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Abstract:
The tourism industry has continuously grown in the last fifty years, promoted economic growth and created jobs (UNWTO, 2017). Nevertheless, this industry is impacting and greatly stressing natural environments and societies inciting a transformation towards a more sustainable form of tourism practices (Williams & Ponsford, 2009).

The United Nations General Assembly declared 2017 as the International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Development (UNWTO, 2016). The purpose of the declaration was to position the tourism industry as a tool to address the Universal 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development with its 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (UNWTO, 2016).

A backcasting participatory approach was used to explore the roles of the SDGs in creating future sustainable tourism destinations, using Swedish Lapland as a reference. The study uses backcasting as a method together with a literature review and semi-structured interviews to key stakeholders. The study concludes that SDGs are good parameters to describe current scenarios in order to develop desired ones. It also finds that sustainable future tourism destinations are highly connected with environment and society as part of the core experience, respecting traditions and culture. In order to achieve sustainable future destinations legislation, better practices and alternative methods of transportation need to be implemented alongside creating an experience that is based on responsibility towards nature and societies.
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Summary:
The tourism industry is one of the fastest growing industries in the world, accounting for rapid economic growth and creation of jobs. The increasing number of tourists, companies and suppliers involved in this industry are accounting for a huge impact on the environment and the societies living in the destinations. For these reasons the United Nations General Assembly called 2017 the year of sustainable tourism, aiming to promote a better practice of this industry by establishing guidelines with its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Choosing three of these development goals, accounting for economic growth, consumption and climate change, this study used a method called backcasting to involve actors of the tourism industry in imagining a desirable future tourism destination. The destination chosen as a model was Swedish Lapland and the actors were related to its tourism organizations. These actors were interviewed, and the results analyzed and compare to other publications related to SDGs and tourism.

The study found that the SDGs are good to describe current tourism destinations status and envisions a desirable one according to stakeholders’ views. Sustainable future destinations involve a great respect and involvement of the natural environment and society as part of the tourism experience promoted by the destination. It requires that all actors involved work together to meet the goals and attract the kind of tourists that embraces new cultures, sustainability and love for nature.
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1. Introduction

This chapter presents the foundations from which this research project was created. It first includes an overall background to provide the reader with an understanding of the topic. Next the problem background is explained, followed by the aim of the study, and finally an outline.

1.1. Background

The tourism industry has been growing during the last fifty years and it is expected to continue its expansion in the next decades (UNWTO, 2015:14). With 1.3 billion tourists traveling every year, and an expected 1.8 billion for 2030, many challenges related to sustainable development arise in this industry (UNWTO, 2017:11). Patterns of consumption, along with other neoliberal trends that rule our economic markets create a picture where the growth of tourism will contribute to amplify issues such as global warming, cultural and land appropriation, environmental degradation, and excessive crowding of urban cities (Budeanu et al. 2015).

Tourism has relatively recently been established as a new industry and it is still striving to establish its importance, and to be seriously recognized (Budeanu et al. 2015). However, it is one of the leading and most dynamic industries in the global economy, even in the times of economic crisis (Piskoti & Nagy 2013). It is a well-known fact that this industry provides overall values in terms of jobs an income generation. Nevertheless, the industry is slow to address the increasingly social and environmental impacts that its activities constantly create (Budeanu et al. 2015). An example of this is the indicators used by the United Nations World Tourism Organization, which only measures economic metrics like numbers of tourists, direct contribution of the industry to GDP, money invested in the sector and employment (Ibid.).

Because of its impact, tourism is known to be an industry that greatly stresses natural environments through, for example, infrastructure development, resources consumption and waste generation processes (Williams & Ponsford, 2009). Additionally, these processes usually take place in some of the most ecologically fragile locations of the planet (Ibid.). In relation to this, the environmental resources that tourism activity heavily stresses are the core ingredients for the production and consumption of tourism experiences. Paradoxically, protection of the integrity and abundance of these resources is required in order to ensure competitiveness within the industry (Ibid.). As a result of the sector’s rapid growth and limited progress in creating a more environmentally friendly global scale operation, it is obvious that tourism is becoming less sustainable (Gössling et al. 2012).

1.2. Problem background

In the late 1960s and 70s international tourist arrivals experienced an unprecedented growth followed by an explosive development of tourism activities and a general lack of development regulation (Williams & Ponsford, 2009: 397). Tourism, a once perceived small and non-invasive economic activity shifted into a massive global phenomenon. In the mid 70s increasing evidence of tourism impacts on natural environment started to arise, both in developed and developing destinations. Land use, infrastructure development, natural resource extraction and waste/pollution generation were identified as the main sources of tourism induced environmental degradation (Ibid.). As a reaction to these impacts, the term “Sustainable Tourism”, first defined by the German Forum on Environment and Development in 1999, established a visionary, future-oriented paradigm, which included a desired future, economic and environmental conditions (Gössling & Scott, 2012).

The paradox of tourism lies in the fact that natural environments are the principle attractions for tourists, at the same time these natural environments that the tourists experience are exploited and compromised (Williams & Ponsford, 2009). Furthermore, because of tourism consumption and production occur simultaneously, the environmental consequences are more immediately evident than in other industries (Ibid.). The tourism industry has been slow to respond to its sustainability challenges, waiting until 1992 to commission a
discussion paper from tourism concern on “sustainable tourism” at the World Wide Fund for Nature, including strategies and action plans (Goosling, 2016). Moreover, there are several doubts regarding the sustainable concept limitations. Sustainable Tourism is considered a “theoretical white elephant” by some authors, as it does not address greed, power, economic short-termism, racism and hypocrisy (Budeanu et al. 2015). Tourism is a dynamic system in which cultural adaptability of all the actors involved is fundamental to achieve transformative change. As the survival of a society depends on its ability to adapt and re-examine core values, tourism has the potential to contribute to transformative change if it is directed to influence people around the world to think about Earth as a global community (Ibid.).

The United Nations General Assembly declared 2017 as the International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Development (UNWTO, 2016). The purpose of the declaration was to position the tourism industry as a tool to address the Universal 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and thus the 17 Sustainable Development Goals. With the implementation of the Paris Agreement, the strategies for the tourism sector are still unclear (Scott et al. 2016). The Global Travel Association Coalition and the World Tourism Organization issued statements committing to meaningful and long-term efforts to fight climate change (Ibid.). A recent study demonstrated that the tourism industry accounts for 8% of carbon emission, three times higher than previous calculations estimated (Lenzen et al. 2018). To reduce emissions and accelerate a decarbonized global economy is one of the main goals of the Paris Agreement, however, a scenario where tourism continues with business as usual means emissions of the industry increasing globally by 130% by 2030 (Scott et al. 2016:939). Emissions from accommodation and air transport will triple, and it has been projected that an unrestricted growth of tourism would consume the whole carbon budget compatible with the 2°C target by 2050 (Ibid.).

1.3. Aim and delimitations

The aim of this study is to explain the role of the Sustainable Development Goals in the creation of future sustainable scenarios for tourism destinations.

The study will focus on the following research questions:

1-How can scenarios of a tourism destination be developed to meet the Sustainable Development Goals?

2-What elements need to be addressed to make a tourism destination future scenario sustainable?

The study is focused on the tourism destination of Swedish Lapland as a model to describe future sustainable scenarios and answer the research questions. The Sustainable Development Goals used to address the aim and research questions are:

Goal 8: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all.

Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns.

Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts.

The reason for choosing these particular three SDGs is related to a publication of the United Nations World Tourism Organization and the United Nations Development Programme (2018:11). In this publication it was established that the tourism private sector is able to address all 17 SDGs. Nevertheless, the same publication stated that it was found that larger international companies of the tourism industry relate mostly to SDGs 1, 4, 8, 12, and 13 due to the clear connection of these goals with their tourism related activities. This study did not take into account SDGs 1 and 4 due to time restrictions and it encourages further research to include them. The tourism approach to SDGs 8, 12, and 13 is described in figure 1.
Figure 1. SDGs 8, 12, and 13 within the tourism approach, with descriptions related to tourism activities and including public policy and Corporate Social Responsibility actions (UNWTO & UNDP, 2018:16)

The reason for focusing on Swedish Lapland comes from its nature-based tourism industry, and that this destination represents the arctic part of Sweden, including sub-arctic nature and a culture considered unique and well preserved (Swedish Lapland Visitors Board, 2016). Additionally, the tourism industry is considered to be growing in this region, implying an increasing number of visitors and development (*Ibid.*).

1.4. Outline
Introduction is the first chapter of the study, its purpose is to explain the background from which the project started, it describes the problem and then presents the aim the study uses to address the problem. Methods are presented in the second chapter which includes a description and analysis of backcasting that is used as a methodical framework. Literature review is presented and described, and semi-structured interviews described and justified. This chapter includes delimitations. Theory is described in the third chapter, presenting elements that build bases that further integrate and develop in the concept of sustainable tourism. Empirical background is presented in the fourth chapter to provide a base for the empirical results, and a bridge that connects them with theory. Empirical results are presented in the fifth chapter; these results are taken from the semi-structured interviews realized to different stakeholders in Swedish Lapland. Analysis of the empirical results is made on the sixth chapter with the elements of theory. Discussion on how the results were analyzed can help develop future sustainable tourism scenarios is made in the seventh chapter. The eight chapter reconnects to the research questions and summarizes the key findings of this study.
2. Method

In this chapter, the methods used for this thesis research are presented. The main purpose of this section is to explain the choices made to complete the research process. First the broad approach is presented. Secondly, the qualitative choices are justified; these choices include backcasting, the literature review, and semi-structured interviews.

2.1. Approach

The main purpose of this research project is to explore how the Sustainable Development Goals contribute to the creation of future sustainable scenarios for tourism destinations. In order to achieve this, a backcasting approach has been chosen as the core methodology in which other methods contribute with information and data to support results. In this backcasting approach, a literature review has been made in the subjects of sustainable tourism, responsible tourism, stakeholder theory, and co-creation of value. Semi-structured interviews were realized as a source of primary data to key stakeholders of Swedish Lapland Visitors Board, Kiruna Lappland Economic Association, Visit Skellefteå AB, and a visitor of the Ice Hotel in Kiruna.

2.2. Backcasting

In the field of future studies, there are various types of futures to be distinguished. These types can be classified in likely futures, possible futures, and desirable futures (Quist, 2007). In the vast majority of forecasting approaches the focus is placed on likely futures, which are projective by nature. These approaches use trend extrapolation and quantitative historical data, however, they are only reliable on the short term, and for well-defined stable systems (De Laat & Laredo, 1998). Forecasting is the dominant approach in the field of future oriented studies, but its capacity to study highly complex long-term sustainability problems is in doubt (Dreborg, 1996). This is a consequence of being based on dominant trends, making it unlikely to generate solutions that are supposed to be breaking off trends (Ibid.).

Possible futures are the focus of foresighting and scenario approaches (Quist, 2007). This is the approach used by the Club of Rome on the “The Limits to Growth” (1972) to warn about global resource depletion. Foresight seeks to imagine the consequences of different futures in order to engage in informed decision-making (Andersen & Andersen, 2017). Therefore, this approach is good for policy making (Ibid.).

The least widely applied approaches in future studies are the ones that focus on normative or desirable futures (Quist, 2007). Backcasting is a representative method of these normative approaches, which are considered highly important for the viewpoint of sustainable development (Ibid.). Backcasting is an interesting alternative to study major societal problems (Dreborg, 1996). Quist and Vergragt (2006:1028), define backcasting as “creating a desirable (sustainable) future vision or normative scenario, followed by looking back at how this desirable future could be achieved, before defining and planning follow-up activities and developing strategies leading towards that desirable future”. The idea of creating desirable futures with no restrictions, to later develop strategies to achieve them, was the inspiration to use backcasting as an approach and method for this study.

Backcasting has been linked to sustainability after the publication of “Our Common Future” by Brundtland et al. (1987) due to its normative and problem-solving character that is better suited for long-term problems and long-term sustainability solutions (Vergragt & Quist, 2011). Since the late 1980s backcasting has been expanded to sustainability issues and to different levels of action, involving regions, companies and socio-technical systems (Quist & Vergragt, 2006). The usual time horizon in most backcasting studies is fifty years as it is realistic, but at the same time enough far away in the future to allow major changes and even disruptions in technology or lifestyles to occur (Vergragt & Quist, 2011).
In relation to its characteristics and normative nature, the backcasting approach was conceived to potentially apply to a wide range of different subjects (Quist, 2007). The relevance of backcasting studies in relation to sustainable tourism destinations is that backcasting aims to provide policy makers and the general public with images of the future in order to incentivize opinion forming and decision making (Quist & Vergragt, 2006). Furthermore, backcasting is not only about how desirable futures can be attained, but also about analyzing how undesirable futures can be avoided or responded to (Ibid.).

In the early 1990s, participatory backcasting was initiated in the Netherlands, including the broad involvement of stakeholders to fulfill sustainable goals in the distant future (Quist, 2007). Since then, different participatory approaches have been designed and used for different projects that aimed to achieve a more sustainable outcomes (Ibid.). In Sweden, the Natural Step Organization has used the backcasting approach to create a methodology for strategic planning focused on sustainability companies. This method is known as the Natural Step methodology and has been successfully applied by corporations like Ikea, Interface and Scandic Hotels (Ibid.).

Participatory backcasting has generated interesting questions regarding the methodological character of the approach. Related to this, backcasting has been pointed as unclear regarding methods (Quist, 2007). In the different participatory backcasting approaches implemented so far, many conventional methods are used and combined. Moreover, backcasting can be described as a method or as an approach. For Quist (2007), backcasting should be referred as a method when applied to a concrete case, even if it uses other combined methods.

Robinson (1988) addressed the issues related to the conceptual and methodological aspects of backcasting including the necessity to broadening the process to a larger group of possible users, and to challenge the hegemony of actual dominant perspectives. Robinson (1988) proposed the need of defining future goals and objectives for backcasting analysis to take place. The next step required using these goals to imagine and create a future scenario. (Ibid.). The new scenario had to be evaluated multiple times to resolve inconsistencies and mitigate economic, social, and environmental impacts revealed during the analysis. In conclusion, when goals are placed into scenarios, the approach allows them to be evaluated in terms of feasibility and policy implications (Ibid.). For Robinson (1988) backcasting mainly focuses on the question of choice.

To have a well-defined backcasting method that fits the purpose of this project, four different backcasting approaches were reviewed and contrasted. Different steps were taken from these approaches to build a methodological framework. The four approaches analyzed were taken from Quist (2007) and are the following: Robinson’s approach, the Natural Step approach, Sustainable Technology Development approach, and SusHouse approach.

Robinson’s (1990:823) backcasting approach is defined as normative and design-oriented. The steps are shown in figure 2, and include exploring alternative development paths as its main purpose. The process starts with setting and defining future goals, objectives, and constraints, followed by creating future scenarios based on criteria set externally to the analysis.

The Natural Step (TNS) backcasting approach consists in four steps shown in figure 2, and is designed for strategic sustainability planning in firms and other organizations (Holmberg, 1998). The first step is to define sustainability criteria for the company. The second step is an analysis of the present situation, activities, and procedures of the company. The third step is to define future options and visions with the help of employees, and creativity techniques can be applied. The fourth step is to develop strategies to move from the present towards the desired envisioned future (Ibid.).

Sustainable Technology Development (STD) backcasting approach consists in seven steps shown in figure 2. A long-term vision based on alternative solutions for sustainable fulfillment is designed in the first three steps (Weaver et al. 2000). Descriptions of actions needed to achieve this future are clarified in steps four and five.
The last two steps are about implementation and facilitation of stakeholder cooperation (Ibid.). Methods used in this approach include stakeholder interview and creativity workshops (Ibid.).

SusHouse backcasting approach was used to develop strategies for sustainable households. It includes seven steps shown in figure 1. For every household function there was a stakeholder analysis that covered supply, demand, government and interest groups. Stakeholders participated in creativity workshops (Quist & Vergragt, 2000).

The four approaches are presented in figure 2 (Quist, 2007:25).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robinson’s backcasting approach</th>
<th>TNS backcasting approach</th>
<th>STD backcasting approach</th>
<th>SusHouse backcasting approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key assumptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Criteria for social and</td>
<td>&gt; Decreasing resource</td>
<td>&gt; Sustainable future</td>
<td>&gt; Stakeholder participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental desirability</td>
<td>usage</td>
<td>need fulfillment</td>
<td>&gt; Factor 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are set externally to the</td>
<td>&gt; Diminishing emissions</td>
<td>&gt; Factor 20</td>
<td>&gt; Sustainable households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>&gt; Safeguarding biodiversity and ecosystems</td>
<td>&gt; Time horizon of 40-50 years</td>
<td>&gt; 2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Goal-oriented</td>
<td>&gt; Fair and efficient usage of resources in line with the equity principle</td>
<td>&gt; Co-evolution of technology &amp; society</td>
<td>&gt; Social and technological changes are needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Policy-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Stakeholder participation</td>
<td>&gt; Achieving follow-up is relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Design-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Focus on realising follow-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; System oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology (steps)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Determine objectives</td>
<td>(1) Define a framework and criteria for sustainability</td>
<td>(1) Strategic problem orientation</td>
<td>(1) Problem orientation and function definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Specify goals, constraints and targets &amp; describe present system and specify exogenous variables</td>
<td>(2) Describe the current situation in relation to that framework</td>
<td>(2) Develop sustainable future vision</td>
<td>(2) Stakeholder analysis and involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Describe present system and its material flows</td>
<td>(3) Envisage a future sustainable situation</td>
<td>(3) Backcasting – set out alternative solutions</td>
<td>(3) Stakeholder creativity workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Specify exogenous variables and inputs</td>
<td>(4) Find strategies for sustainability</td>
<td>(4) Explore options and identify bottlenecks</td>
<td>(4) Scenario construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Undertake scenario construction;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Scenario assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Undertake (scenario) impact analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Stakeholder backcasting and strategy workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples of methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Realisation follow-up and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Social impact analysis</td>
<td>&gt; Strategy development</td>
<td>&gt; Stakeholder analysis</td>
<td>&gt; Stakeholder analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Economic impact analysis</td>
<td>&gt; Employee involvement</td>
<td>&gt; Stakeholder workshops</td>
<td>&gt; Function &amp; system analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Environmental analysis</td>
<td>&gt; Employee training</td>
<td>&gt; Problem analysis</td>
<td>&gt; Backcasting analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Scenario construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; External communication</td>
<td>&gt; Stakeholder workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>methodologies</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Technology analysis</td>
<td>&gt; Scenario construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; System analysis &amp; modelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Construction of future visions</td>
<td>&gt; Scenario evaluation (consumer acceptance, environmental, economic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Material flow analysis and modelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; System design &amp; analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.** Four backcasting approaches. Steps highlighted in yellow were used to create the participatory approach used in this study. The different steps from all approaches present an opportunity to combine and build new models (Quist, 2007:25).

Robinson’s and TNS approaches do not have a step focused on backcasting, instead they apply the term backcasting as the overall approach (Quist, 2007). On the other hand, SusHouse and STD approaches include a
separated step called backcasting. Nevertheless, this step has no references to methods or tools employed to achieve it (Ibid.). In the four examples the overall approach reflects a framework constructed by steps where different types of methods can be applied. In all approaches, learning is fundamental (Ibid.). Stakeholders are important for the process of backcasting because of their context-specific knowledge, their help in endorsing results and their role in proposed actions and follow-ups (Ibid.).

A methodological framework for this study was developed using elements of the four participatory backcasting approaches reviewed. These approaches do not establish specific methods but allow combining different ones. The TNS approach four steps build the core of this methodology that incorporates elements of the other three approaches. This participatory approach created for sustainable destinations consist of four steps:

Step 1: Define criteria for sustainability goals.
Step 2: Describe the destination in relation to sustainability goals.
Step 3: Envisage a future sustainable destination within these goals.
Step 4: Find strategies and action plans to achieve sustainability goals.

The criteria for sustainability goals of step 1 is determined by the delimitations of this paper that include the Sustainable Development Goals, 8, 11, and 13. The next three steps are completed by data collected from semi-structured interviews with relevant stakeholders and complemented with secondary data from the literature review. The sources of the information and data that integrates the four steps is explained next:

Step 1: SDGs: 8, 11, and 13.
Step 2: Empirical data collected in interviews with stakeholders.
Step 3: Empirical data collected in interviews with stakeholders.
Step 4: Empirical data collected in interviews with stakeholders, and secondary data from literature review.

2.3. Literature review

Literature review is fundamental in the structure of any academic project (Webster & Watson, 2002). An effective literature review facilitates theory development and creates a strong foundation to gather and bring forward knowledge (Ibid.). Furthermore, a good literature review uncovers the areas that are in need of more research (Ibid.). A high-quality review covers relevant literature on the topic but is not confined to a specific methodology, set of journals or geographic region (Ibid.).

The literature review conducted for this research project was aimed to get an overview of the core subjects related to the study. The main research words used were “sustainable development”, “sustainable tourism” and “sustainable destinations”. These were the main words from which other concepts were researched to complete the literature review. These concepts are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Concepts used to conduct the literature review. The following words were used to find articles, studies, and papers that provided relevant information to this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Backcasting</th>
<th>Stakeholder theory</th>
<th>Triple-bottom-line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service dominant logic</td>
<td>Co-creation of value</td>
<td>Shared value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business collaboration</td>
<td>Swedish Lapland</td>
<td>Responsible tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The databases used to retrieve articles related to these subjects were: Uppsala University Library, Science Direct, Taylor & Francis Online, Springer Link, JSTOR and Wiley Online Library. The most used journal was Journal of Sustainable Tourism. Articles from 2014 were given priority to certain subjects like sustainable and responsible tourism. Nevertheless, old articles as far back as 1980 were considered when reviewing history and
background of the concepts. The publication “Tourism and the Sustainable Development Goals, Journey to 2030”, by the World Tourism Organization was used to compare and discuss results from the interviews.

In addition, three core books were reviewed to retrieve key information regarding responsible tourism and sustainable tourism. One additional book on the subject of sustainability marketing was used as a complement. The name of the books and authors are presented in table 2.

Table 2. Key books reviewed for the purpose of the study. These books provided knowledge and insights about what responsible tourism is, and provided meaningful understanding of sustainable tourism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harold Goodwin</td>
<td>Responsible Tourism: Using Tourism for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Responsible Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Elkington &amp; Julia Hailes</td>
<td>Holidays That Don’t Cost the Earth</td>
<td>Sustainable Tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Peattie &amp; Frank-Martin Belz</td>
<td>Sustainability Marketing</td>
<td>Sustainable Marketing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In reviewing these articles and books, wide and valuable information regarding sustainable tourism and responsible tourism was retrieved. The literature review provided a truly valuable insight of what has been researched and discussed, as well as the needs of the field.

2.4. Semi-structured interviews

Interviews are considered one of the most common strategies for qualitative data collecting (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). Qualitative interviews are one of the most important and relevant tools to obtain information in a study (Tellis, 1997). Interviews’ different qualitative strategies derived from a diverse universe of disciplinary perspectives that resulted in a wider variation of interviewing approaches (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). In the case of unstructured interviews for example, observational data is conjunctionally collected (Ibid.).

Semi-structured interviews are usually the only source of qualitative data in a research project (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). These interviews are often scheduled in advance at a specific time and location. They are organized as a set of predetermined open-ended questions, giving room for other questions to emerge in the dialog between interviewer and interviewee (Ibid.). Semi-structured interviews are good for exploration of perceptions and opinions regarding complex and often sensitive issues (Barriball & While, 1994). The structure facilitates obtaining more information and answers clarification (Ibid.). These interviews take between 30 minutes to several hours (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006).

The semi-structured interviews are a key part on the collection of primary data for this research project. They provide a sense of reality to the research and are the main source of information to fulfill the backcasting steps. The semi-structured interviews were realized as a source of primary data to key stakeholders of Swedish Lapland Visitors Board, Kiruna Lapland Economic Association, Visit Skellefteå AB, and a visitor of the Ice Hotel in Kiruna. The interview questions were structured to obtain answers about the current situation of the destination first, and subsequently a vision of a desirable future in fifty years in relation to the SDGs 8, 12, and 13. The data is validated by sending a transcript of the interview to the respondents. The names of the interviewees and their roles are presented in table 3:

Table 3. Stakeholders interviewed in Swedish Lapland. The interviewees were realized at the destination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Interview date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ted Logardt</td>
<td>Communications at Visit Skellefteå</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Skellefteå</td>
<td>09/04/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interviews were all realized in person at different locations of Swedish Lapland. This was important to understand the context of every interviewee and their roles as stakeholders of a tourism destination. The interviewees were chosen based on their role as stakeholders according to a model created by Dowling (2001) and presented by Roberts (2003:162). This model is later mentioned and analyzed in the theory chapter. Interviewees Logardt, Mattsson, and Rosenfors were contacted by phone and confirmed by e-mail. Interviewee Poort was contacted in person at the Ice Hotel in Kiruna. The interviews were recorded, giving a great advantage to extend in every subject and ask additional questions when needed.
3. Theory

In this chapter, the theories related to sustainable tourism are presented. It contains multiple elements and concepts relevant to a service industry like tourism is. These elements and concepts are necessary to understand businesses and their stakeholders, as well as their imminent relation to society and environment in relation to the impacts caused by economic activities.

3.1. Sustainable development

As this study is based, inspired and aimed to enhance sustainable development, it is fundamental to understand what it encompasses. Being such a broad concept, sustainable development can be interpreted, studied, and applied within many different approaches. There is no universal definition or line of action that dictates if something is being sustainable. Nevertheless, there are some approaches, definitions, authors and publications that have shaped the sustainability movement into what it is today.

The idea of sustainability is not new. Over the centuries, philosophers and politicians have expressed concerns about the impacts of economic activity on the environment and society, their concerns can be traced back as far as to the ancient Babylon (Belz & Peattie, 2012), and the Mayan civilization (Caradonna, 2014). Moreover, the second half of the twentieth century witnessed a great intensification of social and environmental impacts caused by economic activities, creating new issues and challenges to be addressed (Belz & Peattie, 2012). As a consequence of this, numerous renewed concerns raised in the form of publications, that later shaped the sustainability movement. Rachel Carson’s “Silent Spring” (1962) uncovered the toxic effects of industrial chemicals on the environment and human health. Paul Ehrlich’s “The Population Bomb” (1968) calculated social and environmental impacts caused by exponential population growth. E.F. Schumacher’s “Small is Beautiful” (1973) questioned our political and business systems and the way progress is calculated by economic measures. Fritjof Capra’s “Turning Point” (1982) sought a holistic and systematic base approach to human development, and a new paradigm shift in the way of thinking. Nevertheless, the probably most influential of all publications has been “Limits to Growth” (1972) by the international think tank Club of Rome. The report explored and warned about global resource depletion and the threads to environmental systems produced by overwhelming waste.

Sustainability, as the movement we know today, emerged in the late 1970s and 1980s, as an ideal that involved social, environmental, and economic aspects (Caradonna, 2014; Elkington, 1998). It achieved massive attention after the publication of the already mentioned “Limits to Growth”. Furthermore, the term “sustainable development” gained popularity in 1987 through the World Commission on Environment and Development report, “Our Common Future”, better known as the “Brundtland Report” (Jenkins, 2009). The “Brundtland Report” (1987), is particularly known for recognizing the need to maintain a dynamic balance between the natural environment, human social welfare and economic activity, highlighting the interdependence of these three elements. Furthermore, it provided the most popular definition of sustainable development. The Brundtland report defines sustainable development as: “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of the future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED, 1987:43). This definition does not specify the needs of present and future generations, it also does not clarify what development is. However, it highlights the importance of taking in account the voice of an absent generation that will have to cope with the world that is given by the present one.

The main question about sustainability is if it represents an end point or if it is a process in itself (Caradonna, 2014). This is where the broadness of the concept becomes its major weak point, making it subject to extensive critique. The broadness and multiple perspectives of sustainability makes it a subject that is used to argue for and against free markets, climate treaties, social spending, and environmental preservation (Jenkins, 2009). Sustainability has not been supported universally, and it has been subject of criticism by strong environmentalists such as Bill McKibben, (1996) who described sustainability and sustainable development as
buzzwords. McKibben (1996) main criticism on sustainability is that it does not contribute to stop the core of environmental degradation and instead “the real intent is to put off the day of reckoning for a few more decades” (Ibid.). A lack of clarity on what is considered sustainable versus unsustainable, and in who gets to make these determinations have only attracted more detractors, that have called sustainability as a facilitator of business-as-usual economic growth and a mask to the ongoing environmental issues (Caradonna, 2014). As it is not possible to find a definitive interpretation, some critics have catalogued sustainability as meaningless and unfitting for political purposes (Jenkins, 2009). In relation to this, the Brundtland definition has been critiqued as being too focus on human needs and excluding other forms of life (Ibid.).

Regarding the breadth and ambiguity of sustainability, Caradonna (2014) states that in this sense, sustainability resembles concepts like “democracy”, “justice” or “community”, meaning that they all are discursive fields, suggesting a set of conditions rather than a specific outcome. Caradonna (2014) also highlights the importance of the sustainability movement above its criticism, as it has inspired governments, communities, organizations and individuals all over the world to align themselves with the idea of creating “a society that is safe, stable, prosperous, and ecologically minded” (Ibid., 2). But more importantly, sustainability gives a light to follow in a period where humans have become the dominant cause of the planet’s physical and biological changes, a period called “Age of the Anthropocene” (Sachs, 2012). With most environmental challenges being created by humanity, sustainability has become a counterbalance, a corrective tool, and directly tied to climate change, the biggest concern of them all (Caradonna, 2014). Furthermore, sustainability focuses on the complex mutuality of human and ecological systems, involving economic health, ecological integrity, social justice, and above all, responsibility to the future (Jenkins, 2009). These factors must be integrated into a coherent, durable, and moral vision, in order to address multiple global problems, (Ibid.).

Overall, for those who champion sustainability as an environmental, social, economical and political ideal, a crossroad is presented. Either continue with business as usual, ignoring climate change, environmental issues and pretending the economic system is not on life support, or redefine society along the lines of sustainability and all of what it implies (Caradonna, 2014). As long as a generally recognized mutual feedback between human and ecological systems exists, differences will focus on what to sustain over time (Jenkins, 2009). Sustainability creates the base for a new moral and political debate, as the challenges it involves are urgent and important. Disagreements and diversity of opinion should be expected (Ibid.), and those involved in sustainability practices should be able to cope with it.

Economists, ecologists, scientists and organizations have created precise definitions in order to comprehend sustainability. What most recent definitions of sustainability have in common is an ecological point of view, a notion that society and the economy are intimately linked to the natural environment (Caradonna, 2014). Professor Albert A. Bartlett (1998), seeking to clarify the meaning of sustainability, presented 17 laws regarding population and resource consumption. Bartlett (1998) is also known for critiquing the term “sustainable growth”, defining it as an oxymoron, and for focusing less on the environment and more on economic growth, population, agriculture, and energy principles. William Rees and Mathis Wackernagel (1996) presented the concept of “Ecological Footprint”, defined as the amount of land and water hypothetically required by human population to generate the resources to support itself, and to absorb its waste. It is implied that for humanity to achieve sustainability, the global population’s footprint must be inferior to the total land and water area of the planet.

The Swedish oncologist Karl Henrik Robert (2000) developed a series of requirements for a sustainable society that translated into four conditions to achieve sustainability. These conditions became the basis of Robert’s organization, “The Natural Step”, which since its creation has been dedicated to promoting a sustainable society. Moreover, Richard Heinberg (2007), senior fellow of the Post Carbon Institute, and regarded as one of the world’s foremost advocates for a shift away from fossil fuels, defines the word sustainable as “that which can be maintained over time.” This definition implies that any society that is unsustainable cannot be maintained for long and at some point will stop functioning (Ibid.). Following the steps of Robert’s conditions
of sustainability, Heinberg (2007) introduced five axioms of sustainability. These five axioms took in account previous definitions of sustainability:

“(1) Any society that continues to use critical resources unsustainably will collapse. (2) Population growth and/or growth in the rates of consumption of resources cannot be sustained. (3) To be sustainable, the use of renewable resources must proceed at a rate that is less than or equal to the rate of natural replenishment. (4) To be sustainable, the use of nonrenewable resources must proceed at a rate that is declining, and the rate of decline must be greater than or equal to the rate of depletion. (5) Sustainability requires that substances introduced into the environment from human activities be minimized and rendered harmless to biosphere functions” (Ibid.).

In order to persist, adapt and thrive indefinitely on this planet, humans must live in balance with the natural world (Caradonna, 2014). Sustainability conceives society, the environment and the economic system as indelibly connected, rather than separate or even antagonistic spheres (Ibid.). The most common model of sustainability is a tripartite Venn diagram, which projects the famously known “three Es”: environment, economy and social equity (Ibid.). Although this model is considered as “weak sustainability” (figure 3), it was endorsed by the 2005 UN World Summit, and it is been used in countless occasions, including books and ecological models (Ibid.).
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**Figure 3.** The “Three Es” of sustainability representing environment, economy and social equity (Caradonna, 2014:8). This model of sustainability is the most popular and accepted, however is considered to endorse business-as-usual practices.

There is a different model that re-conceptualizes the “three Es” diagram, portraying a series of concentric circles, in which the environment is seen as the foundation of sustainability (figure 4), with society and the economy nested inside (Caradonna, 2014). This model is considered “strong sustainability” and reflects the vision of authors like Herman Daly (1995) and Victor et al. (1998) that argued that the environment is the support of society and the economy; without the environment, society and economy could simply not exist. “Strong sustainability” prioritizes ecological preservation, including species and the functioning of ecosystems (Jenkins, 2009). In addition, it conceives natural capital as complementary to economic capital but not interchangeable, as it provides functions that are not substitutable by man-made capital (Gutes, 1996).
Contrary, “weak sustainability” conceives natural capital and man-made capital as inherently substitutable (Neumayer, 2003), with no restrictions introduced (Gutes, 1996), and not considering any differences between the wellbeing both generate (Ekins et al. 2003).

![Diagram](Figure 4. The environment as the foundation of sustainability (Caradonna, 2014:9). This model conceives the environment as the base in which society and economy can exist and develop.)

Weak and strong sustainability reflect on two types of economic views. The economic optimists, that believe population, economy and consumption have no limits, and economic pessimists that believes the size of global economy and population are already too high for the planet to provide resources for (Malovics et al. 2008). A third approach mentioned by Jenkins (2009) suggests a pragmatic middle view with no obligations to sustain ecological processes or non-human life, but neither assuming that all opportunities should be measured against one another. Following a pragmatic approach, Jonas (1984), proposed that new human powers should act responsibly for the sake of human survival.

John Dryzek (1997) contributes with an important interpretation of sustainability in his book “Politic of the Earth”. Dryzek (1997) presents and analyses several competing discourses involving the environment. The author explains that the environmental discourse emerged as a consequence of industrial society, hence it has to be positioned in the context of industrialism discourse. For Dryzek (1997), industrialism is characterized for its commitment to growth in the quantity of goods and services produced, and the material wellbeing that is achieved by growth. In addition, all environmental concerns brought by industrialism were conceived in terms of input to industrial processes, meaning conservation efforts were sought to support the growing economy (Ibid.). For this reason, the author states that environmental discourse cannot take industrialism terms as given, on the contrary, it must depart from these terms. To explain his departure, Dryzek (1997) describes two opposing distinctions, reformist and radical, forming one dimension to categorize environmental discourses (Table 4). A second dimension to envision the departure from industrialism can be prosaic or imaginative (Ibid.). Prosaic departure means that the economic and political terms of the industrial society are pretty much given. Environmental problems are issues that require action but a shift in society is not required. Imaginative departures, in contrast, seem to redefine society and see environmental problems as an opportunity to achieve a wholesale transformation of the economic and political structures (Ibid.). Combining these two dimensions produce a matrix to classify environmental discourses.
Table 4. Classification of environmental discourses (Dryzek, 1997:16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reformits</th>
<th>Radical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prosaic</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Limits and survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Green radicalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Dryzek’s (1997) two dimensions classification, emerges four basic environmental discourses. *Environmental problem solving* is prosaic and reformist as it takes the political and economic status-quo as given but recognizes the need for adjustment to cope with environmental problems that might be solved by policy, markets or administration. *Limits and Survival* is a prosaic and radical discourse that seeks a wholesale redistribution of power within the industrial political economy, shifting away from perpetual economic growth but in the light of industrialist terms. *Green radicalism* is both imaginative and radical as it argues for a different alternative interpretation of the environment, humans, society, and their place in the word. Finally, *Sustainability* is imaginative and reformist as it seeks for dissolve the conflict between economic values and the environment. Sustainability redefines the concepts of growth and development and becomes a broader debate rather than a specific model (*Ibid.*).

Sustainability is conceptualized alongside ecological issues, nevertheless, it involves more than just the environment as it is equally interested in social and economic challenges. These challenges can be summarized in well-being, equality, redistribution of wealth, democracy and justice (Caradonna, 2014). Above all, sustainability represents the interconnectedness of these three domains. According to Caradonna (2014) the economic dimension requires the production of good and services to be stable, balancing the demands of different sectors of the economy. The environmental dimension requires the preservation of renewable resources, safeguard biodiversity and essential ecosystem services. The social requires fair distribution of resources, equal opportunities, health, education, social justice and most important, the ability to live safe and meaningful life. In conclusion, to be considered sustainable, a society must address these three dimensions (*Ibid.*). As stated by Caradonna (2014:4):

“This is what sustainability is meant to counteract: a moribund economic system that has drained the world of many of its finite resources, including fresh water and crude oil, generated a meltdown in global financial systems, exacerbated social inequality in many parts of the world, and driven human civilization to the brink of catastrophe by unwisely advocating for economic growth at the expense of resources and essential ecosystem services.”

Sustainability must recognize the need for a shift from our old economic practices, from business-as-usual, and overconsumption. It must acknowledge that most challenges and impacts we face today are a result of an unplanned, ignorant and irresponsible way of living. Sustainability must be a movement of constant change, constant evolution, and constant reflexion in our actions, not only to leave a better world for future generations, but to avoid our own extinction.

3.2. Triple bottom line

Sustainability as a concept, has secured a hegemonic place among regional planning purposes (Coffman & Umemoto, 2010). Consequently, sustainability principles now have a priority place in regional planning dialogs, recreating planning processes around the world (*Ibid.*). As mentioned before, academics have struggled to get a consensus on the definition of sustainability. As a consequence, there is a debate around sustainability with the terminology of balance competing with that of limits, and generating governmental struggle to understand the operationalization of the concept (Healey & Shaw, 1994). According to Owens (1994:442) “the concept of sustainable development is constitutive and responsive to, changing social and political relations with the environment.” Therefore, the lack of an operational definition is proof that there are
new ideas being added (Meine, 1992). The Brundtland definition of sustainability is considered as being the most spread, nevertheless, its use has served as a device for mobilizing opinion rather than developing specific policies (Blowers, 1993). According to Jabareen (2008), understanding sustainable development and its complexities is being blocked by a lack of comprehensive theoretical framework. The author described the concept as an “ethical paradox”. In addition to this, there is a lack of operative definitions for sustainable development (Villanueva, 1997). Nevertheless, even with little consensus on how to put in practice sustainability, policy makers and planners continue to apply a broad definitional frame to sustainability planning processes (Berke & Conroy, 2000). The result is planning outcomes that do not represent a difference than other general plans that do not include sustainability principles (Coffman & Umemoto, 2010). In other cases, the result is that sustainability principles are used to promote an economic agenda (Gunder, 2006). Sustainable development is seen as the reconciliation of environment, society and the economy, so the natural world can thrive while humans can meet their needs and social equity is promoted (Coffman & Umemoto, 2010). These three imperative factors can be difficult to reconcile, and in this process “the triple-bottom-line” has emerged (Ibid.).

The “triple-bottom-line” was conceived by John Elkington (1998) and it suggested that companies should not focus only on a financial bottom line, rather include social and environmental goals as well. It originated within the business community but was later adopted in policy discourse. This interpretation framed sustainability in a different level, concerning companies and incorporating corporate responsibility (Coffman & Umemoto, 2010). For Elkington (1998), to achieve “the triple-bottom-line” was of vital importance, not only for transnational corporations but for small companies as well, redefining the role of businesses in a social and ecological conscious world. This framework focuses on corporations rather than governments or society because it is argued that only corporations have the resources, global reach and the motivation to achieve sustainability (Adams et al. 2004).

The “triple-bottom-line” has gained global recognition as it communicates sustainability in a language that makes sense to a population focused on the economic bottom line (Adams et al. 2004). In relation to this, the concept has also successfully achieved the articulation of the sustainability philosophy to corporations and their stakeholders (Ibid.). Nevertheless, Coffman & Umemoto, (2010) have identified that the “triple-bottom-line” can lead to “trade-offs”, meaning that the environmental, economic and social aspects are often juxtaposed in competition with one another.

Planning and policy-making processes often require deciding between costs and benefits of certain actions that are within the economic, environmental or social scope (Coffman & Umemoto, 2010). Nevertheless, the trade-offs that accompany the “triple-bottom-line approach” tend to highlight stakeholders positions, which often challenge the collaboration, innovation, and creativity of the problem-solving process (Ibid.). As a consequence, Coffman & Umemoto (2010) suggested that if “the triple-bottom-line” framework is adopted, the goals set should be integrated instead of juxtaposed. Furthermore, an approach should be taken in ceasing to prioritize economic growth above the other two bottom lines. The aim should be to achieve environmental goals, emphasizing economic and social initiatives that translate in mutually beneficial outcomes (Ibid.).

3.3. Stakeholder theory

Stakeholders are defined by Freeman (1984: 46) as “any group or individual that can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organizations objectives.” As the concept of stakeholder can become too broad, stakeholder theory attempts to identify which groups of stakeholders require management attention (Mitchell et al. 1997). This differentiation is important as stakeholders can be catalogued as persons, groups, neighborhoods, organizations, societies, institutions and even the natural environment (Ibid.). In addition, stakeholder theorists debate on taking a broad approach or a narrow one regarding a company’s stakeholder universe (Windsor, 1992). This is crucial for recognizing who really counts as a stakeholder, which affects the understanding of a company’s stakeholder environment (Mitchell et al. 1997). Regarding this, a broad
approach is better to fully understand the impacts of an organization and the way its stakeholders interact (Ibid.).

Stakeholder theory argues that companies are required to consider the interests of all parties affected by their actions, as they have a social responsibility towards them (Branco & Rodrigues, 2007). The way companies address sustainability issues can greatly affect their corporate reputation, even when these issues are outside of the organization’s direct control (Roberts, 2003). Regarding this, companies should consider anyone who is or could be affected by business decision, and not only shareholders in the decision-making process (Branco & Rodrigues, 2007). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) was defined by Jones (1980: 59-60) as “the notion that corporation have an obligation to constituent groups in society other than stockholders and beyond that prescribed by law or union contract, indicating that a stake my go beyond mere ownership.” This concept adds the sustainability spirit into companies’ actions and decision making.

A problem that affects stakeholder theory is the difficulty to acknowledge “mute” stakeholders like the natural environment, and “absent” stakeholders like the future generations or potential future victims (Branco & Rodrigues, 2007). The majority of stakeholder definition usually describes them as groups or individuals, excluding the natural environment and therefore making it difficult to be considered (Buchholz, 2004). An alternative to including the environment as a stakeholder, is considering the interests of the future generations (Jacobs, 1997). This alternative is difficult to implement as it is not possible to ask the future generations their opinion on the natural environment (Ibid.). Therefore, according to some authors, to be categorized as a stakeholder, it is required to be human (Phillips and Reichart, 2000). Nevertheless, if a legitimate concern from stakeholders towards the natural environment or the future generations exists, it has to be taken into account (Jacobs, 1997). Jacobs (1997) insist that the interests of future generations and the environment should be represented in the company’s decision-making structures.

A perspective called “the social activist”, promotes the notion that companies are accountable to all stakeholders, meaning they should actively champion social interests, even if it is not expected or demanded by society (Branco & Rodrigues, 2007). In relation to this, the mission of the companies should be identifying opportunities that are not only beneficial for the organization but for society as well, rather than only pursuing the creation of profit for shareholders (Rodriguez et al. 2002).

Environmental management has become a key issue for companies in the last decades, affecting all levels of their operations (Henriques & Sadorsky, 1999). In relation to this, Roome (1992) and Hunt & Auster (1990) proposed a classification of companies based on their degrees of proactivity towards environmental management. This classification described five strategic options. Noncompliance, that encompasses companies not reacting or choosing not to react to environmental standards. Compliance, that involves reaction driven by legislation. Compliance-plus, that is a proactive strategy on environmental management. Commercial and environmental excellence, that views environmental management as good for the company. And finally, leading edge, which conceives the company as an environmental leader in their industries (Ibid.).

A company’s natural environment commitment can be described by the practices it promotes (Henriques & Sadorsky, 1999). These practices can include having and environmental plan, communicating the environmental plan to stakeholders and employees, having an environmental unit, and having a board or committee dedicated to address environmental issues (Ibid.). An environmental plan or statement that describes the corporation’s commitment is considered a starting point for proactive communication (Mastrandonas & Strife, 1992). Furthermore, communicating a company’s environmental plan to stakeholders is an important sign that the organization is serious about its commitment (Henriques & Sadorsky, 1999). Moreover, setting clear goals as well as specific targets to complete them is truly important as communicating them throughout all the levels of a corporation in order to complete an effective environmental management system (Stead & Stead, 1996).
Clarkson (1995) identifies two typologies of stakeholders, naming them primary and secondary stakeholders. Primary stakeholders constitute of those that the corporation could not survive without, including shareholders, employees, customers and suppliers. Secondary stakeholders are the ones influenced or affected by the corporation, but do not engage in any transaction with the corporation, therefore not affecting its survival (Ibid.).

The implementation of CSR can be viewed as a strategy that companies have in order to do business while leading to societal benefits, or as something they should be practicing simply because it is the right thing to do (Roberts, 2003). McWilliams and Siegal (2001:117) define CSR as “‘actions which appear to further some social good, beyond the interests of the firm and that which is required by law.’” In reality, many companies are already investing in such actions and their concerns are not in if CSR should be applied, but how to best apply CSR practices effectively (Roberts, 2003).

A key driver for companies to implement CSR is the necessity to avoid any risk of damage to their corporate reputation (Roberts et al., 2002). Corporate reputation takes into account the opinions that stakeholders have about the company (Roberts, 2003). In relation to this, reputation can be defined as “the evaluation of a firm by its stakeholders in terms of their affect, esteem and knowledge” (Deephosue, 2000). Good reputation is responsible for increasing the time companies spent earning above average financial returns, making it a desirable attribute for companies to engage in CSR (Roberts & Dowling, 1997).

“Reputations reflect firm’s relative success in fulfilling the expectations of multiple stakeholders” (Fombrun & Shanley, 1990), consequently the need for companies to understand who their stakeholders are, and what they expect, becomes crucial (Roberts, 2003). According to Dowling (2001), there is a wider range of stakeholders that often conflict and trade-off on their demands (Figure 5). They can be divided in four categories. Authorisers monitor the performance of the company and provide authority to it. Business partners operate the company and include employees and suppliers. External influencers have a strong interest in the company and its impacts, and include media, NGOs or community groups. Customers have different perceptions of the company’s reputation depending on their interests in the products or services.
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**Figure 5.** Corporate stakeholders clarification by Dowling (2001), in Roberts (2003:162). Different stakeholders often conflict and trade-off on their demands depending on their priorities.

Stakeholders’ expectations of a company often include a high performance on social and environmental actions (Roberts, 2003). The likeliness of companies to implement such actions is strongly related to external
pressure from stakeholders and to concerns being related to the company’s core business and environmental strategy (Ibid.). Furthermore, if there are identifiable benefits from these actions or otherwise a risk from not putting these actions in practice, implementations are more likely to happen (Ibid.). For a good CSR strategy to work effectively, it is necessary that companies develop a systematic mechanism of interaction with all of their stakeholders (Ibid.).

### 3.4. Service dominant logic and co-creation of value

Service dominant logic is a departure from the traditional view that places goods as the focus of exchange, and services as just another representation of goods (Lush & Vargo, 2006). In service dominant logic, specialized skills and knowledge are the focus of economic exchange and represent the essential foundation upon which society is built (Ibid.). Moreover, by exchanging the application of specialized skills and knowledge, humans are improving individual and collective wellbeing (Ibid.).

Lush and Vargo and Lush (2006:283) define service dominant logic as “the application of specialized competences (knowledge and skills), through deeds, processes, and performances for the benefit of another entity or the entity itself.” Moreover, Vargo and Lush (2004) argue that in service dominant logic specialized skills and knowledge are the fundamental unit of exchange, goods are the distribution mechanism for service provision, knowledge is the fundamental source of competitive advantage, all economies are service economies, and the customer is always co-creator of value.

For companies, growth and value creation have become the leading themes to focus on. The process of value creation is experimenting a rapid shift from product and firm centric to a view of personalized customer experiences (Pralahad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Customers have more power than before and are seeking to practice their influence in all the parts of the business system. What customers ask, is to interact with firms and be part in the creation of value. This changing nature of the interaction between companies and customers as the locus of co-creation of value restructures the process of value creation (Ibid.).

Value creation was seen before as a process that took place inside companies, as the concept of “value chain” encapsulated the unilateral role of the company in the creation of value (Porter, 1980). In this vision, the market was a locus of exchange or an extension of the customers (Figure 6), completely separated from the process of value creation (Kotler, 2002). The market had no role at all in value creation but only value exchange and extraction (Pralahad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Traditional views of the market are company centric, and so it is the value creation process. As a consequence, companies conceptualize customer relations as the locus for economic value extraction (Ibid.). Moreover, this interaction between consumers and companies do not represent a source of value creation (Wikstrom, 1996).

![Figure 6. Traditional concept of the market as a locus of exchange (Pralahad & Ramaswamy, 2004:7). This traditional view does not motivate value creation between customers and companies.](image-url)
Customers are informed, connected, empowered and more active than ever, they are also aware of their influence on extracting value from the market (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). The value creation process of industries is being scrutinized, analyzed and evaluated by customers that have more choices than in the past (Ibid.). Customers are now able to choose the companies they want to interact with based on how value is created for them (Ibid.).

Recognizing this shift is imperative for companies. If companies do not acknowledge the importance of co-creation of value, the consequences can be big and affect costs in the value chain activities (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). As globalization, outsourcing and convergence of industries and technologies are challenging companies to differentiate their offers, the reaction of customers is to buy smart and cheap (Ibid.). To avoid this scenario, companies must leave the firm-centric view and adopt the co-creation of value with its customers. To achieve this is essential to leave behind a product-centered thinking and focus on the customers and the experience they want to co-create (Ibid.).

For co-creation of value to take place it is critical that direct interactions between company and customer occur (Grönroos, 2011). Nevertheless, the fact that interactions occur between these two actors do not guarantee that the company automatically enables customers in the process of value creation (Grönroos, 2011). Consequently, companies need to have the ability to understand the needs and wants of customers and learn to manage the interactions (Homburg et al. 2009). The platform for interaction provided by a company can be flawed; therefore, quality of the interactions between the actors becomes fundamental (Grönroos, 2011).

An important aspect to consider on the interactions that promote the co-creation of unique experiences between customers and companies is that it opens new sources of competitive advantage (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). This means value must be jointly created by both customers and companies (Ibid.). The traditional concept of market is slowly disconnected from informed and active consumers. Opportunities for differentiation and value creation are being enabled by the expectations and capabilities of these consumers (Ibid.).

In order to build an effective system for co-creation of value, blocks of interactions between consumers and firms are necessary. These blocks should enable dialog, access, risk-benefits and more important, transparency as the basis for interaction (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Dialog is key for a co-creation perspective, and markets can become points of communication between companies and consumers (Levine et al. 2001). To achieve an effective dialog between the two parts, access and transparency is essential, meaning companies should voluntary provide information regarding risks and benefits of their offerings (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). A transition of a company from a firm-centric view to a co-creation view is not simple or easy. Nevertheless, companies that embrace this view as the source of unique value are significantly enhanced to its customers (Ibid.). Co-creation of value deeply focuses on customer-company interaction and it implies that all stages of consumer-company interaction are essential in order to create value (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2003).

The co-creation approach moves away from the vision of the market as an aggregation of customers and target of the offerings from companies. It encourages firms to learn as much as they can about their customers using effective dialogue (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). The processes and infrastructure to collect information must be focused on customers and encourage active participation in every aspect of the co-creation experience, including the configuration of products and services (Ibid.). By achieving this, the market becomes a forum of dialogue among customers and companies (Figure 7), transforming their relationship and making it clear that responsibility must be taken by both (Ibid.).
3.5. Shared value and business collaboration

Companies are often viewed as prospering at the expense of the environment and broader community. For these reasons they must lead the way in bringing business and society together (Porter & Kramer, 2011). Social responsibility often puts societal issues at the periphery instead of the core of businesses focus. The solution by Porter & Kramer (2011:64) is “create economic value in a way that also creates value for society by addressing its needs and challenges.” Shared value is at the center of companies work and it is seen as a new path to achieve economic success (Ibid.). By compromising to shared value, companies must redefine their economic thinking and include environmental and social considerations (Ibid.).

Shared value is defined by Porter & Kramer (2011:66) as “policies and operating practices that enhance the competitiveness of a company while simultaneously advancing the economic and social conditions in the communities in which it operates.” The concept recognizes the societal costs that need to be addressed in order to create economic profit (Ibid.). Shared value also recognizes the internal costs that social harms cause to companies and that addressing these issues do not represent necessarily and increasing cost but as an opportunity to innovate and increase productivity (Ibid.). Capitalism’s old view perceives business as contributing to social benefit by creating jobs, paying taxes and making profit (Ibid.). This vision leaves communities with little benefit when companies make profit at their expense. To fight this, companies can create shared value by redefining products and markets, reinventing productivity in the value chain, and building industry clusters that support communities at the company’s location (Ibid.).

An important aspect to consider is that every company is affected by other companies and the infrastructure that surrounds all of them (Porter & Kramer, 2011). The success of a company’s shared value will be linked to others as productivity and innovation are highly influence by clusters of related companies, suppliers and infrastructure (Ibid.). Institutions, trade associations and NGOs are also part of clusters, and all play a crucial role in creating innovation, productivity and competitiveness (Ibid.). In relation to clusters, to address corporate responsibility and complex sustainability issues, companies join forces by convening stakeholder networks (Svendsen & Laberge, 2005). This involves new approaches and ways of thinking beyond the traditional old views (Ibid.). A stakeholder network can be defined as “a web of groups, organizations and/or individuals who come together to address a complex and shared cross-boundary problem, issue or opportunity” (Ibid.,92). A network convenor can be an individual, group or organization that helps the stakeholder web to focus its resources, intelligence and innovation to produce new solutions that could not be produced by a member alone (Ibid.).

An essential component for the role of network convenor is systems thinking. This implies a shift in focusing from the parts to the whole, and from taking consideration of a single organization goal to solving the issues of the whole network (Svendsen & Laberge, 2005). The stakeholder network survival and long-term
sustainability depend on the preservation and well-being of natural and social systems in which the network is based (Post et al. 2002). Consequently, relationships between stakeholders are critical, and establishing links, communication channels and developing trust-based relationships is an essential task of the convenor (Svendsen & Laberge, 2005). As relationships cannot be controlled, the network convenor must be aware that parties will co-operate but also compete and co-evolve. This could lead to motivate other parts of the system to grow and change (Capra, 2002). Diversity is critical for a stakeholder network with a systems perspective. For the network to be more creative and innovative to address challenges, diverse views and backgrounds are necessary (Svendsen & Laberge, 2005). Although diversity can cause tension, as part of the network convenor role to reconcile discrepancy, and in doing so, sustainable innovation occurs (Senge & Carstedt, 2001).

Business collaboration has been catalogued as the oxymoron of corporate sustainability as efforts from companies to work together to tackle complex issues have failed due to self-interest (Nidumolu et al. 2014). Nevertheless, there is a rising recognition that Earth’s natural resources provide immense value to society and businesses alike, and that much of this value is being destroyed by the companies’ way of using them (Ibid.). As a result, a growing awareness for collaboration and innovative models for creating value is taking place (Ibid.). Regarding this, an optimal collaboration involves business processes as well as business outcomes (Ibid.).

Businesses have the challenge to redirect value creation towards preserving natural commons while developing their potential (Nidumolu et al. 2014). Natural commons that are experiencing negative impacts by companies of different industries include oceans, the atmosphere, wetlands, watersheds, coral reefs and rivers (Nidumolu et al. 2014). In order to protect these commons and recognize their full long-term value, collaboration models that conceive ecosystems as a whole are necessary (Nidumolu et al. 2014).

There are two characteristics that these models need to incorporate in order to address systemic challenges: first, they need to select stakeholders carefully, and second, they need to focus efforts and innovation on operating processes or business outcomes (Nidumolu et al. 2014). Stakeholder inclusion means that the right players must be required, key stakeholders that are capable of changing practices and behavior can add system value and need to be involved (Ibid.). Processes and outcomes is the second dimension of the new models of collaboration. This dimension can be divided in coordinated processes and coordinated outcomes. Coordinated processes take place when stakeholders focus on innovating processes to reduce resources consumption and waste as well as protecting the natural environment (Ibid.). Coordinated outcomes occur when stakeholders work together setting desired outcomes and creating metric to measure these outcomes environmental impacts (Ibid.). Sustainability collaborations should develop over time, moving between models or incorporating features of different models. The scale of the collaboration will be better if markets have the right incentives in place (Ibid.).

3.6. Sustainable transitions and transformations
Authors have approached system changes and transitions with different propositions regarding pathways in transition processes (Geels & Schot, 2007). A particular perspective called multi-level, explains that transitions come to be through interactions between processes at three levels: niche-innovations, changes at the landscape level, and destabilization of the regime. When these three processes are aligned it enables the breakthrough of novelties in markets (Ibid.). Transition pathways based on multi-level interaction have two particular criteria: timing of interaction, and nature of interaction. Timing of interaction explains pressure of change towards the regime in contrast to the state of niche developments (Ibid.). Nature of interaction explains the relationships between niches and regime, these relationships can be reinforcing if stabilizing the regime or disruptive if seeking for change (Ibid.). A particular pathway to focus in multi-level perspective is called “Reconfiguration pathway”, and it describe innovations that are developed in niches to solve local problems (Geels & Schot, 2007). These innovations are later adopted by the regime and trigger a change in the architecture of the whole regime. A particular factor is that these adoptions are driven by economic
considerations (Ibid.). Reconfiguration pathway delivers a new regime out of the old one, with substantial changes in its basic architecture (Ibid.).

Sustainable consumption and production (SCP) is usually associated only with pollution control and green products, driving away attention from other consumption patterns that strongly reinforce the resource intensity of everyday behavior (Geels et al. 2015). Like the concept of sustainable development, sustainable consumption is divided in weak and strong. Weak SCP is characterized by adoption of green technologies, whereas strong SCP is focused in reducing consumption levels and changing behavior. The two positions towards these approaches can be extreme (Ibid.). These positions are reformist and revolutionary (Ibid.).

Reformist SCP is a vision of a resource efficient status quo, it focuses on changes towards technical products that are made by companies and bought by customers (Geels et al. 2015). The problem with this vision is that it assumes that transport, energy and agro-food systems remain as they are. Moreover, this view is based on neoclassical economics and rationalist business approaches where cost-benefit calculations are the core in decision making by customers and companies (Ibid.).

Revolutionary SCP argues for a transformation in societal structures that support production and consumption (Geels et al. 2015). Supporters of this theory share that environmental problems are symptoms of socio-cultural and politico-economic problems, particularly the obsession on economic growth and overconsumption (Ibid.). This view argues for a fundamental and revolutionary change, with its major challenges being neoliberal economic mindsets, and the interests of political and economic actors within growth and consumption (Ibid.). Revolutionary SCP includes de-growth, sharing economy, slow food, among other concepts (Ibid.).

As a response to critics towards both approaches, a third one called “Reconfiguration” is suggested (Geels et al. 2015). This approach understands the importance of “grass-roots innovation” and promotes local initiatives, decentralized production, self-sufficiency and the use of artisan skills (Seyfang, 2004: 327). Furthermore, the existing capitalist economic system is challenged and replaced with economics that are small-scaled, decentralized and self-reliant (Ibid.). The reconfiguration approach is a middle ground between reformist and revolutionary. It calls for changes in transportation, food, and energy, as these three elements account for 70-80% of lifecycle impacts in developed countries (Tukker et al. 2010). The transitions that reconfiguration propose go beyond individual customers and companies and include multiple actors, representing a process were social movements, media, and public opinion are also taking in account (Ibid.). These transitions include realignments between different elements, and interactions between multiple actors (Geels et al. 2015).

3.7. Sustainable tourism
Tourism can be interpreted by four approaches in the context of sustainable development (Coccossis, 1996). The first approach is a sectoral view, focused on the economic aspect of sustainability. The second approach is ecological, with a strong emphasis in ecology and environment. The third approach is long-term viability of tourism, focused on destination competitiveness. The fourth and last approach is tourism as part of a sustainable development strategy, focused on both physical and human environments (Ibid.).

Bramwell et al. (1996:23) identified seven dimensions for sustainability in tourism management. These dimensions are defined as: environmental, cultural, political, economic, social, managerial, and governmental. Moreover, decision makers in every dimension have distinct interpretations of sustainable tourism (Butler, 1999). Because of these multiple dimensions and interpretations, it is unlikely that one accepted definition of sustainable tourism is applied universally (Ibid.). Many authors and organizations have proposed different definitions of sustainable tourism (Appendix 2) in the 1990s, some including more elements than others, and some being more descriptive than others.
A popular and complete definition of sustainable tourism proposed by the World Tourism Organization and the United Nations Environment Program (2005:12) states: "Tourism that takes full account of its current and future economic, social and environmental impacts, addressing the needs of visitors, the industry, the environment and host communities." This definition is complemented with three guidelines that should be met to achieve sustainable tourism. The first is to make optimal use of environmental resources. The second is to ensure and respect socio-cultural authenticity of local communities. And third is to ensure long-term economics that benefit all stakeholders involved (WTO & UNEP, 2005:11). Another two aspects mentioned in addition to definition and guidelines are the informed participation of all stakeholders involved, and to maintain a high-level of tourist satisfaction by creating meaningful experiences (WTO & UNEP, 2005:11).

According to Hall (2009:53-55) there are two approaches to address sustainable tourism: the efficiency approach, and slow consumption. The first focuses on reducing consumption by using more productive materials and being ecologically efficient but operating in a business-as-usual way (Ibid.). The second approach includes consumer activism, industry and public policy initiatives (Ibid.). Sustainable tourism consumption does not equal to less traveling but rather traveling more locally and staying longer when traveling long distances (Ibid.).

3.8. Theoretical framework
The purpose of a theoretical framework is to understand the interrelationships between theories and topics identified through literature review (Ravitch & Riggan, 2016). A framework is a structure composed of different parts enclosed together. In the case of theoretical framework, the parts enclosed are a combination or aggregation of theories found in literature (Ibid.). Theoretical frameworks can either be borrowed from other research studies or built by the researcher for the purposes of the study (Ibid.).

Models emerging from sustainable development can be conceived as “weak” or “strong” depending on the arrangement of the “three Es” (Caradonna, 2014). These conceptions or models of sustainable development can be linked with the classification of environmental discourses proposed by Dryzek (1997), depending if they are located in the radical or reformist dimension. The “weak” sustainability model is the base of the triple bottom line, which promotes that companies and organizations engage in pursuing societal and environmental goals instead of only economic ones (Elkington, 1998). Stakeholders that conform the organization can be classified as primary or secondary depending on the grade of interaction and relation with its survival. Their interactions and recognition determine the grade of the organization’s engagement with sustainability practices (Clarkson, 1995). Two stakeholders often not recognized by organizations are the “mute” environment and the “absent” future generations, however if being included in decision making the organization’s sustainable approach is enhanced (Brano & Rodrigues, 2007). Stakeholder’s diversity implies the appearance of trade-offs between the “three Es” of the triple bottom line (Dowling, 2001). To understand these stakeholders betters they are classified in four groups: authorisers, business partners, customers and external influencers (Ibid.). Stakeholders engaging in co-creation of value (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004), business collaboration (Nidumolu et al. 2014), and shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2011), distance themselves from the traditional view of the market and the old creation of value, promoting an industry network with established sustainability practices. Transformation can occur by a reconfiguration of sustainable consumption and production (Geels et al. 2015). The reconfiguration of SCP in a tourism scenario translates into sustainable tourism. If transformation comes from a strong sustainability approach it can be defined as revolutionary and change the industry deeply, meaning that a tourism scenario shifts into slow consumption (Hall, 2007). If transformation of SCP comes from a weak sustainability approach, changes can be defined as reformist, meaning that a tourism scenario shifts into an efficiency approach (Hall, 2009), (Figure 8).
Figure 8. Theoretical framework describing the relationship between theories identified (Figure based on the study’s literature review and developed by the author). Sustainable development can be conceived as weak or strong depending on the level of engagement and change towards status-quo. The same trend is identified in sustainable discourses, sustainable consumption and production, and sustainable tourism.
4. Empirical background

In this chapter, the empirical background is presented. It provides a description and relevant information of Swedish Lapland as a tourism destination. This chapter also contains a description and analysis of the term “Responsible Tourism” that is used as bridge between the theory and the empirical results. The concept of responsible tourism contains several elements presented both in the theory section and in the empirical results.

4.1. Swedish Lapland

Swedish Lapland is the name given to twelve individual destinations located in Sweden’s northernmost counties: Norrbotten and Västerbotten. Together, these twelve destinations conform a common place trademark that functions as a platform of cooperation between the local destinations and tourism entrepreneurs (Swedish Lapland Visitors Board, 2016). Historically, Lapland is the name used to describe northern Scandinavia, a vast region that includes portions of Sweden, Norway, Finland and Russia. The Sámi, who are the oldest inhabitants of this region call it Sápmi (Ibid.). Considered the land of the Sámi and the reindeer, Lapland’s forests, glaciers, mountains and marshlands were included as a world heritage in 1996 (Ibid.). The trademark Swedish Lapland was created to clarify the geographical location of the tourism destination it represents (Figure 9). The trademark was developed by the official organization of tourism in the region, the Swedish Lapland Visitors Board (SLVB), taking advantage of the positive associations of the concept Lapland to represent the arctic lifestyle of the region (Ibid.). Because of this, some local destinations like Luleå, Skellefteå, Sorsele, and others, are included as part of the destination although they do not actually belong to the Swedish region denominated Lapland (Ibid.).

Figure 9. Map of the location of Swedish Lapland and the Sápmi (Swedish Lapland Visitors Board, 2016:2). Swedish Lapland is located inside the vast Sápmi territory that includes Norway, Finland and Russia.
Swedish Lapland main attractions are divided by areas. In the mountains area, ski-resorts, national parks and Sámi cultural activities like reindeer herding are the main attractions (Müller, 2011). At the boreal forest, the Ice hotel, which is one of the most visited attractions of the destination, the Tree hotel, fishing and river rafting are the most valued attractions. The coastal area is characterized by camping and in the coastal cities, rural and cultural tourism (Ibid.). In general, Swedish Lapland main attraction is nature-based tourism (Ibid.). The accessibility is considered good with a well-developed road network with the main roads E4, E10, and E45 as its natural arteries (Swedish Lapland Visitors Board, 2016). There are five airports within the local destinations located in Luleå, Skellefteå, Arvidsjaur, Gällivare and Kiruna. It is also possible to access by train as the railway goes along the coast to the mountains, with night trains departing from southern Sweden twice a day (Ibid.).

Swedish Lapland Visitors Board officially represents the tourist industry in the region that encompass Swedish Lapland. Its platform supports the industry through the cooperation of businesses by commercializing the tourism products and experiences of the destination domestically and internationally (Swedish Lapland Visitors Board, 2016). The destination is advertised as “genuine, authentic and small-scale tourism with focus on people and encounters” (Ibid., 1). Swedish Lapland represents 25% of the total area of Sweden, its turnover in 2016 was 6.5 billion SEK (Figure 10), guest nights increased 3% compared to 2015 and 36% compared to 2010, employing 4,068 work units also in 2016 (Ibid., 24). In six years, the turnover in Swedish Lapland has increased 166% and the annual work units 108%, with 30% of guest nights being international in 2016 (Ibid., 24).

![Turnover of Swedish Lapland tourism industry 2010-2016](Image)

**Figure 10.** Turnover of Swedish Lapland tourism industry 2010-2016 (Swedish Lapland Visitors Board, 2016:24). Turnover is expected to keep increasing and SLVB goals is to reach 8.2 billion by 2020.

### 4.2. Responsible tourism

Tourism includes the human activity and the experience, alongside the services that facilitate it, its impacts can be positive and negative (Wall & Mathieson, 2006). Responsible tourism means taking responsibility on the consumption and production of tourism, and making it more sustainable (Goodwin, 2016). It is a response to the challenges of sustainability in the tourism industry. For responsible tourism, sustainability is a goal that includes the elements of the triple bottom line as objectives: economic, social and environmental. This concept argues that in order to achieve sustainability in tourism, responsibility for how the industry works must be taken (Ibid.). Hence, responsibility is the means and sustainability the objective (Ibid.).
Responsible tourism is not a niche but a movement, as every form of tourism can be enhanced to be responsible (Goodwin, 2016). The actors that must take responsibility are consumers, suppliers, and governments alike (Ibid.). Furthermore, responsible tourism ambitions to fight the impacts of mainstream tourism, improving the positive and mitigating the negative, as destinations will need to cope with the number of arrivals that are likely to continue to visit (Ibid.).

The approach of responsible tourism works better if the consumer is engaged, and enables the traveler to have an enhanced experience while the community places tourism on better terms (Goodwin, 2016). Tourism is a phenomenon in constant change, it evolves with economic development and technological improvements (Ibid.). A destination is the place where tourism occurs; in these places tourists interact with locals who live and work there, creating a social experience for both visited and visitors (Ibid.). This interaction is often of great inequality as tourists are in leisure and local residents or workers see them as customers that crowd the streets, public transportation or landmark public areas (Ibid.).

Jost Krippendorff, a professor of politics and theory of tourism, and great promoter of responsibility in tourism was motivated by the damage of the post-war tourism boom of the 1950s and 60s in his native Switzerland. Krippendorf (1982:148) stated: “ecology should be placed before economy in tourism, not least for the sake of the economy itself and all who participate in it.” Krippendorf as stated by Goodwin (2016) understood that the holidaymaker is the core of tourism and the most essential for its sustainability. Krippendorf’s book “The Holiday Maker” (1987) is dedicated to those who would like to reflect about their role either as travelers or actors in the leisure industry. In this book the author argues about an industry that bring as much benefit as possible as long as it is not at the expense of other people or the natural environment (Krippendorf, 1987). An important critique is made towards tour operators that seek only the short-term growth of their businesses instead of long-term development of a balanced tourist exchange.

Regarding tourists and their impact, Krippendorf highlights that consequences of their actions have never been explained to them. The tourists have yet to understand that the responsibility is theirs but at the same time they have been left out of the debate about their way of doing tourism (Krippendorf, 1987). Nevertheless, tourists are becoming more demanding, seeking the satisfaction of social needs, including contact with other people, self-realization by doing creative activities, and seeking knowledge and exploration (Ibid.). Furthermore, tourists are no longer easy to manipulate, and are becoming more critical and informed consumers. As tourists become increasingly independent, a desire for different kind of tourism becomes more widespread (Ibid.). Krippendorf’s (1987) vision of a new form of tourism included the greatest possible benefit to all the actors, including travelers, local population, and businesses, without causing intolerable negative impacts to society and nature. The core of this new model is the needs of local people, hosts and visitors, and to create it, “rebellious tourists and rebellious locals” are needed (Ibid.). To achieve this, partnerships between developers, promoters and the destinations have to be the base of the model, while higher incomes, enhanced social and cultural facilities, more satisfying jobs and better housing the way of measuring it (Ibid.). Facilities that equally benefit locals and travelers and that can be used by both should get priority and investment (Ibid.). Control over the use of land by local authorities is fundamental alongside avoiding dependency, maintaining a diversified economy and a focus on local cultivation (Ibid.).

Responsible tourism recognizes the world’s diversity of environments and cultures and acknowledges that responsibility and sustainability can be achieved in different ways in different places (Goodwin, 2016). It requires a vision of priorities that are established locally and transparency in reporting of achievements by businesses and governments regarding tourism management (Ibid.). As it is in the destinations where meetings between tourist and local communities take place, it is in destinations where tourism must be managed and where responsibility must be exercised to achieve sustainability (Ibid.). Regarding this, there is no blueprint to achieve sustainable tourism because the issues and priorities will vary from place to place as well as the solutions (Ibid.).
Responsible tourism requires that stakeholders, especially producers and consumers, identify sustainability issues that need to be addressed and take responsibility for them and its outcomes (Goodwin, 2016). The core of the responsible movement in tourism is the ethic of responsibility, the willing to act, the capacity to respond, the action of exercising the responsibility. As written in Letter and Papers from Prison by Bonhoeffer (2001:103) and cited by Goodwin (2016:38) “we have learnt, rather too late, that action comes, not from thought, but from readiness for responsibility.” That everyone is involved in taking responsibility, for making a more sustainable form of tourism, is what responsible tourism is about (Ibid.).

4.3. Allemansrätten in Sweden
Allemansrätten is a term used to describe the right to public access in Sweden. It allows people, regardless of their origin to visit, walk and use non-motorized vehicles on almost all public and privately-owned land (Sténs & Sandström, 2014). Some areas excluded from this right are militarized zones, cultivated farmland and private gardens. Conservation natural and cultural areas are subject of specific restrictions, and limited resources such as trees, grass or stones being are also excluded (Ibid.).

For Sweden, allemansrätten represents part of its self-image and national identity. In general, the public regards it as a unique and exclusive national heritage that is worth preserving (Sténs & Sandström, 2014). Nevertheless, the idea of Swedish allemansrätten is not unique as Finland and Norway have laws that provide a similar access right (Ibid.). Other countries like Iceland, Switzerland, and regions like Scotland have also regulations aimed to support public rights to nature (Ibid.). Moreover, allemansrätten in Sweden can be conceived as extraordinarily generous in comparison to its neighbors Norway and Finland (Ibid.).

Although general population regards allemansrätten in high standards, it is also subject to debate in Sweden (Sténs & Sandström, 2014). Pressure has been directed to tourism companies that profit on the public access right for their own businesses (Ibid.). This pressure started after the Second World War when motorized vehicles in land and sea increased significantly, and holiday homes became an issue regarding exploitation of land (Ibid.). In addition, the increasing presence of foreigners using the rights of allemansrätten started to become an issue in the 1970s (Ibid.). When Sweden applied for European Union membership in the early 1990s the debate focused on foreign tourism companies taking advantage of allemansrätten at the expense of private landowners (Ibid.). A demand to realize agreements between landowners and all actors interested in realizing commercial activities was proposed at the Swedish parliament, but never led to any formal structural change (Ibid.). Commercial activities are still part of allemansrätten, although Swedish authorities recommend all commercial actors to make contact with landowners before using their properties for their activities (Ibid.).

4.4. Tourism and the Sustainable Development Goals
This section contains a description of CSR actions related to SDGs 8, 12 and 13, implemented by tourism companies from all over the world and from the three main sectors of the tourism industry: accommodation, transport, and tour operators. These actions were collected by UNWTO and UNDP (2018) from a survey of 60 companies.

4.4.1. SDG 8-Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all
Tourism contributes to 10% of global GDP and 7% of world exports while employing millions of people around the world (UNWTO & UNDP, 2018:53). Nevertheless, it is the responsibility of businesses that decent and fair employment conditions have to be ensured, and profits retained and reinvested locally (UNWTO & UNDP, 2018). Actions implemented by companies are enlisted in Table 5.
Table 5. Actions implemented by tourism companies towards SDG 8 (UNWTO & UNDP, 2018).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>-Creating linkages into local destinations’ value chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Creating jobs and purchasing locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Raising awareness and building capacity of the local population to support them into participating in the workforce and benefit from tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Hire more locals and train local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>-Indirectly generating jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Support the local economy through education and local purchases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Local hiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour operators</td>
<td>-Awareness and campaigns against issues of sexual exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Diversity management towards equal chances and pay, including women, young people and persons with disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2. SDG 12-Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns

Sustainable tourism is strongly linked to this goal as many of the companies’ daily operations contribute to it. For tourism to efficiently address this goal, it must develop and implement tools to monitor results of initiatives (UNWTO & UNDP, 2018). Actions implemented by companies are enlisted in Table 6.

Table 6. Actions implemented by tourism companies towards SDG 12 (UNWTO & UNDP, 2018).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>-Local purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Education in sustainable consumption and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Efficient use of energy and water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Sustainable management and recycling of waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Purchasing of seasonal products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>-Efficiency in production processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Education of staff and host communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Informing customers about sustainable travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Purchasing local good and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour operators</td>
<td>-Influence consumer behavior towards sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Responsible purchase policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Bundling sustainable products with green packages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3. SDG 13-Take urgent action to combat climate change

The tourism industry account for more than 5% of global greenhouse emissions, while being highly vulnerable to its effects at the same time. Efficiency might help to mitigate some of the impact, nevertheless is not sufficient to address climate change (UNWTO & UNDP, 2018). Actions implemented by companies are enlisted in Table 7.

Table 7. Actions implemented by tourism companies towards SDG 13 (UNWTO & UNDP, 2018).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>-Local purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Education in sustainable consumption and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Efficient use of energy and water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Sustainable management and recycling of waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Purchasing of seasonal products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>-Efficiency in production processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Education of staff and host communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Informing customers about sustainable travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Purchasing local good and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour operators</td>
<td>-Influence consumer behavior towards sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Responsible purchase policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Bundling sustainable products with green packages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Accommodation | -Resource efficiency measures  
| | -Investing in landscape protection, planting trees, preserving green space in properties  
| | -Donations when extreme weather events cause damage  
| | -Carbon offsetting initiatives  
| Transport | -Investments in efficient vehicles, ships and planes  
| | -Taxing  
| | -Improving route planning  
| | -Digital tools to support employees in energy saving  
| | -Low emission fuels  
| | -Implementation of carbon offsetting programmes  
| | -Collaboration and joint action with other industries  
| Tour operators | -Influencing behavior of customers along the supply chain  

5. Empirical results

In this chapter, the empirical results of the study research are presented. The results are taken from the semi-structured interviews realized to four stakeholders in Swedish Lapland. They are categorized in four sections linked to different parts of the interview. The first section (5.1) contains a general perceived description of Swedish Lapland in relation to the SDGs. The second section (5.2) contains a projection of a desirable future of Swedish Lapland in fifty years. The third section (5.3) contains the actors and actions needed in order to transition from the general description to the desirable future.

5.1. Description of Swedish Lapland

This section contains the general descriptions of the current status of the destination Swedish Lapland in relation to the Sustainable Development Goals 8, 12 and 13. The descriptions were generated from the interview questions number 1 and 2 (Appendix 1) and are presented in Table 8.

5.1.1. Sustainable Development Goal 8

Swedish Lapland tourism industry is immature because the destination has not been dealing with tourism since long (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). The industry has been experiencing a positive growth and more people are arriving at the destination (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). This has promoted the creation of new jobs. Two and half years ago, a massive project aimed to develop the destination was partially financed by the European Union. The project generated terrific results with a lot of impact in new jobs and more money invested in the region. This was definitely a positive development (pers.com., Logardt, 2018).

The tourism industry has increased turnover by 60% from 2010 to 2015, and more people are being employed (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). More businesses are shifting from seasonal to full year, having repercussions in employment since more jobs are getting permanent instead of seasonal. This is a main goal when referring to overall regional development, especially in the northern peripheral areas of Scandinavia (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). A key issue is to give people a full year job, not only in coastal big cities like Luleå, but in the countryside as well. The transition to a full year destination with permanent jobs is happening slowly. People can stay and live in remote areas or the countryside (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). Furthermore, young people are being attracted because of the structure of the tourism business. As the destination is focusing more on attracting international visitors, the careers available within the sector are expanding. Swedish Lapland can now offer an international environment, making businesses more attractive to work for young people (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018).

Resources are not enough to make a change in a broad perspective, and not engouht to invest in sustainability and societal perspectives for most companies (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Big companies like the Ice Hotel, and big hotel chains have a huge focus on sustainability and the resources to engage in it (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Tourism is booming, in some parts better than in others. Growth has been happening in the recent years and it is creating jobs. Swedish Lapland is getting closer to become a one year-round destination, meaning companies can also employ and educate full staff (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). This aspect is important from an operational perspective, as companies do not have to hire and reeducate staff every season. When getting to a more stable economic state, it would be easier for small companies to invest in social en environmental issues (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). More tourists arriving to the destination mean better infrastructure, accessibility, and improvement in the places where locals live (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018).

Tourism seems to be an industry that is growing in Swedish Lapland, everything around the city of Kiruna seems to be made for tourists (pers.com., Poort, 2018). For indigenous people like the Sami who engage in tourism activities, positive and good impacts seem to be made in their communities (pers.com., Poort, 2018).
5.1.2. Sustainable Development Goal 12

The tourism organizations have been trying to sell something genuine and pure, with nature as the arena to live experiences (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). There are some companies that are very good with sustainability practices. Some even have certifications like Natures Best, but these companies are a minority. The majority of the tourism industry is not yet in a level of matureness and professionalism where they can fully embrace a sustainable way of producing tourism experiences (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). Nevertheless, the companies are well aware about the positive impacts that sustainability can have in order to sell tourism products. Consequently, a lot of companies are going in that direction, but part of them is just greenwashing instead of embracing true sustainability practices (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). The amount of tourism is not a huge problem regarding consumption, although some niches like the salmon fishing are starting to see some impact. The tourism industry has a responsibility to handle the increasing number of visitors for a specific niche and spread them out. People that go fishing are all in the same spots when there are so many other places to fish (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). This can be applied to all nature-based experiences. The idea of Swedish Lapland is not to meet other many tourists, it is about freedom to be on your own (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). From a nature perspective it is not a crowded destination, but there are some places where people has started to notice the increasing number of visitors and see them as some sort of invasion (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). In this region, the locals have special places that hold close to their hearts and are not used to share them with foreigners. The key is to show the local population that tourism brings something good to them, that the industry gives back to society (pers.com., Logardt, 2018).

There is not a general issue with overconsumption linked to tourism activities, although in some specific areas like Abisko, were population is small, tourism can cause pressure to municipal services (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). Abisko has approximately a hundred people population, but in high season the services need to build up (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). This affects water cleaning services and trash services. Nevertheless, the municipality can see the direct tax income generating from foreign guests. For this reason, there has not been a problem in this matter (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). Other problems regarding reindeer herders and snowmobiles happened in the spring of 2018 as there was a lot of snow in the graze lands and the reindeers were returned to the mountains before they usually do (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). Tourist and reindeers usually meet up later in the year, but this time happened way earlier and in the middle of high season (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). The Sami economic associations applied for a restriction to snowmobiles, causing some debate. It is worth to be noted that the snowmobiles used outside the tracks are usually from domestic tourists and not internationals (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018).

More people coming to the destination have an effect on the environment and there is not good information about how to use resources generated by travelers to manage water use and waste (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). If the resources generated by tourism are not used in a smart way or companies do not know how to use them or manage natural resources, challenges might present in the near future (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). There are laws that protect reindeer herding and the tourism industry needs to work around them, meaning more communication and understanding is needed (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Another law describes that only the state can own land in Kiruna and Gällivare (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Because of this law, Kiruna has not grown that much despite fifteen to twenty years of tourism activity. A local program called Sustainable Arctic Destination is being promoted to tourism companies. It is based on the guidelines of the Global Tourism Council for Sustainable Tourism (Rosenfors, 2018). Those guidelines have been brought to be implementable and measured in a local scale and they focus on electricity, waste and fuel used by companies (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018).

The streets around Kiruna look clean in contrast to other cities with mass tourism where it is possible to see trash on the streets left by tourists (pers.com., Poort, 2018). Tourism can bring so many positive impacts but at the same time have negative ones. As a tourist, it is not pleasant to be in places crowded with other tourists although sometimes it is not possible to avoid it (pers.com., Poort, 2018). Sustainability is an important aspect on the way of travel, to visit a place and know that is causing a negative impact would be a bad experience. For
this reason, being informed about the impacts a tourist can have to a certain place is truly important before traveling (pers.com., Poort, 2018). Tourist visiting destinations like Swedish Lapland need to use services from the local communities, for example, the use of water. All these visitors need to drink water, take showers and wash their clothes (pers.com., Poort, 2018).

5.1.3. Sustainable Development Goal 13

The distance is a huge factor to take in account when traveling to Swedish Lapland. It takes a great deal of time to get by train from Stockholm, if someone is coming from the south of Europe or further places this becomes worse (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). Transportation is a huge part of holidays, so there is dependency on airplanes to get people to the destination. The main tourists that are coming by plane are not the kind of tourists the organizations are expecting to come, but business travelers coming back and forth from Stockholm (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). In Skellefteå there was only SAS for a lot of years, and from a year back there is also Norwegian airlines (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). Having two airlines is good for connectivity and for more people to come to the destination. Even though this represents more carbon emissions, more people are acknowledging the development that is happening in the region and want to be part of business creation (pers.com., Logardt, 2018).

Tourism is demanding more flights towards the destination. In the past there was the same amount of flights, but it was mostly people flying because of LKAB, the mining company (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). Swedish Lapland is a periphery destination, far away from the market, which is mainly Europe, the U.S. a small part from Asia, and the domestic Swedish market (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). SLVB is targeting a specific kind of tourist defined as the Global Traveler, but it has to deal with the fact that they will come mostly by plane. The organization works closely with SJ the Swedish railroad company to try to develop better ways to motivate people to come by train (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). There is a sustainable movement that is getting more strength but there are only two trains a day against sixteen flights only to Luleå. SLVB is working in getting more international direct flights to avoid the extra flight to Stockholm, which implies more use of fuel at the extra take off and landing (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). An environmental taxation for flights within Sweden just took place and SLVB is against it. It won’t stop people from flying and will put the destination at risk against its competitors Norway, Finland and Iceland. Another reason to be against this tax is that it targets all companies regardless of the type of planes they use. Some companies have invested in modern more efficient planes and are being taxed the same as the ones with older planes (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018).

Flights have increased both in terms of charters and regular flights (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). The tax flight imposed by the Swedish government will have a huge impact in the cost of traveling to the destination and a negative impact with the volume of people that visit. A better solution would be to invest in environmental technologies with flight companies (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Green fuels, and incentives for better aircrafts are better than taxing the flights that directly affect the competitiveness of Swedish Lapland with similar destinations in Norway, Finland and Iceland (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). The train looks the same as in the 1960s and 70s, and the government should make huge investments in it if they are serious about an environmental perspective. The travel time from Stockholm to Kiruna has increased between 15% and 20% in the last twenty years, mainly because of cargo being prioritized. Transportation of people should be prioritized instead of cargo (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018).

The way tourist travel is important, coming by train is a personal decision because flying is polluting a lot and impacting hard on the environment (pers.com., Poort, 2018). Many tourists choose the plane over other transportsations because sometimes is cheaper, and if it’s not the case, it is always faster. More people coming to the destination would mean more flights and a greater impact on the environment (pers.com., Poort, 2018).

Table 8. Description of Swedish Lapland according to stakeholders interviewed regarding SDGs 8, 12, and 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>SDG 8</th>
<th>SDG 12</th>
<th>SDG 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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| Logardt | - Immature tourism industry  
  - Positive growth  
  - More tourists arriving  
  - Creation of new jobs  
  - European Union investment to develop destination  
  - Positive economic development | - Efforts to sell genuine and pure experiences with nature as background  
  - Some companies are very good in sustainability practices  
  - Majority of tourism industry not mature enough to engage in sustainability practices  
  - Companies are well aware of the positive impacts of sustainability as competitive advantage  
  - Greenwashing is common for some companies  
  - Responsibility in handling amount of visitors  
  - Local population needs to experience part of the benefits of tourism | - Train takes a long time from Stockholm  
  - Dependence on airplanes  
  - Main tourists coming by plane are not the targeted desired tourists  
  - More air connectivity being promoted |
|---|---|---|
| Mattson | - Turnover increased by 60% from 2010 to 2015  
  - More jobs created  
  - Businesses shifting from seasonal to full year  
  - People are able to stay in home villages due to full year work  
  - Careers available within the industry are expanding  
  - International business environment attracting young workforce | - Overconsumption is not an issue  
  - Some areas like Abisko experience pressure in municipality services like water and trash  
  - Municipalities are aware of direct tax income from tourism when upgrading services  
  - Problems between snowmobiles and reindeer herders due use of land | - Tourism is demoing more flights  
  - Targeting “Global Traveler”, a conscious, responsible profile, but they are coming by plane  
  - Working on getting more direct flights to avoid unnecessary stops  
  - Environmental taxation for flight tickets in Sweden |
| Rosenfors | - Resources not enough to invest in sustainability and social perspectives for most companies  
  - Big companies like Ice Hotel and big hotel chains with enough resources and huge focus on sustainability  
  - Tourism industry booming in some parts of the destination better than in others  
  - Economic growth  
  - Creation of jobs  
  - Destination becoming almost a full year  
  - Companies are being able to offer full year jobs  
  - More tourists arriving | - No information in how to best use resources generated by tourists to manage water us and waste  
  - Tourism industry needs to work around laws protecting reindeer herding  
  - Only the state can own land in most parts of Kiruna and Gällivare  
  - Local program called Sustainable Arctic Destination based on guidelines from GTCS promoted  
  - Guidelines aimed measure electricity, waste and fuel used | - Flight have increased  
  - Tax expected to have huge impact in traveling costs affecting competitiveness  
  - Train looks the same as in 1960s and 1970s  
  - Train travel time from Stockholm to Kiruna has increased between 15% and 20% in last 20 years |
5.2. Swedish Lapland in fifty years
This section contains a description of a desirable future of Swedish Lapland in fifty years, and related to the Sustainable Development Goals 8, 12, and 13. The descriptions were generated from the interview question number 3 (Appendix 1) and are presented in Table 9.

5.2.1. Sustainable Development Goal 8
Nature activities combined with locally produced foods and products create a new type of economic activities and jobs (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). The point of these activities is to integrate with the culture. Dogsledding for example, when using as transportation from one point to another with a purpose becomes a beautiful experience. The culture of dogsledding is to access to remote areas or travel long distances (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). This activity is done to watch the northern lights or to go from a village to another instead of used as tour to go in circles. Doing activities with purpose instead of fake experiences in all tour related activities, in order for tourists to experience a purpose, a cultural experience more than a tour (pers.com., Logardt, 2018).

To be the most sustainable, available and welcoming arctic destination (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). There is an Eco lodge in every village in the countryside within the destination, meaning there are jobs related to tourism in every one of them. People can live and work wherever they want to, and local stores are open during the whole year (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). The development achieved is small scale with high end. There are small hotels and operators but with high-level income (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018).

There is enough tourism activities for companies to survive and make enough profit to invest in sustainable practices (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). It is a controlled growth were mass tourism is non-existence, and the destination provides unique experiences in a unique environment (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Companies are experiencing decent growth and will continue growing in a controlled, planed way. The growth has allowed the tourism organizations to advertise the destination to the right desired customers. Companies within the destination are based in giving the best arctic and natural experience and companies that only want to profit either are driven away or cannot meet the guidelines of the tourism organizations (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018).

Eco-hotels affordable to lower income visitors are available and distributed around the destination (pers.com., Poort, 2018).

5.2.2. Sustainable Development Goal 12
The destination is directed to a specific niche of tourists that understands and practice the arctic way of life (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). These travelers like to discover places and experiences by their own and do not like things traditional tours and services. They are dedicated people who truly appreciate being in the kind of environments that the destination offers. When these travelers come, the stay for longer periods of time and not only weekends (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). They want to be part of the culture and way of life of Swedish
Lapland and embrace sustainability practices. The sustainable way of experiencing Swedish Lapland is the core of the tourism companies practices (pers.com., Logardt, 2018).

Guests are sharing the arctic way of life of the locals. They have the possibility to learn something when they come to the destination, and also the possibility to share their own stories and own culture (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). SLVB is not building attractions that the traditional tourists want, it is working towards welcoming to share the local culture and local manners like going into the woods with skis or boiling coffee (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). Locals and tourists alike are enjoying the natural attractions and sharing them without apparent division. The entrepreneurs that need to build hotels or any kind of infrastructure do it according to the cultural context of the area (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018).

The natural environment looks the same as fifty years in the past, and it is more accessible, structured and with more available information to visitors (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). There are platforms that allow travelers to have a huge understanding on how their activities impact local culture, reindeer herding, natural areas, etc (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). The destination has grown in balance with reindeer herding, the mining industry and the space industry. The culture is preserved and celebrated (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018).

Dogsledding companies are less numerous and strongly regulated to ensure the animals are treated in decent way, putting their health and wellbeing first rather than the tourist experience (pers.com., Poort, 2018). Visitors are happy with these regulations and would only choose this activity if the animals’ wellbeing are strongly guaranteed (pers.com., Poort, 2018). The entire destination is plastic free, and the tourists are engaging with the responsibility by bringing their own cups and food containers. Souvenirs shops are selling handicraft local products, with the majority of the income going to the local people who manufactured them. Mass production souvenirs shops do not longer have a market in Swedish Lapland (pers.com., Poort, 2018). Locals and tourist interact in a respectful way and they are seen together around the destination. Certified companies, vegetarian restaurants and sustainable products and services that are affordable can be seen in all the villages and cities of Swedish Lapland (pers.com., Poort, 2018).

5.2.3. Sustainable Development Goal 13
Planes are still the main source of transportation as time is a key aspect for vacations. Time is crucial for modern people that live in developed countries, more than ever (pers.com., Logardt, 2018).

Airlines flying to Swedish Lapland have planes with technology to mitigate emissions, and all their aircraft is considered environmental friendly (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). Every single plane landing in the destination is efficient (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). As an organization SLVB has the strongest codes of conduct towards visitors and businesses regarding CO2 emissions. Nature is the best and most important resource alongside the culture and society (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018).

There is more accessibility by green flights that operate on green fuels that have zero impact on the natural environment (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Companies within the destination are also completely sustainable and working long-term with sustainability in their operations (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Fast modern trains and other ways of transportation have developed and function within Swedish Lapland (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018).

Snowmobiles are now electrical and limited to urban areas. The reason for this measure is to not disturb natural activities and reindeer herding (pers.com., Poort, 2018). Accommodations are CO2 neutral and tourists are demanding this in the destination. Truly fast affordable trains are connecting the destination with the rest of Sweden and Europe. Planes are only coming from places further away from Europe (pers.com., Poort, 2018).

Table 9. Description of Swedish Lapland in 50 years according to stakeholders interviewed regarding SDGs 8, 12, and 13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>SDG 8</th>
<th>SDG 12</th>
<th>SDG 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Logardt     | -New type of economic activities based on locally produced food and products  
              -Integration of tourism activities with local culture  
              -Tour activities with purpose and culture  
              -No fake experiences | -Marketing directed to the “Global Traveler” only  
              -Travelers like to engage in experiences by their own initiative  
              -Tourists stay for longer periods  
              -Tourists want to be part of the culture and way of life  
              -Tourists embrace in sustainability practices | -Planes are still the main source of transportation  
              -Time is crucial more than ever for tourists |
| Mattson     | -Most sustainable, available, welcoming arctic destination  
              -Eco lodge in every village  
              -Full year jobs in every village  
              -People able to work and live in any place of the destination  
              -Small-scale development with high end | -Guests share the arctic way of life with locals  
              -Tourists learn and share when in the destination  
              -Tourists engage in local traditions  
              -Local and tourists enjoy natural attractions together  
              -Entrepreneurs build infrastructure according to the cultural context of the area | -Flight companies have more efficient planes with technology to mitigate emissions  
              -Strong code of conduct towards visitors and businesses regarding CO2 emissions  
              -Nature and society considered best and most important resource |
| Rosenfors   | -Enough tourism for companies to survive and engage in sustainability practices  
              -Controlled growth with mass tourism being non-existence  
              -Unique experiences in a natural unique environment  
              -Advertising to the desired type of tourist  
              -Companies provide the best arctic and natural experiences  
              -Companies that only want to profit are driven away | -Natural environment looks the same as 50 years ago  
              -Natural environment is more accessible, structured and with available information for visitors  
              -Platforms allow travelers to understand their impacts in nature and local culture  
              -Destination has grown in balance with reindeer herding, mining and space industries  
              -Culture is preserved and celebrated | -More accessibility by green flights operating with green fuels  
              -Companies working with long-term sustainability operations  
              -Fast modern trains |
### Poort
- Eco-hotels affordable to lower income
- Eco hotels distributed around the destination

### Dogsledding companies
- Dogsledding companies are less numerous and regulated
- Animals are treated in a decent way with wellbeing put first than tourist recreation
- Destination is plastic free
- Tourists bring own cups and food containers.
- Souvenirs shops only sell handcraft locally produced and benefit locals
- Locals and tourists interact in a respectful way and enjoy the destination together
- Certified companies, vegetarian restaurants and sustainable products and services affordable

### SLVB
- Snowmobiles became electrical and limited to urban areas
- Accommodations are CO2 neutral
- Tourists demanding sustainability codes in the destination
- Affordable and truly fast trains
- Planes only come from long distances

### 5.3. Actors and actions driving change

This section focuses on the actions and drivers needed to create change from the perceived description of Swedish Lapland to achieve the desirable future envisioned. The descriptions were generated from the interview questions number 4, 5, and 6 (Appendix 1) and are presented in Table 10.

Considering Swedish Lapland is a nature-based destination, organizations need to step up in sustainability practices and avoid greenwashing (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). To achieve this, credibility is essential. Visitors are coming to Swedish Lapland to experience nature and a pure and genuine way of life. The destination and all the actors involved in it need to live up to these expectations (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). Swedish Lapland lives up by the reputation that it is sustainable, even if maybe it is not that sustainable, it needs to catch up with the sustainability recent trends. It takes a lot of brave people and a lot of brave decision to make change. (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). The target is the Global Traveler, a traveler that is conscious, that is interested in sustainability, transformative and eager to learn while traveling. SLVB and organizations under its umbrella need to lead by example alongside key companies in the region (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). Stop adapting the destination to the niche and instead bring the niche that wants to live up to what the destination offers. It is crucial to involve the local community. In order for travelers to embrace the arctic way of life, the local society need to be on board as they are the ones creating the experiences just by being who they are. Society needs to see how tourism is giving back to them and the natural environment, not only to companies (pers.com., Logardt, 2018).

SLVB is aware that global warming is affecting nature, and it is difficult because there are good effects when more tourists come to the destination (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). But it is important to acknowledge the way the tourists are coming is not good for the environment. SLVB needs to be regarded as more sustainable. Legislation is needed to be able to establish low impact tourism closer to natural parks (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). A shift in the mindset regarding tourism development needs to happen, and to seek small scale tourism that can bring as much money as other types of tourism with a much better experience (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). SLVB needs to be really smart and strategic with investors, differentiating the ones that are only interested in making money. The brand Swedish Lapland need to ask all its members to work with sustainable labels to make companies engage in the same vision toward sustainable practices (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). Responsibility is shared between entrepreneurs and financiers. SLVB as an organization has a great responsibility showing the way and giving companies the possibility to learn more about sustainability. SLVB
cannot only demand but give the companies the programs to achieve sustainable practices. The market will demand sustainability even more in the future, and SLVB needs to be able to respond to that (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018).

The aim must be in achieving economical sustainability first (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Swedish Lapland has many short seasons and low seasons that make it hard for many companies to be profitable and care about the environment at the same time. An economical base need to come first, so companies can next engage in sustainable practices that focus on society and the environment (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). In order to attract more traffic of tourists to the destination more infrastructure is needed alongside more activities and preservation of natural attractiveness. Developing better tourism products and do a better marketing to generate more income is essential (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Thereafter investments must be done in the environment and society in order to leave the same or a better environment to the coming generations. Trains must be improved both in capacity and travel time, marketing it better to travelers and giving incentives to companies that bring customers by train (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Focus on moderate growth within the sustainable perspective and find the right customers to visit the destination. (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). National guidelines and regional programs need to put in practice, like the Sustainable Arctic Destination program (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018).

In the Netherlands, the tourism organizations have started a new campaign to diversify the amount of tourism from Amsterdam to other parts of the country. They have developed tours to take around the country that are being sold as “experiencing the real Dutch traditional way of living”. A similar strategy could work to diversify the number of tourists in Swedish Lapland in the future (pers.com., Poort, 2018). Universal Basic Income and less work hours, if implemented, would probably change the way tourism is made. By working three to four days a week, and having an economic support, people would travel more often, for longer periods of time and would spend more money in tourism destinations. The time frame would not be as critical so their choices for transportation could expand to trains and buses (pers.com., Poort, 2018). The idea of traveling fast is a reflection of how society works, the mindset of working as much as possible and having a few days for vacations. If the time to travel would not matter, people would choose the train for longer distances. If the system changes, everything else would change too, including the way we do tourism (pers.com., Poort, 2018). By regaining time again, there would be a very positive impact for tourism and the environment (pers.com., Poort, 2018). Mindsets need to change in all the actors involved in the tourism activity: tourists, businesses and destination mangers. By that, tourists would demand sustainable services, organizations would encourage them, and businesses would offer them (pers.com., Poort, 2018). The government should implement some laws like banning plastic and give incentives to companies that engage in sustainable practices. Airlines should have a tax on their environmental impact so they become more expensive while more sustainable transportations get incentives (pers.com., Poort, 2018). People that want to visit Swedish Lapland will visit it even if it gets a little more expensive, because they will know that extra money is for preserving the environment. Those are the tourists the destinations should attract. Everyone needs to be on board to make the destination sustainable, governments, business and travelers (pers.com., Poort, 2018). To motivate companies to certify themselves is important as tourist look for these certifications (pers.com., Poort, 2018).

**Table 10.** Actors and drivers of change according to stakeholders interviewed regarding SDGs 8, 12, and 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Drivers of change</th>
<th>Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Logardt      | -Sustainability policies  
-Avoid greenwashing  
-Catch up with sustainability trends  
-Brave decisions from brave people to make substantial change  
-Target only the “Global Traveler”  
-Local society involved  
-Society needs to get benefits | -SLVB  
-Key tourism companies in the region |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mattson</th>
<th>Rosenfors</th>
<th>Poort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Acknowledge issues</td>
<td>- Achieve economic sustainability first</td>
<td>- Universal Basic Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Legislations</td>
<td>- More infrastructures</td>
<td>- Less work hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Seeking small-scale</td>
<td>- More activities and preservation of natural environment</td>
<td>- Change of mindset by all actors involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td>- Better tourism products</td>
<td>- Taxes to airlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Smart investment strategies</td>
<td>- Investment in environment and society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good investment partners</td>
<td>- Better marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Work with members of SLVB</td>
<td>- Train must be improved both in capacity and travel time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to get certifications</td>
<td>- Incentives to companies bringing travelers by train</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Focus on moderate growth</td>
<td>- Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Right customers</td>
<td>- Tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sustainable Arctic Destination program</td>
<td>- Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Suppliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Local population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Analysis

In this chapter, the empirical results are analyzed with the help of theory from chapter three.

6.1. Stakeholder involvement and responsibility

After reviewing the results, stakeholders related to Swedish Lapland as a destination have been identified using Freeman’s (1984:46) stakeholders definition (Table 11). Following Clarkson’s typologies (1995), primary stakeholders, the ones Swedish Lapland as a destination could not survive without, are tourism companies, suppliers of tourism companies, visitors, and tourism organizations like Swedish Lapland Visitors Board, and Kiruna Lapland Economic Association. An additional and truly important primary stakeholder categorized as “mute” (Branco & Rodrigues, 2007), is the natural environment, as Mitchell et al. (1997) suggested that the natural environment could be included as a stakeholder. The natural environment is considered primary because the destination, being nature-based, would not survive without it. Secondary stakeholders, or the ones affected by the tourism activities of the destination (Clarkson, 1995) account for the local population, and the Sami people. In addition, the future generations of locals are identified as “absent” secondary stakeholder (Branco & Rodrigues, 2007).

Table 11. Stakeholders of Swedish Lapland. Stakeholders identified by the interviews compared with theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism companies</td>
<td>Local population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sami people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists</td>
<td></td>
<td>Future generations (absent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural environment (mute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Animal inhabitants (mute)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The natural environment, animal inhabitants and future generations are key primary and secondary stakeholders of Swedish Lapland as it is a nature-based destination. Moreover, the interviews reflected the awareness of global warming on nature (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018), the importance of the environment looking the same after fifty years, and the necessity of investments to preserve it for the coming generations (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). This level of awareness, importance and necessity towards environment and future generations can be linked to the suggestion by Jacobs (1997) of representing them in decision-making structures of the organization. Furthermore, to consider the interests of all parties affected by and organization is a requirement of the stakeholder theory (Branco & Rodrigues, 2007).

Related to the importance of the environment as key primary stakeholder, Logardt (pers.com., 2018) mentioned nature being the base for a new type of economic activities involving purpose and culture, while Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) imagined the destination providing unique experiences in a unique natural environment. Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) also emphasized in his future vision that companies within the destination should give the best arctic and natural experience, excluding the companies that do not share this vision and only pursuit to profit. A desired tourist that shares the importance of the natural environment that the destination offers, and that embraces sustainability was also mentioned (pers.com., Logardt, 2018), highlighting even more its key role as mute primary stakeholder. Animal inhabitants are also key primary and mute stakeholders as dogsledding is an important tourism activity mentioned in the interviews. Regarding it,
Poort (pers.com., 2018) imagined a future where dogsledding is strongly regulated, and animal wellbeing is put first than the tourist experience.

Companies engaging in sustainability practices in Swedish Lapland were described as having different approaches. For instance, big companies as the Ice Hotel and big hotel chains were reported to have a great focus on sustainability. These companies can be catalogued as compliance-plus, proactive on strategies towards environmental management (Roome, 1992 and Hunt & Auster, 1990). On the other hand, most companies were described as neither mature nor professional enough to fully embrace sustainability (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). These companies fall in the category of non-compliance because they are not reacting to environmental standards (Roome, 1992 and Hunt & Auster, 1990). These classifications are important as the interviews portray a vision of the destination in fifty years that classifies as leading edge, meaning being an environmental leader in the industry (Ibid.).

Commitment of an organization towards natural environment can be described by the practices it promotes (Henriques & Sadorsky, 1999). Kiruna Lapland Economic Association has been promoting the Sustainable Arctic Destination program based on guidelines form the Global Sustainable Tourism Council (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Setting goals and communicate them efficiently is key for environmental management (Stead & Stead, 1996). The future vision of Swedish Lapland involves the Sustainable Arctic Destination program being adopted by all the destination stakeholders (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Other practices described for a desired future were having strong codes of conducts for visitors involving CO2 emission (pers.com., Mattson, 2018), and accommodations being CO2 neutral (Poort, 2018). Demanding sustainable certifications to businesses in order to be part of Swedish Lapland Visitors Board was also listed (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018).

In the desired future, companies within the destination promote best practices towards culture, society and the arctic way of life, providing the best experiences possible. On the other hand, companies that only want to profit are driven away by established guidelines (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Like in the “social activist” perspective, social interests are champion even if not demanded by society (Branco & Rodrigues, 2007), and companies are encouraged to not only seek profit but to identify opportunities for society as well (Rodriguez et al. 2002). This is particularly encouraged on strategic investors and suggested to be smart when differentiating which ones are only interested in making profit (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018).

When the interests of parties that are not directly related to the company are acknowledged and addressed, companies and organizations step into the field of CSR (Jones, 1980). A key driver to implement CSR is to avoid damage to reputation (Roberts et al., 2002). Interviews described the destination as marketed as sustainable, with the core of the tourism activity being the natural resources. Therefore, reputation as a sustainable destination is fundamental, and all the stakeholders interviewed recognized it. Catching up with the trend of sustainability was described as a necessity as reputation could be at stake (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). The experiences of Swedish Lapland are sold as pure, genuine and based on nature (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). Nevertheless, the attraction of genuine free access to nature marketed by the tourism industry might generate more pressure in the debate of allemansrätten mentioned by (Sténs & Sandström, 2014). Mattson (pers.com., 2018) mentioned an issue between snowmobiles and reindeer herders colliding in the same areas. Allemansrätten is kept in high standards by locals but also is in the spot for tourism companies that profit from it (Sténs & Sandström, 2014). Communication between all actors and strategies to avoid conflict are necessary in the strategy to bring the type of tourist that respects and enjoys the free access to nature.

Following Dowling (2001) classification of stakeholders related to expectations and trade-offs, interviewees Mattson (pers.com., 2018) and Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) classify as authorisers. Logardt (pers.com., 2018) is in the business partner category and Poort (pers.com., 2018) classify in both external influencer and customer. This differentiation is truly important because, although all of them support sustainability, their priorities towards it are not the same. Mattson (pers.com., 2018) place a special priority in connectivity and number of tourists, trading off with emissions from planes impacting the environment. Rosenfors (pers.com.,
2018) strongly believes that economic sustainability is the first goal that must be achieved. Emphasising that only with economical stability, companies can start to engage in sustainability and social practices. Logardt (pers.com., 2018) places priority in maintaining and promoting the cultural arctic way of life, and that society receives benefits from tourism activity. Poort (pers.com., 2018) places the environment first, demanding sustainable certifications and best practices for companies, and trading off faster transportation and unsustainable consumerism. This relates to Roberts (2003) statement about stakeholders’ expectations, including not only high business performance but social and environmental actions as well. Society and environment are related to the core business of Swedish Lapland, all stakeholders acknowledged it, and this is a main factor in order to implement better actions (Ibid.). The second factor is related to amount of pressure from external stakeholders (Ibid.), meaning trade-offs might be switched if a great amount external influencers and customers like Poort (pers.com., 2018) demand it.

Companies already driving change in sustainability practices are the key stakeholders that can add system value according to Nidumolu et al. 2014. Corporate and external collaboration is strongly needed to achieve the goals of these practices (Ibid.). This includes not only tourism companies and its suppliers within the destination but NGOs, local people and universities as well. Responsibility must be shared between all the actors including financiers, entrepreneurs and tourism organizations (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018).

Coordinated processes mentioned by Nidumolu et al. 2014 can be described as the necessity of companies to adopt certifications (Mattsson, 2018), measure their waste, electricity and use of fuels (Rosenfors, 2018), tax on flight tickets and banning of plastic (pers.com., Poort, 2018). Coordinated outcomes (Nidumolu et al. 2014) involve efficient planes and CO2 neutral hotels, universal basic income and less work hours (pers.com., Poort, 2018). Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) also added improvement of capacity and travel times of trains. The collaboration must occur in all levels of the industry, including the government and coordinated by organizations like SLVB (pers.com., Poort, 2018).

6.2. Co-creation of value for the tourism industry

Visions of Swedish Lapland are strongly service dominant logic oriented; such is the case of tourism activities integrated with culture and purpose, like in the case of dogsledding (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). In service dominant logic, the focus of economic exchange is in specialized skills and knowledge (Lush & Vargo, 2006). Logardt (pers.com., 2018) expanded on a new type of economical activities based on nature and locally produced services and products. The desired exchange of the specialized skills and knowledge that includes culture and purpose in Swedish Lapland integrates with the improving of individual collective wellbeing as mentioned by Lush & Vargo (2006).

In reference to co-creation of value, knowledge is the source of competitive advantage, with the customer deeply involved (Vargo & Lush 2004). The critical task is to identify and develop core competences using marketing (Ibid.). Swedish Lapland has identified a specific market, “the global traveller”, visitors with high conscience on the environment, positively transformative and eager to learn (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). This type of traveler seems the perfect fit to engage in co-creation of value according to the values expressed about sustainability, the importance of the natural environment and embracing of local culture. It is mentioned during the interviews that currently the majority of arriving tourists do not meet those specific standards. Therefore, co-creation of value within other types of tourist might no be happening. Logardt (pers.com., 2018), Mattson (pers.com., 2018), and Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) stated that the “global traveler” is the profile they want for the future of Swedish Lapland. Poort (pers.com., 2018) on the other hand, can be classify as exactly this kind of tourist. Furthermore, companies should advertise themselves to this type of customer (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018), and then co-creation of better sustainable tourism services could start to happen. The core competences projected for this targeted type of tourist are embracing nature and the arctic way of life, with a high cultural involvement and respect. This applies for both companies with visions beyond profit (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018) and tourists that choose the destination because they identify themselves with these competences (pers.com., Logardt, 2018).
On the side of the customers, they have more power than in the past and can influence companies and organizations (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Poort (pers.com., 2018) reflections included that companies are sustainability certified, CO2 neutral and accountable for their impacts. This can be also linked with the desire of banning plastic from every business and the shift to electric snowmobiles. Nevertheless, Poort (pers.com., 2018) also emphasized on the responsibility of tourists to bring their own cups and food containers, in what could be interpreted as customer’s interaction with companies to restructure the process of value creation (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Furthermore, the influence of customers goes beyond the product or service and seeks influence in every part of the business system (Ibid.).

The value of the process creation is being more scrutinized and evaluated by customers, and they have the power to choose companies based on how value is created for them (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Dogsledding is again an example, as Poort (pers.com., 2018) desired vision includes stronger regulations to ensure animals are treated decently. The animals’ wellbeing is put first than the tourist experiences. These informed customers represent power to influence and change the market, and also to extract value from it (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004).

A challenging problem that is presented relies on globalization and convergence of industries and technologies. These factors challenge organizations to differentiate from each other, and reactions from customers often resume in buying smart and cheap (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). These challenges are expressed in the fears of Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) and Mattsson (pers.com., 2018) on flight taxation and its effect on competitiveness. According to them, an environmental tax would increment vacations costs and drive potential customers to choose cheaper alternatives like Norway, Finland or Iceland. Prahalad & Ramaswamy (2004) solution is for organizations to leave the firm-centric view and embrace co-creation of value with customers. Poort (pers.com., 2018) insights revealed a willing to pay the environmental tax as it aligns with consciousness in the impact of transportation. She expands by suggesting this measure might even motivate the right kind of customers (global traveler) to choose Swedish Lapland from its less sustainable competitors. Following this idea, Logardt (pers.com., 2018) stated that the global traveler should be the only kind of tourist the destination attracts, with SLVB leading by example and motivating key companies to be on board. Asking tourist what they want in relation to consumerism and prices should not be the strategy, and instead offering a destination based on culture, arctic way of life and sustainability, involving the type of tourists that wants to contribute to this view (pers.com., Logardt, 2018).

Co-creation involves dialog, consumers and organizations must have clear rules of engagement and discuss the issues of interest to both (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Platforms for travelers to acquire good understanding on how their activities impact local culture, reindeer herding, and natural areas is part of the future vision of Swedish Lapland (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). The vision also stated that visitors learn and share with local stakeholders, especially culture, motivating the tourists to engage in local traditions (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). Referring to entrepreneurs, local and foreign, a desire of building any kind of infrastructure within the cultural context of the area is desired (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018). In addition, information about the impacts traveling carries to the destination are important before tourists make a decision (pers.com., Poort, 2018). Transparency is essential in the exchange of information for the co-creation of value to be effective (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). In the case of the stakeholders interviewed, all seemed to be willing to engage in it.

Processes and infrastructure to collect information must be focused on consumers and encourage active participation in every aspect of the co-creation experience (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). The vision stated that travelers stay for longer periods of time, and for them to want to be part of the arctic culture (pers.com., Logardt, 2018), making the market a forum between the destinations and its customers (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). This willing for dialog and exchange with locals and companies is also expressed by Poort (pers.com., 2018) that desired a destination where all stakeholders interact respectfully and where there are not designated tourists’ areas, rather than an overall enjoyment of all-natural spaces and infrastructure.
6.3. Shared value in Swedish Lapland

The interviews portrayed a lot of references to shared value and business collaboration. There was a clear statement by Poort (pers.com., 2018) on big corporations prospering at the expense of local communities, linked to the statements of Porter & Kramer (2011). The statement defined a desired future where souvenirs shops are selling handcraft locally products that benefit the local people that manufacture them. Logardt (pers.com., 2018) also expanded on this by arguing of the crucial involvement of local communities as part of the experience of Swedish Lapland. As society is an important element of traveler’s experiences, it is imperative that they see tourism is giving back to them and the natural environment, instead of only companies. These ideas follow the ones of shared value proposed by Porter & Kramer (2011), where companies create economic value while also creating value to society and environment.

Mattson (pers.com., 2018) and Logardt (pers.com., 2018) expressed that the tourism industry is growing creating more jobs and bringing economic development to the region. Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) was a little more cautious suggesting the growth is happening but is booming better in some areas and agreeing about jobs becoming full year. Mattson (pers.com., 2018) stated that turnover has increased, and more people are being employed full year, meaning positive reactions for people that want to stay and live in particular villages or cities. Overall, for all Mattson (pers.com., 2018), Ronsefors (pers.com., 2018), and Logardt (pers.com., 2018) the economic growth seemed positive and desired, connecting to the first part of shared value by Porter & Kramer (2014), which is to create economic value. The second part of shared value is that society and environment are also benefitted, which all interviewees agreed needs more actions in order to be achieved.

Clusters to address CSR and complex sustainability issues are formed by convening stakeholder networks with new approaches on how to do business (Svendsen & Laberge, 2005). A network convenor can be in the form of an organization that helps the stakeholder web to focus resources and intelligence to produce innovative solutions (Ibid.). Swedish Lapland Visitors Board and Kiruna Lapland Economic Association are an example of network convenor for businesses to join forces towards sustainability and social issues. KLEA already promotes the adoption of the Sustainable Arctic Destination program (pers.com., Rosnefors, 2018), while SLVB desired future is to implement an obligatory certification for members to join (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018).

To attract more visitors, the destination needs more and better infrastructure, more nature-based activities and the preservation of the natural resources and attractiveness (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). This connects to the idea that a stakeholder network survival depends on the preservation of the natural and social systems in which is based (Post et al. 2002). Focus on moderate growth with a sustainable perspective is part of the strategy envisioned (Rosenfors, 2018). The way tourists travel is part of the preservation of the natural environment, which calls for better and faster trains and incentives for sustainability practices (pers.com., Poort, 2018).

Diversity is a critical factor in the stakeholder networks, diverse backgrounds are necessary for better innovative solutions, and although diversity can cause tension, this is part of the process to create sustainable innovation (Svendsen & Laberge, 2005). Besides the different kind of business and suppliers of the tourism industry, development needs to be balanced with other industries on the region, including the reindeer herding and the space industry (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Big companies are already engaging in sustainability practices (pers.com., Mattsson, 2018), and are key leaders to drive smaller companies that might prioritize business development over nature and society. The role of the tourism organizations is to guide the sustainable vision for all companies to be on the same page.
7. Discussion

In this chapter, a discussion connects the results and analysis with the aim established in chapter one.

7.1. Developing future sustainable tourism destinations

Results and analysis of the study showed that primary stakeholders of Swedish Lapland include “mute” natural environment, “mute” animal inhabitants and “absent” future generations. Defining stakeholders clarifies two important aspects, first who is responsible on taking action towards a sustainable future. Second, identify who will be affected if these actions are not achieved. An example of this is how Mattson (pers.com., 2018) acknowledged that bringing tourists by plane is an issue that is affecting the natural environment of the destination. Another example is that Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) stated that economic sustainability has to be achieved first in order for companies to start engaging in sustainability issues.

Big companies like the Ice Hotel and other big chains are mentioned to be strongly environmental focused (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018) This contrast with the smaller companies that are mainly focused on achieving economic balance (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018) There is clearly a gap between companies to be able or required to engage in sustainable practices. Both Poort (pers.com., 2018) and Rosnefors (pers.com., 2018) suggested that companies engaging in sustainability should get incentives. A particular idea was to provide incentives to companies that bring travelers by train (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). This idea connects to Mattson’s (pers.com., 2018) statement on the paradox of bringing more tourists by plane.

Following the idea of only big companies engaging in sustainability, it appears that other smaller companies acknowledge the competitive advantage of sustainability, and market themselves as green, even if they are not (pers.com., Logardt, 2018). This is extremely dangerous for a destination that is nature based and aims to attract a type of tourists like the “global traveler” that will not like these kinds of practices. Greenwashing can cause more damage to the destination than taxation of plane tickets. Regarding this, Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) argues that companies that only want to profit should be discarded or driven away by either policies or actions from the tourism organizations. It is important that all companies and suppliers from the tourism industry become active in sustainable practices, and not only the ones with better resources. As a nature-based destination, and from a business approach, becoming the sustainability leader in the industry is fundamental for Swedish Lapland.

Trade-offs between stakeholders analyzed are well understood in the study. There are clear positions among stakeholders towards priorities when addressing economic, social and environmental issues. Taking in account the results from the interviews Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) and Mattson (pers.com., 2018) as heads of tourism economic associations prioritize economic development although they recognize the importance of both environment and society. Logardt (pers.com., 2018) prioritizes society and constantly states the importance that the tourism industry benefits local people as they are an inherent part of the tourism experience. Poort (pers.com., 2018) prioritize environment and takes decisions based on the impacts her actions might have towards it.

Service dominant logic and co-creation of value play a major role in the tourism activities of the destination to meet sustainability. Specialized skills and knowledge are expressed to be the drivers of economic exchange (Lush & Vargo, 2006). Tourism activities are imagined integrating culture and purpose (pers.com., Logardt, 2018), with the arctic way of life as the core value that integrates the traditions of local population and the respect towards the environment (pers.com., Mattson, 2018). Co-creation of value involves the interaction with the already identified desired tourist, the global traveler. On the other hand, it was stated that is not the main type of tourist visiting the destination (pers.com., Logardt, 2018), and that even if attracted, might mostly come by plane (pers.com., Mattson, 2018).
Customer’s empowerment is the core to demand companies their accountability with society and environment. The desire of CO2 neutral companies and airlines, banning plastic, and shift of snowmobiles to be electrical (pers.com., Poort, 2018), are examples of the customer expectations to co-create value. This idea meets with the tourists’ responsibility to do their part by bringing own cups and food containers (pers.com., Poort, 2018). Scrutiny and evaluation are elements for customers to ensure companies and organizations are meeting with their expectations on sustainability (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004).

There is an important difference between Mattson (pers.com., 2018), Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) and Poort (pers.com., 2018) about flight tickets taxation. The first two, as responsible of tourism organizations oppose completely to the action as they fear Swedish Lapland might lose customers to Norway, Finland and Iceland. On the other hand, Poort (pers.com., 2018) as a customer that truly prioritizes the environment sees it as competitive advantage to attract the type of tourists that care the most, giving a competitive advantage to Swedish Lapland over its competitors.

7.2. Elements necessary for sustainable tourism destinations

Results and analysis identify actors and actions as drivers of change. Kiruna Lapland Economic Association promotes the Sustainable Arctic Destination program based on guidelines form the Global Sustainable Tourism Council to reduce water consumption, waste and fuel used (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). Contrasted with the UNWTO and UNDP (2018) publication, accommodation companies established that resource efficiency measures, sustainable management and recycling of waste are among their actions. Moreover, the future vision of Swedish Lapland involves the Sustainable Arctic Destination program being adopted by the majority of stakeholders within the destination (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018).

Promoting best practices towards nature, culture, society and the traditional way of life of the destination is suggested to guarantee the best experience possible to visitors (pers.com., Rosenfors, 2018). In relation Logardt (pers.com., 2018) stated the importance of locally produced services and products. Local purchasing, and seasonal products are also mentioned by UNWTO and UNDP (2018). Although an interesting vision from Ronsefors (pers.com., 2018) is moderate controlled growth, with Mattsson (pers.com., 2018) suggesting small-scale growth that promotes high income for the arctic way of life to be preserved. UNWTO and UNDP (2018) survey results just focused on creating jobs and educating local people to become part of the working force, with no mention of the importance of preserve the way of life of their destination.

UNWTO and UNDP (2018) stated actions to influence in consumer behavior towards sustainability and responsible purchase policies. Logardt (pers.com., 2018) argued for attracting tourists that are not only sustainable and responsible but want to spend longer periods of time to live the culture and traditions of the destination. Regarding the way of traveling UNWTO and UNDP (2018) included taxing, improving route planing, low emission fuels and implementing carbon offsetting program. None of the interviewees mentioned carbon offsetting, Mattson (pers.com., 2018) and Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) were against taxation but other alternatives were suggested. Better faster trains were with better capacity were proposed by Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) and Poort (pers.com., 2018). Another idea by both Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) and Poort (pers.com., 2018) already mentioned, was to promote incentives to companies that bring travelers by train.

Collaboration and joint actions with other industries was part of the actions in UNWTO and UNDP (2018). In relation, Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) mentioned the importance of the industry developing in conjunction with reindeer herding, mining and space industry. He also mentioned the importance of better infrastructure and investments to society and environment. UNWTO and UNDP (2018) also mentioned investments in landscape protection, planting trees and green spaces. UNWTO and UNDP (2018) also coincided with Poort (pers.com., 2018) on informing customers about sustainability practices.
Sustainable labels and certifications were a suggestion by both Mattson (pers.com., 2018) and Rosenfors (pers.com., 2018) to motivate companies to engage in sustainability practices. Legislation that supports sustainability and smart investments were also ideas approved by Mattson (pers.com., 2018). UNWTO and UNDP (2018) did not mention any of these, nevertheless, it described other elements not mentioned by the interviewees like education in sustainable consumption and production, donations for natural disasters and bundling sustainable products with green packages. Finally, an element only mentioned by Poort (pers.com., 2018) suggested Universal Basic Income and less working hours as a trigger for a sustainable slow industry. Poort (pers.com., 2018) also added a vision where all-natural attractions, cultural activities and infrastructure can be enjoyed by both locals and visitors.
8. Conclusions

The aim of this research project has been, using a backcasting approach, to explain the role of the SDGs in the creation of future sustainable tourism destinations. This chapter reconnects with the aim in chapter one and summarizes the key findings of the study.

The role of the Sustainable Development Goals in creating future sustainable tourism destinations relies in the examination of current scenarios and the formulation of alternatives towards what can be changed. Participatory backcasting seeks to encourage stakeholders to envision a desirable future and work backwards in order to identify the steps to achieve it. The backcasting method used in this study implied first to define the criteria for the SDGs 8, 12, and 13. These criteria was defined in the aim and delimitations section of the study, and then used to formulate questions to help stakeholders describe current scenarios and envision future desired ones.

The study revealed that SDGs help to describe current tourism destination scenarios, creating a parameter to establish the actual status and the actions that have been applied in relation to a specific Sustainable Development Goal. The interesting part is to jump from there to the most desirable future in which sustainable development is a reality for the whole tourism destination. The study reflects that a sustainable future destination is one in which the environment and society are the core elements of the tourism experience. Where traditions, local products and services are above overconsumption and mass tourism. Controlled economic growth and creation of jobs are part of the elements defined, alongside the joint development with other industries that also exist in the destination area. Tourism companies engage in sustainability practices such as water and waste management and encourage visitors to help in supporting these practices. The ways of transportation are efficient and environmental friendly, and culture is preserved and celebrated as something the visitor should embrace to enhance the whole experience.

The strategies found to achieve future sustainable scenarios in tourism destinations involve policies, embracing sustainable trends, include local society and take in account environment and new generations in decisions making. It is also important to work in conjunction with all the actors involved and to have strong and leading organizations that set the parameters to follow, like tourism organizations or the government. Transparency and full responsibility are keys, to avoid greenwashing and engage in practices that actually make a difference. Investments in the environment and society and targeting the right customer are also part of the strategies. In addition, taxation on transportation with high emissions and incentives for transportation alternatives like the train are important strategic to follow. Actors that have the capacity to drive change are businesses, tourists, tourism organizations, governments, financiers and local population.

Implementing a participatory backcasting method might limit the disruption level of the imagined desirable future as usually stakeholders portray desirable futures in base of what the industry is today. Nevertheless, the information and insights about all the elements involved, and challenges to be addressed is extremely useful. This study was limited by the number of stakeholders interviewed, although they are considered key stakeholders. To extend the scope of the results in future studies more stakeholders should be involved in the backcasting process. Using workshops after the interviews in order to motivate a more disruptive desirable futures is also suggested for future research.
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Appendix 1. Interview guide

1-What is in your opinion the current scenario of these three goals in Swedish Lapland?

2-What are the main issues related to these goals that Swedish Lapland is facing today?

3-Envisioning and ideal scenario in 2050 Swedish Lapland, how would these goals be integrated? How does it look? (What can change?)

4-What do you think is the path to obtain this scenario? How change can take place? How do we get there?

5-What are the major challenges to achieve this scenario? Legislations needed or currently in practice?

6-Who could make these changes happen? What actors or stakeholders have the power to make change happen?

7-What do you think is the best method or way to follow up these changes in order to achieve an ideal scenario?
### Appendix 2. Sustainable tourism definitions

Definitions of sustainable tourism. Obtained from (Butler, 1999). Different views of sustainable tourism have different delimitations and focuses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable tourism definitions</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism which meets the needs of present tourists and host regions while protecting and enhancing opportunity for the future.</td>
<td>World Tourism Organization (1993:3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable tourism is tourism and associated infrastructures that: both now and in the future operate within natural capacities for the regeneration and future productivity of natural resources; recognize the contribution that people and communities, customs and lifestyles, make to the tourism experience; accept that these people must have an equitable share in the economic benefits of local people and communities in the host areas.</td>
<td>Eber (1992:3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism which can sustain local economies without damaging the environment on which it depends.</td>
<td>Countryside Commission (1995:2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It must be capable of adding to the array of economic opportunities open to people without adversely affecting the structure of economic activity. Sustainable tourism ought not interfere with existing forms of social organization. Finally, sustainable tourism must respect the limits imposed by ecological communities.</td>
<td>Payne (1993:154-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable tourism in parks (and other areas) must primarily be defined in terms of sustainable ecosystems.</td>
<td>Woodley (1993:94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable tourism is tourism which develops as quickly as possible, taking into account of [sic] current accommodation capacity, the local population and the environment, and: Tourism that respects the environment and as a consequence does not aid its own disappearance. This is especially important in saturated areas, and: Sustainable tourism is responsible tourism</td>
<td>Bramwell <em>et al.</em> (1996:10-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism which is developed and maintained in an area (community, environment) in such a manner and at such a scale that it remains viable over an infinite period and does not degrade or alter the environment (human and physical) in which it exists to such a degree that it prohibits the successful development and well-being of other activities and processes.</td>
<td>Butler (1993:29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>