourism business and community development as important. However, as has been noted in other studies, in order to change the image and identity of an area, visible results are crucial (Pettersson, 1999). This is often difficult for organisations to accomplish in the beginning when there often is a lack of resources. It must be stressed that this is very important in order to get the vast majority to recognise the network and see what have been achieved. As said, LIFT has been very active considering the short time the network existed in its early form. Their achievements were not however, very well communicated or visible to target groups such as visitors, residents and businesses.
Gender related differences

I would like to end this chapter with some thoughts regarding gender related differences between the two approaches of creating IDC Tourism and LIFT. At this point it is important to note that, although very interesting and current, the gender perspective was not explicitly included in the studies. The scope for a doctoral thesis is not endless and I felt it was difficult to do gender issues justice given the other strands that needed to be investigated. Nevertheless, issues seemingly related to gender have kept emerging throughout the studies, which is why it is important to at least acknowledge and discuss its presence, if perhaps more briefly than it deserves. The most obvious cases where gender seemed to have an effect were IDC Tourism and LIFT and hence the reason for including a discussion regarding gender at this point.

At the time of the study, IDC Tourism can be said to have had a predominantly male approach to preparing for the creation of the centre. Of the people involved, including the project team and the steering group, only one of them was a woman and she left the project at an early stage. Moreover, even though ‘increased equality between men and women’ was included as a strategy in the ‘business plan’, the inclusion of more women was not discussed further at any of the meetings I attended or in any of the other documents available.

The situation for IDC Tourism is similar to that of other regional development projects, where evaluations have found discrepancies regarding equal opportunities for men and women and analyses from a gender perspective. In other words, regional and rural development in Sweden has for a long time been influenced by a male culture and approaches. There has however recently been a shift in power from a national to a regional level; a transition from a ‘top-down approach’ to giving the responsibility to regions in a sort of ‘bottom-up approach’. This creates a culture where networks and co-operation is in focus and encouraged (Forsberg, 2005), which is in line with the transfer from ‘government’ to ‘governance’ (Shaw & Williams, 2004). IDC can be seen as a reflection of the attempt of these ideas. The question is: has it worked? Not really, at least not as far as the case of IDC Tourism in Västerbotten is concerned. The idea of an IDC came from a handful of men involved from various regional public organisations who seemed to be more used to the traditional way of implementing regional development politics. Even though they aimed to create a network and increase collaboration, they focused on building a structure with a centre that had not been established by the local businesses who, after all, were expected to run it.

I would say that LIFT also embraced thoughts about ‘governance’ and development through networking and working together on a local level, but applied a more female approach to implementing this. The network was initiated by two women, and, at the time of the study, there was a fairly equal distribution of men and women in both the board and among the active
participants. During the first years of LIFT, the focus was on strengthening the network by creating trust; exchanging knowledge and taking actions of benefit for the development of both community and tourism businesses.

When it comes to the so-called ‘masculine/feminine’ dimension of cultures in countries, the difference between Great Britain and Sweden is clear. In Hofstede’s studies for example, Sweden is seen as the least masculine country of the 53 studied, whereas Great Britain shares place number 9 with the former West Germany in terms of masculinity. Masculine cultures are in this case based on clearly separate gender roles; whilst in feminine societies gender roles overlap each other to a greater extent. The following traits are examples of values that are found in a masculine society: material success and progress are highly valued; the ideal society is based on achievements; work related conflicts are solved through disputes until one part wins, and international conflicts should be solved through displays of power or through fights. The feminine culture on the other hand is based on, for example, the following: care for others and preservation of resources is highly valued; a welfare society is the ideal; and work-related as well as international conflicts should be solved through compromises and negotiations (Hofstede, 1991).

Whereas the people involved in IDC Tourism in Västerbotten were influenced by the relatively masculine culture in Northern Sweden, the participants of LIFT broke many ‘rules’ of the traditionally patriarchal culture in Scotland. Being part of British culture, Scotland is considered having a more masculine culture than for example Sweden (ibid.). These are generalisations, but might still give us some clues to the development of LIFT. Like many other projects, LIFT eventually ran out of funding and could not continue in the form of a network including businesses, voluntary associations and public organisations. It is likely that this ‘hybrid’ with a female approach to their way of working did not fit into the structures based on a more British male approach; a trap that also has been recognised by others (Forsberg, 2005).

Summary and conclusions

A crucial element of the complexity of tourism is that a substantial part of development takes place in groups of various sorts. This makes it important to study groups such as projects and networks in order to gain a better understanding of destination development. Projects and networks are also signs of recent development, and the movement from societies dependent on traditional production industries to communities with industries based on service, communication, networks and experiences.

In this research, two cases of groups who are trying to incorporate destination, business and community development in their plans and activities, have been studied. The cases are the Industrial Development Centre for Tourism (IDC
Tourism) in Västerbotten, Sweden and Leith Initiatives for Tourism (LIFT) in Leith, Scotland. IDC Tourism was a planned centre and network for tourism businesses in a part of Northern Sweden. It started as a project where the centre was planned and was going to be established; something that in the end did not happen. The idea was based on an existing formula of industrial development centres for production industries, which has its roots in the governmental need of turning around the economic recession experienced in many rural areas of Sweden. LIFT was a network in the Edinburgh waterfront area, and former town of Leith, and was a sign of the local development and regeneration of the area. The network was aimed at developing tourism in the area for the benefit of visitors, businesses and residents and consisted of private businesses, voluntary associations and public organisations.

The two cases are analysed in terms of degree of formality and socio-spatial networks. Although having similar aims of wanting to achieve tourism and community development, they differed in terms of their approaches. IDC Tourism was an attempt to create a structural, formal regional network by using a format from traditional production industries. LIFT on the other hand started as an action-oriented, local informal network, which tried a rather new method of creating a commercial-community interface. There were also differences relating to gender in their approaches, with IDC Tourism being predominantly male and LIFT having a more female way of working.

So far, the two projects have been discussed in terms of their structure or form, i.e. as networks. Equally important, and which has been mentioned above, are the processes within groups, which might be called networking. This is a form of interaction process that is seen as vital in order to develop tourism, where personal relations are very important (e.g. Frisk, 1998 and Johannisson, 1997). This can be viewed as a form of collaboration or struggle depending on the nature of the interaction, or in some cases absence of the same. The next chapter will discuss and analyse further the interaction within the two cases.
PROCESSES IN PROJECTS

Introduction

The previous chapter focused on the structure of development projects and networks. This was exemplified by two cases, the Industrial Development Centre for Tourism in Västerbotten, Sweden and Leith Initiatives for Tourism in Leith, Scotland. I have argued that structure or organisation itself does not alone spur development of the tourism industry and communities. We need to turn our attention to processes within projects and networks. As organisations and groups change, so do their ways of working, i.e. the processes within them. In order to understand projects and networks and thus destination development it is important to use processes when analysing people’s interactions in groups and organisations (e.g. Hosking & Morley, 1991).

In other words, having analysed the two cases as ‘networks’, I now turn to their ‘networking’, i.e. their processes in terms of the strength of social relations. In order to obtain a fuller picture of the processes of, and strategies employed, by tourism development groups and other involved actors, their relationships and interactions were mapped out and are now presented in this chapter. However, through analysis of the two groups in terms of their purpose, structure and relations, a pattern of similarities was reinforced by their dilemmas as groups with dual development goals. The chapter therefore ends with a discussion of the cases in terms of what I call ‘mixed organisations’.

Processes

As mentioned in the previous chapter, some organisational theories see organisations as closed units, e.g. system perspectives (e.g. Michels, 1983; Mintzberg, 1979; Parsons, 1951; Taylor, 1911 and Weber, 1997). My views are closer to those approaches that see the relationship between a person and its context as characterised by ‘mutual creation’, i.e. to some extent people create their context and become created by it (Berger & Luckmann, 1991; Giddens, 1990 and Hosking & Morley, 1991). In the organisations of our contemporary Western society, a large degree of work is undertaken in informal situations and leadership is exercised through negotiations. This means that staff and leaders negotiate about tasks and are thereby part of the creation of a ‘social order’. The most important aspect of the context thus becomes other people and one’s relationship to them, which leads to relational processes becoming vital (Hosking & Morley, 1991).

The central parts in this organisational perspective are relational processes, where organising is an activity that is conducted through different processes. From the perspective where organisations are seen as closed units, relational
processes are seen as simple causal mechanisms that link input (from persons and organisations) to output (for persons and organisations). Relational processes thus become reduced to complex but in principle predictable interactions (ibid.). I would argue however, that relations between people and contexts are mutually created and that the concept of processes is therefore different. Processes are complex with mutual influence, and predominant qualities that cannot be reduced to independent contributions from either persons or contexts.

Therefore, I mean that better understanding of social organisations can be gained through a process-oriented perspective that focuses on processes based on relations, which in turn are built on social interaction. A certain kind of interaction where group processes become visible is networking, which is the focus of the next section.

Networking

As was discussed in the previous chapter, in this thesis, interaction in terms of networks is divided into two main dimensions or perspectives. On the one hand, there is the network, i.e. the form or structure for organising people in a group, which indicates that they have some connections between them and relations to each other. There are many ways of looking at networks, but in this thesis, they have been distinguished by their degree of formality and as socio-spatial networks. Another way of categorising co-operation in relation to destination development is to divide it into permanent or temporary co-operation. Projects or networks at destinations, such as the two cases discussed above, can be characterised as temporary co-operations, which are more difficult to define in terms of boundaries (Elbe, 2002).

On the other hand, I would argue that when studying networks the focus should be explicitly on the relations and activities rather than the structure and the form alone. This perspective and way of working in networks thus focuses on the interaction between actors. Networking then becomes a kind of ‘collective behaviour’, i.e. behaviour, actions and relations that are socially meaningful for the group as they reflect social meanings and create new ones (Drury & Reicher, 2000). The focus of groups working in this way is thus on co-operation and increasing the number of contacts, and/or making the network ‘denser’, with more contacts between the ‘members’ of the network.

Others that have recognised the importance of interactional studies of organisations and groups are Dingwall & Strong (1997). In line with the thoughts discussed above, I would wish to stress the importance of the ‘negotiated order’ approach, which argues that:
All social order is negotiated; these negotiations take place in a patterned and systematic fashion; their outcomes are temporally limited; the negotiated order constantly has to be reconstituted as a basis for concerted action; the negotiated order on any day consist of the sum total of the organization’s rules, policies and local working understandings or agreements; and finally, any change arising within or imposed on the order will require renegotiation to occur. (Dingwall & Strong, 1997:140ff)

Group processes thus become visible through networking, which involves this ‘negotiated order’. This in turn makes social relations important and I find it useful to include thoughts from the theory about the ‘strength of weak ties’ (Granovetter, 1973). So called ‘strong ties’ are seen as crucial in order to encourage people to take actions and a certain type of so-called ‘weak ties’ are useful in gaining new and valuable information. Networks created by ‘strong ties’ mainly become focused on activities, while those formed on the basis of ‘weak ties’ becomes more oriented towards information (e.g. Borell & Johansson, 1996; Burt, 1995; Elbe, 2002; Granovetter, 1973; Johannisson, 1988b and Karlqvist, 1990). ‘Weak ties’ have also been called ‘bridging social capital’ and refer to links between people and networks that would not normally have any areas of contact (e.g. Putnam, 2000).

If these ideas are applied to my empirical examples, IDC Tourism was at the time of the study mainly based on so called ‘strong ties’. The aim was that a handful of businesses within similar fields, and from the same area, would form the base for this network. LIFT on the other hand was in its beginnings and at the time of this study based on a combination of ‘strong’ and ‘weak ties’. The network included members from different parts of the community (voluntary, public and private), that despite their close geographical proximity did not have any other reason to interact. As the formalisation of this network increased, so did the strength of the ties, with the participants with most in common, i.e. the private businesses such as restaurants and retailers, forming the new organisation LIFT Ltd. The following section will discuss in more detail the group processes within my two cases.

**Processes within IDC Tourism and LIFT**

As was pointed out in the previous chapter, although the two cases both had the aim of developing tourism and communities, in particular businesses, there were quite a few differences between IDC Tourism and LIFT. Below the differences between IDC Tourism and LIFT in terms of the degree of involvement of different actors is discussed.
As shown in this figure and as implied above, the extent to which actors were initially involved, and hence their knowledge and involvement, varied. At the time of the study, one future crucial task for the working group of the project was how to induce greater involvement among key parties such as tourism businesses and the different networks and groups that already existed. Other questions that were still to be answered concerned the structure of the planned IDC. For example, what kind of people should be members of the board? The make up of the board has been put forward as one key factor in the success of IDCs, both by the written regulations and as a result of IDC experience. The make up of the board was also still to be decided upon as was the content of the activity plan. There were no clear ideas of what kinds of resources were needed, in terms of knowledge, money and people, in order to continue the process and realise the ideas.
The situation in terms of involvement of key people in LIFT was somewhat different to that of IDC Tourism. This network was initiated by two people with a small tourism-related service based business. They engaged several other local businesses involved in various ways in tourism. The invitation to join the network also extended to voluntary associations with an interest in developing Leith. This included, for example, groups focusing on heritage, youth, environment and ethnic minorities. Thereafter support agencies, such as the local council and to some extent local and regional tourist organisations and other development agencies, were contacted and negotiations and discussions were held.

In both IDC Tourism and LIFT, the community in general, i.e. residents and organisations and groups not explicitly involved in tourism, were the last dimension to be included. This occurred mainly through one-way communications informing residents and others about their plans and activities. This strategy was most likely necessary in the initial phases of these networks as most of the energy and resources were needed ‘internally’ in the network to build up relations etc.

**Network or networking**

The two cases also differ in their approaches and, as indicated by the description of ‘IDC for tourism’, concentrated on the network. During the initial process of this network, they focused on creating a structure, a skeleton if you like, that was thought would be fleshed out as more ‘members’ joined. To reach their goal of developing tourism business in Västerbotten, there were many different strategies the key agents could have chosen, but they decided to try to be included in a group of networks with a fairly strict form set by the government. It is likely that this limited the choices of what to develop and how to do it, in reality and in the thinking of the people involved. Another consequence of concentrating on the network was that it created ‘vertical’ contacts as the project leader tried to receive legitimacy for the network by getting support from representatives at all hierarchical positions. Therefore a rather narrow selection of people in key positions were approached and involved on a national, regional and local level.

The work in LIFT on the other hand has been characterised by networking. The network grew from a sense of frustration about the lack of development in the area. The initiators therefore approached representatives for key organisations and invited interested organisations to work together for the development of tourism in Leith, as well as other parts of the local community. They did not have any set form and started with the issues that seemed to be most urgent, and tasks that were quite concrete and feasible in the short term. As a part of the networking they arranged many social events with the explicit purpose of linking organisations to the network and getting people to know
each other. Moreover, the interaction in this network was characterised by co-
operation, in other words they tried to form ‘alliances’ with different kinds of
organisations to reach their common goal of developing a local tourist
destination in close relationship with the local community. Involving people
from different sectors was seen as very important, which created a ‘horizontal’
network including many ‘weak ties’, as was mentioned above.

Mixed organisations

Let us return for a while to the similarities between the two cases in terms of
their tasks and goals they set out to achieve. Firstly, they both had long-term
sustainable local and regional development as their main goal and as the base
for their strategies. Secondely, although their focus was on tourism
development and of small businesses related to tourism, in both cases they
emphasised the importance of developing tourism in close connection to the
development of the community. Hence, there are at least two perspectives in
these networks that form their strategies and goals. One of the perspectives is
business related or commercial (e.g. Frisk, 2003) since the explicit aim of both
these networks was to develop the tourism industry in the area by helping the
development of small tourism businesses as well as strengthen the destination
and make it more commercialised. The other perspective is the political (ibid.)
where these networks take on a certain social responsibility that goes beyond
their members and concerns the community the networks are part of. In this
case, IDC Tourism had the ambition to become the voice of the tourism
industry in political debates regarding the region and local economic life (Vision
för IUC Turism, 2000). LIFT on the other hand engaged themselves in the
physical and social problems of the waterfront area of Edinburgh.

LIFT (Leith Initiatives for Tourism) is a voluntary not for profit partnership
working to develop Leith and the adjacent waterfront area, through sustainable
tourism-based initiatives, for the benefit of the local community, businesses and
visitors. (LIFT Mission Statement, 1999)

Moreover, there are embedded conflicts within these kinds of organisations or
companies that are based on ideas of regional and local development. They
automatically have two different roles to fulfil or dissociate themselves from:
the commercial role and the political role (Olofsson, 1983). These roles are
based on different world views and also include differing goals and rationales
(Frisk, 2003). Hence, I would argue that these networks are ‘mixed
organisations’, which is a way of managing and even embracing these two roles.
This poses a few dilemmas, which will be discussed below.

72 See pages 106-107.
73 See pages 106-107.
The set form for IDC Tourism steered it into becoming an enterprise where the purpose would be to trade tourism products. Parts of it would also have become an association since the ‘members’ would choose to engage themselves in this organisation if they shared the same idealistic values of co-operation among businesses and connecting tourism and community development. Still, some parts of this network would also resemble a public organisation since there had to be representatives from the government on the board of the organisation. A public organisation had also set the forms for the network and it had an ambition to act as a spokesman in political debates on a regional and local level.

LIFT on the other hand was mainly an association where organisations and individuals were ‘members’ because they shared the common aim of developing tourism in Leith as well as the local community. However, the majority (ca 2/3) of the participants were representing businesses (either as an owner/manager or as key staff) and as an outspoken aim was to develop these tourism related businesses, the network also had the traces of an enterprise. There are also some parts of it that resembled a public organisation since it was acting as an advisor in issues initiated by the state, and had also been named as the organisation to carry out some of the activities mentioned in the strategic framework for the area.

As mixed organisations trying to bridge different sectors of society, I mean that they have ‘dual loyalties’. One loyalty is related to business and the enterprises involved in the network, who are expecting to develop their businesses through this network and eventually receive commercial value. On the other hand, these networks have a political or social loyalty towards the community since they want, and are expected, to contribute to the development of the community in terms of creating employment etc (Grängsjö, 1998).

Thus, these mixed organisations with their dual loyalties face several problems. The situation creates internal problems within the networks, which creates a ‘split personality’ in the group. This expresses itself, for example, in terms of lack of focus. In the case of IDC Tourism, since they were only in the initial phase of starting up, the dual perspectives, loyalty and goals where visible not only in their aims and strategies but also in the differences in expectations and apprehensions among the participants (Frisk, 2000). LIFT on the other hand had problems with finding a focus in their goals and activities that suited all participants and that concerned both businesses and community. The dual perspectives of these networks also created external problems, i.e. the way the surrounding community perceived them. Both these organisations experienced difficulties in how they were treated by key agents around them, as well as from the public in general. They also encountered difficulties in getting resources such as funding. This is related to their nature of mixed organisations, as they cannot be pigeon-holed so to speak, and do not fit in to the established political or administrative system of today. Therefore, these networks had to spend a
significant amount of time creating legitimacy for their group and their way of working. As said, IDC Tourism spent time on convincing key agents on a regional and local level, and to some extent national level, that their network was a good concept. LIFT on the other hand sought legitimacy among as many different organisations involved at local level as possible, to try to become acknowledged not only by tourism related organisations but also by other parts of the community.

Having dual perspectives, goals and loyalties thus seem quite troublesome, which leads to the question of why these networks decided to incorporate the dual roles in the first place and then persist in maintaining them. One explanation might be that so called ‘cognitive processes’ are a dominant characteristic of these mixed organisations. Cognitive processes include knowing, learning and thinking and are based on values that are affective, emotional and normative (Hosking & Morley, 1991). It seems as though the learning aspect was somewhat evident in IDC Tourism when, for example, people from ‘IDC Wood’ and ‘IDC Music’ were contacted and their experiences was incorporated in the plans for IDC Tourism. The learning aspect was even more explicit in LIFT through, for example, familiarisation trips (which were also social but one aim being to learn about each other's businesses), e-commerce seminars etc. Moreover, the emotional aspect was explicit in both cases, i.e. the willingness to take a wider social and political responsibility for their local and regional area. This might be seen as a reason for trying to develop tourism connected to the development of the local and regional community. One of the initiators of LIFT expressed her experiences of trying to connect tourism and community development in the following way:

I’ve learned a lot about the difficulties of economic development, and getting everybody on board. … Learned perhaps a lot about how councils work and how LEC’s [Local Enterprise Companies] work and how you have to fit into their…see, people outside of these big organisations think: ‘Oh, we’ve got a wonderful project, the council or LEC will fund it’, and of course it’s not like that at all. You have to know what they will fund you know, and the little tunnels of projects and you have to fit that into what they want to do. And maybe that’s one of the main learning things I can see there. … If you do too many things, then people can’t understand who you are. … We hear all the time it has to be bottom-up, it has to be local and so on, in fact people can’t deal with that at all.

In sum, one could say that despite the rather tentative focus of these kind of mixed organisations and networks, and the difficulties of placing them in pigeon-holes, they nevertheless contribute to the development of an area and its businesses.

One could argue that differences and multiplicity in many cases spur development (Kuhn, 1996 and Törnqvist, 1990), which is seen in these kinds of
mixed organisations as they create arenas for meetings and discussions among a
variety of organisations and persons. Like several other networks however, they
struggle with problems such as lack of finances and dependency on a few
committed key people. Another problem, related to the complexity of tourism
industry, when including both commercial business and social development, is
the lack of focus regarding both objectives and actions. As a way of dealing
with this complexity, these networks embraced the dual goals of developing the
local community as well as tourism businesses. This caused internal frustration
and confusion, and difficulties among external actors in placing them in
appropriate categories. The latter is most likely one of the reasons for a certain
lack of support by external agencies.

Summary and conclusions

I would argue that a process perspective helps in gaining a further
understanding of social organisations. In other words processes, activities and
the content of networks are seen as important. A crucial type of interaction in
these processes is networking, i.e. the ‘collective behaviour’, actions and
relations that are meaningful for groups. This is a ‘negotiated order’ created
through interaction in terms of networking, where group processes become
visible.

This chapter has shown that the differences between IDC Tourism and LIFT
in terms of the process of involvement of actors and the operational co-
operation are quite explicit. The former was planned by a working group
backed by some public organisations, whilst LIFT was initiated by tourism
businesses and voluntary associations. This is related to differences in norms
and group ethos. As said, IDC Tourism concentrated on forming the structure
of a planned network, with a lack of interest from businesses and lack of
support from agencies as a result. The work in LIFT on the other hand was
characterised by networking processes. This created an action-oriented
network, which achieved quite a lot but faced problems in terms of funding etc,
when trying to establish more formal structures.

The main common theme of these two cases is the inclusion of both a
commercial and a political or social perspective. This makes them into what I
call ‘mixed organisations’, which might be seen as a sign and a way of managing
the dilemma of combining business and community development. I would
argue that the development of both tourism businesses and communities is a
crucial part of destination development, but it creates problems for groups
trying to achieve this. The groups will no doubt include elements of private
businesses, voluntary associations and public organisations in various
combinations depending on the situation. This implies that very different values
and rationales need to be included in one network or group, which as the two
cases have shown, is difficult. Other problems occurring when trying to
encompass the ‘dual loyalties’ or goals found in these cases were: lack of funding; dependency on a few very committed key people; lack of focus; internal frustration and external confusion among supporting agencies.

The last two chapters have tried to show the importance of networks and projects for the development of destinations. The discussion has focused on both the structure of groups and processes within these. No place, destination or group can however, develop without the commitment and creativity of individuals. They are in this thesis called ‘enterprising people’ and will be discussed in the next chapter.
ENTERPRISING PEOPLE

Introduction

So far, I have discussed destinations in the form of geographical entities and social communities on a contextual level and as projects, groups and networks. I would argue however, that tourist destinations and their development cannot be studied without taking people into consideration. Moreover, one could say that the type of co-operation that truly benefits destinations in terms of new business opportunities is entrepreneurial (Elbe, 2002), which is an argument for studying the people with these qualities involved in destination development processes. Indeed, certain types of people are crucial in this process; I call them ‘enterprising people’. These are key people who act as catalysts for learning and development processes to occur.

When analysing my data from an individual perspective, different roles emerged when key people talked about their involvement in tourism development. Therefore, I felt it was necessary to find out in what way they make a difference, i.e. through their roles. Three roles emerged as particularly relevant for networking and destination development, and are discussed in this chapter. Furthermore, in order to understand how enterprising people fulfil their roles, the tools and resources these people use are explored. Networks were found to be one of the main tools, and social and cultural capital a pool of resources, for the ‘enterprising people’ to draw their strength from. In order to understand these key people better, I also discuss the context or culture that they operate in, in terms of attitudes towards tourism development in general and towards co-operation and competition in particular.

Enterprising people

The importance of studying people involved in the development processes of destinations has been shown in several studies (e.g. Frisk, 2000, 2003; Gibson et al, 2005; Karlsson, 2005; Karlsson & Lönnbring, 2003, 2005 and Philips, 1988). The patterns emerging from these studies point towards a core of ‘entrepreneurial’ key individuals being crucial for development to take place. In addition, I mean that these people are a vital part of the success factors for tourism development but in connection with development of the place (i.e. the destination), its history and resources and through development in projects and networks.

Entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship

‘Enterprising people’ is based on the concept of ‘entrepreneurs’, which in this thesis is seen in its widest sense; the notion that entrepreneurs might be found
in different sectors of society, such as the public, voluntary and private. The way I use the concept of entrepreneurs in this thesis, includes people who are creative, bold, dynamic, innovative, initiating and resourceful; in other words ‘enterprising’. I would argue that people with these characteristics are important for development to take place and function, and these are people who, for example, work with tourism related activities, attractions, organisations, events and so on.

The concept of entrepreneurs was introduced around 1730 among economists and many types of people have been regarded as entrepreneurs over the years: adventurers, capitalists, risk takers, the owner/managers of small businesses and so forth. Rather recent studies have also focused on ‘entrepreneurship’ and the process embedded in this, often the founding of new businesses. The research of entrepreneurs has in this process taken a step out of the economic field and is now a multi-disciplinary area of research, which includes: management changes within businesses, SMEs, family businesses, co-operative entrepreneurship, female entrepreneurship, innovation, development and growth etc (e.g. Kasarda & Sexton, 1992 and Swedberg, 1994). A concept with this many meanings has also been defined in different ways, where most definitions include traits such as: developing new ideas, creating new opportunities, finding radical solutions, being the driving force behind new businesses and so on (Gaddefors, 1996). Moreover, entrepreneurial people have been regarded as those who are committed and often heavily involved in activities and are driven by much enthusiasm (Philips, 1988).

The way I use the concept ‘enterprising people’ is related to social psychology and takes into account the personal traits and behaviour of people. The reason to include other people than just those from private businesses, is that this sector alone does not develop destinations. Development processes also occur in other types of organisations, such as museums, tourism organisations and voluntary associations, through projects and networks.

Other concepts related to entrepreneurs that have been studied are ‘identipreneurs’ (Brulin & Nilson 1997) and ‘social entrepreneurs’ (Johannisson, 1992). The former are people who base their business on local and regional identity and culture. He or she will, in processes of these types of entrepreneurship, include something that is specific to the place and turn this into a business idea or something else beneficial for the community. Social entrepreneurs are found in all sectors of society and are characterised by:

- seeing the development of local communities as a goal;
- encouraging others to set up their own businesses;
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74 See for example Gaddefors (1996) for a literature review on definitions.
75 So called ‘eldsjäl’ in Swedish.
76 See chapters ‘The importance of projects’ and ‘Processes in projects’.
77 The latter is called ‘samhällsentreprenör’ in Swedish.
• finding confidence and skills in others and inspiring them into action;
• seeing authorities and other agencies as collaboration partners and
• acting as a mediator in the building of networks (Johannisson, 1992).

These two specific types of entrepreneurs, ‘identipreneurs’ and ‘social entrepreneurs’, are thus interesting for the purpose of this thesis. I would argue that these people are crucial for destination development, in other words, they facilitate tourism development in various ways. Enterprising people seem to do this by fulfilling different roles and using certain resources, gained by tools. The roles, i.e. the way enterprising people act as mediators, initiators, inspirers, interpreters, links or ‘bridges’ between different actors, will be discussed below, followed by a discussion of tools and resources important for enterprising people.

Entrepreneurial roles

During my studies of destination development I have been intrigued by people ‘who make it happen’. It became more and more evident throughout my research project that people who create links between different parts of development and people, are thus necessary for development processes to take place, in combination with projects and certain conditions at the destination, as has been discussed in previous chapters. The involvement of people that have combined experience from businesses and the private sector with a social responsibility seems to be particularly important. I came across this combination in several key people involved in the earlier studies of the research project. One example would be the owner manager of an accommodation establishment in Tornedalen. He created one of the first and most successful tourism accommodation establishments in the region. He runs this business and at the same time is active in networks with other small enterprises in the area, with public organisations as well as being active in tourism development groups and associations. One of these is an association that promotes the cultural heritage of saunas in Northern Sweden. Through his work, he is a source of inspiration for the people at the destination and at the same time creates more business for others.

Another example is the founder of the ICEHOTEL in Jukkasjärvi. As was mentioned previously, Jukkasjärvi has been a traditional meeting place for centuries, where people have come to go to church or visit the annual markets. Although nature based tourism in this region started in the mountain area at the turn of the 20th century, it was not developed as an industry until the 1980s. The founder, originally from the area, and active in the local heritage association, realised the potential for tourism and started an ‘adventure tourism business’ offering amongst other things river rafting. It was however, through

---

76 See pages 46-47.
the engagement and contacts in the art sector that the idea of investing in tourism during the winter came. Acting as a negotiator, mediator and innovator, the founder was able to build the ICEHOTEL, a completely new idea, for a very different market than the area had attracted thus far. This has now turned into an attraction known worldwide and its success has made the development of several other tourism businesses possible, and inspired other similar destinations to be creative and change their perception of elements such as coldness, darkness, ice, snow and northern lights.

An important person for the destination development process of Västerbotten at the time of the study was the project leader and manager of IDC Tourism. He had, among other things, worked as a private consultant as well as in the economic development department of a public organisation. It was important to have skills and experiences from various sectors in order to fulfil the tasks of the particular post as a manager of this project. The tourism businesses approached during this project were reluctant and needed convincing; several local and regional public support agencies needed confirmation that all was going according to plan and the idea also needed to be promoted to national organisations.

It is important to note that as destinations’ development has been discussed in terms of life cycles, this can be done on an individual level too. In other words, cycles are found in many parts of society and enterprising people might be needed in different roles at different stages of development, both at destinations and in projects. Initiators are needed in the beginning of a process, which is then taken over by ‘managers’ and so on.

During my studies of the tourism development network LIFT in Leith, Scotland, I also met some key people with quite clear enterprising roles in the development of their network, community and destination. Some of the important roles of enterprising people are discussed in more detail below illustrated by the examples of three of the key people involved in LIFT.79

The Initiator

One person who acted as an ‘initiator’ was a woman, one of two initiators and founders of the network Leith Initiatives for Tourism (LIFT). She is Scottish but had no previous strong links to Leith. After having trained staff at the tourist attraction of the yacht Britannia, the initiator along with her colleague invited interested people to a discussion session regarding the future development of tourism in Leith and the regeneration of north Edinburgh. LIFT had its first meeting in June 1999, where the name was decided upon and where, from the very start, the need to socialise and get to know each other was

79 These analyses are mainly based on interviews but also on discussions and participant observations.
added to the agenda. Thereafter the network started to hold regular monthly meetings, with a few exceptions. The network has been open to everyone interested and engaged people to attend meetings and get involved. Especially in the beginning, the initiator used her own network and contacts.

At the time of the study however, the initiator felt it was time to withdraw from her participation in LIFT and summarised her experiences from the two years the network had existed in a rather disillusioned manner.

The support that we've got has all been personal and that makes me feel quite downhearted in some ways because it's seems that you can never do anything without knowing somebody somewhere. … It's all personal connecting. I don't mind working like that in fact I quite enjoy working like that but it's a bit disheartening sometimes.

As an initiator she had had much influence on LIFT and realised both the strength and weaknesses of the network being dependent on key people.

So people from outside identify LIFT with certain people and if they're not around then there's not that connection.

When asked what she would have done differently in LIFT she mentioned some concrete actions such as organising more heritage guided tours and trails and capitalising on familiarisation trips. The initiator also reflected on her and the other initiator’s role in the network.

Once we discovered there was no funding maybe we should just have dropped it. … Maybe standing back earlier than we did.

The initiators of LIFT were two women who had a small training and guiding business. They came to influence the initial phase of LIFT to a large extent, stressing the core ethos of networking, co-operation and social goals, as well as tourism development and inclusion of the local community, from a bottom-up perspective.

I do believe that unless the community is more involved and understands tourism and understands the benefits of tourism it will not happen either; there will be an obstructive. … What's good for tourists can be very nice for locals as well.

In her role as an initiator she influenced the way the network was set up and how it continued to work. She believed the fact that it was founded by two women had influenced the development of the network:

If we had been a huge company like Forth Ports [owning the majority of the docks], setting this thing up, it would have been a completely different thing. But they wouldn't have done it so nicely. And I use the word nice, I know that I’m
saying that. That sounds terribly twee and feminine and all that, but to bring these people together was the hardest thing ever. To get people to work together is a really hard thing.

[The male chairman] is very keen on structures and constitutions and so on, he's from a political background so he knows a lot about that kind of thing, or believes a lot in that kind of thing.

The masculine and feminine way of working, they're both better if they work together, rather than doing one or the other.

As is shown in the latter quote however, the initiator pointed out that the ideal would be a combination of the two ways of working, i.e. including both informal networking and formal structures.80

The Mediator

The second key person involved in LIFT, I call a ‘mediator’. This woman was at the time of the study a member of LIFT and working full time for the Chamber of Commerce81 in the area. She was also an owner/manager of a renowned restaurant in Leith to which she had returned decades ago, although, she was about to sell her business after more than 20 years of running it. She described Leith in the following way:

It [Leith] has a real community feel, so it's good for business; people know vaguely where it is and it has a lot of character to it, so it's good for restaurants, it's good for artists, it's good for perhaps the graphic artists, architects and things like that. … There also is a real feel of friendliness and it has a great support if you've ever been a Leither, they all want come back here.

I would argue that this person had two main roles that she fulfilled in her community. Firstly, through her position in the Chamber of Commerce, she was continuously convincing businesses to establish themselves in Leith and once they had done so, ‘educating’ them in the history of Leith and its community culture.

'cause we [the Chamber of Commerce] could persuade business to come in, employ one, or two or three or four…

A lot of the businesses are fairly new to Leith, they're people who have come in to Leith. Most of the business, historically the business people in Leith would be Leithers. But today it has attracted a lot of people, because of the costs in Edinburgh city centre, they came to Leith, they could purchase buildings here and
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80 Gender related differences are also discussed on pages 108-109.
81 The equivalent of 'Handelskammaren' in Sweden.
they’ve liked it when they come and the parking’s easier. But they don’t know Leith, they don’t know the background. One of the jobs in the Chamber of Commerce, I feel, is for them to know more about Leith and they’re interested because they turn up.

Secondly, she was also a mediator who acted like a ‘filter’ of information; trying to convey the message about LIFT through to the right people and connecting with people from different parts in the community.

Very often the city people, they find it very difficult to get access to different groups. How can you feed information up and how can you get the information back down? LIFT provides one of the ways of getting a lot of information out to a lot of groups. I think that’s clever.

I thought: ‘This is a new development there, sounds quite interesting, should give them support if that’ll help at all’. And also it flags under a bigger community. You know if you go along to a meeting, you hear what’s there. You can tell more people: ‘They’re trying to do this’. And I’m also, as you know, a restaurant business and interested in the development of tourism. And I thought they needed support, cause anyone trying to develop that [tourism] it’s such a drag factor…anyone who comes along gives support and says: ‘Yes, let’s do it!’; then that’s good. I think it’s…Leith is… I think it’s very interesting. Lot of potential there.

It’s the networking that’s so good, to meet all these people from all sorts of different parts of Leith. It’s an opportunity, you don’t normally, within your own business, you meet all the people in business, you tend to meet the more successful ones, it’s quite an opportunity to meet people of different aspects all together. …And I think the best thing from LIFT so far has been meeting all these different people…and if only we had a membership list we could do more, I think.

To some extent her role is similar to that of the initiator mentioned above, in that they both include the networking aspect in their way of working. However, the mediator will not take the initiative of creating the group but rather provide important support to what the initiator has started.

It probably needs a fanatic and enthusiast to pull around it.

The differences between these roles might be due to different factors, but one of them is no doubt the personalities and interests in the area, which was also acknowledged by the mediator in this case when she talked about the difficulties for the initiator of LIFT to get it established.
The Facilitator

The third key person was a man acting as a ‘facilitator’. He comes from a family of ‘Leithers’ who have had businesses in the area since the 19th century. He had himself run his office furniture and stationary business for most of his life when he sold it some years ago and started a business service centre for small and medium enterprises in Leith. He takes an active part in the community life of Leith and was at the time of the study a very committed member of Leith Civic Trust, the local Rotary club and a key supporter of LIFT.

Similar to the mediator mentioned above, one could argue that this person has several roles in his local community; some of a mediating or networking character, particularly when he connects different groups to each other, which is summed up in the quote below.

We [Leith Civic Trust] can be a focus for different community councils. Basically, they can come together through the Civic Trust. And we link with LIFT and we link with Rotary and we link with other groups.

The role he has played for LIFT has been mainly that of a facilitator. He was one of the first ones the initiator contacted when she was about to establish the network and he made this start possible with a loan of money and by allowing the initial applications for grants for the LIFT website and leaflet to be submitted through the Leith Civic Trust.

I think there are a lot of groups around that have similar aims. You don’t actually achieve anything by amalgamating the groups. Our aims [Leith Civic Trust] and their aims [LIFT] are probably that little bit separate that they should be kept separate.

He has also tried to help LIFT in realising their aims by connecting them to the right people in the Rotary, authorities, churches, the national levels of organisations involved in historic and cultural heritage and so on. He sees his role as having been one of ‘helping’ businesses all his life; whether it has been through his former office supply company, the business service centre or being involved in LIFT. Thus, this facilitator has a very human attitude to his way of working, stressing the importance of individuals in development processes and the need not to take things too seriously.

Important to not leave people behind. … It’s got to be fun.

His role is somewhat different from the initiator in that that he does not start up groups, projects etc, but is similar to the mediator and the initiator as he
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82 Leith Civic Trust is an organisation started in the 1950s but re-launched in 1998, which donates money to be put in use for the benefit of developing Leith and protect its historical and cultural heritage.
uses networking and views people as key to development. As a facilitator however, he is more action-oriented and provides help, both tangible in terms of money and administrative support, and immaterial in terms of advice, ideas and recommendations.

Even though having been a ‘Leither’ all his life, he recognises that LIFT is one of the groups that has been successful due partly to the fact that the two initiators came from ‘outside’ of Leith. They were more or less ‘neutral’ or at least perceived as such and were not part of the conflict in the area and therefore not ‘invading anyone’s territory’.

**Homecomers, incomers and residents**

The insight from the facilitator regarding the origin of people is an example of an important dimension that might help us understand the ‘roles’ of these enterprising people further, i.e. to study them according to their connection to the place. Enterprising people can thus be divided into: ‘homecomers’, ‘incomers’ and ‘residents’. A ‘homecomer’ is a person born and raised in a place, who has moved away from it, often due to studies or work and then returned to the area. An ‘incomer’ is a person who is not born or raised in the area, but later in life moved there. A ‘resident’ is as the word implies, a person who for the vast majority of their life been living and working in the area where he or she was born and raised (e.g. Brulin & Nilson, 1997 and Bull, 1993).83

People in these categories normally differ in their types of experience, competences and contacts. ‘Homecomers’ have many opportunities thanks to their ‘dual status’. One can assume that they have broadened their minds and gained more resources from their time away from the place, and also have the local knowledge from their upbringing in the area. ‘Incomers’ have the advantage of seeing the problems of the region with ‘fresh eyes’ and bringing with them their contacts and knowledge gained elsewhere. When these persons become new residents to the area, they lack local knowledge and might find it difficult to create relationships with people from the area. ‘Residents’ on the other hand usually have a wide local network and extensive local knowledge but risk being ‘blind’ to new ideas and ways of working.84 Studies suggest that enterprising people are more often found among ‘home comers’ and ‘incomers’, as they bring with them vital new ideas, knowledge, experience and contacts (e.g. Karlsson, 2005).

In the case of Leith as discussed in this chapter, the Initiator was an incomer; the Mediator was a homecomer and the Facilitator was a resident. Having a combination of these involved in development processes will most likely benefit the destination; people with different experiences and knowledge will
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have the possibility to complement each other. This might be one explanation of why ‘transient’ places such as harbours, trade and market places are often more developed as destinations. They are more likely to have a culture influenced by a larger influx of people from other places, thus creating openness towards new ideas and an innovative climate.

Above, I have described enterprising people as, among other things, ‘resourceful’. In other words, they are ingenious in using their networks as tools to gain resources to be used in their work of developing their destination and its community. Networks as tools to gain resources in terms of social and cultural capital is discussed below.

**Enterprising tools and resources**

**Networks as tools**

The way networks have been discussed previously, implies that they can be seen as an ‘end product’; that creating networks is the aim of certain groups and projects. However, networks could also be treated as means to an end, i.e. to be used as tools when trying to gain resources and achieve goals such as community and tourism development. The importance of networks, and knowing how to use them in order to fulfil aims of tourism development, has emerged in my studies; perhaps most clearly in the case of LIFT. Other studies have also shown the importance of networks for successful entrepreneurs (e.g. Frisk, 1998 and Johannisson, 1988a, 1988b). In their roles as, for example, mediators and links between people, enterprising people strengthen ‘weak ties’ and put people in contact with one another who might otherwise not have met, and this in turn stimulates creativity and new ideas and actions. In their roles as initiators, enterprising people use their contacts to spur an interest strong enough to start up certain activities. Furthermore, as facilitators, enterprising people will no doubt make use of knowing other people who might be able to help in various ways. Enterprising people also use their contacts, relations, and ‘membership’ of different networks to gain resources such as information, material, support, ideas, knowledge and money (Frisk, 1998). These resources are in turn gathered under the larger umbrella of social and cultural capital, which will be discussed below.

**Social and cultural capital as a resource**

Social and cultural capital is important for the development of a tourist destination. Indeed, I would argue that one of the most important types of resources vital to enterprising people as they strive to develop tourism, is their
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social and cultural capital. Like other forms of capital, this can be seen as a resource, i.e. an asset that could be turned into business opportunities or other actions with the purpose of developing the destination. Social and cultural capital is here defined as social relations, skills and cultural assets such as traditions and heritage. This influences tourism development in that enterprising people use it as a resource, but it is also crucial in stimulating further entrepreneurship (Karlsson, 2005 and Putnam, 1993, 2000). This might not explain entrepreneurship and growth in terms of cause and effect but they have been closely connected, particularly in Scandinavian countries (Putnam, 2000). Social capital also refers to connections between people in terms of social ties forming networks. Theories and studies have shown that communities with plenty of social capital are more productive; solve joint problems and share information more easily; have a higher degree of trust and tolerance and in general are able to ‘advance smoothly’ (e.g. Karlsson, 2005 and Putnam, 2000). A certain type of social and cultural capital is ‘bridging’ (or inclusive) social capital (Putnam, 2000). This capital characterises groups that include people from various social sides of society, as oppose to ‘bonding’ social capital, which unites people of homogeneous backgrounds, beliefs and interests. ‘Bridging’ social and cultural capital has been considered particularly beneficial for entrepreneurial development, in that it is more likely to provide access to assets and information and a broader mind-set (Karlsson, 2005 and Putnam, 2000).

Enterprising people will also benefit from the cultural capital of their place. The three enterprising people presented above were active in Leith. As mentioned previously, this place has a history as a port, where people from various parts of Scotland and other countries have met and where trading has taken place. This multi-cultural atmosphere with thriving businesses is still present and most likely influences the development of the place as a destination. There is for example a Sikh community, who take an active part in the development of Leith and bring tourism business there in terms of visiting friends and relatives from other places in Britain and elsewhere. The places where other enterprising people mentioned in this chapter live and work have a similar past. Jukkasjärvi, Tornedalen and Lycksele (the latter the place where there were plans to base IDC Tourism) are all meeting places where trade has taken place over the centuries.

Negotiating

As part of their social and capital, I would argue that enterprising people use their skills in negotiating. In all their work, these key people ultimately act as ‘negotiators’, to varying degrees. In order to fulfil their roles as initiators,
mediators, facilitators etc, as discussed above, enterprising people need to persuade other people to work together, to volunteer, to compromise, to understand and so on. Key people thus stimulate development processes by building up experiences and skills in negotiating, which includes learning about relations and people in order to use these more efficiently to achieve the aims of the development. This is important, as processes that include organising aim to create a social order, which is an order that arises through negotiations (Dingwall & Strong, 1997). Both the internal negotiations within an organisation and external negotiations are part of a collective process where people try to handle changes and jointly decide how to deal with these. In other words, enterprising people need to encourage participants of networks to overcome internal disagreements in order to continue their work, and ‘lobby’ for the network among other organisations in order to get recognition, funding and other types of support.

The ‘negotiators’ have two important tasks to fulfil here: to describe relevant changes in the ‘social order’ (a so called cognitive task) and to fight for commitment from other people (a political task). This means that there are two aspects of negotiation: a cognitive aspect and a political aspect with two criteria for successful negotiations. From a cognitive point of view, the participants should be able to understand what kind of changes have occurred or been suggested, why and what these might lead to, in order for the negotiation to be successful. From a political point of view, the participants should organise disagreements within and between involved groups (Hosking & Morley, 1991).

Leadership

Furthermore, in order for enterprising people to be successful they also need to show their actions to others; in order to make the destination development visible and inspire others. Other studies have shown that people running businesses often need to see tangible results before joining the process (e.g. Pettersson, 1999). Actions can be made visible in a number of ways; e.g. a list of achievements produced by LIFT; the visionary document and progress reports of IDC Tourism and the latest news from the ICEHOTEL on their website. In this sense, these people are also leaders, showing the way and encouraging others, both direct and indirect, to follow. In other words, they are positive role models, and thus particularly important in encouraging young people to invest their time and money in the tourism industry. Others have also recognised this important part of entrepreneurs and called it ‘enterprising abilities’ or ‘determination’, which can be seen as a vital part of their bridging social and cultural capital (e.g. Karlsson, 2005 and Karlsson & Lönnbring, 2005).

The next sections will discuss attitudes towards tourism development and interaction. This provides a context or culture in which enterprising people

89 ‘Driflighet’ and ‘egensinnighet’ in Swedish.
operate and which I argue is necessary to investigate in order to understand these people better.

Attitudes

All individuals have certain attitudes and values, which affect their thoughts as well as their actions. In order to understand and improve the development of tourism destinations, greater knowledge is needed about the reasons behind actions and decisions (Frisk, 2003). Behind the meaning of attitude is the view that only human beings can hold an attitude and that it is always held towards something or someone. Furthermore, ‘attitudes involve what people think about, feel about, and how they would like to behave toward an attitude object’ (Triandis, 1971:14). The concept attitude thus contains three components:

- A cognitive component; that is the beliefs and ideas we have regarding a certain object, situation or individual.
- An affective component; that is the emotions we have towards the object in question.
- A behavioural component; that is our tendency to act in a certain way in relation to the person or situation in question (Angelöw & Jonsson, 1990:170).

Attitudes play an important part in people’s life. One could say that attitudes have different functions. Firstly, they help us to understand the world and things that happen. They are our tools, which help us to interpret daily events. Secondly, attitudes contribute to satisfy our needs and to achieve our goals. By experience, we know which attitudes reward us and which give us punishment. Thirdly, attitudes defend our self-esteem, strengthen our self-confidence and defend us against criticism. Finally, attitudes are expressions of our values, which tell the world about who we are, what we like and dislike etc (ibid.).

General definitions state that values and opinions are the two ends on a scale and differ in character. Although opinions and attitudes are sometimes used synonymously, attitudes can be said to be somewhere in between, depending on what the attitude concerns. In short, each individual will have a few numbers of values, which tend to be general and not directed towards specific objects. Values are complex and therefore do not change easily and are closely connected to our emotions (Oskamp, 1991).

Obviously people are individuals, but they are also to some extent representatives of different sectors (such as the private, public and voluntary) and are key actors involved in the development of a tourist destination. The sector a person predominantly works in is partly related to his or her attitudes and values, which affect their thoughts as well as their actions (Frisk, 2003). Attitudes towards tourism development in general will be discussed in this
Attitudes towards tourism development

As has been mentioned previously, in the first study that was conducted within my research project, focus groups and complementing telephone interviews were conducted at five destinations in Northern Sweden. At these group discussions and interviews, enterprises, public and voluntary organisations were asked questions about tourism development. The participants were asked to ‘define’ tourism development and to describe tourism development in their area in the past decade, at the time of the study and in the future.

Their discussions regarding tourism development can be analysed in terms of the following four categories: what individuals can do themselves to develop tourism; what one can achieve together with others; what parts of tourism development other actors and agencies manage and other ‘larger’ structures, systems and trends that are seen as affecting tourism development. As will be discussed below, tourism development was mainly discussed in terms of active processes where actions were taken together with others, implying the need for co-operation within tourism development. The elements mentioned in each of the categories are discussed in order of the most mentioned first.

Active individual tourism development

Quite a few ways of developing tourism were discussed in terms of what individual people, businesses and organisations can do themselves. The activities that were most mentioned were product development and improvement, e.g. in terms of increased quality; specialisation and refinement of the existing resources and products. For most enterprises, this was a natural way of ‘defining’ tourism development.

Tourism development is about our product development; first and foremost in terms of what we can offer. (Group discussion in Jukkasjärvi – private enterprises)

Another important part of tourism development, according to these participants, also mentioned development of their own business although perhaps in less technical terms. It included being active and finding the uniqueness in each enterprise and of each destination, and identifying new projects and markets or groups of customers to focus on.

---

90 It is important to point out that the attitudes have not been measured in any statistical sense, but have been explored.
91 See pages 26-36 for a discussion about methodology and the methods used.
Identify which type of travellers that come and which ones we should take care of.
(Group discussion Sundsvall – private enterprises)

A further active development of tourism enterprises mentioned was to find new ways of working, e.g. new activities, for staff and the business, in order to achieve profit.

We are just as trapped in the old system as everyone else, I think. It’s a bit up to us to stand on our own two feet and go on and find new forms [of working].
(Group discussion Tornedalen – private enterprises)

The majority of answers in the third study within my research project, reinforced the pattern of individual responsibility for those involved in tourism related activities to the development of their destination. The core members of the network studied in Leith (LIFT) were sent a questionnaire to fill in regarding their views on tourism development, co-operation and competition in general, and about the network and Leith in particular. One of the open-ended question was: ‘How would you define tourism development in your own words?’ In general, the majority saw tourism development as a wide concept that concerns both the tourist product of each business and the development of the local and regional community.

Active coordinated tourism development

The most mentioned element of an active coordinated tourism development process was co-operation and networking, e.g. across national, regional and local boundaries; in projects; between accommodation establishments and activities providers. A type of collaboration that was seen as particularly important for tourism development was to have joint strategies.

It was however recognised that it is not always easy to co-operate; making everyone pull in the same direction was still seen as difficult. Therefore tourism development would also have to involve a collective change of attitudes towards co-operation and against egoism. The participants discussing this pointed out that this would take time and might not change until generations change.

We are not used to co-operating, we haven’t got that tradition. (Group discussion Sundsvall – private enterprises)

Other activities within tourism development that were seen as important, and discussed in terms of doing with others, were development of new products; the quality of existing products; quality of packages of tourism products; clarification of the products and the profile or the uniqueness of destinations. It

92 For a more detailed presentation of LIFT, see pages 97-102.
was mainly participants representing private enterprises who mentioned these. Participants from public organisations on the other hand spoke of tourism development in terms of what they could do together to facilitate tourism enterprises, e.g. organise seminars, courses and meetings for different groups. They also saw their role as jointly informing politicians and other industries about the importance of tourism and informing the public about tourism in general.

In addition, both public organisation participants and private entrepreneurs mentioned that it was important for Swedish tourism development in general to find appropriate forms and structures of local, regional and national tourism development and to clarify the roles and responsibilities of private, public and voluntary organisations. Both types of participant also mentioned the importance for tourism development to improve service levels and to welcome businesses not traditionally thought of as tourism businesses, such as shops, petrol stations and taxis. This could be achieved by joint courses and seminars.

Quite a few participants also saw tourism development that includes cooperation regarding increased access as important. In particular, this involved 'virtual or 'mental' accessibility, i.e. to place the destinations in Northern Sweden in the frame of potential visitors' minds in order to stimulate them to consider these destinations. Increased and better information, marketing and more flexible systems for bookings were also seen as ways of improving this kind of accessibility. A joint focus on the marketing to right markets, preferably non-domestic with strong financial positions, was something else that was seen as important.

To make sure they [visitors] find what they want. (Group discussion Jukkasjärvi – private enterprises)

Part of the marketing to improve ‘mental’ accessibility was discussed in terms of joint efforts to extend the main tourist season. This was a problem that was discussed somewhat differently at the destinations. The ski resorts Åre and to some extent Kiruna mentioned it in terms of extending the winter season and/or greater investment needed in the summer season. It was however seen as difficult to obtain an overview of who would be interested, and have the resources, to stay open during the summer as well. For Torndalen, Skellefteå and Sundsvall on the other hand, improving the products offered in winter time was seen as a vital part of their tourism development. They referred to Jukkasjärvi, Åre and other winter destinations as examples of what could be achieved. The obstacles to this development were mostly discussed in terms of attitudes and values rather than a lack of resources. Restaurants, activity operators and similar businesses taking turns to stay open during the low season was seen as a possible way of starting this process.
The extended season was thus seen as a necessary step to achieve two of the tangible results of tourism development, i.e. increases in visitor numbers and staff all-year round. It was thought that the latter, in particular, would contribute to increased professionalism in the industry.

Tourism development managed by others

In the focus groups and interviews of the first study, tourism development was also discussed in more general terms, and as being the responsibility of others apart from themselves. The two most mentioned themes were improved infrastructure and physical accessibility, in terms of roads, railway and other means of transport, and long-term rules and regulations. It was mostly the private entrepreneurs who stressed the importance of clear rules and regulation from public authorities, particularly regarding projects, e.g. support to projects for other stages of development than those focusing on new development.

Other parts of tourism development that it was felt other actors should take responsibility for were: financial provisions for private businesses; price development, e.g. flights; visitor surveys and other research; political actions, visions and ideas; signage and information in general and investment in tourism at national level.

Development influenced by structures, systems and trends

Finally, there were other, larger structures, systems and trends that were recognised as influencing the development of tourism, but seen as difficult to manage as an individual business or organisation or even jointly. The main elements mentioned here were:

- Negative attitudes towards tourism in general and in particular towards changing the tourism season and co-operation, both among people involved in the tourism industry but also among other local residents.

- ‘Old rights’, e.g. Sámi people’s rights to certain parts of the countryside at certain times of the year, which affect where some nature based tourism can be undertaken.

- ‘Separate worlds’, i.e. differences in ways of working, attitudes and values between private and public organisations and large and small businesses and so on.

- Too few people involved in tourism, both in terms of too few tourists visiting and too few entrepreneurs, which makes these destinations vulnerable against competition.
• The Northern peripheral geographical location, which affects the weather and accessibility, i.e. the destinations are perceived as cold, wet and dark for large parts of the year and difficult to travel to.

These types of perceptions of tourism development as discussed above, show the way that people connect different levels; i.e. it reflects the complex relationship and connections between local and global levels as well as between larger systems and individual actions. Thus, the section above is an attempt to show that there are two sides to development; on one hand, the development of a society, in which tourism is influenced by complex structures and trends, for example laws, regulations and changed patterns of consumption. On the other hand, every individual to some extent controls their environment by their actions in different situations and the choices they make. Since there are many different sorts of individuals, there are many different types of tourists and different forms of tourism. It is impossible and inefficient for the local or regional community to try to satisfy all these types and forms. Therefore, there is a delicate balance between on the one hand adapting to global chaotic changes and on the other hand planning for development by using and controlling the own community’s assets, knowledge and resources.

**Attitudes towards interaction**

Co-operation could be regarded as a key social relation since it influences people’s interactions. Based on the ideas of Goffman, one might argue that the creating of our self is a result of the interactions between individuals, and this may be seen as a process of co-operation where people help each other to build up their self image (Collins, 1992).

One way attitudes towards interaction and social relations were explored in this research project was through the questionnaire to people involved in LIFT, which included a question regarding co-operation and competition. They were asked: ‘To what extent to you agree with the following statements about co-operation and competition?’ They were asked to indicate the degree of agreement by marking a cross on a line, representing a scale, where they would mark in the middle if they preferred a combination of the paired statements.93 There were 16 statements (see below) with half of them more positive towards co-operation and half of them favouring competition.

---

93 The analyses are primarily based on open ended answers in the survey among the most active participants in LIFT. The questionnaire is found in appendix 7.
Table 4: Paired statements regarding co-operation and competition (Author’s own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired statements</th>
<th>1a) On the whole it is better to co-operate than compete</th>
<th>1b) On the whole it is better to compete than co-operate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a) The reason I co-operate is to give others some access to resources they lack</td>
<td>2b) The reason I co-operate is to get access to resources outside our organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a) Competition causes an unnecessary splinter in my line of work</td>
<td>3b) Competition gives opportunity to improve the quality of our organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a) I prefer co-operating with organisations or persons in similar job areas as mine</td>
<td>4b) I prefer co-operating with organisations or persons from other job areas than mine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a) I see organisations in my area mainly as partners or allied</td>
<td>5b) I see organisations in my area mainly as competitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a) I mainly co-operate on strategic, long term issues</td>
<td>6b) I mainly co-operate with others when it comes to the daily business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a) Competition is about doing the same as someone else but better</td>
<td>7b) I try to compete by creating a uniqueness in our organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a) Theoretically speaking, one could co-operate about everything</td>
<td>8b) There are certain parts of the job one cannot co-operate about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the enterprising people involved in LIFT were in general positive towards co-operation; only one of the respondents marked the ‘competition half’ of the imaginary scale on the first statement. Most of the respondents also stated that the reason that they co-operate with others was to both give and gain resources. There was also a secondary pattern where a smaller group of people who were less inclined to favour collaboration. Similar to the participants in Northern Sweden (see below), competition was however seen by the majority as necessary and even beneficial in terms of giving opportunities to improve the quality of their businesses or organisations.

The attitudes towards whom and what to co-operate about were somewhat more dispersed. Most of the respondents to some extent agreed that they preferred co-operating with organisations or persons in similar job areas as their own. About the same number of respondents agreed that they saw organisations in their area mainly as partners or allied, although this was not the same group of respondents. Those who preferred to co-operate with enterprises and organisations in the same line of work, were more likely to see enterprises and organisations in the area as competitors. Although they were prepared to co-operate about certain things, the collaborating partners were also to some extent competitors as they operate in the same type of work.

Most respondents indicated that they co-operate with others about strategic, long-term issues as well as daily business. A smaller group stated that they mainly co-operate on strategic issues. In terms of the nature of competition, nearly all respondents tried to compete by creating uniqueness in their business or organisation.
Finally most, but not all, respondents agreed to a large degree with the statement that theoretically speaking, one could co-operate about everything. A secondary group, however, tended to agree with the statement that there are certain parts of the job one cannot co-operate about. Surprisingly, it was mostly people from public and voluntary organisations that answered the latter, rather than businesses who one might assume would be more protective of their business ‘secrets’.

Including both co-operation and competition in the notion of interaction, is similar to the pattern that emerged in the discussions in the first study. The people in that study in Northern Sweden also saw both co-operation and competition as necessary for successful tourism development. The preferred way of dealing with the balance between these two was to co-operate with most people on a local level at their own destination, but compete with those geographically further away.

Furthermore, it was felt that it had become more necessary to co-operate within a destination, as over the years competition was perceived to have become fiercer from other destinations. It was also seen as important to be co-ordinated against others, e.g. when informing and lobbying for better transports, prices, tax and so on.

_We have to make joint efforts as the competition is so tough._ (Interview with private entrepreneur in Kiruna)

In this study, co-operation was also seen by many as being easier when there was some sort of ‘crisis’ or harder times, and less so when business was going well.

_There is a lot of co-operation when things are a bit tough, then when everything is a bit easier and money starts to come in, you don’t give a shit about co-operation; one does not need it then. This is what we need to protect and take care of when things are getting better; that we keep together and our co-operation, otherwise it is ruined._ (Group discussion Åre – public organisations)

Unlike the industrial districts, both co-operation and competition at tourist destinations tends in many cases to be controlled in an explicit, formal fashion. Institutionalised agreements via tourist boards and similar organisations replace the tactics and moral equivalencies of the industrial districts. Public authorities play an important part here, since in tourism the organisational environment is often fragmented and complex. It seems crucial to destinations to achieve or manage this relationship between co-operation and competition. Following the lines of Lynch et al (2000), this might be done through the creating and supporting of enterprising people and their networks.
As I have tried to shown in the section above, the concept of interaction and social relations is multi-faceted and involves both co-operation and competition. Co-operation has been put forward as important for development and defined as a joint operation between two or more actors with a purpose irrespective of the interests of each of the participants. When it comes to tourism, we can talk about destination developing co-operation when 'co-operation contributes to making the network, which the destination consists of, function in a better way; i.e. it contributes to an increased integration of actors and their businesses in order to use resources more efficiently' (Elbe, 2002:39).

Shall we then all live as one big happy family where a total consensus exists? No, this would most likely not lead to dynamic development with good value for money and enjoyable experiences for tourists. Competition is thus an important element of destination development too. Different views are not however necessarily an obstacle against development. Other studies have shown that great variety and different ways of thinking might lead to dynamics and creativity, which are crucial to development (Kuhn, 1996 and Törnqvist, 1990). Different views might however be a problem if a dialogue or some sort of 'bridge' that crosses them is absent. There is a lack of knowledge and awareness among decision-makers and others about the significance of tourism as an economical, political and social factor. There is also a lack of ability to lead and control international tourism and even less ability to identify, accept and keep the 'right level' of tourism. Even if it was possible to decide upon the optimal level of tourism in a country, there are too few examples of how one keeps this level without exceeding its limits. Tourism can therefore be seen as one of many industries, since it causes effects, in which its development is 'autonomous' and not easily reversed (Butler, 1994).

Therefore an alternative way of studying destination development, as has been illustrated by the cases discussed above, is one that involves both co-operation and competition or conflicts, in terms of so called 'co-operative competition'. This is one of the most striking paradoxes among the characteristics of industrial districts, i.e. co-operation and competition co-existing. Enterprises compete for and focus on the same market but manage to each acquire a share, which can be profitable for them in one way or another. This is not managed in any formal way, but is 'controlled' by tactical or moral, informal agreements according to the norms of the group. Family ties have been seen to enable this sort of agreed competition. Research into innovation networks, collaboration and user-producer relationships has also noted another important factor, namely spatial proximity, since it enables face-to-face communication to take place (Hjalager, 1999).

94 See also discussions regarding forms of interaction on an organisational level, where interaction for example is divided into exchange, collaboration, conflict and competition (Ahrne, 1994).
Other researchers have recognised the importance of balancing co-operation and competition. Buhalis & Cooper (1998) discussed this dilemma and it has been called ‘co-opetition’ by others (e.g. Baum, 2000; Bengtsson, Hintu & Kock, 2003 and von Friedrichs-Grängsjö, 2003). It has been argued that it should be increased among tourism businesses by, for example, promoting destinations over local rivalries. There is also the possibility of ‘co-opetition’ between similar destinations, for example cold water seaside resorts, in order to enhance the profile of certain types of destination (Baum, 2000). It has also been stated that there is a ‘planned co-existence’ between both local or domestic SMEs and large investment projects (Wanhill, 2000).

Summary and conclusions

Key individuals and the roles they fulfil, such as initiator, mediator and facilitator, are crucial for destination development processes. The key people in destination development are not necessarily what has traditionally been defined as entrepreneurs, but rather so called ‘identipreneurs’ and ‘social entrepreneurs’, or ‘enterprising people’ with the aim to develop tourism businesses as well as the community. They interact with other people through their roles, where initiating, mediating and facilitating roles are seen as particularly important for destination and community development.

To fulfil these roles, enterprising people use networks, which might also be seen as means to an end; i.e. tools that enterprising people often successfully use in order to gain resources. These resources that key people use can be labelled their social and cultural capital and in particular their ‘bridging’ social capital. This includes the cultural capital of the places in question, for example a trading tradition or multi-cultural atmosphere. Negotiating skills and being leaders and role models for others were recognised as being important parts of the personal social capital of enterprising people. Being aware of and managing the possible exclusion of some people is important and unavoidable when acting as a leader and creating networks.

Furthermore, I would argue that the complex context of tourism and community development is better understood if related to individuals involved, in particular the culture in terms of their values and attitudes towards tourism development. The views of tourism development showed a clear connection between local and global levels and structural and individual dimensions.

Attitudes towards co-operation and collaboration among enterprising people were also discussed. The majority of people studied in Leith favoured co-operation, although competition was also seen as vital in order to improve businesses and organisations. A similar pattern emerged in the study of Northern Sweden where both co-operation and competition were seen as necessary for successful tourism development to happen. Overall, the preferred
strategy was to co-operate with people nearby and similar to oneself in order to be able to compete with those located further away. The need for collaboration becomes greater and particularly important in ‘hard times’. In general there were quite a few differences between the people from public and private sectors in Northern Sweden; more so than in Leith.

Many factors, both in terms of facilitating and obstacles, have been discussed at different levels throughout this thesis. However, as has been noted previously, by conducting analyses at different levels one risks dividing the reality so much that it becomes distorted. Therefore, it is also important to place the different dimensions in relation to each other; in other words consider factors and mechanisms that might be found at each level and their implications for development. This is the focus of the concluding chapter.
LEARNING DESTINATIONS

Introduction

This concluding chapter summarises the main aspects that have emerged through my research in terms of a framework called ‘Learning Destinations’ and discusses this framework’s fruitfulness for understanding the complexity of tourism development. This involves social and cultural factors, which place the three analytical levels context, group and individual, in relation to each other. Finally, some reflections are made regarding the feasibility of planning for development involving creativity and innovation, and the need for further research.

The overall question for this thesis was: What are the crucial social and cultural factors that facilitate and prevent local and regional development of tourist destinations? This question first led to the study of places, then of projects and finally focused on people. At the end of this journey, I realise that I am back to where I started, so to speak. It is not as though I have gone round in a circle, rather I have been on a continuous journey, filling a ’sack’ full of ideas and knowledge that now become part of my luggage on future trips. By ending this thesis and research project, this particular sack will be tied up.

Learning Destinations

Throughout this thesis, the complexity of our global contemporary society and the development of tourist destinations have been discussed. In this concluding chapter, I propose a way of dealing with the complexity of tourism development by using a framework I call ‘Learning Destinations’. This includes places that have taken the different dimensions of tourism development into consideration and found ways of connecting them. In other words, it involves learning processes as mechanisms including and acknowledging factors on the three levels of local and regional tourism development: places, projects and people, that have been discussed in this thesis.

The matrix below is an attempt to summarise the main findings of this thesis in terms of the social and cultural factors influencing tourism destination development. Through the table below, I also try to illustrate the thoughts behind Learning Destinations and propose the idea that this figure includes a kind of learning that might benefit the viable long-term development of tourism.
Table 5: *Levels and factors of Learning Destinations* (Author’s own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Rationales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places</td>
<td>Heritage and degree of transition (see 58, 85)</td>
<td>Institutional norms, collective consciousness (see 59-60, 74)</td>
<td>Strategic collaboration (see 84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>Structural or action oriented networks (see 106-109)</td>
<td>Norms, group ethos (see 115-116)</td>
<td>Operational co-operation (see 113-115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Social and cultural capital (see 130-132)</td>
<td>Attitudes and values (see 134-142)</td>
<td>Through roles (see 124-130)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analytical levels of this thesis are found on the horizontal rows in this matrix (i.e. places, projects and people). Cultural and social factors make up the vertical columns, cultural factors in terms of history, and rationales and social factors in terms of interaction and boundaries. The text in each of the ‘boxes’ provides a description of how these factors may manifest themselves at each analytical level, which is discussed further in the coming sections of this chapter.\(^95\) It is important to note that this framework is tentative and needs further elaboration and discussion. Moreover, this is not an exclusive logic and levels and factors are to some extent related to each other and overlapping, indicated by the dotted lines in the matrix above.

I have studied enterprising people from various sectors in society at the individual analytical level (‘people’); networks with mixed development goals at the group level (‘projects’) and tourism destinations and communities at the contextual level (‘places’). At a first glance, these entities seem to belong to their own respective levels, but they are important parts on each of the levels. I have therefore also tried to take into account that networks consist of people, and that destinations consist of both people and networks. Similarly, networks and people are influenced by the communities they are part of, and similarly people are given opportunities and restricted by the networks they are part of.

In other words, destinations that take socio-cultural factors into account, such as the ones in the matrix above, are what I call Learning Destinations. I also include ‘cosmopolitanism’ in this framework, where the global is connected to the local; complexity is managed and even embraced and a certain degree of failure is accepted and expected. One of the ‘emergent properties’ or characteristics of the global complexity is ‘cosmopolitanism’, which includes increased travel; curiosity of new places; willingness to take risks; increased interpretation skills and global standards to make judgements by (Urry,

---

\(^95\) The page numbers in each ‘box’ refer to examples of where the aspects have been discussed in the thesis.
2003:133ff). It also involves the connection between the local and the global, to relate to one’s own local situation, comprehend other local places, while acknowledging a global context (ibid.).

This involves taking advantage of failures and past experiences and including these in the learning process. This type of collective learning is particularly visible through projects, where there are clear reasons to collaborate; common goals; fixed ambitions, deadlines and frameworks for activities; tangible, measurable results and a beginning, middle and an end, in line with the natural life cycle. Projects are often encouraged by funding and support systems, but for them to have a real effect on learning processes, destinations need to aim for different development projects that suit their overall development phase. It is equally important to include short-term projects as well as long-term ongoing networks to ensure continuity in the development process. The type of funding available, and the conditions under which it is granted, affect destination development throughout Europe. The majority of funding is given to new projects, and mostly to those with a tangible, physical outcome, e.g. the building of a new museum. Hence, the current system in Europe favours the type of people needed in starting up new business projects, i.e. entrepreneurs in the traditional sense and not ‘enterprising people’ with a whole spectrum of roles that are useful at various stages of development processes.

**Cultural factors**

*History and heritage*

The specific objective of this thesis relating to the ‘place’ level was to understand crucial aspects of places as destinations and how these develop. One vital part of this has been to try to understand the socio-cultural and touristic dimensions of destinations, exemplified by cases in Northern Sweden and Scotland. I have argued that destinations are places with both a high degree of connection to local community and a high degree of tourism infrastructure and activity. This has implications for the long-term development of tourism based on local history and heritage, which play a role in the movement towards the emphasis of local and regional uniqueness in a global world. A destination’s past in terms of social and business life, and geographic location, e.g. harbour, market place etc, is connected to which stage of tourism development the destination is in and its sense of identity. For example, by using a traditionally strong identity and cultural uniqueness to attract visitors, the visitors’ needs have to be taken into account, thus in some ways adapting the culture to the potential visitors’ expectations. Thus, both residents and visitors have to be included; who sometimes will have the same needs, as for example improved transport to and around Leith, but at other times whose needs will be different. For example, continued development of easy access retail facilities outside
Sundsvall for visitors, detracts from the bustling atmosphere and culture of the city centre, which is likely to be important for local residents.

The specific objective corresponding to the ‘project’ level was to investigate the structure of, and processes within groups and networks important for destination development. In this thesis, two groups in the initial stages of their development have been studied. These groups have dealt with the process of creating networks in different ways, to a large extent influenced by the traditions in their respective cultures. The project that tried to dress the ‘new’ industry of tourism into the formal clothes of the traditional producing sector found that the suit did not fit. The group that tried to join tourism business development with community development through informal networking discovered the difficulties of having dual goals, difficulties such as internal conflicts; lack of focus in their work and being difficult for others to place, thus not fitting into the established system, leading to problems in receiving funding and other resources.

The specific objective connected to the ‘people’ level was to explore the crucial roles, resources and attitudes of key people for destination development. I have argued that certain people are necessary for tourism development; indeed, including these in the study of development of any sort is fruitful. This thesis focuses on so called ‘enterprising people’ who are creative, bold, dynamic, innovative, initiators, resourceful and so on. This includes people from various sectors of society, but with a quite clear connection to and feeling of responsibility for their community. One important resource for these people is their bridging social and cultural capital and connection to the history of a place. A tradition of the community being open to new residents, and a strong multi-trade heritage and character, increases the chance of a culture being open to new ideas. It also gives enterprising people a pool of new people to engage in projects and networks, and opportunities to obtain new perspectives on issues.

Rationales

Communities are complex in that they include determining structures as well as encourage freedom of speech, thoughts, actions etc. In order to achieve development of tourism destinations, it is therefore vital that the development process includes rationales based on voluntarism or free will, combined with knowledge about controlling systems (Urry, 1995). I would argue that this combination forms one of the basic value systems required in order to make learning processes possible and useful for the destination. If the combination of values is institutionalised into norms, I would argue that they could form a collective consciousness beneficial for destination development. One example is the development of Jukkasjärvi, where the concept of the ICEHOTEL was created. The founders showed the strength of free will when they built a hotel of ice, thus breaking institutionalised norms of perceiving snow, ice, darkness
and coldness into business opportunities. However, this innovation could not change some of the determining structures and situations, e.g. the relatively peripheral geographic location of Jukkasjärvi, making it a rather inaccessible destination for the majority of the potential tourist market. This was overcome by organising charter flights from the chosen markets, rather than waiting for the visitors to try to organise trips themselves. Actions like these do, however, challenge institutionalised norms and the collective consciousness of what is perceived as possible and acceptable. It requires a culture of voluntarism, groups of entrepreneurial businesses and a pool of people with a variation of experiences and knowledge.

In my first study, there were quite clear differences in rationales at the group level, between private businesses and other organisations. In the analysis of this initial study, two main norms or group ethos, behind engaging in tourism development emerged, the social and political (seen among mainly public organisations and voluntary groups) and the economical or instrumental (mainly found among businesses) (Gibson et al, 2005:91). It is worth pointing out that these norms are theoretical ideal types and further studies suggested a more complex situation where a system or combination of values influences strategies for tourist destination development. The networks including public, private and voluntary organisations discussed in this thesis might be seen as signs of norms in different sectors being complex and becoming less distinct. Differences in rationales were relatively clear in the studies of Northern Sweden, but emerged in the study of Leith in more complex forms. This was for example, evident in the case of LIFT where private business owner/managers showed social responsibility in trying to develop Leith as a community as well as a tourist destination, and where people in supporting public organisations had a very ‘business-like’ approach. The attempt to join people from different sectors in LIFT was, however, filled with problems, which might be a sign of the impossibility of grouping different norms together. A growing number of public-private partnerships have recently been created for development purposes, and funding such as EU structural funds have encouraged this by demanding matching private funding by the applicants themselves. It has, however, been mostly intra-organisational co-operation, i.e. established private businesses collaborating with public organisations in specific projects, and not so much these actors joined together in one group.

The studies discussed in this thesis also included enterprising people’s attitudes, which show that enterprising people are aware of the complex and multi-faceted nature of tourism. Their attitudes towards tourism development implied awareness of tourism involving both external (such as marketing) and internal (such as improving infrastructure and services) activities. The focus on external or internal elements did, however, depend on the situation of the destination where the enterprising people were active. Key people in Leith for example, stressed the importance of marketing as they felt Leith was fairly unknown despite being part of an established tourist destination like Edinburgh. Kiruna
and Tornedalen, however, discussed improved accessibility as the crucial element in their tourism development. In addition, there were some notions of tourism being developed for the benefit of residents and businesses, as well as visitors. The enterprising people also recognised that responsibility for developing tourism falls on everyone involved in tourism related activities, although there was a certain focus on private businesses as the driving force. These attitudes towards tourism development imply that a large proportion of values are based on free will or voluntarism combined with a degree of determinism. In other words, the enterprising people acknowledge that they have control and responsibility over certain parts of tourism development, either individually or in groups together with others. However, they also recognise that other parts are determined by systems, structures and larger trends in society. This is a sign of connections between local and global spheres as well as between different social dimensions, from individuals to systems.

The enterprising people’s attitudes towards co-operation and competition also show signs of the complexity of tourism development, as well as reflecting the nature of social life. There was a quite clear tendency towards preferring co-operation and acknowledging the importance of this, thus showing the willingness and necessity of belonging to a collective. On the other hand, competition was seen as providing opportunities for improving quality and enhancing uniqueness, in other words satisfying individual needs. There were also ambiguous attitudes towards how and whom to co-operate with. On the one hand, co-operation with others in close proximity and of similar character to one’s own organisation was seen as the easiest option as it involved built up trust, relationships and similar conditions. On the other hand, it also included a risk of losing business on a short-term basis and giving more than gaining. Public organisations with less daily business to risk were also less concerned about this. A clear pattern evolved, where collaboration was seen as very important in crises or difficult times, implying the importance of a collective that is strong when needed.

Social factors

Interaction

Individuals define themselves in terms of their personality and interact with other people through their roles; individuals interact together in groups, and groups interact in terms of businesses, associations and organisations within the region and with other destinations, which in turn are involved in intra-regional interaction. Tourism involves endless examples of these meetings and thus contributes to enhancing cultural and social patterns of interaction.

Rural destinations are facing increased competition from urban areas with the growth in co-called city tourism. The natural co-operation that occurs in rural
areas will need to become more strategic in nature in order to face this competition and for them to continue to develop as destinations. Some examples of such strategic collaboration have been discussed in this thesis, e.g. Swedish-Finnish collaboration in Tornedalen; the creation of a theme destination such as ‘Guldriket’ and the formation of ‘Åre Five Villages’ to create a larger and stronger destination. Besides the growing competition from urban areas, competition occurs on a local or regional scale, e.g. in terms of competition between ski resorts in Sweden and Norway, but also on a global level, such as the competition Europe faces from other continents in terms of attracting tourists. This can be seen as part of the emerging pattern of the importance of local and regional communities in a more complex globalised world. I would argue that the relationship between the global and the local is important to take into account when developing tourism based on socio-cultural aspects. Yet, part of the paradox is that, as the phenomenon involves people from one culture meeting another, tourism also contributes to the understanding of other cultures and as such provides opportunities for increasing the understanding of other people’s lives and the blending of cultures.

Interaction was quite different in the two groups studied. One followed a ‘top-down’ approach or strategy, where the creating of a network started by establishing a more formal organisation of clear regulations, statues, membership criteria and so on. The content and activities of the network were then adapted according to this set framework. The framework was decided on a national and regional level, and the need for such a network driven mostly by public policies for stimulating local development. The opposite strategy or ‘bottom-up’ approach of interaction was adopted by the other group I studied. This began with an informal network of people and groups with common interests and visions. This network had a flexible ‘membership’ and the people involved were the main driving force, and had the aim of achieving recognition in other parts of society. Creating an IDC for tourism did not work in Västerbotten, but the idea seems to have succeeded for the music business in Hultsfred. One plausible reason for this is that they already had an informal network within the local area. The businesses in Leith needed a few years of ‘coming together’; getting to know each other; learning about the area’s potentials and marketing themselves, before an economic association was formed with the specific aim of developing tourism businesses. There was a group in Västerbotten who approached the IDC project management claiming to be ‘ready’ to start up a business development centre, having worked with their ‘internal’ issues for quite some time. Are these natural processes of networks created through interaction from ‘the inside and out’? One could argue that these particular processes of going from informal to formal groups are connected to the development stages of the places. As said above, there are critical issues for each development stage of a place and indeed for tourism destinations. Different types of interaction might therefore be likely to be needed at different stages.
As said, on the individual level people interact through their roles. To fulfil their roles in development processes enterprising people use certain resources in terms of their social and cultural capital. This capital is to a large extent obtained through enterprising people’s networks, which are used as tools. Thus, social networks of enterprising people are vital and an important ingredient of social and cultural capital. In a mediating role, enterprising people link other individuals to each other and thus enhance lateral thinking and implement the strategy of ‘the strength of weak ties’. Initiators use their engagement in networks to create interest, encourage commitment and so on. Facilitators need their networks when trying to lobby, gather information, secure funding or in other ways support activities and projects.

**Boundaries**

Boundaries are the other social factor discussed in this chapter that goes through the three levels of tourism development included in this thesis. Boundaries create a dilemma within tourism as administrative boundaries are not always the same as areas marketed to tourists. The six places presented in this thesis have primarily been studied in their municipal context, even though the political borders of an area rarely coincide with those of the tourist destination. The boundaries defining an area in administrative terms have often been drawn for other reasons than those that define an area in cultural terms. The latter are more commonly used for marketing purposes particularly when there is a need to define the place to the ‘outside world’ and provide it with an identity. Differences in borders and definitions of areas cause problems when undertaking research and also in the practical development of tourism, as statistics are frequently based on political boundaries making it difficult to identify the main tourist destinations within a region.

The stories and discussions in this thesis about the six destinations and their development imply the importance of boundaries. Setting boundaries is vital in tourism destination development in order to strengthen and/or develop local and regional identities, which give each area a unique place in the wider society. In some respects tourism development also provides a reason for places to join forces in order to develop, market or take other actions across borders, which might be different to the administrative or political region and areas. Administrative boundaries set the agenda in terms of the rules and regulations businesses and organisation are obliged to follow, as well as the support and advice people have access to. The tourism development group in Leith, for example, had similar financial problems to other groups in Scotland and Scandinavia, but the place is located in an area not eligible for funding such as the EU structural funds. Administrative and political boundaries can also become an obstacle for tourist organisations and businesses when developing tourist products and wanting to market them. This has happened in Tornedalen where a national border was ‘drawn’ in the middle of the Torne river, thus
artificially dividing a cultural landscape. An example is fishing licenses where, at
the time of the study, only one fishing license was needed for the river on the
Finnish side, compared to about 30 on the Swedish side.

As has been shown in this research and by others, creativity is a vital ingredient
in development. Development is therefore often spurred by an input from ‘the
outside’ and the destinations discussed in this thesis, with traditional transitions
of people, through harbours, trade or market places, were also advanced in their
learning processes. There is thus a paradox involved in creating borders to
strengthen the identity of an area in order to develop tourism based on
uniqueness. As said, this includes a certain exclusion of, or distancing from,
others; thus ‘closing’ the community, which might have a negative effect on the
development process. By ‘closing’ ranks in order to strengthen the identity of a
community, one also risks losing the opportunities to obtain new perspectives.
Hence, communities such as those presented in this thesis cannot afford to be
inflexible in who they involve in development processes.

The stories about the two tourism development projects are also stories about
how these groups have created boundaries between themselves and other
groups and sectors. At the same time, these two groups have to some extent
been trying to break down some of these dividing boundaries by establishing
commercial-community interfaces. As said, transforming informal, open, and
perhaps mixed networks into formal, more focused ones also has implications
for the local community. By only including businesses in various development
projects and groups, one is excluding voluntary associations and public
organisations from being part of more integrated co-operation. As mentioned
in this thesis, co-operation is seen as most natural in homogenous groups and
organisations consisting of people from different sectors face some difficulties.
These processes need to be understood and taken into account when studying
groups.

As said previously, boundaries are also drawn on an individual level. Implied in
the discussion regarding key people, are also boundaries between types of
individuals. By being who they are, enterprising people can achieve remarkable
results but their nature as leaders, visionaries and negotiators can create rifts
and conflicts. Moreover, including people in certain groups indirectly makes
others excluded. These imaginary boundaries make it important for initiators to
be open-minded and flexible, particularly in the beginning of projects and
networks. This happened in both the network cases discussed in this thesis, in
which the initial meetings and discussions were open for anyone who was
interested. This was also the ethos that the network in Leith tried to maintain
during their first years.
Planning for development?

Embedded in the ideas about Learning Destinations, as well as in studies of development in general, are development processes based on past experiences and culture in combination with innovative ideas and visions for the future. For innovation to take place however, it requires creativity. One could argue however, that creativity and innovations cannot be planned and produced on demand. Columbus’ ‘discovery’ of America; the invention of penicillin, the worldwide use of the Internet are but a few examples among the many truly transforming innovations and events throughout human history that have happened more or less by coincidence. In this thesis, I have also argued that we are influenced by global activities in an increasingly complex society; that tourism is a complex phenomenon, an industry, and that tourism experiences are impossible to produce by actors involved in tourism at destinations, as the visitors themselves create them.

Considering this, is there any point in talking about or studying development processes? Should we not surrender to chaos theories and admit that everything is relative and nothing is predictable? Naturally, complexity does include parts that are chaotic and unpredictable. However, what can be planned for is the creation of necessary pre-conditions and the reducing of obstacles, i.e. finding ways of stimulating and encouraging creativity and innovation rather than stifling them. In order for this kind of development to also contribute to learning processes, solutions that cross boundaries; are based on tradition and history; involve interaction and are open to different rationales need to be included. In other words, creativity is encouraged by stimulating environments and processes characterised by lateral communication and interaction across sectors and competences, which in turn requires face-to-face meetings and appropriate places (Törnqvist, 1990).

For tourism development at the contextual level, this could for example involve forming destinations spanning over administrative and political boundaries and based on the local culture, as in the case of the theme destination ‘Guldriket’. Attractions based on a certain theme in the area have created a ‘place within the place’ that is not to be found on any ordinary map. Such horizontal cooperation (Elbe, 2002) will however require more resources for marketing (a new destination has to be marketed and communicated) and extensive convincing of political actors in order to obtain their agreement in order to legitimise the destination. This can lead to a desire from public organisations and other actors to be involved, which can turn into a political ‘fight’ rather than a fruitful development process.

For tourism development at the group level, one solution is to encourage networks with a mix of people from private, public and voluntary sectors to a greater extent. Too little focus on changing perspectives, values, building networks, strengthening culture and identity and other long-term effects,
creates risks of local group polarisation. If the focus is mainly on private businesses, the contributions of voluntary and public organisations are neglected. This might lead to fewer reasons for residents to engage politically or in voluntary associations, which weakens the social capital (Putnam, 2000). Although groups based on one type of rationale or sector are more focused, they risk not realising parts of the community’s social and cultural capital in terms of lateral thinking and the opportunities, creativity and learning arising through so called ‘weak ties’. It has been argued that competition spurs creativity, and development groups therefore need to find ways of managing this and to openly discuss and even expect conflicts and competition. This might be difficult but is particularly important in cultures characterised by values based on the importance of keeping consensus in the collective.

For tourism development at the individual level, solutions need to involve support for existing enterprising people and encouragement for new ones. Relying on a few strong people will however pose a dilemma for destinations. It is unlikely that any significant development will happen without these kinds of people. On the other hand, people with strong minds, views and opinions who are passionate about their work, ideas and visions, sometimes scare other people off; run over them; become disillusioned; ‘burn out’ and so on. Furthermore, there comes a time when the key people no longer are a part of the development process; they might move on; give up; pass away etc. Therefore, destination development and development processes need in general to include support mechanisms and contingency plans for how to manage the unavoidable absence of key people and perhaps an idea of how to encourage new ones. As has been implied in this thesis, young people and persons from ‘outside’ the community have a vital role to play in this respect. New perspectives and the influx of people creates creativity and therefore schemes to encourage and help young entrepreneurs and/or attract ‘incomers’ to establish themselves in the area, will most likely contribute to creativity in the long term.

Future research

In order, however, to be able to know how to stimulate and facilitate development based on learning processes, which include creativity and innovation, one needs to know more about which pre-conditions are essential at various levels and times. All kinds of development processes require pre-conditions, e.g. to complete a thesis one needs an inspiring environment, technical solutions, a solid financial situation, determination, discipline and so on. This will vary during different phases, i.e. when collection of data, reading of books, input from colleagues or just peace and quiet is needed. The combination also differs according to the individual although certain elements are common such as interest and curiosity. In a similar way, more research is needed regarding the various pre-conditions for tourism development, when
these are needed and in which combinations. Findings, from a relatively limited pool of sociological tourism research, have led to the recognition of the importance of tourism development processes, involving social, physical, ecological and economical aspects. However, as discussed in this thesis, compared to other sectors tourism has only recently begun developing as an industry. People and organisations within more mature industries have most likely been through processes that are yet to come for tourism. Therefore, the development of tourism would gain much by learning from the successes and mistakes of other industries. In order to contribute to a long-term beneficial development of tourism, in a way that prevents exploitation and other detrimental effects on communities, greater knowledge is needed about tourism’s economic, physical or environmental development as well as the cultural and socio-spatial dimensions of the development of places, projects and people.

Learning processes are one of the crucial aspects of the socio-cultural dimension, and there is a need for more research regarding creativity and innovation within development in general and tourism in particular, both collective and individual. What happens when different rationales meet? How can these differences lead to creativity and dynamic development? For example, it is important to continue to study the learning processes of key people involved in destination development, who are learning how to use their own social and cultural capital as well as that of the groups they are part of and which exist at the place they want to develop. How do they do this and what are the signs that learning has occurred? What are the influences from enterprising ‘role models’ on young people involved in tourism?

In general, I would argue that further research within tourism from a cultural and socio-spatial perspective can contribute to greater understanding about our contemporary society and some of the most important ‘opposites’. Further research of development processes in tourism will contribute to a greater understanding of socio-cultural concepts such as ‘male and female’ by investigating gender related issues. More light could also be shed on the ‘private and public’ spheres by studying different rationales. Knowledge about socio-spatial concepts such as ‘urban and rural’ would also benefit from further studies of different types of destinations. More research about interaction and development would also contribute to greater understanding of the connection between dimensions such as ‘conflict-consensus’, ‘global and local’ and ‘individual-society’. We use concepts like these to look upon and understand our world. When the meaning of these is not questioned and they are used in a routine manner, we risk perceiving the world in the same fashion. In order to develop, it is necessary not to take reality for granted but to dare to question it. I would argue that there is a need for further studies into how we can move away from perceiving these concepts as ‘either or’ and come to an understanding based on ‘both included’ that better suits our complex society.
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Appendices

1a) Map over geographical location of cases studied – Study I
1b) Map over geographical location of cases studied – Study II
1c) Map over geographical location of cases studied – Study III
2) Focus group discussion guide – study I

Väva in samarbete eller lägga det sist?
Hur mycket tid på varje del?
Vilka frågor ska inriktas sig specifikt på övriga aktörer?
OBS! Koncretisera och exemplifiera!

➢ Turismutvecklingen förr
- situationen för 10 år sedan (hur många var med?)
- förändringar fram till idag (vad det gäller personer/org., fler/färre?, ändrade uppgifter?)

➢ Turismutvecklingen nu
- vilken fas i utv. processen befinner sig området i, som resmål (idé, start, planering, genomförande, utvärdering)
- vad har blivit bättre/sämre? varför? konsekvenser?

➢ Turismutvecklingen i framtiden
- hur ska utvecklingen fortsätta (kvantitet – kvalitet)? varför?
- vad är önskvärt (visioner) resp. realistiskt (planerade åtgärder, uppsatta mål)?
- vilka ska ansvara för genomförandet av det ovan diskuterade? på vilket sätt?
  varför?
- vad hindrar resp. möjliggör det som diskuterats ovan?

➢ Samarbete
- när – i vilka sammanhang?
- var – vid vilken typ av verksamhet?
- hur – mellan vilka personer/org? skillnad på samarbete företag-företag och företag-offentliga org?
- varför – i vilket syfte, vad är fördelarna?

➢ ”Icke-samarbete”/ konflikter
- varför inte – vad är nackdelarna? när uppstår konflikter? mellan vilka?
- vad kan man göra åt det? vem gör/bör göra det?
- hur hantera ”krocken” samarbete – konkurrens?

➢ Funktioner
- vilka gör vad idag? (info, finans, idéer, tillstånd, servar, marknadsför, utbildar, stöd, råd, mm?)
- positivt/negativt med detta?
- bör det förändas i framtiden? varför?
3) Discussion guide additional interviews – study I

Namn:  
Org:  
Info: 

➢ **Turismutveckling allmänt**  
-vad lägger du in i ordet turismutv.? vad tänker du på när du bör ordet?  

➢ **Turismutvecklingen för**  
-Hur länge har du varit med i turismutv i området?  
-Positiva förändringar senaste 10 åren?  
-Negativa förändringar?  

➢ **Turismutvecklingen nu**  
-Var står destinationen idag (vilken utvefas) eller var befinner sig olika delar av destinationen?  
-vilka problem finns? vad göra åt?  

➢ **Turismutvecklingen i framtiden**  
-vad är önskvärt (visioner)?  
-är detta en realism och trovant utveckling?  
-vilka ska ansvara för genomförande av det ovan diskuterade? på vilket sätt? Varför?  
-vilka möjligheter (potentialer) o förutsättningar behövs för turismutv?  

➢ **Samarbete/ samverkan/ samspel/ samordning**  
-vilket av ovanstående begrepp använder du mest? vad lägger du in i det  
-vad samarbetar du med andra kring?  
-vad är det för skillnad på samarbete ftg-ftg och ftg-off org? skillnad på samarbete liten-liten org o stor-liten org?  
-i vilken form sker samarbetet, använder du skriftliga avtal som underlag eller är det mest muntligt?  
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- behöver man träffas personligen eller räcker det med mail, telefon och annat?

-projekt är en vanlig samarbetsform nu för tiden, har du varit med i några projekt, vilka fördelar och nackdelar ser du med projekt?

- vad hindrar samarbete?

- vad krävs för att samarbeta?

  ➢ "Icke-samarbete"/ konflikter
  - Kan man samarbeta om allt?

  - Vad kan man aldrig samarbeta kring? Varför?

  - Hur hanterar man dilemmat med samarbete – konkurrens?

  - När uppstår konflikter? Vilka är de stora konflikterna idag?

  (Omfint finns)

  ➢ Funktioner
  - vilka gör vad idag? (info, finans, idéer, tillstånd, servar, marknadsför, utbildar, stöd, råd, mm?)
  - positivt/negativt med detta?
  - bör det förändras i framtiden? varför?
4) Observation guide – study II

- Vilka personer verkar vara nyckelpersoner = drivande, inflytelserika och utanför projektet?

- Hur ser strukturen i och runt IUC och SLT ut i termer av organisationer?

- Vilken roll/funktion har de olika organisationerna och personerna; dvs deras bidrag till IUC-projektet nu samt det tänkta när/om IUC kommer igång?

- Vilken typ av samarbete och med vilket syfte beskriver SLT, Länsturismen, IUC Trä mfl?

- Vilka föreställningar, förhoppningar och farhågor kan skönjas hos de olika aktörerna?
5) Observation template – study II and III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kontext</th>
<th>Händelse</th>
<th>Tolkning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) Themes and core questions in interviews – study III

- **Background**
  - Name, profession, organisation
  - If any, work related to tourism
  - If any, connection to and knowledge of LIFT

- **Values**
  - General def of tourism development
  - Important factors influencing tourism and its development
  - Main positive effects of tourism (in Scotland/Edinburgh/Leith)
  - General values of co-operation and competition: what is preferable, why, with whom,

- **Network**
  - Description of the network in terms of what is being done and nature (horizontally or vertically integrated?)
  - Agree with LIFT statement, is/should focus
  - Potential of LIFT (strengths, opportunities)
  - Problem of LIFT (weaknesses, threats)
  - Overall impression, general view of LIFT
  - Thoughts of future tourism development in Leith/Edinburgh – esp re funding (TCS)
7) Questionnaire – study III

I) Tourism development

1a) How would you define tourism development in your own words?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________

1b) In your opinion, to what extent are the following factors important to the development of tourism? Please tick one of the boxes in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not very much</th>
<th>To some degree</th>
<th>To a large degree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Attitudes and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Laws and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Competence and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Economy and funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Co-operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Product development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Entrepreneurial spirit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Accessibility and infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Status of tourism industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1c) Which ones of the following positive effects of tourism in Scotland in general, would you rate as the three most important? Please rank the effects below. 1 = most important, 2 = second most important, 3 = third most important.

☐ a) Job opportunities
☐ b) Economic profit
☐ c) Better quality of life for residents
☐ d) Business contacts
☐ e) Commitment to own neighbourhood
☐ f) Product development
☐ g) Preservation of Scottish heritage
☐ h) General development of businesses
☐ i) Increased co-operation
☐ j) Marketing of Scotland
☐ k) Other _________________________________
2a) Do you work in the same part of Edinburgh as you live?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

2b) Which ones of the following positive effects of tourism in Leith, would you rate as the three most important? Please rank the effects below. 1 = most important, 2 = second most important, 3 = third most important

☐ a) Job opportunities  
☐ b) Economic profit  
☐ c) Better quality of life for residents  
☐ d) Business contacts  
☐ e) Commitment to own neighbourhood  
☐ f) Product development  
☐ g) General development of Leith  
☐ h) General development of businesses  
☐ i) Increased co-operation  
☐ j) Marketing of Leith  
☐ k) Other _________________________________

2c) Would you say you are positive towards tourism in general?

☐ Yes  ☐ To some extent  ☐ No  ☐ Do not know

II) Co-operation and competition

3a) To what extent do you agree with the following statements about co-operation and competition? Please indicate your degree of preference with a cross on the scale. See example. Please make a mark in the middle of the scale if you think that a combination is preferable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I like dogs better than cats</th>
<th>I like cats better than dogs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a) On the whole it is better to co-operate than compete</td>
<td>1b) On the whole it is better to compete than co-operate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a) The reason I co-operate is to give others some access to resources they lack</td>
<td>2b) The reason I co-operate is to get access to resources outside our organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a) Competition causes an unnecessary splinter in my line of work</td>
<td>3b) Competition gives opportunity to improve the quality of our organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a) I prefer co-operating with organisations or persons in similar business areas as mine</td>
<td>4b) I prefer co-operating with organisations or persons from other business areas than mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a) I see businesses in my area mainly as partners or allied</td>
<td>5b) I see businesses in my area mainly as competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a) I mainly co-operate about strategic, long term issues</td>
<td>Others when it comes to the daily business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7a) Competition is about doing the same as someone else but better
7b) I try to compete by creating a uniqueness in our organisation
8a) Theoretically speaking, one could co-operate about everything
8b) the business one can not co-operate about

III) LIFT – Leith Initiatives for Tourism

4a) How did you find out about LIFT in the first place?
   - a) Initiators made contact
   - b) Word-of-mouth
   - c) Internet
   - d) Attended meeting
   - e) Other __________

4b) Why did you decide to participate in LIFT meeting and activities?

4c) How long have you been a participant of LIFT? __________ months

4d) In which activities have you been involved?
   - a) Attending meetings
   - b) Waterfront festival
   - c) Fundraising events
   - d) Other events
   - e) The website
   - f) Familiarisation trips
   - g) Other __________

4e) What have been the benefits of participating in LIFT so far? Please rank three benefits below. 1 = most important, 2 = second most important, 3 = third most important.
   - a) Higher turnover
   - b) Increased knowledge for me personally
   - c) Able to employ more people
   - d) More co-operation within Leith
   - e) Increased knowledge for my staff
   - f) More networking between businesses and community
   - g) Marketing
   - h) Have got a human face to people only heard of
   - i) More customers
   - j) Have learnt more about tourism and visitors
   - k) Customers spending more
   - l) Opportunities to meet people I would not meet otherwise
   - m) Other __________
4f) If anything, what has not filled you expectations of LIFT so far? Please rank three of them. 1 = most important, 2 = second most important, 3 = third most important. Also try to elaborate your answer by giving your own example.

- a) Information given
- b) Activities
- c) Structure of the organisation
- d) Funding
- e) Goals, visions and focus
- f) People involved
- g) Meetings
- h) Other

---

4g) Do you feel having participated in LIFT has changed your way of thinking about issues regarding tourism development?

- Yes
- No

If your answer is Yes, in what way?

---

4h) To what extent has the revenue of your business increased due to your participation in LIFT? Please circle the statement you agree with. (NB: This question was not asked members from public and voluntary organisations)

- To a large extent
- To some extent
- Not at all
- Can not estimate

---

5a) The mission statement of LIFT is ‘Leith Initiatives for Tourism is a voluntary, not for profit partnership, working to develop Leith and the adjacent waterfront areas through sustainable initiatives for the benefits of the local community, business and visitors’. In your opinion, is this corresponding to what is being done in LIFT?

- Yes
- No
- To some extent

---

5b) Do you think the focus of LIFT should be upon tourism development?

- Yes
- Yes, but we should also focus on community development
- No
- No, the focus should be upon community development
- Other
5c) Which ones of the following contributions do you think LIFT makes to Leith at the moment? Please rank three of the contributions below. 1 = most important, 2 = second most important, 3 = third most important.

- [ ] a) Causes an increase in business for our organisation
- [ ] b) Makes Leith a nicer area to live in
- [ ] c) Markets Leith as a tourist area
- [ ] d) Gets people engaged in working for the community’s common good
- [ ] e) Makes people involved in tourism in Leith more co-operative towards each other
- [ ] f) Increases job opportunities in Leith
- [ ] g) Makes Leith an interesting complement to the tourist products offered in Edinburgh
- [ ] h) Stimulates general development of Leith
- [ ] i) Stimulates development of the businesses in Leith
- [ ] j) Improves image of Leith
- [ ] k) Other ___________________________

5d) To what extent do the following factors, at present, prevent LIFT to progress? Please tick one box in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not very much</th>
<th>To some degree</th>
<th>To a large degree</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Different perspectives and goals among those involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Unwillingness among businesses to develop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) General attitude in Leith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The structure of LIFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The dual goals of developing tourism and community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Dependency upon decisions taken in Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Lack of active participants in LIFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Future funding of LIFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) The complex nature of tourism as an industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) The presence of traditional port industry in Leith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) The reputation of Leith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6a) What are your expectations of what you are going to gain from LIFT in the future? 
Please tick one of the boxes in each row below. 1 = No expectations, 2 = Some expectations, 3 = High expectations, 4 = Very high expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Personal development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Business development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Community development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) More local business contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Ideas and inspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Increased knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6b) Do you see any threats to LIFT and its future role in developing tourism in Leith?

☐ Yes
If your answer is Yes, what does your concern consist of? ______________

☐ No
If your answer is No, why not? ______________

6c) Would you be willing to make a contribution for three years for a full time post partly funded by the government and supported by a local university? One aim of the post would be to support the aims of LIFT with regards to destination marketing, business marketing and staff and product development. (NB: Members from public or voluntary organisations were asked an alternative question: Would you be willing to make a financial contribution to LIFT?)

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Do not know
☐ Am not authorised to make such decisions
☐ I would be interested in learning more about this

6d) Regardless of what you are doing for LIFT or have done until now, would you be willing to spend some of your time working voluntarily for LIFT in the future?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Do not know

6e) If your answer is Yes, how much time could you possibly put in?

______________ hrs per week
IV) Information about your organisation

7) What kind of organisation do you own or work in? (NB: Alternative categories for members from public or voluntary organisations were: Local public, Regional public, National public, Co-operation, Voluntary organisation)

☐ a) Single owned business
☐ b) Partnership
☐ c) Private Limited Company
☐ d) Public Limited Company
☐ e) Trading company
☐ f) Cooperative
☐ g) Other _________________

8) What is the core business of the organisation? Please, tick one of the boxes below. (NB: Members from public or voluntary organisations were asked: ‘If applicable, in what way is this organisation involved in tourism’ and were given the following categories: Regulating, Funding/financing, Managing attraction or similar, Providing information etc, Supportive in other ways)

☐ a) Accommodation
☐ b) Retailing
☐ c) Transport
☐ d) Marketing
☐ e) IT
☐ f) Restaurant, bar or similar
☐ g) Museum, gallery or similar
☐ h) Tour operator
☐ i) Tourist attraction
☐ j) Other _________________

9a) How much of your time at work relates to tourism?

☐ All my time
☐ More than 50 %
☐ Less than 50 %
☐ None

9b) How many people are employed in the organisation?

☐ 0
☐ 1-4
☐ 5-9
☐ 10-19
☐ 20-49
☐ 50-99
☐ 99 or more

9c) What is the annual turnover of the organisation? (NB: This question was not asked members from public or voluntary organisations)

☐ Less than £25,000
☐ £25,000 – £50,000
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9d) How long has the organisation been in business? ____________ years

➢ If you are the owner of a business, please answer the following questions below.
Otherwise, please proceed to question 10a. (NB: Questions in this section were not asked members from public or voluntary organisations)

9e) What was the reason behind the establishment of this organisation? Please tick one of the boxes below.

- a) Work independently
- b) Realisation of own ideas
- c) Unemployment or risk of
- d) Saw business opportunity
- e) Make money
- f) Other ________________

9f) What are the three most important positive things about running this organisation? Please rank the reasons below. 1 = most important, 2 = second most important, 3 = third most important.

- a) Realise own ideas
- b) Build positive relations
- c) Learn something new
- d) Meaningful job
- e) Shape own future
- f) Motivate and inspire employees
- g) Decide over own work time
- h) Decide over own working day
- i) Control own working situation
- j) Continue family tradition of running a business
- k) Watching others enjoy my goods and services
- l) Make money
- m) Other ______________________

10a) Are there plans to make the organisation grow in terms of number of employees?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

10b) Are there plans to make the organisation grow in terms of increased turnover?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know
10c) Are there plans for some other kind of development of the organisation?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Do not know

If your answer is Yes on 9c, in what way?  

V) Personal information

11a) I am  ☐ Female  ☐ Male

11b) Year of birth  

11c) Place of residence  

Leith  
Central Edinburgh  
Vicinity of Edinburgh  
Other  
Postal code

11d) Number of years lived in present area  

11e) Place of origin

☐ a) Leith  
☐ b) Edinburgh other than Leith  
☐ c) Elsewhere in Scotland  
☐ d) England  
☐ e) Wales  
☐ f) Northern Ireland  
☐ g) Ireland  
☐ h) Other European country  
☐ i) Other non-European country

11f) What kind of education do you have? Please tick the box that represents your highest education.

☐ a) Secondary education  
☐ b) College  
☐ c) University  
☐ d) Other

11g) If applicable, what kind of education and/or experience do you have that is related to tourism?

☐ Working experience in own business. Number of years  
☐ Working experience in other business or organisation. Number of years  

☐ Tourism education. What kind of?

☐ Tourism courses (practical). What kind of?
Learning Destinations
- The complexity of tourism development

Our world is becoming increasingly complex and is rapidly changing. Societies today are also in a transition from traditional production industries to increasing reliance on communication, consumption, services and experience. As one of these emerging ‘new industries’, tourism is part of this movement.

The main aim of this thesis is to understand the complexity of local and regional tourist destination development, by exploring social and cultural factors that influence this development. In order to fulfil this aim, analysis has been conducted at three different levels: places, projects and people. More specifically, by examining places and how they develop as destinations; investigating the structure of and processes within groups and networks important for destination development and by exploring the roles, resources and attitudes of enterprising people who are seen as key for development.

The social and cultural factors connected to tourism development are in turn part of learning processes, which in this thesis are seen as fundamental mechanisms for processes of development. A framework called ‘Learning Destinations’ is introduced that demonstrates how important social and cultural factors manifest themselves at each of the three levels: places, projects and people. History and heritage, and rationales are the main cultural factors discussed, whilst interaction and boundaries are prominent social factors found to influence tourism development. It is suggested that the framework of ‘Learning Destinations’ may serve as a tool for understanding the complexity of local and regional tourism development.