



Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

Faculty of Natural Resources and
Agricultural Sciences

Coordination of tourism in the Swedish National Parks

– A case study of Kosterhavet National Park

Emma Wogel



Department of Urban and Rural Development
Master's Thesis • 30 HEC
Environmental Communication and Management - Master's Programme
Uppsala 2018

Coordination of tourism in the Swedish National Park

- A case study of Kosterhavet National Park

Emma Wogel

Supervisor: Lars Hallgren, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences,
Department of Urban and Rural Development

Examiner: Sofie Joosse, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences,
Department of Urban and Rural Development

Credits: 30 HEC

Level: Second cycle (A2E)

Course title: Independent Project in Environmental Science - Master's thesis

Course code: EX0431

Programme/Education: Environmental Communication and Management – Master's Programme

Place of publication: Uppsala

Year of publication: 2018

Cover picture: A marine national park, Emma Wogel

Copyright: all featured images are used with permission from copyright owner.

Online publication: <http://stud.epsilon.slu.se>

Keywords: National park, Tourism, Collaboration, Coordination, Symbolic interactionism, Trust, Conflict, Local perspective

Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

Faculty of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural Development

Abstract

Stakeholders involved in Swedish nature conservation and the tourism industry have noticed difficulties in the coordination of activities between private tourist actors and public conservation authorities in national parks. This research demonstrates and explains a collaboration problem that occurred in a pilot project in Kosterhavet National Park in 2015. The pilot project intended to create a method for collaboration between the national park management and tourist actors. The research aims to examine the collaboration process of coordinating the organization of tourism and examine the perspectives and experiences of the stakeholders. From the results of this case study it aims to learn how other local collaborations can be successfully carried out. It is a qualitative study based on interviews carried out during fieldwork in the autumn of 2016. The theoretical framework is based on the foundations of Symbolic Interactionism.

The results show that the collaboration problem in the pilot project had many causes. The members in the pilot project had different perspectives, interests, and goals, and the actors found it difficult to communicate about their differences. The communication difficulties caused a coordination problem between the stakeholders. This led to a conflict where the stakeholders lost trust in meaningful interaction.

The communication and collaboration between the national park administration and the local tourist actors are carried out through an informal communication. The actors at the local level are content with the collaboration, but they wish for a formal more structured collaboration in the future. Lessons learned from this case study is the importance of taking time to build relations and trust among the stakeholders, as well as to create a transparent process where the stakeholders get the same information and knowledge about the issue. All the actors do also need to understand the institutional framework of the governing documents that are limiting the conditions in order achieve a successful collaboration.

Keywords: National park, Tourism, Collaboration, Coordination, Symbolic interactionism, Trust, Conflict, Local perspective

Table of contents

1 Introduction	7
1.1 Problem formulation	8
1.2 Aim and Research questions	8
1.3 Background	8
2 Theory	10
2.1 Communication and Interaction	10
2.2 Conflict and Trust	12
2.3 Progress triangle and Collaborative learning	12
2.4 The institutional framework within Governance	13
3 Research design	14
3.1 Collection of empirical data	14
3.2 The analysis of the collected data	15
3.3 Reflections of the research design	16
4 Results and Discussion.....	17
4.1 The collaboration problem of coordinating tourism	17
4.1.1 The relationships within the pilot project.....	19
4.1.2 The process of the pilot project	22
4.1.3 The substance negotiated in the pilot project	23
4.1.4 The complexity of the collaboration problem	26
4.2 The local perspectives and experiences	27
4.2.1 The relationships on a local level	27
4.2.2 The local collaboration process	28
4.2.3 The substance discussed on a local level	30
4.2.4 The complexity of the local collaboration.....	32
4.3 Lessons learned for future collaborations	34
5 Conclusion.....	36
References	38

Table of figures

Figure 1. The definition of the situation, self-configured figure based on Charon (2004).....	11
Figure 2. The social circle where the nodes becomes meeting point for interaction, self-constructed figure. Based on Kadushin (1968).....	12
Figure 3. The progress triangle, Daniels and Walker (2001, p 156).....	13
Figure 4. Stakeholder presentation, Self-constructed.	18
Figure 5. Table of interactions in the social circle, self-constructed	29

Abbreviations

CAB	County Administrative Board
et al.	et alia, scientific abbreviation for and others
KNP	Kosterhavet National Park
NGO	Non-Governmental organizations
SAERG	Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth
SEPA	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency

Translations

Länsstyrelsen
Svenska Ekoturismföreningen
Kosteröarnas Företagarförening

Naturvårdsverket

Tillväxtverket

County Administrative Board
The Swedish Ecotourism Society
Association of Entrepreneurs at the
Koster islands
Swedish Environmental Protection
Agency
Swedish Agency for Economic and
Regional Growth

1 Introduction

Before 2001 Swedish National Parks have in principle been closed for commercial operations. The Swedish government published in the year 2001 a writing "En samlad naturvårdspolitik" ("A comprehensive Nature Conservation policy"). It emphasizes sustainable tourism in protected areas can be an opportunity for regional development (Regeringen, 2001). This meant a complete turnaround in the Swedish Government views on the Swedish nature conservation policy concerning tourism and outdoor recreation in national parks (Fredman, Hörnsten, Friberg & Emmelin, 2007; Stenseke & Hansen, 2014). For the first time a local dialogue and participation was included in national nature conservation management (Hongslo et al., 2016). Nevertheless, how commercial tourism activities should be integrated with nature conservation has shown to be a complicated issue. The new regulations are allowing tourism activities in national parks requiring new forms of collaboration between actors such as national park administrations, interest organizations, tourist companies and local and regional authorities.

There is a division of how the balance of interests in protected areas should be managed. On the one hand, there is an interest in preserving the area, on the other hand, there is an interest in permitting visitors to appreciate the protected areas. (McCool, 2009) The stakeholders give a different meaning to the areas and have different perspectives on how sustainable tourism should be managed. To coordinate sustainable tourism in national parks, it is essential with co-understanding and collaboration between the management of the national park and the stakeholders active in the area (Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). The co-understanding and collaboration between the stakeholders in the communication become challenging though they have conflicting interests and values. These interests need to be negotiated and compromised to resolve the conflict of interest. (McCool, 2009)

The change in national policy regarding tourism in national parks during the last two decades has so far been implemented to a small extent on a local level. In many national parks in Sweden the regulations have in the last decade been changed or soon will be changed to be opened up for commercial tourism activities within the National Parks (Naturvårdsverket, 2014b). The new policies which allow commercial activities within national parks have resulted in stakeholders expressing a need to receive guidelines of how the tourism activities should be handled in national parks.

In 2009 the area of Kosterhavet became a national park. Before the formation of the national park, commercial tourism activities were well established. The regulation of Kosterhavet National Park has included planning for tourism activities. (Naturvårdsverket, 2009a) Therefore, Kosterhavet National Park is an interesting case to study the collaboration process of coordinating multi-stakeholders, on the issue of how to coordinate tourism in national parks. In November 2014, the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) published a notice about a start-up of a pilot project in Kosterhavet National Park. The project aimed to develop and implement a model for collaboration between the management of the National Park and local tourist companies. Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth (SAERG) and SEPA financed the project. The stakeholders in the project group represented authorities on a local, regional and national level, representative of a local association of entrepreneurs and representatives from a member interest association working with ecotourism related issues in Sweden.

This thesis will study the complexity of coordination between stakeholders on different levels of society which are trying to agree on a common management plan for how to work with tourism in National Parks. This study will also discuss the local tourist actor's views on how the collaboration between the tourism actors and the National Park management is handled, as well as the local tourist actor's expectations on how they want the collaboration with the National Park management to be in the future. The study was carried out through field work during the fall of 2016.

1.1 Problem formulation

Coordination of tourism in national parks are involving many stakeholders on different society levels, with diverse interests, perspectives, and experiences. Which can lead to a collaboration problem, as a conflict of interest or a conflict (Daniels & Walker, 2001). In the case of the pilot project in Kosterhavet National Park during 2014-2015 a collaboration problem occurred in the project group. There has been little academic research done in the field regarding public-private partnerships concerning commercial tourism in protected areas. (Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009) No studies have been done in a Swedish context. Therefore, this thesis will study and seek understanding of the causing factors of collaboration problem that occurred in the pilot project. By analyzing narratives from participants of the project group it is possible for the researcher to get an understanding of different perspectives and structures of the issue of tourism in National Parks.

Understanding the issue of coordinating tourism in national parks, it is essential to understand the experiences of local tourism actors. By understanding the causing factors of the issue of coordinating tourism in Kosterhavet National Park this study can provide suggestions for lessons learned that could be applied to similar situations in the future.

1.2 Aim and Research questions

The study aims to examine the collaboration process of coordinating the organization of tourism in Kosterhavet National Park. The thesis also aims to study the perspectives and experiences of the stakeholders and from this case study learn how other local collaborations can be successfully carried out.

- What is the collaboration problem when coordinating tourism in Kosterhavet National Park?
- How is the collaboration of dealing with tourism carried out on a local level?
- What lessons are learned for future collaboration processes in national parks?

1.3 Background

The numbers of tourists visiting national parks are increasing in northern parts of Europe (Fredman, Hörnsten Friberg & Emmelin, 2007), and in the world (Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009; Puhakka & Saarinen, 2013; Stokke & Haukeland, 2017). Nature-based tourism in national parks has become an attraction worldwide (Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). The tourism sector has become a significant user and driving force for change in National Parks all over the globe (Puhakka & Saarinen, 2013; Eagels 2001). Traditionally commercial activities have been absent from national parks (Eagels, 2001). The last decade's recognition of social and economic values in protected areas increased (Swedish Government Writ 2001/02:173; Eagels, 2001). In many countries nature protection policy has been changing direction towards viewing protected areas out of a broader regional context, including seeing tourist development as a tool for regional growth (Stokke & Haukeland, 2017; Saarinen, 2007; Puhakka & Saarinen, 2013). The aim of National Parks has shifted to include both conservation perspectives and regional development. (Eagels, 2001; Puhakka, Sarkki, Cottrell & Siikamäki, 2009; Laven, Wall-Reinius & Fredman, 2015).

The change in policy regarding tourism in protected areas has opened up for conflicts of interests. Managing tourism in protected areas is about handling a balance between preservation of natural values and permitting access for visitors to appreciate the protected nature (McCool, 2009). Conflicts concerning the traditional top-down implementation of conservation policy can be explained through two categories of issues. The first issue is about how should the state or the local community have the decision-making power over

the area. The second issue relates to humans versus conservation (Stokke & Haukeland, 2017). Handling a conflict situation of how to manage protected areas among stakeholders have been suggested being managed through the methods of co-management. Co-management can be explained as a tool for the state to share power and cooperate with both the public and the private sector (Stokke & Haukeland, 2017). It can be identified as similar to a governance system (McCool, 2009).

To arrange sustainable tourism in national parks it is essential with collaboration and co-understanding between the administration of the national park and the stakeholders who are active within the area (Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009). To manage different interests in protected areas, partnerships can be an important tool to include the public interest. By common planning, a consensus and learning process can develop between actors. (McCool, 2009) Partnerships can be divided into two variations: a formal partnership based on a program and a field-level partnership. The field-level partnership does not have to serve a formal program. A partnership should be formed at the local level with public meetings and aim towards participation (Hall, 1999). For a partnership planning process to succeed McCool and Guthrie (2001) have identified four dimensions that are important; learning, relationship building, responsibility (ownership) and interests representation. The foundations for collaborations in a partnership is trust among the actors, distribution of power and access to knowledge (McCool, 2009).

The new demands from the tourism industry have pushed national park managers in Australia to discover new methods of dealing with tourism and to provide suitable tourism experiences. One method they used was about forming collaborations and partnerships with various stakeholders. A partnership is consisting of the relationship among stakeholders sharing the same resources and are trying to achieve similar goals and visions. Experiences from the public and private partnerships in national parks in Australia pointed out that there has been much bureaucracy and complexity in forming the commercial partnerships though navigating the binding legislation. This can be frustrating and prohibit successful development. To have long lasting partnership collaboration between private and public actors mean that actor needs to focus on the process of the collaboration and pay great attention to process-related factors such as trust, open communication, commitment, flexibility and conflict management. (Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009)

2 Theory

This thesis aims to examine the collaboration process of coordinating organized tourism in Kosterhavet National Park and to study the perspectives and experiences of the stakeholders. Thus, from this case study learn how other local collaborations can be successfully carried out. To answer the aim it is required to make theoretical assumptions of how humans communicate and interact. Assumption for how people coordinate with one and other in a conflict situation with multiple stakeholders, at last, understand a multi-stakeholder decision-making process. Therefore, are the theoretical framework based on assumptions of *Symbolic interactionism*. A central theoretical assumption in Symbolic Interactionism are humans acting towards social objects, based on the meaning one has given them. By applying symbolic interactionism, actors' perspectives and experiences can be analyzed through their use of language and symbols in an interview situation. The interviewees tell their narratives, speak about interaction with others and how they perceived others and themselves. With the information given in the interview situation, it is possible for the researcher to interpret the stakeholders action in a given situation. (Charon, 2004; Reynolds, 2006; Meltzer, Petras & Reynolds, 2015)

Understanding the coordination problem in Kosterhavet National Park, Daniels and Walkers (2001) model of the progress triangle will be used as a tool to explain the complexity of the multi-stakeholder conflict. A coordination problem can be seen as a decrease of trust in the interactive situation. The coordination problems involve many stakeholders which act within the framework of policies and regulation on a national, regional and local level. This framework will become the arena of decision making. Explaining the arena of decision making and explain how a decision is being made within the given frame, the term Governance is used.

2.1 Communication and Interaction

The theoretical framework of Symbolic Interactionism emphasizes what is happening in the interaction situation between individuals. People become aware of their own and others perspectives through social interaction. Symbolic Interactionism is a sociological perspective which points out communication as a key process in the constitution of society. A central theoretical assumption in symbolic interactionism is that humans act towards social objects, based on the meaning one has given them. Through interactions with others and by new experiences people can change perspectives, the meaning of social objects and symbols and thereby change ideas. (Charon, 2004; Reynolds, 2006; Meltzer, Petras & Reynolds, 2015)

Symbolic Interactionism is built on assumptions of societies being constructed, reconstructed and maintained by interactions between individuals that are creating norms and structures. Development and change is a social process through interaction. Communication is a constant flow of information happening in the interaction between people, called *the stream of action*. The stream of action is always connected with each other, where one action leads to another. An action of individuals is based on how they define the present situation. By dividing the stream of action into single actions people can make sense of the moment they are in. People define the present moment by their experiences in the past, how they view their situation in the present and what goal and expectations they have of the future. Through interactions with others, people can take the role of the other and thereby gain an understanding of the perspective of others. With new experiences and knowledge people can change their definition of the situation, which may lead to a change in the stream of action.

Through the social interaction situation, the actor's identities are formed. Identities are based on who we think we are, and what others think of us and how we are labeling and attributing identities to others and ourselves. We are recognized for who we are through

acts of others and we recognize others through their acts. Identity shaping is an ongoing process; thus, people have different identities in different situations. Identity matters in the way we and others see ourselves and the way we act and communicate with others in different situations. (Charon, 2004)

A person's reality is based on his ideas of how the world works according to the persons knowledge, memories, experiences from the past and the persons goals in the present, how he relates to his perception of reality and how he perceives the reference group and his significant others in the present situation. How the person define itself and others in the situation, the identity the person give itself and how he wants the future to be and what may be the consequences of his actions. See figure 1.





Figure 1. The definition of the situation, self-configured figure based on Charon (2004).

Symbolic interactionism means actors' perspectives and experiences can be analyzed through their use of language and symbols in an interview situation. The interviewees tell their narratives, speak about interaction with others and how they perceived others and them self. With the information given from the interviewee it is possible for the researcher to interpret one's action in a given situation (Charon, 2004; Reynolds, 2006; Meltzer, Petras & Reynolds, 2015). By analyzing the way interviewees speak about a given situation the researcher can understand the stakeholder's perspectives and meaning.

To understand the formation of the local collaboration at Kosterhavet National Park the concept of a social circle will be used. A social circle is a form of informal communication. It can be defined as a group of people who are connected to each other by social choice. A social circle can be identified either by informants naming a person they have contact with or by two persons which are mentioned together by a third person. (Kadushin, 1968) This study will use the definition of informal communication as a meeting that is unstructured or spontaneous. It can be compared to formal communication which is written information, reports and meetings where the agenda is planned. (Weedman, 1992) Understanding communication as information in a network where information is flowing between the nodes in a system is based on the theory of Cybernetics (Craig & Muller, 2007), which is an assumption that is not compatible with the theoretical framework of Symbolic Interactionism. This study will use the social circle as a platform where the nodes are the



interaction between individuals. By using the analytic tool of a social circle, the researcher can explain how the informal network function among actors and how the actors are connected with each other. The social circle will, therefore, be used as an instrument to explain the dimension of process and relationship in Daniels and Walkers (2001) model of “the progress triangle”.

Figure 2. The social circle where the nodes become meeting points for interaction, self-constructed figure. Based on Kadushin (1968).

2.2 Conflict and Trust

The stakeholders in this case study have different interests, values, expectations in the collaboration situation, and have different experiences from the past. The actor's different definition of the situation may lead to a conflict in the interaction situation. A conflict arises in social interactions between actors, where the actors lose trust in a meaningful interaction (Hallgren & Ljung, 2005). This thesis will use Lewicki (2006, p 94) definition of trust “an individual’s belief in, and willingness to act on the basis of, words, actions, and the decision of others.” Distrust in the communication situation can lead to actors expecting the other actors to act in a destructive way and thereby actively disrupt their interaction situation. People may trust each other in some respects, but not in other. When distrust in communication occurs, an actor may have the belief that they do not share the same level of basic competence in the subject, well as the actors may not have a belief a collaboration toward shared understanding is necessary for the communication. (Allwood, 2014)

Conflicts can escalate through interactions when actors do not have trust in the interaction situation, by continuing the interaction can make the trust decrease further (Glasl, 1999, Hallgren & Ljung, 2005). Distrust between actors makes communication difficult and may stop the communication between the actors (Allwood, 2014). The thesis will also discuss the concept, conflict of interest. A conflict of interest is when two or more actors have interests in the same object. If one act towards one's interest it limits the other one's possibility to act. (Hallgren & Ljung, 2005)

2.3 Progress triangle and Collaborative learning

During the fieldwork, the researcher has noticed, that stakeholders are using the normative concept of collaborative learning. The interviewees have been using expressions such as “dialogue is important” and “we need coordination and collaboration” and are using collaborative method for coordinating issues. The main strategies in collaborative learning is deliberation and dialogue. Collaborative learning is common in complex environmental conflicts with multi-actors are involved (Daniels & Walker, 2001). Collaborative learning is built on the foundations of symbolic interactionism. Actors are learning from each other, which means that they are creating new perspectives, meaning, knowledge and ideas together (Charon, 2004).

To be able to progress or handle a conflict situation it is essential to understand the causing factors of conflict. A conflict situation where many stakeholders are involved is often complicated. To get an understanding of coordination problem in Kosterhavet National Park I will use Daniels and Walkers (2001) model of “the progress triangle,” as a tool to explain the multi-stakeholder conflict. The progress triangle is based on assumptions that a conflict situation is complicated and can be based on three different dimensions; substance, relationship and procedure. The dimensions are interacting and are overlapping. Conflicts may have been initiated in one of the dimension and then escalate to one or both

of the other dimensions. To make progress in a conflict situation it is essential that all three dimensions will be understood and managed. (Daniels & Walker, 2001)




Figure 3. The progress triangle, Daniels and Walker (2001, p 156)

The relationship dimension examines who the stakeholders are, what their role is in the conflict and what the stakeholder's interests, values and world views are. The stakeholders have a history with one and other and if there is trust, respect and legacy between the actors. Additionally, the relationship dimension attempt to explain if the individuals representing the organizations can work together and in what way the stakeholders want to work together. (Daniels & Walker, 2001)

The procedure dimension study if the situation has been handled, which stage the conflict are at and which methods have been used in the situation. This dimension looks in to if the situation is ready to be handled, what the legal constrains are and if the situation has all the recourses needed in case of time, money and staff. Furthermore, how the situation has been handled in the past, do the stakeholders wish for mutual understanding and learning. Lastly who has the decision-making power and looking in to the decision space between the actors. (Daniels & Walker, 2001)

The substance dimension is looking in to the issue of which the stakeholders disagree and negotiate about. It examines if there is an issue that may be symbolic for the stakeholders and what may be the source of disagreement. The substance dimension looks in to if the stakeholders have all the information needed and the actors meaning and interpretation of the issue. Furthermore, what are the possibilities for mutual learning and understanding in the situation. (Daniels & Walker, 2001)

2.4 The institutional framework within Governance

During the analysis of empirical data gathered in this study, the researcher noticed that the theoretical base of governance has been recurrent in the data. As an arena for decision making within an institutional framework of policy documents, regulations and projects. Therefore, I will use the term governance as an analytic tool and explanation model to discuss the procedure dimension in Daniels and Walkers (2001) progress triangle. Thus, to analyze the influencing power at different levels by visualizing a governance system in a figure. A governance system is a way to see how different actors influence a decision in different arenas. When a decision is taken, there may be many actors in different levels of society whom have affected the decision.

Governance is a theory which can be used to explain how a system is governed (Hedlund & Montin, 2009; Arora-Jonsson, 2013; Peters & Pierre, 1998). The theory of governance does not exclude the parallel theory of the traditional government system. The actors without formal decision-making power raises various perspectives on contemporary problems to the formal decision-makers. (Hedlund & Montin, 2009) A governance system is a complex interactive governing theory, where actors enter an institutional collaboration and claim their voice and presence in a context. Actors may have different goals and questions they want to pursue, which can complicate the process of agreeing on consensus in the issue. (Beland Lindahl, 2008)

3 Research design

A qualitative approach has been chosen for this study. The research problem needs a methodology which helps seeking understanding and interpretation of meanings in its context (Silverman, 2014). This study of the interactions between individuals in the collaboration process in Kosterhavet National Park consists of a study of the perspectives and experiences of the stakeholders through the theoretical framework of Symbolic interactionism.

3.1 Collection of empirical data

The primary data has been collected during the field study on the Koster islands and its surroundings, during two occasions in the fall of 2016. The empirical data has been gathered through interviews semi-structured character, with follow up questions for clarification or for more information about unforeseen tracks in the narratives. Semi-structured interviews enable understanding the underlying motives behind the informant's arguments (Silverman, 2015). Which enables me to examine the collaboration process of coordinating tourism and to study perspectives and experiences of the interviewees through the narratives of people who have been present in the collaboration process. According to Symbolic interactionism it is possible to analyze an informant's narratives through their use of language, in how they define *the definition of the situation* in the interactive situation in the past. Therefore, it is possible for the researcher to describe and analyze what happened in situations in which the researcher was not present.

During the field work, in total nine interviews have been held. Five interviews with tourist actors who are having a business within the Kosterhavet National Park, two interviews with the employees of the management of Kosterhavet National Park and two interviews with project group members in the collaboration project. Eight interviews were held face to face and one was a phone interview. The interviews with the tourist actors were carried out by using a question guide (see appendix). The interviews with the other actors were held with an individual question guide that was formed based on the interviewee's roles in the situation. The empirical data have been treated by ethical considerations. The interviewees have participated voluntarily and were informed by the aim of the study. The interviewees will be kept anonymous in the report except for official person that will be named by their working title. The respondents were informed that the setting of Kosterhavets National Park will be announced (Teorell & Svensson, 2007).

The sampling of the informants has been done through stakeholder mapping, where informants relevant for this case study have been identified (Westin et al., 2014). The researcher has identified them through documents from early phases in the collaboration model, local tourist magazines and programs of local tourism activities. After the stakeholder mapping, were the informants chosen based on purposive sampling (Silverman, 2015). The purposive sampling was based on six criteria's, which was; if the informants were active within the National Park, representing a diversity of activates among the businesses, a representation of businesses that have their bases on both the Koster islands and on the mainland, a diversity of organizational forms and finally actors who were active in the area before the formation of Kosterhavet national park in 2009 and actors how stated their business after 2009.

Through the interviews, the researcher has identified the primary stakeholders (Daniel & Walker, 2001) in the project group to be the administration of Kosterhavet National Park, the Swedish Ecotourism Society and Association of Entrepreneurs at the Koster islands. Because of administrations of Kosterhavet National Park has the operating responsibilities towards the County Administrative Board of Västra Götaland, the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, and the Kosterhavet Delegation. The Swedish Ecotourism Society was the initiator and the project owner. Association of Entrepreneurs at the Koster islands had

an important role in the project group since they were representing the interest of local entrepreneurs. Their spokespersons in the project were chairpersons and operations managers. This study will mainly be focusing on the primary stakeholders. This limitation has been done because of the demarcation by time frame within the research.

During the autumn of 2016 SEPA in the starting phase of implementing a partnership agreement for collaboration between national park administrations and tourist actors within the brand Sweden's National Parks. In September 2016 SEPA arranged a 24-hour education meeting about how to "Live, build and care for the brand (Sweden's National Parks)." National Park managers from all national parks in Sweden were invited, the meeting was held at three different locations based on the geographical setting. The meetings were held at Kosterhavet National Park the 27th to 28th of September 2016. The researcher was invited to participate because of the subject of the study. By doing a participatory observation of the meeting, the researcher was able to get an understanding of the SEPAs work with their partnership model (Creswell, 2009).

3.2 The analysis of the collected data

The empirical data has been analyzed through coding into the themes. The interviews were recorded with the permission of the interviewees. The recorded interviews were then fully transcribed, except a fragment of the interviews that was irrelevant for this study. Next was to conduct categories that was used as codes. The selection of the codes was based on the content of the collected empirical data, the aim of the study and the theoretical framework. The interview transcripts have been treated based on categories, with paragraphs that belonged to a category has been divided and then been summarized in the text to get them in context (Creswell, 2009). Because of the theoretical framework is processing a broad spectrum of information in the situation as relationship, process, and substance (Daniels & Walker, 2001), both through the collaboration project and the collaboration on a local level many categories was established. The summarized text has been giving meaning through the theoretical framework. (Creswell, 2009)

The categories have been:

- Opinions and experiences of tourism in national parks
- Plans and wishes for the future
- The local communication
- Conflicts and competition at local level
- Partnership agreement arrange by the SEPA
- Networks and collaboration at local level
- About the pilot project
- The collaboration problem in the project pilot
- The collaboration problem at local level
- To be active in a national park
- About the stakeholders
 - The Swedish Ecotourism Society
 - Kosterhavet National Park Administrations
 - The local tourist actors

3.3 Reflections of the research design

The choice of methodology has an impact on the scientific credibility of a study. The credibility of a study can be discussed through the concepts of reliability and validity. Reliability refers to stability, by analyzing the possibility that the same or another researcher can follow the same method and get the same results at different occasions to ensure the results were not influenced by accidental conditions influenced by the researcher (Silverman, 2014). To ensure the reliability of this research, have the interviews been transcribed, double checked the coded material and followed an interview guide (Creswell, 2009). Validity evaluates the truthfulness of the results of the research. A qualitative research can be validated through triangulation or responded validation. (Silverman, 2014) The data parts of the collected data have been validated throughout triangulation with other research done in the field. (Creswell, 2009) Since there has been little research done on the issue in Sweden, the research which has been used for this purpose has been carried out abroad. There has been limited access of relevant secondary data though the research is studying a pilot project. The study has taken part of similar published secondary data to investigate if the researcher can find similarities and make the answers to the research questions more generalizable. Which can make the conclusion to go further than just the case study (Silverman, 2014). The thesis is aiming to describe a complex problem which has many different angles and perspectives.

The researcher is not able to analyze and describe all the informant' perspectives. The content of the research is not able to receive knowledge about everything in the time frame given by a master thesis. Even though the collected data is analyzed through a theoretical framework it is the researcher as an individual who drawing the conclusion of the study and thereby becomes reflected on the perspectives on the given situation. The sampling of interviewees in the project has been limited due to the time frame of the project. The researcher has therefore chosen to interview the primary stakeholders of the collaboration project. By only interviewing three out of nine project group organizations there is a possibility that the study has not been able to get all the perspectives of the issue in this study.

4 Results and Discussion

Stakeholders involved in Swedish nature conservation and the tourism industry have noticed difficulties in the coordination of activities between private tourist actors and public conservation authorities in national parks. To facilitate their coordination the Swedish Ecotourism Society initiated a pilot project. The pilot project took place in Kosterhavet National Park. The pilot project aimed to develop a method for collaboration between the stakeholders. As the analysis of the case study will show, the attempt to develop a common working method ended in a collaboration problem between the actors in the project group. The actors could not agree on the content of the model and the method never became tested in practice. This study aims to get an understanding of what is causing the collaboration problem that occurred in this case study at Kosterhavet National Park and also discuss lessons learned from this case study. The result and discussion chapter will present and analyze the empirical data divided into three sub-chapters based on the research questions; (4.1) the collaboration problem of coordinating tourism in Kosterhavet National Park, (4.2) the local perspective on the collaboration and (4.3) experience of the collaboration in Kosterhavet National Park and lesson learned from this case study.

4.1 The collaboration problem of coordinating tourism

This chapter will present the case study of the pilot project, about creating a collaboration model between public conservation authorities and the private commercial tourist actors, in Kosterhavet National Park, through their perspectives and experiences. Thereby attempt to get an understanding for the reasons why the pilot project did not succeed and why a collaboration problem occurred.

In 2014 the pilot project was formed which aimed to develop and test a model for collaboration between national park management and local tourist actors in Kosterhavet National Park. (Naturvårdsverket, 2014a; Jiborn, 2015) The project group consisted of many stakeholders on different levels in the society. The SEPA and the SAERG had hopes that the collaboration model would contribute to rural- and regional development and create preconditions for effective management. (Naturvårdsverket, 2014a; Tillväxtverket, 2016).

The project was initiated by The Swedish Ecotourism Society, which is a member interest association working with ecotourism in Sweden. The collaboration model aimed to be developed in collaboration between The Swedish Ecotourism Society, the management of the Kosterhavet National Park and the companies operating in the surrounding of the National Park.

The project group consisted of actors from organizations on local, regional and national level in society. The members of the project group are shortly presented in figure 4. Because of the limited time frame of a master thesis this study will focus on the primary stakeholders. The primary stakeholders in the project group has been identified to be the administration of Kosterhavet National Park, The Swedish Ecotourism Society and the Association of Entrepreneurs at the Koster islands.

Organization	Presentation
The administration of KNP	Kosterhavet National Park is administered by CAB in Västra Götaland through a local administrative office at South Koster Island. The decision making-power concerning the administration of the National Park is delegated to Kosterhavs delegation.
The Swedish Ecotourism Society	National member association working with ecotourism related issues. The Swedish Ecotourism Society is an active opinion maker for tourism to be with active nature conservation. Ecotourism shall be a tool for sustainable development, especially in rural areas and for environmental friendly tourism.
Association of Entrepreneurs at the Koster islands	Association of companies at the Koster Islands. In the case study, they represent the local entrepreneur's interests and perspective.
The Kosterhavs delegation	The national park administrative office is governed by a delegation consisting of representatives from the public and private sector on regional-, municipal- and local level. The aim of Kosterhavs delegation is to create local influence in the park.
West Sweden	Company owned by Region Västra Götaland, working with tourism related issues. Their mission is to develop and promote Western Sweden (Västra Götaland County) as destination.
The SAERG	State authority with mission to promote sustainable business development and regional growth.
The SEPA	State authority working with environmental issues. Mission in relation to national parks are, establish and manage valuable natural areas on behalf of the state in Sweden and work towards maintaining and developing the conditions for outdoor life and coordinating authorities and interact with other actors in the field of outdoor life.
Strömstad municipality	Municipality that Kosterhavet National Park is located in.
Tanum municipality	Municipality that Kosterhavet National Park is located in.

Figure 4. Stakeholder presentation, Self-constructed.

The primary stakeholders had different interest in the collaboration model. The Swedish Ecotourism Society initiated (Naturvårdsverket, 2014a; Tillväxtverket, 2016) the pilot project and had a leading role in the project. The Swedish Ecotourism Society represented seven active members in Kosterhavet National Park in September 2016 (Ekoturistföreningen, 2016). The Swedish Ecotourism Society has interests in ecotourism to blossom in Sweden's National Parks (Jönsson-Rajgård & Östling, 2015). The operation manager stated in an interview the pilot project was a way to attempt to move forward in the issue and favor the ecotourism industry in National Parks. The operation manager for The Swedish Ecotourism Society expressed a fear the protected nature will be seen as a constraining element for ecotourism. The administrations of Kosterhavet National Park had the role of being the local administrator. The management of Kosterhavet National Park are required to follow the directions and regulations from Kosterhavsdelegation, the County Administrative Board of Västra Götaland and the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency. In the project, they had to follow the collaboration model aligned with the regulations and guidelines present in the National Park. The local administrative office at Kosterhavet National Park need to follow the mission of Naturum, which is to bring people's interest, inspire and contribute to increased knowledge about nature conservation and human impact on nature. Naturum is an information and visitor center about the biodiversity in a protected area. The Association of Entrepreneurs at the Koster islands include the local actors working with tourism at the Koster islands. According to the interviews with the tourist entrepreneurs they want to make a living of their business and also develop sustainable tourism in the area.

The pilot project was designed through four project group meetings in Strömstad, including one bigger meeting with local tourist entrepreneurs and by conversations over email and phone. The Swedish Ecotourism Society initiated the project and did the formal invitations for the project group meetings, except the bigger meeting where local actors did the invitation. It took time to get a draft of the model. The nature conservation authorities did not agree on the content of the final draft, but it was approved by The Swedish Ecotourism Society and the Association of Entrepreneurs at the Koster islands. Within the time frame of the pilot project did the actors not agree on all of the content of the collaboration model. (Jiborn & Hermansson, 2015) The interviews in this study showed the same result.

The parties had difficulties agreeing on parts of substance of the collaboration model. The National Park manager expressed “*It was almost like it was no idea to continue, we do not agree...*”. The SAERG who co-financed the project wanted the project group to clarify in the document what they disagreed on. After the discussion with the SAERG the project group had another meeting and send the document on review among the project group members a few rounds. At the time, 16th of October 2015, the final project report was delivered to the SAERG, the project group chose not to publish the draft of collaboration model. The Kosterhavet National Park management responded with a writing clarifying their disagreements. In the final report delivered to SAERG the project group agreed on to wait with publishing the collaboration model and explore the possibilities for a continuous dialog later on in the autumn (Jiborn & Hermansson, 2015). In November 2015, The Swedish Ecotourism Society published a document with the collaboration model on their website called” Tourism in Kosterhavet National Park – a suggestion for a collaboration model between tourism and administration” (Ekoturismföreningen, 2015a).

The actors gave different meaning about the document of a collaboration model which was published on The Swedish Ecotourism Society’s website. The Swedish Ecotourism Society meant all participants in the project agree on the model while the national park manager means the document was in parts only written by The Swedish Ecotourism Society. The pilot project also aimed to implement and test the collaboration model in practice. In April and September 2015 two meetings were planned with tourist entrepreneurs within the pilot project. Both meetings were postponed by the National Park management. The Swedish Ecotourism Society utter in the project’s final report, which was delivered to the SAERG, they did not understand why the national park management postponed the meetings, and formulated the following: “*However, it cannot be ruled out the lack of motivation in the National Park management may have contributed to these canceled meetings*”. (Jiborn, 2015. p 2) After the pilot project was finalized the communication between the actors stopped. The stakeholders began to act individually to achieve their vision of how commercial tourism should be coordinated in national parks.

To understand the coordination problem of coordinating tourism in Kosterhavet National Park, the data will be collected, presented and analyzed the three dimensions of the progress triangle; relationship, process and substance (see figure 3). The chapter ends with a final discussion of the connections of the three dimensions in the progress triangle. The data will be presented and analyzed though the progress triangle to get an understanding of the complexity of the coordination problem. The collaboration problem can occur in one or more dimensions of the progress triangle and escalate to the others. (Daniels and Walker, 2001)

4.1.1 *The relationships within the pilot project*

In order to understand why a collaboration problem occurred in a collaboration process it is according to Daniels and Walker (2001) essential to analyze the relationship between the stakeholders. The relationship includes attributes of trust, respect and legitimacy between the actors. The greater relationship among the stakeholders, the better collaboration potential is in their interactions. (Daniels and Walker, 2001) Trust among the actors are

reflected on their belief in the willingness to act on the basis of actions of others (Lewicki, 2006). How the actors' relationship has been in the past and how it is in the present affects how they give meaning to each other in the present situation, and therefore affects how they act towards each other in an interaction situation (Charon, 2004; Reynolds, 2006; Meltzer, Petras & Reynolds, 2015). The actors' trust in each other can be reflected in previous common history and how they interpret their own and other roles, values and interests in the situation, as well as their belief that the other actors will act in a constructive way. The relationship among the stakeholders can also be analyzed by their willingness to collaborate and learn from others. (Daniels and Walker, 2001) Distrust between the stakeholders may lead the actor to have the belief they do not share the same level of basic competence and understanding in the subject. Trust in the communication is necessary in a collaboration situation. (Allwood, 2014) Distrust in the communication situation can lead to some actors expect the other actors to act in a destructive way and thereby actively disrupt their interaction situation and the conflict can escalate (Allwood, 2014; Glasl, 1999; Hallgren & Ljung, 2005).

Relations in the past

The stakeholders in pilot project group have on a national level in the past been working different ways for sustainable tourism in protected areas. The SEPA is responsible for the regulations in National Parks in Sweden (Naturvårdsverket, 2015c). Until the beginning of the 2000th there was strict restrictions of allowing commercial tourism in National Parks (Regeringen, 2001; Fredman, Hörnsten Friberg & Emmelin, 2007; Stenseke & Hansen, 2014). Thereafter the SEPA and the Swedish government have been working for changing regulations in Swedish National Park. The Swedish government wrote in 2012 an official document about Swedish goals for outdoor recreation policy, where they utter outdoor recreation and nature tourism can be a good opportunity for economic growth and employment opportunities in rural areas (Regeringen, 2012). The SEPA and the government has identified National Parks as an arena for regional and local development (Naturvårdsverket, 2015a). The SEPA states that one of their core tasks is to make the Sweden's National Parks the finest nature available to visitors in Sweden. The SEPA believes that nature tourism develops an interest in environmental and nature conservation (Naturvårdsverket, 2014b). The SEPA have in the past handled tourism in National Parks by developing guidelines for how tourism and organized outdoor recreation in protected areas should be managed.

The Swedish Ecotourism Society's aim is to promote ecotourism in Sweden (Ekoturistföreningen, 2017) The Swedish Ecotourism Society expressed in an interview conducted by a researcher the Society has worked for promoting sustainable tourism in protected areas the last decades, but they say they have perceived the SEPA have been making resistance. The Swedish Ecotourism Society has the opinion of they have being the stakeholder who has been pushing about the issue of commercial tourism in national parks.

In 2010 The Swedish Ecotourism Society did a feasibility study to map out areas where eco-tourism in a decisive way strengthens nature conservation, financed by the Swedish Board of Agriculture. The Swedish Ecotourism Society (2010) feasibility study highlighted opportunities and constraining factors for tourism in protects areas. The results of the feasibility study were presented to the board of SEPA. The SEPA wrote an official answer to The Swedish Ecotourism Society, where they emphasized that the SEPA is positive to collaborate with the Swedish Ecotourism Society (Naturvårdsverket, 2010). Even though the interviewee from the Swedish Ecotourism Society described they do not have good relations with the staff at the SEPA. The Swedish Ecotourism Society expressed that they did not understand why. In interview with the researcher expresses the operation manager for the Swedish Ecotourism Society that employees of The SEPA has uttered tourism in national parks is not an issue for SEPA. The Swedish Ecotourism Society perceive this is

strange because SEPA has the task of coordinating sustainable tourism in protected areas given from the Swedish government.

The Swedish Ecotourism Society is asking the question of which actors own the issue of coordination of tourism in national parks in Sweden with focus on new job opportunities and regional development. They are questioning if the private sectors have the responsibility themselves. Swedish Ecotourism Society is attempting in different ways to affect the policy and regulations which are restricting ecotourism in protected areas. They are trying to get new collaboration partners to make their voice heard to decision makers, to be able to influence the possibilities for more job opportunities in protected areas. The Swedish Ecotourism Society expressed hopes for better relations with the SEPA in the future.

Since the formation of the Kosterhavet National Park the management of the national park has been arranging and participating in projects with commercial tourism actors on the local level (Forsberg, 2014) and creating sustainable tourism destination (Tyskling et al., 2008). Before the pilot project started The Swedish Ecotourism Society and the management of Kosterhavet National Park have been collaborating with each other.

Relations in the pilot project group

The relationship and trust between the actors in the project group affected their ability of working together. The actor's relationship to each other is presented through the interviewees narrative about the others and themselves in the collaboration situation. The stakeholders entered the pilot project with the overall aim of the project: to develop and test a collaboration model for tourism in Kosterhavet National Park (Tillväxtverket, 2014; Naturvårdsverket, 2014a). The stakeholders enter the project with their perspective of how the collaboration would be carried out and based on their own organizations mission, guidelines and policy document. These things they needed to take in to consideration when defining their goal in the situation. Their previous experience, knowledge and perspective are of importance. The individual's roles in the project were based on the organizations they represent. Even though the stakeholders in the pilot project represent their organizations, they are individuals in the interaction situation. In the pilot project the project group had difficulties in having a dialogue about their different perspectives. Which affected the actors' relationship in a negative way.

During the pilot project the national park manager perceived the Swedish Ecotourism Society tried to get a new forum for proceeding their key issues. The issue about how tourism in national parks should be managed. The national park manager expressed that he knew before the pilot project started the Swedish Ecotourism Society had such key issues. The national park manager expressed he might be hesitant before participating in the pilot project, if he had the knowledge of the agenda of Swedish Ecotourism Society. In interviews with the pilot project group members were all the interviewees talking about who they wanted to work through collaboration and dialog in the collaboration model. From their narratives in the empirical data the researcher has seen similarities with of collaborative learning (Daniels & Walker, 2001). The actors wanted to collaborate in the project but they did not succeed. The stakeholders said they wanted to collaborate, but they felt like the others did not want to collaborate. The actors did not have belief in the will of others to act on the basis of action and direction of others in the collaboration situation (Lewicki, 2006, p 94).

The collaboration problem that occurred in the project have been identified to be a conflict by the definition of Hallgren & Ljung (2005). That means a conflict occur when actors lose trust in a meaningful communication. The actors encountered difficulties in reaching agreement on the substance in the content of collaboration model. The actors had different views about the results in the document of the collaboration model. A cause of disagreement was whether the collaboration model was written in consensus between the stakeholders. The National Park manager felt representatives from The Swedish Ecotourism

Society had their own clear view about what they wanted to be included in the model. The manager felt like The Swedish Ecotourism Society integrated their views in the collaboration model, thereby was not willing to negotiate. The actors did not understand the perspective of the others, and could not take the role of the others in the definition of the situation. The stakeholders acted according to how they defined the situation according to their interests. When the actors had different definitions of the situations, it resulted in expectations in how the others would act in the interaction situation.

4.1.2 The process of the pilot project

The process of how the decisions were made affected the actor's ability to collaborate in the pilot project. The procedure dimension will present and analyze the pilot projects working process, how the conflict has been managed, what are the legal constancies and decision-making space in the project. (Daniels & Walker, 2001) The stakeholders' had different perspectives of how the collaboration of tourism should be carried out in Kosterhavet National Park. In the process of the pilot project a collaboration problem occurred between the actors. The procedure dimension demonstrates the project group members ability to act. And how the decision space within the project affect the collaboration problem. Without meaningful interactions and a lack of desire common understanding it became difficult for the stakeholders with different interests and perspectives to learn of each other (Charon, 2004).

The complex decision-making process

To illustrate the complex decision-making process in pilot project, the situation will be explained through a governance model. The governance model demonstrates many stakeholders on different levels who are affecting the decision-making process. The aim of the governance model is to illustrate at which level different decisions have been made and who is influencing the decisions. The governance model with the project consisted of actors from organizations on different levels in society, with different regulations, guidelines and policy documents. Coordination of tourism is occurring both horizontally and vertically in a governance system (Hall, 1999). Planning processes in protected areas can be explained as a governance system (McCool, 2009).

The stakeholders have different formal decision-making power. Within the governance model the project group members can with less official decision-making power influence their opinions on the issue to other stakeholders through share meaning and perspectives. There by effect the policy of tourism in National Parks through influencing official decision makers. (Holmgren, Sandström & Zachrisson, 2017; Hedlund & Montin, 2009) Through interaction can the stakeholders change their definition of the situation and the steam of action can change direction (Charon, 2004). The Swedish Ecotourism Society and The Association of Entrepreneurs at the Koster islands do not have formal decision-making power regarding how to coordinate tourism in National Park, they to therefore need to influence their perspectives to formal decision makers.

The governance system became an institutional framework within the pilot project. The institutional framework consisted of the actors governing documents, policy's and regulations. The framework became an arena for decision-making with limitations which limited the project groups decision space. The actors governing documents, interests and goals was taken in to an account in the social interactions, before a common decision could be made. The National Park manager said in an interview that they need to follow the guidelines and governing document from the SEPA and cannot conduct a model that is similar to the guidelines because of participants in a project group wanted to do it in other ways. The chairperson of the Association of Entrepreneurs at the Koster islands mean they preceded that there were to many actors in the project group, though the actors in the project had their own perspectives and project that they were attempting to follow through, this complicated the collaboration situation.

At the same time as the work with the pilot project, SEPA work to develop a new method for partnership agreements, within the brand 'Sweden's National Parks'. The partnership agreement included a model for collaboration where tourism companies can enter partnership with a National Park. The companies are for instance able to use Sweden's National Parks logotype in their marketing (Naturvårdsverket, 2015a). The National Park manager said that after the pilot project did the SEPA launch a model for partnership agreements within the brand Sweden's National Parks. According to the National Park manager was some of the content treated in the pilot project recurrent in the implementation of partnership agreements. The National Park manager do not think the project was a waste of time. A start up seminar about implementation of the partnership agreements was held for national park managers during September 2016.

The management of the conflict

The conflict that occurred in the pilot project was never managed. The stakeholders acted differently according to their view of the final version of the collaboration model. A representative from The Swedish Ecotourism Society meant that all project group members agreed on the final document when it was published and sent to the SEPA and SAERG. The Swedish Ecotourism Society pointed out that there are some texts in the model that needs to be developed further on. The National Park manager meant that the document was only signed by The Swedish Ecotourism Society, and just parts of the collaboration model was supplemented from the Swedish Ecotourism Society. The National Park manager said that he had heard from others that The Swedish Ecotourism Society have been saying that the pilot project had resulted in a collaboration model, which he does not agree on.

The conflict has not been handled. Since the pilot project ended, according to the interviewees, there has almost been none communication between the stakeholders. According to the informants there has been no feedback from the SEPA. The collaboration model has not been implemented and tested in National Parks. The parties were at the time of the study in 2016 working on their own to coordinate tourism in National Parks. After the pilot project ended, the Swedish Ecotourism Society has continued to find new partners to work with in the issue. The administration of Kosterhavet National Park has been focusing on the SEPAs work with the brand Sweden's National Parks and started preparing for implementation of a partnership agreements within the brand Sweden's National Parks. (Observation, 27-28/9 2016) The actors have given a different meaning to the pilot project. The actors interpreted the situation differently and defined the outcome of the situation in different ways, although they were in the same situations.

4.1.3 The substance negotiated in the pilot project

This sub-chapter is focusing on the substance of the collaboration problem that occurred in the pilot project. The substance is symbolic for the stakeholders which are based on their different perspectives, interests, and opinions (Daniels and Walker, 2001). By describing what the actors disagree and negotiate in the collaboration situation the conflict of interest in the pilot project can be visualized and analyzed.

All the interviewees in the project group emphasized tourism in a National Park can be a great opportunity for a regional development, including new working opportunities for local inhabitants. However, the stakeholders had their own experiences, perspective and interests in the issue, as well as the governing documents from their organizations. This resulted in the stakeholders had different ideas and approaches of how they thought the pilot project should reach the projects goals. The overall aim of the pilot project was to create a collaboration model between the national park management and local tourist entrepreneurs.

The issues identified to be discussed in the pilot project are presented in form of three issues. All informants spoke about that these issues were discussed during the working process of the project. But all the actors did not agree whether all these topics were a

problem. The three issues identified to be discussed among the interviewees in the projects group were; the national parks external activities, roles and responsibility and the third issue about the managements role in promoting of tourism companies.

The National Park's external activities

The first issue identified during the field study was the disagreement about the National Park and Naturum's external activities. The purpose is to inspire visitor for outdoor recreation in the surrounding nature. Naturum is a concept and a brand of the SEPA. The guideline of Naturum declares that a Naturum operation shall provide nature interpretation, which can be in form of guided tours, the activities shall be held both indoors and outdoors (Naturvårdsverket, 2015b) The manager of the National Park expressed if the management should act in another way they need new guidelines and regulations of the National Park and for Naturum.

Naturum Kosterhavet offered during the high season 2016 (28/6-27/8) activities for visitors such as guided tours, activities to explore the marine life, shoreline excursions and snorkeling lesson for beginners. During the high season these activities were offered at 47 different occasions. All activities except the snorkeling lessons for beginners cost 80 Swedish Krona for people older the age of 15. (Länsstyrelsen Västragötaland, 2016)

The Swedish Ecotourism Society expressed in an interview with the researcher that they perceive Naturum to arranged guided tours which was targeting the general visitors, to a small cost. The Swedish Ecotourism Society did not think that the management of the national park should offer cheap experiences to visitors who could afford to pay for a guided tour offered by local guides. By the management offering experiences to a low cost in national park doing so argues the Swedish Ecotourism Society that national taxes should not be used to counteract regional development. They think guided tours arranged by the administration should be directed to groups with less money, such as disabled, older people, schools and new arrived immigrants. The Swedish Ecotourism Society believes local guides can't compete with the low price offered by Naturum, and still be able to make a living. The Swedish Ecotourism Society think this situation is unfortunate, and they mean that there is a challenge in creating new job opportunities in National Parks.

The National Park manager perceived that the Swedish Ecotourism Society did not want the National Park management to arrange activities for visitors outside Naturum. Swedish Ecotourism Society precede it was competing with local companies. The National Park manager means that they need to follow the mission from the SEPA to manage the National Park and the operations of Naturum according to their regulations and guidelines for Naturum. The opinion of the manager of the national park is thinks the National Park administrations and the local tourist companies complement each other. The manager explains further that if an actor wants to arrange an activity the management and the actor can have a dialog about the tourism actor's plans so they don't compete with each other.

The division of roles and responsibilities

The actors in the pilot project had different perspectives of how the roles and tasks should be divided between the public and the private sector. The role between the public and the private actor can be a symbolic issue for the actors. In the case Kosterhavet National Park, tourist activities and recreation have been part of the identity of the place before the National Park was formed. The SEPA states that one of their core tasks is to make the Sweden's National Parks the finest nature available to visitors in Sweden. The SEPA believes that nature tourism develops an interest in environmental and nature conservation (Naturvårdsverket, 2014b). Although the Swedish authorities has a positive attitude towards organized tourism in protected areas, members of pilot project group did not agree on how the roles should be divided between the private and the public sector in national parks. The National Park manager believes there is a division of roles though they are managers and

tourist actors in the National Park. He explains that their operations encounter each other's in the National Park administrations work with external activates.

The role of the administration office and Naturum is governed by guidelines and regulations. The Swedish Ecotourism Society want the tourist entrepreneurs to be more integrated and involved in the management of the national park. The project group members did not agree on the role of tourism actor should have in National Parks. The Swedish Ecotourism Society wished for the tourist companies to have a bigger role and responsibility in the management of national parks. For example, through informing visitors about the National Park regulations and help out with supervision of the national park and be the primary actor for arranging guided tours. The chairwoman of Association of Entrepreneurs at the Koster islands believed the Swedish state has difficulties with private and public working together. The chairperson of the Association of Entrepreneurs at the Koster islands believes the state is considering private businesses as ugly. The National Park manager does not agree on that view, he means that there has been a change in politics, where the regulations in Swedish National Parks either have or should be changed to allow commercial activities. Further on he explains that in Kosterhavet National Park has it never been conceded ugly to make money delivering good experiences in nature.

The Association of Entrepreneurs at the Koster and the Swedish Ecotourism Society have the opinion that the national park management and the state can do more when it comes to promote tourism in the national park. The Association of Entrepreneurs at the Koster mean that the works at the management gets paid for all there working hours, while local tourist actors needs to work had for their income. Therefore, precede the local tourist actors that the management can do more work to promote all the tourist actors equally. The Swedish Ecotourism Society does not feel that the state is taking responsibility for the question new working opportunities in tourism in national parks.

The managements role in promoting of tourism companies

The third problem is about the actors' disagreement on the role of the National Parks website in marketing local tourist actors. The Swedish Ecotourism Society expressed that they wanted the tourist actors and their activities to be exposed on the National Parks official website. The Swedish Ecotourism Society believes that many of the national parks visitors start to plan their visit to the area on internet and on the national park official website. Therefor the Swedish Ecotourism Society' emphasizes on the importance of easy accessible tourist information on the website. Kosterhavet National Park has developed a local solution for information about tourist actors on their website, by having a link to a tourist information website were all the information is available. The Swedish Ecotourism Society is not content with the local solution. They mean that the visitors need to push on a link on the National Parks website which leads them to a tourist information website with the information. By clicking on the link do the Swedish Ecotourism Society mean that the visitors need to start their search for information all over again. They perceive this solution to be it difficult for both the Swedish and international visitors to be able to find information about what to do in the park, where to stay and where to eat and so on. The chairperson of the Association of Entrepreneurs at the Koster islands experienced that National Park management mainly positive to work with the collaborative model. But not when it came to the question of tourist actor's appearances on websites, then they were told it was not possible.

The National Park management are content with the local solution and thinks it works well. The manager said that it is not possible for the National park management and the SEPA to decide which companies that should be allowed on the websites. National Park manager mean that the administration office is part of a governmental authority and there for cannot raising individual companies in their marketing, their role is to be neutral and not favor on companies before another. The National Park management perceives the local actors are content with this solution. The National Park manager experienced that the

Swedish Ecotourism Society pushed for the issue of local tourist actors should be on the national parks website. The national park manager perceived it to be a key issue in the project for The Swedish Ecotourism Society.

4.1.4 The complexity of the collaboration problem

The three dimensions of the progress triangle are interlinked. The issues in the dimensions affect the dynamic of the other dimensions of the collaboration problem. (Daniels & Walker, 2001). The analysis of the progress triangle shows that there is a conflict among the actors in the collaboration group in form of a collaboration problem. The actors did not have belief in the willingness of others to act based on action and direction of others in the collaboration situation (Lewicki, 2006). The actors did not understand each other and they lost trust in meaningful interaction, and a conflict situation occurred (Hallgren & Ljung, 2005). The analysis of the case study shows the collaboration problem is consisting in all of three elements of the progress triangle. The issues in each one of the element needs to be handled to improve the situation in the project group.

The stakeholders in the project had different interests, values and expectation of the project and the collaboration situation, based on the aim of their organization and their governing documents. As well as their experiences from the past. The actor entered the project with a common aim to create a collaboration model, but had different goals and visions for how the models should be formed and the content of the collaboration model. The actors had a clear opinion of what they wanted to be included or not includes based on their goals in the situation and goals and expectation on the future.

The decision space become limited within the institutional framework of governing that became constructed within the project group. Since there are many actors on different levels in society who are involves in the question concerning tourism in protected areas are there many guidelines and governing document that need to be taken in to consideration when creating a collaboration model. The actors have different formal decision-making power, by the actors taking the perspective of others may everyone be able to influence the decision. Governance in a planning partnership be an opportunity for common learning (McCool, 2009), but the actors did not trust in that a meaningful interaction would occur, and it became a conflict situation.

The project working process limed the learning process since the project was set within a limed time frame. With more time, money and recourses in form of a facilitator could may be a different outcome of the process. More time could be used for interpersonal meetings of with focus on collaborative learning with trust building and work towards a common meaning for the situation. (Daniels & Walker, 2001). Another factor that may contributed to that the pilot project has not been implemented can be that the SEPA at the same time was developing a partnership agreement within the brand the Sweden's National Park. There were many actors involved with different interest. Many of the actors had their own projects concerning tourism or protected areas at the same time as the pilot project.

McCool and Guthrie (2001) identified four dimensions which are important in planning a partnership; learning, relationship building, responsibility (ownership) and interests representation. The actors were not ready for learning process since they did not have trust in the interaction situation. The actors' possibility to feel ownership in the collaboration process was limited by the institutional framework of policy document, which was mainly regulated by the SEPA and County Administrative Board (CAB). The process was involving a broad spectrum of representatives. The big representation is good for a sustainable outcome of the project but limited the possibility to act. There were many interests to take in to consideration.

4.2 The local perspectives and experiences

When planning for a collaboration model and a partnership between the tourism industry and national parks managements it is important to understand the local perspective and experiences of their collaboration. Co-understanding and collaboration between the national park management and the tourist actors' active in the area is essential to achieve sustainable tourism in national parks (Wilson, Nielsen & Buujltjens, 2009).

To understand the local condition and processes of collaboration between the national park management and local tourist actor this chapter aims to answer how the collaboration of dealing with tourism is carried out on a local level. In order to understand the experiences of the tourist actors and the management of Kosterhavet National Park seven interviews have been held, five with local tourist actors and two with employees of management of Kosterhavet National Park.

For a partnership planning process to succeed McCool and Guthrie (2001) have identified four dimensions that are important; learning, relationship building, responsibility and interests representation. The narratives from the interviewees are presented through Daniels and Walkers (2001) model of the progress triangle. The three dimensions of the progress triangle give a full picture of the collaboration situation and if there is a collaboration problem on a local level. In order to obtain an understanding of the perspectives and experiences of the local collaboration process the chapter ends with a final discussion about the connections of the three dimensions in the progress triangle.

4.2.1 *The relationships on a local level*

This part aims to describe the relationship and trust between the Kosterhavet National Park management and the tourist actors. This is done according to Daniels and Walkers (2001) definition of the relationship between actors in a multi-stakeholder situation and how it can be analyzed. Their terms trust, respect and legitimacy were explained under chapter 4.1.1.

The tourist actors describe the National Park managements role in their collaboration in different ways since they have different relations and experiences with one and other. Some actors perceive the National Park managements role as someone who give them information and material about the National Park, which they can distribute to their visitors. One interviewee expressed that the management has an important role because they can recommend each other's operations. Another actor described the role of the management as a portal for the activities in the National Park, regardless if they want to serve this purpose or not. The National Park manager believe there is a distinction of the roles due to they are the manager of the park and the others are companies. He explains that their operations encounter each other's in their work with external activates for visitors and thinks they complement each other.

The National Park management and some of the tourist actors have been in cooperation with each for a long time, both before and after the formation of the National Park. The cooperation was mainly in the form of informal relations and through projects. At the time of the formation of the Kosterhavet National Park, the management was in collaboration with the Norwegian National Park, Ytre Hvaler, which was formed and officially opened together with the Kosterhavet National Park the 9th of September 2009. The Swedish and Norwegian National Parks arranged a hostmanship education for companies who were active in the National Park. The entrepreneurs how participated in the education received a diploma. (Swedberg & Forsberg, 2012)

The tourist entrepreneurs and the staff from Kosterhavet National Park which have been interviewed have all a strong connection to the area. The actors have either been growing up in the area or been living in the area for a long time, therefore they are well anchored in the local community. The tourist actor's connection to the area are affecting how they give meaning to the situation of being a tourist actor in the national park. Most of the tourist actors expressed that they feel privileged to be active within a National Park, even though

actors expressed that it does not need to be a National Park for them value the area. The meaning the actors give to the national park will affect how they view their relationship with the national park management. The tourist entrepreneurs identified the aims of their businesses to be; to make a living, to offer a good experience for customers, to affect the customers view on a sustainable environment, and to work with something they enjoy.

Most of the tourist actors and the national park management believe there is a good cooperation between them and they want their collaboration to continue, to develop further and to be improved in the future. One of the tourist actors said in an interview with the researcher he does not have collaborations with the national park management. The national park management and the tourist actors think their cooperation adds values to both parties. The actors trust one another and they have willingness to collaborate with each other (Lewicki, 2006). Although the actors have trust in the interactive situation there is a conflict of interest among the actors in some issues (Hallgren & Ljung, 2005).

4.2.2 The local collaboration process

The method used for interactions at local level between the national park management and the local tourist actors affect the actor's possibility to collaborate with one another and their ways to improve the collaboration. The local collaboration process is explained according to Daniels & Walker (2001) as it was explained in chapter 4.1.2. Shortly the process is affected by how the communication is managed, the constraints in the communication, whether the actors have all the recourses needed, by looking at the local decision space and finally explaining how the actors wish to collaborate in the future.

From the narratives presented in the interviews with the local tourist actors and the national park management, the researcher identified an informal network of interactions (Weedman, 1992). The National Park management do not have formal meetings with tourist actors in the area. The National Park manager explained that he has a network of actors that he is in contact with. He explained that his network consists of tourist actors and the municipalities. He called them his tourist network, although he was not certain that the tourist actors are aware that he considers them to be a part of his network. Some of the actors in the network have been participating in previous projects with the park manager. The interactions between the National Park management and the tourist actors take place as formal individual meetings, emails and phone calls, as well as spontaneous meetings where the actors meet by coincidentally.

Collaborations through a social circle

The informal network of interaction will be explained through the method of a social circle (Kadushin, 1968). The informal network between the tourist actors and the national park management is identified through a method of a social circle where the stakeholders naming one another as partners of collaboration during the interview with the researcher. The local collaboration can be seen as a partnership which is carried out in field level in an informal setting (Hall, 1999). The network is consisting of collaboration between the national park management and the tourist actors and an internal collaboration between the local tourist actors. The collaboration is carried out by recommending the other actors' activities to tourists, co-arranging activities for tourist groups, offering guided tours and other activates for others' tourist groups, booking restaurant visits on the Koster islands, distributing other services needed for the companies' businesses, helping the other with marketing and management and offering education for some tourist actors' staff. Their network consists of informal meetings where the actors for example meet on the Koster island ferry, in meetings related to other projects or just meet coincidentally. The actors' relations and interactions within the network become the source of information between the actors. Through the relations within the social circle the actors collaborate and help each other with their businesses and operations.

The contact between tourist actors and the National Park's management is, according to the tourist actors, usually their initiative, unless the management wants to book activities for their visitors. The National Park management describes that their communication with the tourism companies partly goes through the two municipalities' tourist offices.

The tourist entrepreneurs who have participated in this study have all been collaborating with other actors or been a part of the social network through an acquaintance. To illustrate the interactions within the social circle, the informants have been named by the codes A, B, C, D, E and K (five companies and the national park management). Actors who were not informants in this study have been given the codes F-N. The interviewees have named the actors they have had collaboration with spontaneously during the interviews. The informant may have more collaboration partners than the ones mentioned during the interviews.

Organization	Social circle/collaboration
Actor A	C, E, F, H, K, L
Actor B	K
Actor C	A, E, F, H, I, K
Actor D	C, G, K, N
Actor E	C, F, H, K, L, A
National Park manager (K)	A, C, D, E, F, J, L, M

Figure 5. Table of interactions in the social circle, self-constructed

There is no formal communication platform for the interactions between the national park management and the tourist actors. However the city of Strömstad, the Koster islands and the surrounding areas are relatively small and distinct places, where there is a possibility to meet other actors in other settings by coincidence. The fact that the administrative office for the national park management is located in the national park may have facilitated the actors' relationship and method of collaboration. The local method of communication and sharing information can become difficult for a new tourist actor in the area as they are not in the network within the social circle. By the methods of the social circle the stakeholder spreading and obtaining information gets new contacts for future collaborations. The network through the social circle have worked well according to the stakeholders. The actors connect with each other through relations and collaborations. When the actors interact, they share their views of the situation and their perspectives with each other. Since there is no formal network or common meeting platform where all actors can meet and get the same information at the same time, the actors receive information concerning the National Park at different times and therefore may interpret and give different meaning to information.

The national park management thinks they do not have the time and resources to all the communication activities they would like to do and wish to improve the situation for tourist actors in the area. There is now a small part of their employment that is focusing on communication and collaboration with tourist actors. The management wants to have more interactive meetings with the tourist entrepreneurs, which they have not had time for so far. The companies stated they do not have a lot of time for big meetings during the high season. They prefer to have informal meetings, speak over the phone and send emails during the high season, and formal meetings preferably during the low season.

The National Park management needs to follow the regulation and guidelines concerning tourism in the national park. They also have the formal decision-making power concerning whether they want to collaborate with tourist actors or not. The tourist companies have the possibility to influence decisions concerning tourism in the national park by sharing their perspectives and views on the situation through interactions with the national park

management. Tourist actors feel that they do not have access and do not receive information about processes and meetings that they wish to be invited to and participate in. The tourist actors mean that they need to be alert and to show interest to receive information about processes concerning planning for tourism in the area.

4.2.3 The substance discussed on a local level

The substance in the local collaboration situation is presented based on issues that are symbolic for the stakeholders and their different perspectives, interests, and opinions (Daniels and Walker, 2001). The issues discussed concerning the local collaboration are identified to be; the managements role in marketing tourist actors, the commercial tourism within the National Park and the collaboration in the future. The actors in the interviews have different perceptions of whether the topics discussed were problematic.

The managements role in marketing tourist actors

The tourist actors and the national park management have different views on the role that the management should have in marketing the tourist actors activities in the National Park. The tourist actors described the national parks management as an actor who is marketing them towards visiting tourists through the national park website, the national park program leaflet, by recommending them to visitors and by joined events with the National Park.

Tourist actors mentioned in interviews that they do not think they are properly shown on the National Park's websites. By being more visible on the National Parks website tourist actors believe they would attract more visitors and especially foreign visitors. The management emphasizes that a governmental authority cannot select which actors that can be visible on the national park website. Instead the management has developed a local solution by having a hyperlink to a tourist information website where the information about the tourist actors in the area is available. The national park management is content with this solution and has the perception that the tourist actors are content as well.

Every summer season the management of Naturum creates a program leaflet for the activities organized by the Naturum and as well as a selection of activities offered by the actors in the area that has a connection to the operations of Naturum. The program is distributed to tourists through different channels. The tourist actors think the program leaflet is an important information channel to reach tourists. The Naturum manager explained in the interview that they want to have a wide variety of activities in the program leaflet. He thinks they do not have the time and resources to do all the communication operations that they would like to do and there is a restricted time limit to look for new companies who are interested in cooperation. Therefore it is easiest to cooperate with the actors who are willing to participate and which they know deliver a good product. The Naturum manager explained in the interview that the Naturum operations are evaluated by a Naturum council yearly. The council consists of different actors and organizations as CAP, municipalities, companies and NGOs. At the Naturum council the Naturum manager presents the activities in the program leaflet and receives feedback on the arrangement of the leaflet and the need for more or less representation of the different categories of activities.

The tourist actors had different experiences and perceptions of the leaflet. Not all the interviewees in the study has been asked to participate in the program leaflet. One of the interviewees expressed that he did not understand why some actors were in the program leaflet and others were not and perceived it as some actor pass through a filter when others do not. Another tourist actor had the view that all the actors which are active within the National Park are presented in the leaflet. The tourist actors which are represented in the program leaflet have been asked to be included through different channels, one actor received a question by email, one over the phone and another interviewee was represented in the program leaflet by representing an organization in the Naturum council and at the same time being employed by the national park management.

Opinion about commercial tourism with in the National Park

The interviewees were all positive to commercial tourism in the National Park. However, they are not positive to all forms of tourism. Both the National Park management and the local tourism companies in the study have hopes that the tourism will increase in Kosterhavet National Park in a sustainable way. The interviewees meant that there is a great potential for tourism in the National Park. They have hopes that tourism will provide more working opportunities for those living in the local area. Tourist actors in the study expressed a worry that the conditions will be changed in the national park which will reduce the space to act with their operations in the national park. The actors have different perceptions for the current national park restrictions. Some of the actors think that the restrictions are beneficial for their operations while others experience that some of the restrictions are limiting their operations.

The interviewees in the study consists of tourist actors which were active within the area before the formation of the national park as well as actors which started their business in the area after the formation of the national park. They have different views on how they will benefit from being active in the National Park. Many of the interviewees mentioned that it feels safe to be active in an area that is protected for the future. By being active in a National Park many of the tourist actor's working season has become longer because of an increase of international tourists in the end of the season. Some of the tourist actors said that they received more requests from visitors when the National Park was newly formed. A few interviewees said that they have benefitted from being active in National Park by being increasingly recognized in media and magazines. One interviewee said that it has not benefitted their business economically to be active within Kosterhavet National Park. The tourist actors said that there is hard job to get costumers to visit their companies. They expressed that they are benefitting from being active within the national park by marketing their business though the name 'the National Park', and through cooperation with Naturum. They can receive information, materials and education, which they can use in their businesses.

The National Park management states that humans are a part of the biodiversity in the National Park. It convinced that the National Park management's activities in Naturum and its surroundings have attracted a lot of people and also benefitted the local entrepreneurs. The National Park manager thinks that it is up to the tourist companies to offer and develop a good range of attractive experiences. The National Park manager says that there are no thoughts about reducing tourism, but to channel tourists around the National Park. The administration believes that they have prepared information boards, hiking trails, hiking apps and an infrastructure that tourist companies can use. The National Park administration thinks it is very important to have tourist entrepreneurs in the National Park. The actors enable the tourists to transport themselves to the National Park by boat. They also offer food, accommodations and activates for visitors.

Most of the tourism actors feel proud and privileged to have their business in a National Park. The tourist actors inform their costumers about the National Park and its regulations. They believe that the brand 'National Park' is good for their business and stands for quality. Actors pointed out that it is appreciated that there is a management who organizes services such as information boards, toilets and also can inform and answer questions concerning the natural values in the National Park. The tourist actors feel they attract visitors into the National Park, and to some extent attracts other target groups then the national park management does. The tourism actors offer other services and experiences then the National Park offers to visitors. For example, they enable tourists to go beyond the shoreline and get other experiences in nature.

The future collaboration

The interviewees on a local level believe there is a good cooperation between the management and the tourist actors. They think their cooperation adds values to both parties but have different perception on how their collaboration should be formed in the future.

The tourist actors expressed that they want more transparency from the National Park management in their work within the national park, their research projects, plans for the future, exhibitions in Naturum and the planning process for the Naturum program leaflet. The interviewees wished to be more involved in the early stages of the planning concerning changes of the conditions for tourism in the national park and any discussed or planned changes within the National Park that can affect their operations.

The tourist actors in the interviews had different reflections about entering a partnership with the National Park management in the future. Some have a positive attitude and thought it would be good to enter a partnership where all the actors would have the same goal and vision for the National Park. Some actors said that they have been asked for a partnership, and believe that it can help to encourage the professional companies and allow them to collaborate with the National Park management. Some of the actors said that they wish for a future partnership between them and the national park management. One informant said that he could not speak out his attitude towards a future partnership, he expressed a fear it would cost money and involve contracts. Within a future partnership the actors wished for an improved dialogue among the actors. The tourist actors wished that at future partnership would include: a stricter division of roles, be focused on quality of the tourism, customer services, an environmental profile, include marketing and demand a good knowledge about Kosterhavet National Park. One actor suggested that a partnership could be managed by a giving and taking among the actors by the carrot and stick method, where the management set demands and the actors benefits from the partnership. The National Parks manager hoped that there will be a change to a more organized communication between the National Park management and tourist companies, when implementing the model for the SEPA partnership agreements.

4.2.4 The complexity of the local collaboration

From the three dimensions of the progress triangle: relationship, process and substance there is no collaboration between the actors on a local level. To get an overall view of the process and perceptions of how collaborations of dealing with tourism are carried out on a local level the data presented in the dimensions of the progress triangle are connected in this chapter. The three dimensions of the progress triangle are explaining different views of the collaboration situation. The collaboration may work well in some of the dimensions but not in the others. A collaboration problem may have been initiated in one of the dimensions and then escalated to one or both of the other dimensions. To make progress in a collaboration problem, it is essential all three dimensions are understood and managed. (Daniels & Walker, 2001)

The analysis of the collected empirical data shows there is no conflict nor a collaboration problem between the actors on a local level. The actors trust in one another seeing they have the willingness to act on the basis of action and decision of others (Lewicki, 2006). Although the actors have trust in the interactive situation, issues are discussed among the actor which do not agree.

The Kosterhavet National Park administration has been working on collaboration with commercial tourism actors within the National Park before this study through different projects. The management expressed not having the time or the recourses needed to do all the communication activities they want to do. The national park management wishes its work with tourism actors in the National Park will become ordinary operation through big group meetings and implementation of a partnership through the brand 'Swedens National Parks'.

The coordination of commercial tourism in Kosterhavet National Park is carried out through an informal network between national park management and the tourist actors (Weedman, 1992). The informal collaboration network has been identified to be similar to a Social circle (Kadushin, 1968). The local collaboration by the social circle can be seen as a partnership, being carried out on a field level in an informal setting (Hall, 1999). The tourist actors have different experiences of the collaboration with the management of Kosterhavet National Park. The communications in the social circle are carried out by interpersonal communication through a planned meeting, phone calls, email and running into one another by coincidence. From the concept of a social circle conclusions have been drawn there is a significant variation of collaboration partners between the tourist actors in Kosterhavet National Park. This might affect them negatively by receiving less information on different issues. The size of an actor's network differs between the actors. Figure 5 shows there are three actors who have a more central role than the other actors. Because a lot of information regarding issues concerning tourism in Kosterhavet National Park is channeled through an informal network, it may be difficult to receive the same information if an actor is outside the social circle or are new in the area or the business.

The collaboration between the actors is built on the foundations of the actors having a good relationship with the other actors and have a big network. This is included in the collaboration of tourism in Kosterhavet National Park. According to the interviews done in this study and a study done by Morf, Sandström and Jagers (2017) do the tourist actors they think have a good dialogue with the management. One of the reasons for why the collaboration in the informal works well at Kosterhavet National Park may be because the area is geographically defined though it's within a marine area. Administration of the National Park is placed at the Koster Islands in the national park. There is condition identified to be essential for the local collaboration in Kosterhavet National park to succeed, and they are; the geographical boundary, the national park administrative office being placed in the area, also all the informants have shown to be well rooted in the local society. Thus it makes it possible for the actors to meet in another forum than just in a formal settings and thereby build relationships. This makes it easier for the actors to interact with each other and share perspectives and information in informal settings. As well as many of the actors meet each other in other situation as in projects and associations. The tourist actors and the staff at the National Park administration office that is participating in this study, has connections to the area and in the local community.

The tourist actors and the National Park management believe they are attracting different target groups to the National Park. They are offering various services to the National Park visitors, and thereby complementing each other's operations. The National Park management think it is essential having tourist entrepreneurs within the National Park that are offering services as transportation, food, and accommodations. The National Park management is convinced its operations in Kosterhavet National Park and Naturum attract visitors and benefits other companies in the area.

Most of the tourist actors feel like they are profile carrier of the National Park in interactions with their customers. The interviews with the researcher and in a study conducted by Morf, Sandström and Jagers (2017) show the tourist actors feel proud to be active within the national park and perceive the national park as a quality mark for their business and as an attractiveness for tourists. The tourist actors perceive they receive positive marketing for being active within a National Park. The actors have different perceptions of how the national park restrictions affect their operations. Some of the actors mean that the restrictions are beneficial for their operations while others experiencing some of the restrictions are limiting their operations.

The tourist actors wish for the National Park management to be more transparency in the communication and planning of the managements operations. Tourist actors do not feel like they are invited to meetings regarding tourism in the National Park. The tourist actors want

to be informed early in the planning process of changes regarding tourism in the national park.

4.3 Lessons learned for future collaborations

This chapter is analyzing and discussing how knowledge generated by this research can be applied in future collaboration between National Park managements and commercial tourist actors. The lessons learned in this thesis is mostly to be applied on National Parks which are in the same situation as Kosterhavet National Park, where tourism has been present in the park for a long time and not something that is going to be implemented in a National Park. The circumstances of being a marine National Park and a popular tourist destination with many activities based on the Koster Islands may affect the communication and the relations between the actors because it is a physically distinct area. Though a national discussion as well involves multiple actors who have different governing documents and project that needs to be taken into consideration in collaboration. To an extent, there are the same actors in the pilot project as are involved in the national discussion of commercial tourism in protected areas.

Lessons learned from this case study is the importance to take time to build relations and trust among the stakeholders. It is essential to create a transparent process where the stakeholders get the same information and knowledge about the issue and to give time for the actors to interact and share means of the situation. For a partnership to be a success it needs to build on foundations trust among the actors, distribution of power and access to knowledge. The actors need to have access to the same information to be able to participate in a situation on the same terms, to feel trust in a meaningful interaction to occur. (McCool, 2009).

By using collaborative learning in a collaboration situation, it is more likely to have a smoother change in the stream of action, thus the actors are giving new meanings and ideas together to the issue. (Daniel & Walker; Charon, 2004) The process needs time for the actor to get to know the perspective, ideas, goal and knowledge of one and other. Therefore, more likely the role of the other and gain an understanding of the perspectives of the other in the decision-making process. (Daniel & Walker; Charon, 2004; McCool, 2001) For the situation to be improved, the actors need to build trust among the each other to improve the situation. The actors need to listen to the perspective of the other and take the role of the other (Charon, 2004). The actors need to clarify in the project group what the legal constraints and their space to act on the question are (Daniels and Walker, 2001). The decision space within the institutional framework of governing documents needs to be expressed and analyzed among the actors before they are trying to agree on a common collaboration model. By considering the institutional framework together the project group can share knowledge and information and also discuss the power differences in the group and further build trust to the interactive situation. Without a common definition of the game roles and the decision space in the situation the actors have different expectations of the situation and distrust can occur.

The actor's decision space became limited because the actors were represented as individuals instead of having the role of an actor from their organization. By taking the role of their organization the individuals needed to take their organizations governing documents into consideration in the negotiating situation. There were many actors involved in the collaboration process and the issue regarding tourism in protected areas. The stakeholders in the interactive situation have their aim on other organization. Governing documents and regulations also has to be taking into consideration. If the stakeholders do not have trust in each other in the interaction situation, it can help to involve a neutral facilitator who can mediate the stakeholder' interests in the situation.

In the pilot project, the group members did not have the time needed for the actors to be able to have a meaningful interaction. Such a meaningful interaction could lead to the actors changing their ideas being able to create a common collaboration model. Through a dialog the actors can take the role of the other and they can get a greater understanding of the perspective of the others in the situation (Charon, 2004). For the actors to build trust in the interactive situation they need to listen and try to get an understanding of the perspectives of the others by taking the role of the others in the interactive situation.

If there are many actors involved in the collaboration process, it can be difficult for the actors to take the perspectives of the others. If there are many actors involved in a collaboration process, it is a good idea to give the project group time and resources to create the conditions for meaningful interaction between the actors. With many actors involved it is difficult for the project group to reach a consensus in a collaboration model. On the other hand, it is important that everyone involved in the collaboration model should be able to influence the decision. There is not only a challenge to find a method of collaboration within the project group, but as well find a method to involve the local tourist actors in the formation of the collaboration model. At the same time as the pilot project was ongoing to create a collaboration model, the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency started an own parallel project. This may have complicated the collaboration between the actors because they had different goals with the process.

The communication on the local level in Kosterhavet National park has been identified in this study to be an informal partnership (Hall, 1999). The actors communicate when needed through telephone, email, arranged meetings or speak when they meet each other in another setting. Most of the actors were content with the method of communicating but wished their communication would develop further. The stakeholders in the study wanted formal information meetings through a formal partnership. A partnership is consisting of a relationship among stakeholders who are sharing the same resources and are trying to achieve similar goals and visions. (Wilson, Nielsen & Buultjens, 2009) Without sharing the same goal in the partnership the collaboration become difficult, though the actors give the project the same meaning in the definition of the situation. Thereby the stakeholders act in different directions. (Charon, 2004).

5 Conclusion

The study aims to examine the collaboration process of coordinating the organization of tourism in Kosterhavet National Park. The thesis also aims to study the perspectives and experiences of the stakeholders and from this case study learn how other local collaborations can be successfully carried out. The field study was carried out during the fall of 2016. The conclusions from this study are presented through the research questions.

- What is the collaboration problem when coordination the tourism in Kosterhavet National Park?

There are multiple reasons why the pilot project in Kosterhavet National Park during 2015 about creating a common collaboration model did not succeed. A conflict of interest and decreased trust occurred in the interaction situation between the stakeholders in the project group (Hallgren & Ljung, 2005). This complicated the communication and coordination between the actors. The stakeholders were not able to follow the project through. The collaboration problem had many causes, for instance, the stakeholders had different perspectives, goals, and ideas of how tourism in a National Park should be coordinated. The project group had representation from national, regional and local levels. The project group members needed to follow their own goals, strategies, guidelines, and regulations within the frame of the collaboration process. The actors governing documents became an institutional framework that needed to be taken into account in the decision-making process. The actors give different meanings to the situation and had different definitions of the situation and thereby acted in different ways. The actors did not have the time needed to negotiate and share their meaning on the substance of the collaboration model.

The actors' different perspectives on how tourism should be carried out in the National Park became three issues that were discussed and negotiated. The issues of substance were; 1) The national park's external activities, 2) The division of roles and responsibilities and 3) The managements role in promoting of tourism companies. A lack of time and recourses limited the process of the project. Though the actors had different perceptions of how tourism in Kosterhavet National Park should be managed, they gave a different meaning to the situation. Therefore, the project group needed time to build a relationship to be able to understand the perspective of the others and thereby be able to change their own view on the situation.

The actors had different perceptions of how the project ended. The actors gave different meanings to the result of the pilot project and the project group members acted thereby differently towards the results. This affected the actors' relations negatively after the project ended. The project ended without the actors agreeing on the content of the collaboration model. The actors had a different perception of the published collaboration model, therefore gave it a different meaning and acted in different ways towards it. Another factor that may have contributed to the project not having been implemented could be that the SEPA at the same time developed the brand 'the Sweden's National Park'.

- How is the collaboration of dealing with tourism questions carried out on a local level?

The collaboration between Kosterhavet National Park management and the local tourist actor is carried out through informal collaborations (Weedman, 1992). The actors meet, call or email each other when needed as well as meet coincidentally in other settings. The informants are content with the way they communicate with each other, even though the actors wish for a common formal meeting arena where all actors can get the same information at the same time. The collaboration through the social circle may work well in Kosterhavet National Park where the surrounding areas are a relatively small and distinct places, where there is a possibility to meet other actors in other settings coincidentally. All

the interviewees either are from the area or been living in the area for a long time, which may facilitate their method of collaborating.

There are no major conflicts among the actors on a local level and the actors have trust in the interaction situation. However, there were a few subjects the actors have different perceptions on the substance, and in some of the issue were there a conflict of interest. The actors did not agree on; 1) The managements role in marketing tourist actors, 2) commercial tourism with in the National Park and 3) had different opinions about the future collaboration.

- What lessons are learned for future collaboration processes in national parks?

It is essential to let the collaboration process to have the time, resources and money the process needs. Building relations and trust between actors in the process may take time. For the actors to collaborate and negotiate they need to understand the perspectives of the others.

By using collaborative planning, it is more likely to have a smoother change in the stream of action. Since the actors are creating new views and ideas together and time is given within the process for the actors to get to know the perspectives, ideas, goals and knowledge of one another, they are more likely accept the role of the others in the decision-making process.

The actors have different perspectives and wishes for how they want the future collaboration to be formed. In order for a future collaboration around other projects to be successful, it is important for the actors to analyze the institutional framework and try to agree on a common model.

References

- Arora-Jonsson, S. (2013). *Gender, Development and environmental Governance*. Routledge.
- Beland Lindahl, K. (2008). *Frame Analysis, Place Perceptions and the Politics of Natural Resource Management*. Diss. Uppsala: Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences.
- Charon, J. (2004). *Symbolic interactionism: an introduction, an interpretation, an integration*. 8th ed. New Jersey. Pearson Prentice Hall
- Craig, R.T. & Muller, H.L. (2007). *Theorizing communication*. Unit 6. SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 3ed edition. USA: SAGE Publications
- Daniels, E. & Walker, G. B. (2001). *Working through Environmental Conflicts. The collaborative learning approach*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers
- Ekoturismföreningen (2015a), *Turism i Kosterhavets nationalpark - Förslag till samverkansmodell mellan turism och förvaltning*. Access: http://www.ekoturism.org/illustrationer/fil_20151126165249.pdf [2018-03-22]
- Ekoturistföreningen (2016). Bohuslän. Access: <http://www.ekoturism.org/ekoturismforeningen/varaMedlemmar/foretagsLista.asp?Urval=Landskap&Sortering=Foretagsnamn&SorteringStigande=true&LandskapId=9.4.7a446fa211f3c824a0e8000171076.html> [2016-09-19]
- Ekoturistföreningen. (2010). *Bättre naturskydd med mer ekoturism*. Access: http://www.ekoturism.org/illustrationer/fil_20100701140659.pdf. [2018-06-03].
- Ekoturistföreningen. (2017). *stadgar*. Access: http://www.ekoturism.org/illustrationer/fil_20171119121410.pdf. [2018-06-03].
- Forsberg, C. (2014). *Kosterhavet-Ytre Hvaler*. Access: <http://www.interreg-sverige-norge.com/?portfolio=rabbitmq-bridge> [2018-06-03]
- Fredman, P., Friberg, L. H. & Emmelin, L. (2007). *Increased Visitation from National Park Designation*. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(1), pp 87–95. DOI: 10.2167/cit293.0
- Glasl, F. (1999). *Confronting conflict. A first aid kit for handling conflict*. Hawthorne press
- Hall, C. M. (1999). *Rethinking Collaboration and Partnership: A Public Policy Perspective*. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7(3–4), pp 274–289. DOI: 10.1080/09669589908667340
- Hallgren, L. & Ljung, M. (2005). *Miljökommunikation: aktörssamverkan och processledning*, Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Hedlund, G. & Montin, S. (2009) *Governance på svenska*. Stockholm: Santérus Academic Press
- Holmgren, L., Sandström, C. & Zachrisson, A. (2017). *Protected area governance in Sweden: new modes of governance or business as usual? Local Environment*, 22(1), pp 22–37.
- Hongslo, E., Hovik, S., Zachrisson, A. & Lundberg, A. K. A. (2016). *Decentralization of Conservation Management in Norway and Sweden—Different Translations of an International Trend*. *Society & Natural Resources*, 29(8), pp 998–1014.
- Jiborn, P. (2016). *Slutrapport, samverkansmodell för nationalparksturism*. Tillväxtverket. (Ärende id 00185376)
- Jiborn, P. & Hermansson, P. (2015) *Slutrapport för utvecklingsprojektet samverkansmodell för naturturism*, Ekoturistföreningen, Västervik & Uddevalla
- Jönsson-Rajgård, P. & Östling, E. (2015). DN Debatt. ”Rätt satsningar på Sveriges nationalparker kan ge en miljard i lokala turistintäkter”. 15 of July.
- Kadushin, C. (1968). *Power, Influence and Social Circles: A New Methodology for Studying Opinion Makers*. *American Sociological Review*, 33(5), pp 685–699. DOI: 10.2307/2092880
- Laven, D. N., Wall-Reinius, S. & Fredman, P. (2015). *New Challenges for Managing Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas: An Exploratory Study of the European Landscape Convention in Sweden*. *Society & Natural Resources*, 28(10), pp 1126–1143. DOI:10.1080/08941920.2015.1013166
- Lewicki, R.J. 2006. *Trust, trust development and trust repair*. I: Deutsch, M., Coleman, P.T., & Marcus, E.C. (Eds): *The handbook of conflict resolution – theory and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

- Länsstyrelsen Västragötaland. (2016). Programblad 2016 Naturum Kosterhavet. Access: <http://extra.lansstyrelsen.se/kosterhavet/SiteCollectionDocuments/sv/naturum/kosterhavet-programblad-2016.pdf>. [2018-06-03]
- McCool, S. F. (2009). Constructing partnerships for protected area tourism planning in an era of change and messiness. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(2), pp 133–148. DOI:10.1080/09669580802495733
- Meltzer, B. N., Petras, J. W. & Reynolds, L. T. (2015). *Symbolic Interactionism: Genesis, Varieties and Criticism*. London and New York. Routledge.
- Morf, A., Sandström, A. & Jagers, S. C. (2017). Balancing sustainability in two pioneering marine national parks in Scandinavia. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 139, pp 51–63.
- Naturvårdsverket (2009a) Naturvårdsverkets föreskrifter för Kosterhavets nationalpark, (NFS 2009:7)
- Naturvårdsverket (2009b). Skötselplan för Kosterhavets Nationalpark. Access: <https://www.naturvardsverket.se/Documents/publikationer/978-91-620-8471-4.pdf>. [2018-06-03]
- Naturvårdsverket (2010). Naturvårdsverket svar på Ekoturistföreningens dokument ” Bättre naturskydd med mer ekoturism”. Stockholm. (383- 4875-10)
- Naturvårdsverket (2014a). Kosterhavets nationalpark utvecklar modell för samverkan. Access: <https://www.naturvardsverket.se/Nyheter-och-pessmeddelanden/Pressarkiv/Nyheter-och-pessmeddelanden-2014/Kosterhavets-nationalpark-utvecklar-modell-for-samverkan/> [2018-03-24]
- Naturvårdsverket (2014b). Översyn av föreskrifter för nationalparker. (NV-00291-12)
- Naturvårdsverket. (2015a). Riktlinjer för entréer till Sveriges nationalparker. [Broschyr]. Stockholm: Naturvårdsverket. Access: <https://www.naturvardsverket.se/Documents/publikationer6400/978-91-620-6656-7.pdf?pid=14474>. [2017-03-22]
- Naturvårdsverket. (2015b) Riktlinjer för Naturum. Bromma: Arkitektkopia AB. (Rapport 6696)
- Naturvårdsverket. (2015c). Så bildas en nationalpark. [Broschyr]. Stockholm: Naturvårdsverket. Access: <http://www.naturvardsverket.se/Documents/publikationer6400/978-91-620-8721-0.pdf?pid=14322>. [2017-03-22].
- Peters, B. G. & Pierre, J. (1998). Governance Without Government? Rethinking Public Administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 8(2), pp 223–243.
- Puhakka, R. & Saarinen, J. (2013). New Role of Tourism in National Park Planning in Finland. *The Journal of Environment & Development*, 22(4), pp 411–434. DOI: 10.1177/1070496513502966
- Regeringen (2012). Mål för friluftslivspolitiken. Stockholm. (Skr. 2012/13:51)
- Regeringen. (2001). En samlad naturvårdspolitik. Stockholm. (2001/02:173.)
- Reynolds, L.T. (2006). *Interactionism explosion and critique*, Third edition, USA, General Hall
- Silverman, D. (2015). *Interpreting Qualitative Data (Fifth Edition)*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Stark, E. & Sundholm, K. (2014). Utvärdering av förvaltningsmodellen för Kosterhavets nationalpark. Länsstyrelsen Västra Götalandslän. (2014:58)
- Stenseke, M. & Hansen, A. S. (2014). From rhetoric to knowledge based actions – Challenges for outdoor recreation management in Sweden. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 7–8, pp 26–34.
- Stephen F. McCool, K. G. (2001). Mapping the Dimensions of Successful Public Participation in Messy Natural Resources Management Situations. *Society & Natural Resources*, 14(4), pp 309–323.
- Stokke, K. B. & Haukeland, J. V. (2017). Balancing tourism development and nature protection across national park borders – a case study of a coastal protected area in Norway. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, pp 1–15.
- Swedberg, S. & Forsberg, C (2012). Kosterhavet & Ytre Hvaler nasjonalparker. Vårt gemensamma/felles arv 2008-2012”. Access: [2018-06-03]
- Teorell, J. & Svensson, T. (2007). Att fråga och att svara. Samhällsvetenskaplig metod. Malmö: Liber
- Tillväxtverket. (2014). Beslut om projektmedel. Stockholm: Tillväxtverket. (Dnr 2014003820)
- Tillväxtverket. (2016). 2015 årsredovisning. (Info 0642)
- Tysklind, A. et al. (2008) Crest verktygslåda - med rekommenderade åtgärder för att utveckla en hållbar turism destination. Access: http://extra.lansstyrelsen.se/kosterhavet/SiteCollectionDocuments/sv/publikationer/CREST_Verktygslada_Svensk_andrad.pdf. [2018-03-24]

- Weedman, J. (1992). Informal and formal channels in boundary-spanning communication. *Journal of American society for information science.*, 43: 257-267
- Westin, M & Calderon, C & Hellquist, A. (2014). *The Inquiry Based Approach (IBA)*, Visby: Elanders
- Wilson, E., Nielsen, N. & Buultjens, J. (2009). From lessees to partners: exploring tourism public-private partnerships within the New South Wales national parks and wildlife service. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(2), pp 269–285. DOI: 10.1080/09669580802495774

Observation

Observation, 27-28/9 2016, participating during a 24h seminar at the Koster Islands about the brand 'Swedens National Parks' organized by the SEPA.

Appendix

Interview guide in Swedish

Om företaget

- Berätta om er verksamhet
 - o Syftet med verksamheten?
 - o Målgrupp av kunder?
 - o hur länge har ni varit verksamma?
 - o hur ofta är ni verksamma i nationalparken?
- Hur kommer det sig att ni börja ha verksamhet i just Kosterhavets nationalpark?
- Berätta om din syn på att vara verksam i Nationalparken?

Om Identitetsskapande

- Hur önskar ni att era kunder uppfattar er?
- Hur tror ni att ni blir uppfattade av kunder i samband med er verksamhet i nationalparken?
- Hur blir ert företags identitet påverkad av att ni är verksamma i en nationalpark?
- Hur uppfattar ni nationalparks förvaltningen?
- Blir er verksamhet påverkad av att ni är verksamma i Nationalpark?
- Hur uppfattar ni er själva?
- Hur förhåller ni er till era kunder i och med att ni är verksamma i national parken?
 - o Vad berättar ni, vilka åtgärder gör ni osv.
- Hur skiljer sig ert arbete i nationalparken och utanför?

Kosterhavets Nationalpark

- Vad tycker ni om turism i nationalpark?
- Vem på National Parks förvaltningen har ni haft kontakt med?

Möten mellan Kosterhavets nationalparks och aktörerna

- Kan ni berätta om hur det gick till när ni började ha verksamhet i nationalparken
 - o Vem tog ni kontakt med i Nationalparksförvaltningen? Hur var första kontakten? Vad diskuterade ni?
- Berätta om era samarbeten med Nationalparksförvaltningen?
- Kan du berätta hur er kontakt nationalparken ser ut idag?
 - o Hur brukar er samtalssituation se ut?
 - o Vilka möten/tillfällen möts ni?
 - o Vad diskuterar ni?
- Har ni haft samråd eller dialog med nationalparken om er verksamhet?
 - o Hur såg mötet ut, vilka var där, vad diskuterades, hur uppfattade ni det?
- Vad är er roll i samarbetet?
- Vad är förvaltningens roll i samarbetet?
- Vad är bra i samtalssituationen, vad hade kunnat varit bättre?

Marknadsföring via Naturum

- Hur såg samtalet ut kring att ni fick vara med i naturum programblad och affischeras på Naturum?
 - o vilka var inbjudna till samtalet?
- Hur tror du att andra aktörer ser på sin kommunikationen med national parks förvaltningen?

Marknadsföring

- Berätta om hur ni marknadsför er?
 - o Hur tänker ni kring marknadsföring?
 - o Vilket skulle ni säga är ert bästa sätt att marknadsföra er?
 - o Är det något som har förändrats över tid?
- Hur skulle du önska att din marknadsföring ser ut i framtiden?

- Är det konkurrens mellan företagen som genomför likande verksamhet som er?

Kontakt nät

- Är ni aktiva eller har kontakt med andra företag eller organisationer på koster eller inom nationalparkens område?
- När det något eller några företag som företräder turistföretagen i Kosterhavet i kommunikationen med nationalparken?

Pilot projektet 2014-2015

- Var ni på samverkans mötet mellan Ekoturistföreningen, förvaltningen, Strömstads kommun, Strömstad turistbyrå och lokala företag januari 2015?
 - o Berätta om mötet

Mervärden

- Vad får ni ut att vara verksamma i en nationalpark?
 - o Vad är positivt?
 - o Vad är negativt?
 - o Några mervärden?

Idag och Framtiden

- Vad har ni för framtid visioner för ert företag och arbete i Kosterhavets nationalpark?

Utbyte vad att vara verksam i nationalparken

- Vad får ni som företag ut av att vara i samarbete med Nationalparken?
- Vad tror ni att Nationalparken får ut av att vara i samarbete med er?
- Hur tror du att Nationalparken påverkas av att du har din verksamhet där?
- Hur ofta ha ni kontakt med Nationalparken?
 - o Hur ser er kontakt ut?
 - o I vilka forum sker den idag?
- Hur önskar du att den skulle se ut i framtiden?
- Hur påverkas ditt företag av att vara aktivt Nationalparken?
 - o Vad är positivt?
 - o Vad är negativt?

Samarbeten nu och i framtiden

- Hur skulle ni beskriva ert samarbete med Nationalparken?
- Vad tycker ni om naturvårdsverkets arbete kring partnerskap?
- Berätta om vad du hoppas på att få ut av att vara i partnerskap med Nationalparken?
- Vad tror du att det skulle kunna ge dig och ditt företag?

Konflikter

- Har det uppstått oenigheter mellan er och förvaltningen?
- Har det uppstått oenighet mellan er och andra företag på grund av verksamheten i Nationalparken.
- Vet du om det har uppstått oenigheter mellan andra inom national parken?

Definitioner

- Vad skulle du säga att dialog är?
- Vad skulle du säga att samverkan är?
- Vad skulle du säga att partnerskap är?

Interview guide translated in to English

About the company

- Tell about your business
 - o Purpose of the business?
 - o Target group of costumers?
 - o How long have you been in business?
 - o How often do you have operations in the national park?
- How come did you start having operations in the Kosterhavet National Park?
- Describe about your view of being active in the national park?

About identity creation

- How do you want your customers to perceive you?
- How do you think you are perceived by your customers, in relations to your operations in the national park?
- How is your company's identity affected by being in a national park?
- How do you perceive the national park management?
- Do your operations become affected by you being active in a national park?
- How do you perceive yourself?
- What is your approach to your customers, in that you are active in a national park?
 - o What do you say about the national part,
 - o What measures do in consideration being active in a national park?
- How does your work differ in the national park and the work outside the national park?

Kosterhavet National Park

- What do you think about tourism in the national park?
- Whom at the national management do you have contact with?

Meetings between the Kosterhavet National Park and the tourist actors

- Can you tell me how it happened when you started operations in the national park?
 - o Who did you contact in the national park management? How was the first contact? What did you discuss?
- Describe your cooperation with the national park management?
- Can you describe how your communications with the national park management looks like today?
 - o How is your collaboration situation formed? In what occasions do you meet? What are you discussing?
- Have you had consultations or dialogue with the national park management about your operations in the national park?
 - o How was the meeting formed? Who were there? What was discussed? How did you perceive the meeting?
- What is your role in the collaboration with the national park management?
- What is the role of the national park management in your collaboration?
 - o What is good in the collaboration situation?
 - o What do you think can be done been better?

Marketing thought *Naturum*

- How did the conversation carry out about your participation in Naturum program leaflet and on Naturum notice-board board? when you were allowed to participate in Naturum program leaflet and posted on Naturum?
 - o who were invited to the meetings?
- How do you think other actors are perceiving their communication with the national park management?

Marketing

- Tell about how you market your operations?
 - o How do you think about your marketing?
 - o What would you say is your best way to promote you?

- Is there something that has changed over time?
- How would you like you the marketing of your company in the to be in the future?
- Is there any competition between companies that is performing similar activities as you are?

Contact network:

- Are you active or have contact with other companies or organizations at Koster or within the national park area?
- Is there any company or companies whom is representing the tourist companies in communication with the national park management?

The pilot project 2014-2015

- Did you attend a meeting between The Swedish Ecotourism Society, the management of the national park, Strömstad municipality, Strömstad tourist office and local tourist actors in January 2015?
 - Tell about the meeting?

Added values

- What do you think of being active in a national park?
 - What is positive?
 - What is negative?
 - Do you perceive added values in being active in a national park?

Today and the future

- What future visions do you have for your company and operations in Kosterhavet National Park?

Exchange of experiences

- What do you think as a company of being in collaboration with the National Park?
- What do you think the national park managemet get out of collaboration with you?
- How do you think the National Park is affected by your business there?
- How often are you in contact with the National Park?
 - How is your contact formed?
 - In which forum does it take place today?
- How would you like contact to look in the future?
- How is your business affected by being active in the National Park?
 - What is positive?
 - What is negative?

Collaboration now and in the future

- How would you describe your cooperation with the National Park?
- What do you think about the work of the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency with with conducting a partnership model?
- Discribe what you hope to get out of being in partnership with the National Park managment?
- What do you think it could give you and your business?

Conflicts

- Have there been any disagreements between you and the management?
- Has there been disagreement between you and other companies due to the activities in the national park.
- Do you know if there have been disagreements between others within the national park?

Definitions

- What would you say that dialogue is?
- What would you say that collaboration is?
- What would you say that partnerships are?