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Abstract

The three founding fields of sustainability, social equity, economic development and environmental protection, strive for opposing goals. The differences of these disciplines are often likely to lead to compromised solutions between their actors, than to any type of holistic sustainable outcome. This reality transcends to the debate of sustainability in tourism. Responses to mass tourism gave way to forms of tourism such as alternative and sustainable tourism. The latter type of tourism was criticized for asking for an unachievable balance between three opposing disciplines.

The question at stake asks if creative tourism could be used by actors in local tourism schemes in order to resolve the conflicts between the three goals of sustainability. Given the nature of creative tourism, the latter concept could resolve the conflicts of sustainable development because it would help to establish beneficial links between the different goals and resources of the actors involved in sustainability and in tourism. Creative tourism enables such complementation because it promotes the tourists’ active participation in their destinations’ development schemes and it enables communities to valorize their local space in creative and complementing ways that preserve their cultural and natural integrity. Actors in sustainability and tourism thus avoid the need for compromised outcomes and are more likely to head towards sustainable development. It is also claimed that a framework combining the two sets of theory can be built as theory unfolds.

Through qualitative research on the case study of Sólheimar eco-village in Iceland, it is revealed that creative tourism rather contributes to strengthen existing complementation between goals in sustainability. The overall results establish that creative tourism can be used as a tool to find a way to create stronger and more meaningful links between goals in sustainable development. A final framework coupling the two sets of theory is presented.

The findings shed light on a few points. Firstly, the focus of actors involved in sustainable development should be on complementing each others’ goals rather than compromising. Sustainability is found in the interactions between its actors. Conceptualizing sustainability as a form of interaction makes the concept more accessible to local actors. Moreover, tourists have a responsibility in the process of local development when they become participants. It will be the community’s decision how it wants to promote its essence, to what extent it wants to open up to tourists and what role it is willing to let these play in its local development. Further research needs to consider the challenges in sustainability and tourism left unelaborated in this work.
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1 Introduction

Tourism has been identified both as a blessing and a curse in places around the world (Mundt 2011; Weaver 2006). Its proponents see in local tourism an opportunity for economic development; it creates jobs for local inhabitants, increases consumption of local goods and attracts investments in infrastructure (Weaver 2006). With tourism, cultures can be diffused in a positive manner in an attempt to educate and reconcile global differences (D’Amore 1988). Tourism can also be used as a pretext to preserve local attributes of cultural and natural value from falling into the hands of economic development. This possibility is seen through projects in nature conservation and ecological restoration aimed at attracting visitors interested in natural sites (Buckley 2004; Blangy and Methac 2006). The tourism sector has become one of the largest economic sectors in the world (UNTWO 2010) and is continuously growing. Under these circumstances, even tourism enterprises pursuing sound social and environmental development schemes are likely to exceed their carrying capacity and burden local communities with stress and pollution, rather than bring growth and opportunities. It is under this light that critics of tourism accuse it of leading to the commodification of local cultures, degrading environmental and cultural assets and offering low-wage, low-benefit, part-time and seasonal jobs to local people while the benefits are reaped by just a few (Munt 2011; Weaver 2006; Kiss 2004; Forstner 2004; Briassoulis 2002).

At its emergence with the Bruntland Commission in 1987, the concept of sustainability was coupled with the debate surrounding tourism and resulted in the conception of sustainable tourism (Weaver 2006, p.10; Hunter 2002, p.3). The implications for tourism were a growing concern to offer sustainably appropriate touristic products and for visitors to become responsible consumers of touristic products. Sustainable tourism would use a holistic approach as it sought to minimize the impacts of the industry on local environments and communities while it maximized its economic benefits.

Sustainable development turned out to be a severely criticized concept often referred to as conflicting, vague and calling for holistic-thinking without offering specific steps for achievement (e.g., Lane 2009; Rist 2002; Campbell 1996; Romeril 1994; Wheeler 1993; Worster 1993; Redclift 1987). The difficulty in reaching an objective of sustainability stems from the creation of conflicts between the disciplines sustainable development is meant to consider. The conflicts relate to questions such as: what should be developed? What should be sustained and for whom? This as the environment, society and economy compete in parallel to use sustainable development to sustain and develop their respective interests. Conflict negotiation and compromised outcomes are thus more plausible approaches to sustainable development than striving to fulfill a holistic cause.

As for tourism, the debate became centered on the same questions: what should be sustained in tourism? What should be developed in tourism? For whom should there be tourism? (e.g., McCool and Moisey 2008; Weaver 2006; Wahab and Pigram 1997; Butler 1993) As the numbers of tourists world-wide were increasing, it became apparent that tourism would need to reform its practices. Would sustainability in tourism mean that it would sustain itself and promote its own development, or should sustainable tourism serve a better purpose in the quest for sustainable development? The notion of sustaining simply the tourism sector and its continuous growth as an economic activity is now usually discarded in the realm of academic over a notion that embraces tourism as a tool for development (McCool and Moisey 2008; Moscardo 2008; Miller and Twining-Ward 2005; McCool et al. 2001; Robinson 1999). Tourism should be used as a means to create economic development, promote environmental protection and empower societies in their livelihoods, rather than represent an end in itself. As for generating sustainable tourism, it is understood that it will require negotiations and compromises between various stakeholders (McCool and Moisey 2008; Bramwell et al. 1996). It is in
this manner that sustainable tourism is often conceptualized: a compromised outcome between stakeholders meant at fostering sustainable development. How to stop relying on compromised outcome and find a way to generate solutions that fully fulfill the ambitions of actors at the social, environmental and economic level?

It must be considered that these localized development conflicts are occurring on a canvas of social trends constantly shaping the behaviors of individuals around the world. This reality has major implications for the tourism sector and for communities wishing to use tourism as a tool for their development. Differentiation has become crucial in a highly globalized world where culture risks to be presented in a commercialized and serial manner (ECORYS 2010). Moreover, advancements in technology and a higher than ever access to information have led to preferences in consuming memorable and customized intangible goods (i.e., experiences), rather than consuming material goods and services (Ek et al. 2008; Pine and Gilmore 1999). Increasing importance is placed on participation and creativity in tourism (Richards and Wilson 2005, 2007; Wearing and Wearing 1996), which led to the conception of creative tourism. Creative tourism takes culture and gives it the new edge it needs to become a unique experience that can be offered to tourists at any location (Richards and Wilson 2005, 2007). Increasingly, tourists want to use their creative skills and participate in the design and production of their consumption goods while on site (Ek et al. 2008; Richards and Wilson 2005, 2007). Through participatory and sensory activities at the destination, the tourists connect with the local providers who facilitate their experience, thus coming closer to a genuine cultural experience (Sims 2009; Cloke 2007). Creative tourism enables local actors to play an active role in the process as they can use their creative skills to valorize the essence of their place (Prentice and Anderson 2007). Through creativity, meaning can be extracted from a place regardless of changing trends and attitudes. These characteristics make creative tourism adaptive and inventive in the face of challenges.

1.1 Problem Formulation
Sustainable tourism is difficult to translate into local sustainable development. Sustainable tourism requires the engagement of many actors from many disciplines with opposing goals. Conflicts between different actors and their goals are thus likely to occur instead of sound development schemes. On the other hand, creative tourism responds to challenges due to its ability to adapt and re-invent objectives. Creative tourism is a problem-solving and competitive form of tourism. These are attributes that sustainable tourism could use to resolve its differences and thus serve its purpose.

- How can actors in local tourism schemes (e.g., community members, the tourists and tourism businesses) use principles of creative tourism such as facilitating becoming, reproducing space and complementing culture, to resolve their conflicts between the economic, social and environmental goals and generate sustainable development?

Literature coupling these two sets of theories is mostly sparse and thus no definitive model exists to conceptualize how principles of creative tourism could be used, and by whom, to fulfill local sustainable development schemes.

- Can such a framework be devised through existing literature on sustainable tourism, sustainable development and creative tourism?

1.2 Hypothesis
Creative tourism helps to resolve the conflicts of sustainable development by establishing beneficial links between the different goals and resources of the actors involved in sustainability and in tourism. Creative tourism enables complementation of this kind because:
• Creative tourism promotes the tourists’ active participation in their destinations’ development schemes
• Creative tourism enables communities to valorize local space in creative and complementing ways that preserve cultural and natural integrity.

By using creative tourism in this way, actors in sustainability and tourism avoid conflict and the need for compromised outcomes and are more likely to head towards sustainable development schemes.

A conceptual framework establishing the links between the two sets of theories can be conceived by using literature that outlines the respective goals of actors in sustainable development and creative tourism. The conceptual framework can then be used in real life settings. A case study can be used to demonstrate how to use the conceptual framework as it will clarify how the actors from these two groups can complement each other in the pursuit of their objectives and how that would lead to sustainable development.

1.3 Report Structure
This study starts with a theory section where a literature review outlines established research on sustainability, sustainable tourism and creative tourism. Through the literature presented, three conceptual frameworks are designed and presented in order to later be used as tools for research. A case study is used as the method to verify the hypothesis under study. The case is presented under the method section, which starts off by outlining the methodology of the data collection. Background information on the case is presented before the data collected is outlined and analyzed. The case study is of the Sólheimar eco-village: an Icelandic eco-village with strong social and cultural attributes, which hosts a Center for Sustainable Education, Sesseljuhus, and which hosts visitors all-year round. Results are drawn from the case study and are presented in their own section. A discussion will seek to clarify the meaning of the results in a wider context. The difficulties associated with the results will be assessed and used to discuss larger challenges in tourism as will further research in the field be suggested. Also, potential weaknesses in the report will be discussed. A summary and conclusion sum up the research.

2 Theory
In the theory section, a literature review is first presented to outline the relevant research that has been established in the fields under study. First off, literature on sustainable development and tourism is explored. The literature advances that the goals in sustainable development, those of economic development, social equity and environmental protection, are conflicting and thus impossible to resolve independently. This reality transposes to sustainable tourism which leaves this form of tourism questionable in its feasibility and purpose. Ultimately, academics such as Gianna Moscardo (2008), Stephan McCool and Neil Moisey (2008) advocate that sustainable tourism is meant to be a tool for sustainable development and not an independent industry. In the search for methods to turn sustainable tourism into sustainable development, the attention is turned to theory on global trends and creative tourism. Creative tourism, a term conceived by Richards and Raymond in a 2000 paper (Richard and Wilson 2005, p.1210) is defined through a review of existing literature on the topic. It is a newer field and thus the literature is less abundant than for sustainable tourism. The proponents of creative tourism claim that it is a competitive and participatory type of tourism which appeals to the tourists who now increasingly want to live experiences and connect with local people.

Three conceptual frameworks are derived from the work of literature explored. The first framework relates to tourism and sustainability and outlines the conflicts that exist between
the opposing goals of sustainability in tourism. The second framework is used to define creative tourism and outlines its conflict-free interactions between its actors. The last part of the theory section is used to link the two sets of theory, on tourism sustainability and creative tourism, in order to conceptualize how creative tourism could resolve the challenges of sustainable tourism and turn tourism into an actual tool for sustainable development. This framework is insightful as it will serve as a tool to work with the case under study.

2.1 Tourism and Sustainability

The tourism and travel industry have become very significant business sectors around the world. With a forecasted contribution of $US 5,991.9 billion to the world economy, the industry is projected to make up 9.1% of the global GDP in 2011 (WTTC 2011). Tourism increased in popularity most notably after the Second World War, a peaceful period during which the advancement of long distance transportation along with the rise of a strong middle-class with money and time to travel appeared. The global number of international arrivals shows an evolution from a mere 25 million in 1950 to an estimated 806 million in 2005, corresponding to an average annual growth rate of 6.5% (UNTWO 2001). The terrorist events of September 2001 in the United States and the global economic downturn of the beginning of the century caused significant damages to the industry for a certain period of time. Figures from the United Nation’s World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) showed a 9% decrease in international arrivals in the last four months of 2001. Nonetheless, the tourism industry did not decline for too long and global trends demonstrate a forecasted average growth rate of 4% and a number of arrivals of tourists worldwide reaching 1.6 billion by 2020 (UNTWO 2001).

The ever-growing wave of tourists created a phenomenon referred to as unsustainable mass tourism. The term is defined as “a large number of people coming to a highly commercialized space for leisure over a short period of time” (Weaver 2006, p.40). The phenomenon is especially apparent through the appearance of large scale accommodations that service high densities of guests, such as hotel and resort complexes. These spaces are often concentrated in areas that develop into touristic districts built according to an obtrusive ethnocentric architecture. Instances of this type of architecture are common in the Caribbean, along the Mediterranean coast as well as in other sunny destinations where homogenic complexes leave no trace of the existence of a local distinct culture. Figure 1 and 2 illustrate such buildings. Figure 1 is a picture of a resort complex in the Bahamas and figure 2 represents a hotel complex on a Greek island.

Figure 1: A hotel resort in the Bahamas (Le-Caribbean-Island.com 2011)

Figure 2: A hotel complex on a Greek island (Poli Real Estate 2010)
The concern over the detriments of tourism on local environments and communities was first conceptualized in the work of Jafar Jafari (1988), founding president of the International Academy for the Study of Tourism and now professor in hospitality and tourism at the University of Wisconsin. In 1988, Jafari established a sequence of four platforms that describe the evolution of how tourism is perceived, studied and approached in terms of development (in Beeton 2006, p.14; in Weaver 2006, p.6). The first platform of Jafari’s model, the post-World War II advocacy platform, starts off by strongly supporting tourism as a means to stimulate economic regional development. The advocacy platform had proponents that contended that tourism promoted cross-cultural understanding and provided incentives to preserve cultural and natural heritages (Blangy and Methac 2006; Buckley 2004; D’Amore 1998; McNulty 1985). Beeton defines the advocacy platform in terms of seeing tourism as an industry in its own right, often presented as a “savior” particularly in rural communities in need of economic development (2006, p.15). As tourism intensified, reaching every corner of the world, it became apparent that it more likely caused adverse effects on local spaces. Mass tourism was soon accused of a number of evils, such as leading to the commodification of local cultures, degrading environmental and cultural assets and offering low-wage, low-benefit, part-time and seasonal jobs to local people with low economic returns (Munt 2011; Weaver 2006; Kiss 2004; Forstner 2004; Briassoulis 2002).

The first platform to see tourism beyond an economic purpose was the cautionary platform which appeared in the late 1960s and early 1970s (in Beeton 2006, p.14; in Weaver 2006, p.6-7). The cautionary platform was a reaction to the advocacy platform and worked to shed light on the detriments of tourism. However, it did not suggest corrective methods. It is with the appearance of supporters for the adaptancy platform of the late 1970s and early 1980s that solutions and other ways of doing tourism started seeing the day. Weaver describes the adaptancy platform as: “a perspective aligned ideologically with the cautionary platform that is so called because it espouses tourism that is adapted to the unique socio-cultural and environmental circumstances of any given community” (2006, p.8-9). The adaptation to traditional mass tourism led to the creation of concepts in tourism such as alternative tourism. Alternative tourism was recognized by some academics as the form of adaptability that was needed to procure alternative options to mass tourism (Gonsalves 1987; Holden 1984; Dernoi 1981). More specifically, alternative tourism was defined as a form of tourism interested in providing “authentic, cultural, historical and natural attractions that are perceived to capture a destination’s unique sense of place and allow for interactions between visitors and local residents” (Weaver 2006, p.38). The alternative tourists avoid spaces of mass tourism, packaged tours and arrangements, preferring to travel on their own, visiting off-path destinations where there is a distinct culture, usually for a more extended stay. In the mid-1980s, ecotourism emerged as another alternative to mass tourism. The practice was first conceptualized by the Mexican consultant Hector Ceballos-Lascuráin who invited tourists to avoid resorts and commercial areas in order to study and enjoy natural wonders out of the reach of most people (1998). Clarke declares that, at that time, such types of tourism were recognized by some of mass tourism’s harshest critics as the solutions with which to replace mass tourism (2010, p.225).

Kirsten and Rogerson claim that alternative forms of tourism are usually associated with limited environmental and social impacts and greater participatory opportunities for local businesses because their activities are smaller in scale (2002). This means that these types of tourism thus became only partial solutions as tourist destinations with small carrying capacities became increasingly flooded with visitors regardless of their targeted size of audience. It was realized that any form of tourism faced with an increase in its volume had negative impacts on a location and its population. The logic by which there is on one end of a spectrum a good form of tourism, such as alternative tourism, and on the other end another form of tour-
ism, mass tourism, which is bad was discarded as too simplistic and impractical. A solution was needed to deal with a dynamic and complex phenomenon, rather than to offer small-scale alternatives (Clarke 2010, p.226). Moreover, alternative and eco-tourism got accused of being mere marketing schemes to generate higher business profits than the result of environmentally conscious entrepreneurs (Butler 1999, p.13). Liu discusses that these alternative forms of tourism threaten to lead to the creation of “staged-authenticity” where the identity of a place is created by entrepreneurs to appeal to tourists seeking to fulfill a certain desire, instead of creating a demand out of the true local identity (2003, p.468).

Tourism development thus required a new approach, which gave rise to yet another platform in tourism academics; the knowledge-based platform (in Beeton 2006, p.15; Weaver 2006, p.9). The focus of the knowledge-based platform is put on the discovery and development of scientific knowledge to manage tourism. Indicators and baselines have been devised following the premise that good-practices can be measured and implemented in the fields related to tourism in order to minimize and repair unavoidable damages. It resulted in a demand, if not to change, to at least improve practices in mass tourism. It seemed more appropriate to see mass tourism in that way than as an evil to counter with alternatives such as sending people to pristine environmental areas (Clarke 2010, p.227; Liu 2003, p.471). In fact, a position was taken that all forms of tourism could converge towards a goal of sustainability, regardless of their scale (Clarke 2010, p.229). This type of tourism became known as sustainable tourism and started appearing in academic discourses in the early 1990s (e.g., in D’Amore 1992; Bull 1992; Zurick 1992; Lane 1991; Pigram 1990).

This position that tourism should move towards a goal of sustainability appeared in unison with the conception of the term sustainable development in the late 1980s. The concept of sustainability was established with the Bruntland Commission in the 1987 document entitled “Our Common Future” and calls for “meeting the needs of the present, without compromising the needs for future generations” (p.8). The statement was an acknowledgement that economic development could not continue as it too often did without any consideration to environmental protection and social justice. Rist believes that the document aroused widespread interest in environmental problems by depicting a clear portrait that humankind could no longer continue living as it did (2002, p.192). Since then, the term sustainable development has become part of the language of a great deal of project developers, both in the private or public sector, be they extracting natural resources or offering customer service. The phenomenon is obvious nowadays with a widespread instance of major companies publishing reports stating environmental objectives. Examples are: the energy and petrochemical giant Shell (2011), the mining company Rio Tinto (2011) and the Canadian hydro-energy provider Hydro-Québec (2011). The latter even has a foundation dedicated to the protection of the local environment. Companies in transportation such as airlines and train transportation have developed sustainable objectives. For instance, British Airways (2011) has an environmental plan which can be found on its website, and the national train company SJ (2011), in Sweden, shares with the public its environmental policy and sustainability reports as it claims it is the best travelling alternative for the environmentally-conscious traveler. In addition, governments on all levels have created sections and action groups to target objectives of sustainability. For instance, the economic and political partnership institution forming the European Commission has elaborated extensive strategies to meet environmental goals, like its 2007 Sustainable Development Strategy, which it reviewed in 2009 (2010).

Sustainability is recognized as a worthy long-term goal, working as a unifying concept to enable the adoption of a common vision over an array of disciplines (Munt 2011; Campbell 1996). The multidisciplinary nature of sustainability is however also at the root of its complexity, which critics believe causes the term to remain vague and encompassing opposing fields of interests (Lane 2009; Rist 2002; Campbell 1996; Romeril 1994; Wheeler 1993; Wor-
Dryzek insists that environmental problems are found at the intersection of ecosystems and human social systems (1997). As these two systems clash, conflicts between the different actors at stake and their notion of “what should be developed”, “what should be sustained” and “for whom” take place as the environment, society and economy compete in parallel to use sustainable development to their advantage. Critics have called the term sustainable development an oxymoron as it supports neo-classical economic theories of growth and affluence while supporting its very counter-culture of environmentalism and eco-centricity (Dryzek 1997; Turner 1993; Friend 1992; O’Riordan 1981). The interconnectedness of the various disciplines also makes it difficult to single out problems and give them objectives. Dryzek insists that the relation between human systems and natural systems leaves us to confront two levels of complexity in our goal of sustainable development since ecosystems and human social systems are both complex in their state of being and in their interactions (1997). He states: “environmental issues do not present themselves to us in well-defined boxes labeled radiation, national park, panda, coral reefs, rainforest, heavy metal pollution, and the likes. Instead they are interconnected in all kinds of ways” (1997, p.7). For instance, as problems of climate change relate to the diffusion of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere from burning fossil fuel, they will require attention from political and scientific actors. At the same time as this issue relates to transportation policy as motor vehicles produce a large amount of carbon dioxide emissions, problems of climate change will also affect environmental management policies as ecosystems are destroyed by the phenomena. The problem will also relate to investment and research in alternative energies such as wind-power and nuclear power. Moreover, our knowledge of ecosystems is limited by the field of science. The ability of some species to regenerate, proliferate or survive is dependent on multiple factors such as seasonality, temperature, availability of other resources, the presence of predators and the likes. Entire ecosystems will be affected from unbalances in their attributes. These can easily be disturbed from their interaction with human systems, which are themselves very complex in their local cultural patterns, norms and other social practices. As communities go through different experiences, their distinct cultural and historical attributes (e.g., how they live their daily lives, work, behave, share norms, culture and symbolic representation and relate to each other) become important factors to consider in attempts for local development or policy-making. Human systems are connected through economic systems where goods and income are distributed within a society. The forces of the economic system are complex and create wide-scale inequalities between individuals as some find themselves marginalized by its activities. The state of the economic system is also very dependent on conceptualizing ecosystems as natural resources to extract from the environment. As many individuals around the world find their source of income in fishing, mining, tree-cutting, factory-work and the likes, there are many livelihoods dependent on destructive environmental practices.

It is in this regard that Scott Campbell, a planner at the University of Michigan, claims that the plan of action to address the realms of sustainability is found primarily through conflict negotiations (1996). Campbell states that: “planners will find their vision of a sustainable city developed best at the conclusion of contested negotiations over land use, transportation, housing, and economic development policies, not at the premise for beginning the efforts” (1996). Campbell does not believe in a “pre-ordained balance” and sees rather an array of complex problems and conflicting needs rather than goals and objectives (1996). Conflict negotiation and resolution will be used to conceive innovations rather than aim at discovery and converting the non-believers (Campbell 1996).

Coming back to the realm of tourism, the question of “what should be sustained and developed” also led to difficulties in conceptualizing and generating the concept of sustainable tourism (e.g., in McCool and Moisey 2008; Weaver 2006; Wahab and Pigram 1997; Butler 1993). Liu exemplifies the issue when he asks “should a destination keep its natural assets
such as wilderness areas untouched, or transform them into tourist attractions and through tourism increase capital stock in the forms of improved technology and infrastructure while accepting limited changes or reductions of the natural assets?” (2003, p.465) The question of for whom should a destination be developed leaves four actors in the dilemma: the tourists, the tourism businesses, the host community and those representing the needs for environmental protection. All these groups are equally significant in the debate and will be needed to compromise (Liu 2003, p.467). Just as there is over the debate of sustainability, there is an acknowledgement that sustainability in the tourism sector is to be built on negotiations and compromises over complex issues (McCool and Moisey 2008; Bramwell et al. 1996). McCool and Moisey claim that competing goals and uncertainties in science leave planning in tourism to rest on the notion of social learning to better understand the relationship of the different fields, and on consensus building to organize the social action needed to implement a plan (2008, p.9). Accordingly, Liu advocates the need to move beyond the stage of pleading for conservation and preservation to a realm of retaining “a balance between the consumption, transformation and creation of tourism resources” (2003, p.466).

A number of challenges believed to be central issues in sustainable tourism have been outlined in the report Action for More Sustainable European Tourism by the Tourism Sustainability Group at the European Commission’s division on Industry and Enterprise (2007). The group was set up by the European Commission in 2004 with the long-term goal to stimulate action in Europe to make tourism more sustainable. The group was formed with individuals from international bodies, member state governments, regional and local authorities, the tourism industry, professional bodies, environmental organizations, trade unions and research and educational bodies, having expertise and experience in the sustainability of tourism (2007). As for the challenges they outlined in their report, these justly represent examples of what Campbell (1996) defines as conflicts in sustainable planning. Campbell (1996) presents a framework intended for planners where the three goals of sustainability are laid out as the angles of a triangle and the conflicts they generate are included between the respective angles (see figure 3 on the next page). The author identifies three conflicts: the property conflict between social justice and economic development, the resource conflict between economic development and environmental protection, and the development conflict between social justice and environmental protection. Campbell (1996) places the notion of having reached sustainability in the middle of the framework. Sustainability is placed inside the triangle the framework forms as a challenge to be solved through negotiations rather than a goal to reach. The notion that an answer to the challenges in sustainability rest in the middle of a triangle of dilemmas coincides with McCool and Moisey’s (2008) idea of “consensus building” and Liu’s (2003) “balance” between the different aspects of tourism development. These three conflicts, along with their related examples in terms of tourism, extracted from the work of the European Commission’s Tourism Sustainability Group, are worthy of attention.

In Campbell’s notion, the property conflict relates to how land should be allocated and used (1996). The conflict mostly stems from “the tension generated as the private sector simultaneously resists and needs social intervention, given the intrinsically contradictory nature of property” (Campbell 1996). As land distribution should be the result of capitalist forces over market supply and demand, government intervention often needs to be applied to ensure that a property generates the social aspect it is meant to offer. The Tourism Sustainability Group, in its report on actions for sustainable tourism, identifies the challenge of conserving and giving value to sites of natural and cultural value in the face of growing curiosity amongst travelers (2007). Historical, cultural and natural sites are crucial aspects to the appeal of a tourist destination. These sites display a unique set of cultural attributes such as cuisine, buildings, architecture, fine art, festivals and crafts, and natural attributes such as fauna and flora (Rainforest Alliance n.d.). The challenge is to open these places to tourists so as to use
them as a driver of economic development (e.g., creating jobs, generating profit, financing infrastructure), whilst preserving them from the detriments of touristic activities to conserve local culture. The conflict is between the extent to which the place belongs to tourism activities or to natural and cultural activities. The common detrimental impacts of the arrival of tourists to sensitive sites are over-use and specific intrusive activities (e.g., inadequate waste disposal, noisy activities scaring wildlife, native flora picking and so on). Also related to tourism is the local growth of some economic sectors to foster the arrival of visitors at the detriment of heritage sites (e.g., building roads, hotels, parking lots and any other facility). Other factors are outside of the control of a location such as climate change and a lack of financial resources to fund preservation, but their negative consequences can be aggravated by the presence of tourists.

![Figure 3: Campbell's framework displaying the three different types of conflicts in sustainability due to clashes between its holistic goals.](image)

The resource conflict encompasses the debate over the social allocation of natural resources. The question is: should these be exploited by businesses and turned into capital or should they be left unspoiled due to their intrinsic natural value? Campbell defines this conflict as the limit between the realm of human activity and the undeveloped wilderness (1996). The tension of the conflict is in the debate over the economic utility of nature in the industrial society and their ecological utility in the natural environment. Furthermore, the resource dilemma is similar to that of property; while there are two distinct aims at stake, the actors might have to rely on each other to strive. A business would in the majority of cases wish to exploit natural and material resources free of regulations or consideration, but these regulations and considerations are necessary for its long-term exploitation of that input.

Minimizing resource use and the generation of waste is a pressing matter at tourism destinations (Tourism Sustainability Group 2007). The Rainforest Alliance (n.d.), in a manual on sustainable tourism best-practices, outlines the concern that the tourism sector may divert lo-
cal resources from a community in order to support tourist consumption. Touristic destinations can be high consumers of physical resources, such as water for activities ranging from maintaining golf courses and gardens, filling up pools, cleaning and producing artificial snow. Touristic destinations can be high consumers of energy by using advertisement, air-conditioning, heating and powering appliances. Such touristic destinations will also generate extra waste to be treated by local facilities. This is assuming that waste is disposed of properly by the tourism businesses and guests and that the community has the adequate facilities to process it. The challenge is to find ways to allocate resources to tourism to support the businesses without exceeding the carrying capacity or regenerative rate of an environment and its resources. Both the Rainforest Alliance and the Sustainability Tourism Group claim that technologies to reduce or render efficient consumption and disposal, certified alternative products and better means of organization and distribution are to be invested in to resolve the issue (n.d. and 2007).

The third conflict in sustainability is presented as the development conflict and occurs as goals in social justice and environmental protection oppose. According to Campbell, this is the most elusive and challenging dilemma to reconcile as it requires increasing social equity and allocating property and resources fairly, while simultaneously protecting the environment regardless of the capacity of the economy (1996). Campbell asks: “how could those at the bottom of society find greater economic opportunity if environmental protection mandates diminished economic growth?” (1996). Environmental protection is often recognized as a link to poverty for communities dependent on the exploitation of natural resources. Some communities may have no choice but to engage in environmentally destructive activities. This could be by working at incinerators, toxic waste sites, factories that do not abide by environmental regulations and other sites damaging the environment and quality of life in a community. These operations often cannot be refused by a community seeking economic development.

The tourism sector presents a similar parallel between the environment and social justice in communities. Tourism alters the characters of settlements and landscapes. It can alter these in a positive way by providing incentives for investing in infrastructure, such as better roads. Often though, development in tourism can lead to undesirable urbanization which destroys green spaces and local amenities (Tourism Sustainability Group 2007). A second unfavorable factor for community prosperity is the possibility of the restructuring of local economies. As the tourism industry is seen as a replacement to traditional activities, such as agriculture and fisheries, it separates communities from their cultural values, often driving them to depend on global trends in the tourism sector. On the other hand, Liu outlines in a critique on sustainable tourism that there are regions which are expected to retain their traditional cultural habits for the sake of the tourists’ desire to visit exotic locations (2003, p.468). He believes this expectation, which often stems from the demand of tourists from affluent parts of the world, is potentially unfair for regions seeking modernization or those which are unable to resist to it (Liu 2003, p.468).

Gianna Moscardo, an elected scholar at the World Tourism Organization’s International Academy for the Study of Tourism, believes that tourism risks leading to these problems (i.e., altered settlements, restructured economies and retaining primitive cultures) because of the ingrained notion that tourism must be sustained for its own sake (2008). When a tourism business comes as a single entity seeking its own development inside a community, it will not resolve any goals of development. Sharpley outlines the same paradox when he claims that the role of tourism as a developmental tool is rarely questioned: “the aim becomes sustaining tourism itself and the lack of attention paid to a balanced relationship with other economic sectors results in tourism competing for, rather than sharing, resources” (2000, p.9). These issues bring Moscardo to challenge the assumption that tourism can be sustainable in its own
right. Sustainable tourism has mostly been related to the continuity of tourism by minimizing the negative impacts that would destroy its existence, rather than to the contribution tourism can make to sustainable outcomes. She underlines that tourism becomes inevitably unsustainable when external agents, such as NGO staff and consultants, are focused on pursuing a market-driven activity (2008, p.6). Lane outlines society’s obsession with growth as an obstacle in the pursuit of sustainable tourism (2009, p.23). Lane point out that the tourism industry has been growing for over sixty years at an incredible rate and it is not ready to change neither its mindset nor its practices (2009, p.23). Butler voices that often agents in tourism, such as hotel owners, tour operators and governmental agents, support sustainable strategies but disregard their interconnections with other sectors which reveals their true intention of solely sustaining tourism’s viability (1993). Weaver acknowledges also that tourism activities have by far not moved beyond the imperative of profit and growth (2009). He brings up the term “veneer environmentalism” to describe agents in the industry that use environmentalism and sustainable practices to yield higher public relations and profit from supporting a cause (2009, p.24). Butler calls terms like “sustainable development” and “green tourism” little more than a marketing gimmick (1999, p.13). The focus on environmentalism is simply for the sake of the tourist project to call itself “green”, which undermines the existence of tourism as a driver of local development. This reality is often apparent in developing regions. Daltabuit and Pi-Sunyer, in their research on tourism development in Mexico, outline how a local environment can be subtly appropriated by outsiders (1990). They explore the case of the village of Coba, a major archeological hot spot for Mayan culture which in the hands of Western developers became a profitable global ecological patrimony, rather than a source of grass-root development opportunities (Daltabuit and Pi-Sunyer 1990). Survival International, an organization working for tribal people worldwide, reports examples of flawed eco-friendly tourism: in Nepal, the Chhetri people were moved from their land to create Lake Rara National Park, and, in Kenya’s Shaba reserve, the scarce water used by the Samburu herdsmen to water their cattle is diverted to fill the swimming pool of the Sarova Shaba Hotel (1995, in Mowforth and Munt 2003, p.51). A green façade also emerges within an enterprise when environmental policies are adopted but do not translate into concrete actions. As participation in green principles is ultimately optional for staff and managers, sustainable actions are focused on sacrifices and incentives. Ultimately, with veneer environmentalism, the focus is on the attitude of the company and tourism developers rather than on the status of the community (Weaver 2009, p.36).

The challenge for tourism to lead to development is to make the industry instrumental in maintaining and enhancing community prosperity and quality of life in the face of change. This is a challenge that the Tourism Sustainability Group (2007) also supports. Resolving the development challenge requires seeing tourism as a tool to development, which McCool and Moisey do when they define sustainable tourism as “a method to protect the natural and social capital upon which the industry is built” (2008). Accordingly, Moscardo prefers to label tourism as a potential resource for communities seeking a path to sustainable development (2008, p.7). Doing so, she believes, would prevent tourism to be viewed in isolation from other activities and industries shaping a community. It would prevent communities to be viewed as resources to input in tourism development projects and therefore ultimately avoid the disempowerment of local residents and stakeholders in the tourism development and management process of local tourism (2008, p.6-7). Moscardo suggests that, for this to occur, the theory of Holmerfjord (2000) on the synergies of tourism and local activities be used by local communities (2008, p.7). Holmerfjord proposes three types of synergies: product synergies, market synergies and marketing synergies (2000). Product synergies means that the infrastructures and facilities used for tourism activities are integrated as parts of the community or already exist as parts of the community. When tourism becomes an end in itself, infrastructure and facilities will be funded at the detriment of the community with hopes that it successfully
reaps profit in the long-run. On the other hand, adding tourism to existing activities will sustain and increase their development while preserving the authenticity of the place. The Tourism Sustainability Group acknowledges this implication when it claims that tourism should be integrated with the existing activities of the community (2007). The Group also adds at the same time that priority should be given to construct facilities which preserve the character of a location, have minimal environmental impact and deliver empowerment and employment to the community (2007). In market synergies, tourists are additional customers in an already existing market of local goods and services, which supports the Tourism Sustainability Group’s claim that changes in development should follow market trends and demands (2007). Local goods such as food products, agricultural goods and crafts already purchased by local customers can lead to customer-based tourism, attracting visitors interested in particular tastes. Moscardo also identifies volunteer tourism as a means for local development. During volunteer tourism, tourists become resources beneficial to the community in the form of, for example physical labor or nature-based or community project participants (2008, p.8). Volunteers give a chance to businesses and communities to use low-cost labor in activities with low profit margins which are nonetheless necessary for development such as in agriculture, ecological restoration and heritage research. The third type of synergies, marketing synergies, refers to ways of using tourism as a channel to create a broader awareness of other aspects of the region. In this case, marketing distribution systems are used to transform the tourists themselves in promotional material for regional products and for the joint development of regional brands. Local producers can use channels of tourism information, such as magazines, websites and promotional agencies, to market their resources to customers outside of the area and widened their market.

2.2 Global Trends and Creative Tourism

The second body of literature to explore in this research relates to creative tourism. The conception of creative tourism stems from significant global trends in the consumer and producer’s behavior which must be elaborated before defining the aspects of creative tourism which can be used to generate sustainable development. Increasingly, importance is placed on creativity in product development. Björn Bjerke, Swedish economist and professor of entrepreneurship at Stockholm University, claims that with the rise of the age of information, where information and education are highly valued, and high-technologies are increasingly developed to ease lifestyles, it is no longer growth which is optimized, but innovations (2007, p.13). Generally and increasingly, individuals in society are more inclined to value a good lifestyle instead of striving for economic growth and wealth. It is not the quantity of the output that matters to have a good life, but its quality. Moreover, results are appreciated for their uniqueness which distinguishes them from other products created for the same purpose (Bjerke 2007, p.13-14). This reality places a lot of importance on creativity in product development. Creativity can be loosely defined with terms such as imaginative, inventive, showing imagination as well as routine skills, and also as stepping beyond traditional ways of making, knowing and doing (Richards & Wilson 2007, p.15). The importance we place on creativity as a tool to lead us forward can be identified in the definition it is given by the online Business Dictionary: “mental characteristic that allows a person to think outside of the box, which results in innovative or different approaches to a particular task” (2011).

Moreover, according to some contemporary debate amongst academics of urban planning and geography, the importance that our society concedes to creativity has grown to become its very own identity (Florida 2005). Richard Florida claims that more and more individuals belong to what he calls the creative class (2005, p.4). The creative class encompasses those who “think for a living” such as designers, artists, writers, planners and researchers. These individuals search for ideas and inspiration as they value the quality of their work and
life over the accumulation of wealth. Florida advances that this reality is reflected through the fact that individuals will seek to be in places not necessarily where the cost of business is low or where firms have clustered, but rather where there is a quality of place and openness to creativity. This openness encourages them to use their creativity and live fully their lifestyles. On this matter he states: “places that are open to creativity of all sorts (technological and cultural as well as economic) reflect an underlying environment or habitat which favors risk taking and thus will stimulate entrepreneurship and new firm formation” (2002, p.7-8).

With the creative class rising and clustering in urban and rural spaces comes the rise of creative industries (Richards & Wilson 2007, p.4-5). Creative industries are described by the United Kingdom Creative Industries Task Force as: “those activities which have their origin in individual creativity, skills and talent, and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property” (in Richards & Wilson 2007, p.5). In his work on creative industries and their policy implications, Nicholas Garnham argues that the adoption of the term “creative” came as a replacement of “cultural” in defining industries dedicated to produce and distribute symbolic goods (2005, p.20). Cultural industries traditionally related to sectors of the economy that were purely meant to promote the essence of culture such as art, artifacts and local festivals. Garnham believes that the symbols diffused by culture have not changed with the influence of innovations in information technology, but the manner in which they are distributed has. Creativity is thus, according to Garnham, a shorthand reference to the place of culture in the information society (2005, p.20). Culture is diffused through mediums such as film, print, broadcasting and music which in turn evolve in their distribution process according to technological innovations. The industries of culture and creativity therefore cannot be separated when devising and planning economic policies and strategies (Garnham 2005, p.18). Cultural businesses are thus transformed into pieces of the creative industries where multi-media, software production, audio-visual, architecture, interpretation and design matter as much as the symbols on display (Richards & Wilson 2007, p.5). An example of this phenomenon is taking place in Buenos Aires, the birth place and world capital of tango. In an investigative report on the cultural industries of the city, the Argentinean Ministry of Production writes that what started off as a cultural aspect of the city turned into a respectable economic activity of its own in the last decades. The industry of tango brought in a direct revenue of SUS 405 500 000 in 2006 (Marchini et al. 2006, p.15). In Buenos Aires, the art of tango is diffused through shows, workshops, books, souvenirs, music discs, specially designed garments, media and copyrights (Marchini et al. 2006, p.54). Innovations in creative sectors have the possibility to enhance the quality of cultural distribution since even culture eventually begins to lack distinction and requires new tools to find a unique appeal. Ultimately, cultural quarters and creative producers will be clustered in order to generate the atmosphere of uniqueness and novelty that is sought after by the creative class. The city of New York is an interesting example of such clustering. In the report Creative New York, the Center for an Urban Future points at the city’s non-profit art community as a magnet for tourists (2007). The Center adds that, more importantly, the presence of the art community works to keep creative talent in the city since it allows workers the freedom and opportunities to innovate and do projects they find exciting (Center for an Urban Future 2005, p.10). Through data retrieved from the 2000 U.S. Census, the Center for an Urban Future states that New York City is in fact home to more than a third of the United States’ actors and to around 27% of the country’s fashion designers. It also hosts more than 5% of the country’s set designers, architects, graphic designers and fine artists (2005, p.16). Clusters of creative industries can also be identified in regions. In terms of rural regions fostering creative clusters, Fiskars village in southern Finland is a good example. The community defines itself as the center for Finnish arts and design as it hosts over a hundred creative professionals as permanent residents. The village started off as a hub for iron manufacturing in 1649 and developed
through the years into a center for creative design in arts such as blacksmithing, pottery and glass work (Fiskars Village 2011).

Another trend worthy of attention is the notion that individuals nowadays seek to consume experiences. This notion conceptualizes Pine and Gilmore’s elaboration of the experience economy. The experience economy is the latest phase of the economy now that it has emerged from its agrarian, industrial and service phases (1999, p.2-3 and 170). Pine and Gilmore explain that experiences appeal better to people, in comparison to products or services, because though these are intangible and immaterial they are nonetheless memorable (1999, p.11-12). Experiences are inherently personal since no two individuals will extract the same experience from the same event (1999, p.12). This is so because the value of an experience lies within a consumer and will be felt depending on the level of interaction the individual has with the event and on his state of mind and his state of being prior to the event. In this regard, Ek et al., in their research on the experience economy and tourism, coin tourists as designers of their own experience, destinations, brands and anticipations (2008). As tourists live an experience, they re-design it from the original offer designed by the producers into an experience based on their personal attributes. Experiences are lived through engaging and enabling the participation of the consumer so that they can, with their personal characteristics and prior knowledge, produce their own memorable experiences (Pine and Gilmore, 1999, p.12).

However, Pine and Gilmore acknowledge that experiences can eventually become commodified. It is unavoidable that as an experience is repeatedly felt, less enjoyment will be derived from it and the level of engagement will decrease (1999, p.165). To avoid commodification, an experience should be customized, the two economists suggest (1999, p.165). Customizing an experience to cater specifically to an individual will lead to a transformation. Transformations are experiences which give the opportunity for a client to transform himself during a journey into a new character, where the individual becomes the end product of the experience (1999, p.172). Transformations are impossible to reproduce due to the uniqueness of the relationship between the transformer and the transformed, which can never be made common property (Pine & Gilmore 1999, p.172). Unlike mere experiences, which are revealed over certain durations, transformations are lasting and will be sustained through time. The clients are not just guests, but aspirants who seek guidance into new traits. At a restaurant adhering to the principles of the service economy, the customers would be served local food of their own choice. In the restaurant following principles of the experience economy, the customers prepare their own meal in a staged manner with the restaurant’s cooks so as to get a feel of cooking with local ingredients. The restaurant of the transformation economy invites the customers to learn from the cooks the techniques that will enable them to become cooks themselves so that they can eat these types of meals at home when they wish. The experience will have been customized to the clients’ previous abilities to cook and to their aspirations based on their lifestyle. Justly, in an investigation on the recreational experience preferences of visitors to Fulufjället National Park in Sweden, researchers have found that the satisfier domain of self-discovery surpassed the other domains linked to a purpose of visit (Raadik et al. 2010). In this research, the domain of self-discovery included the factors of: a chance to think and solve problem, stimulate creativity, reflect on life and oneness with nature. These factors coincide with Pine and Gilmore’s (1999) thesis that individuals seek involvement in an experience to undergo their own transformation. Interestingly, the least popular domain identified by Raadik et al. (2010) in their research, which was labeled natural environment, included passive purposes such as enjoying the view and observing wildlife.

These shifts in the global economy and society are noteworthy in terms of tourism destination development. Traditionally, tourism was largely related to the delivery of goods and services; offering the possibility to see cultural sights and enjoy relaxation packages (Prentice and Anderson 1999, p.90). With the rise of the creative class, creative industries and the tran-
osition of the experience economy into the transformation economy, creative consumers are “increasingly looking for more engaging, interactive experiences which can help them in their personal development and identity creation, by increasing their creative capital” (Richards and Wilson 2005, p.1215). There is less satisfaction derived from traditional forms of tourism where local and traditional sites and landmarks are passively visited and where souvenirs and tours are passively consumed. The tourists’ appreciation for creativity in addition or relation to culture has led to the recent emergence of a form of tourism which got called “creative tourism” (Richards and Wilson 2007, p.2-7). The term creative tourism was coined by Richards and Raymond in a 2000 paper to define a form of tourism that would attempt to avoid serial reproduction of cultural goods and focus on providing tourists with experiences of self-development (Richards and Wilson 2005, p.1210). Creative tourism’s definition is given as: “tourism which offers visitors the opportunity to develop their creative potential through active participation in courses and learning experiences which are characteristic of the holiday destination where they are undertaken” (Richards and Wilson 2005, p.1215). Mostly, creative tourism differs from traditional and cultural tourism because it has objective. The objective is mostly centered on finding venues for self-development. Rather than partaking in mindless activities, the tourists want to gain knowledge and skills, undergo discoveries or live unusual experiences. The tourists want to be transformed through new experiences so as to bring home new skills, while contributing with their creative ability in making the experience their own.

Creative tourism therefore aims to transform intangible elements, such as the culture of a place, into experiences that can be consumed by tourists. The key to understand how creative tourism is supplied is done by recognizing that tourists contribute to the conception of their own product; this with their individual cultural capital, expertise, experience, skills, knowledge, background and the likes (Prentice & Anderson 2007, p.91). Since creative tourism implies a wish from the consumer to become an element of the process of discovery, there is a need for tourism destinations to facilitate an engagement with the culture, nature and symbols at stake. Suppliers must facilitate the experience where tourists “become” and suggest a meaning to the experience. Accordingly, Prentice and Andersen claim that creative tourism is about “facilitating becoming” (2007, p.89). The engagement of the consumers in creating their own experience is such that they must be involved in the process of designing, distributing and performing the experiences themselves. Tourists basically become the producers by supplying the creative input of their consumption of creative goods and services. The link between creative tourism and the transformation economy is apparent as tourists wish to become chefs to the traditional food they taste, archeologists to the fossils they contemplate, surfers to the beach they discover and artists depicting the scenery they see. Richards and Wilson explain that, in this sense, creative tourists become “prosumers” (2007, p.17). The development of creative tourism is found in the mixture of products and services leading to innovations such as crafts tourism, art festivals, workshops and master classes, where the tourists can actively participate and become actors on the stage that is offered to them, extracting lasting memories, knowledge and skills from the experience (Richards & Wilson 2007, p.17). Among their examples of creative tourism, Richards and Wilson, present: perfume-making in Provence, France; creative activities such as outdoor painting, drawing, sculpture, carving and photography sessions in Ontario, Canada (see figure 4); Catalan gastronomy and cooking course in Barcelona, Figure 4: A digital-photography workshop at Sleeping Giant Provincial Park, Canada (Ontario Parks 2010)
Spain; and traditional handicraft workshops (such as bone carving, weaving, woodwork and felting) and Maori language classes in New-Zealand (2005, p.1219).

Creative tourism has advantages over cultural tourism. Firstly, since the capital of creative tourism is created by the tourists themselves, the results are undeniably genuine in the eyes of the tourists. As the tourists produce their own experiences, they couple tangible resources with intangible resources that are ultimately attributes of their perceptions, past experiences and ambitions. A process of creative consumption and creative production then ensues. These intangible resources represent the creative and social capital of an individual and will be used to reach customized outcomes, which will then be added to the individual’s creative and social capital (Richard and Wilson 2005, p.1217). The tourists making perfume in Provence will be informed of the variety of local ingredients and special techniques, but ultimately will choose themselves which smells to blend, how to decorate the package, how to incorporate the specialized techniques of fabrication with their own sense of art. All of this will be guided by these individuals’ expectation (i.e., will this perfume be offered to someone or does the tourist wish to decorate a fashionable living-room with the result) and enthusiasm (i.e., the simple pleasure to create and discover new smells or a new skill to develop even further upon return).

A second advantage of creative tourism is its ability to redefine its objectives. In order to stimulate creative production and consumption, rather than offering museum and monument site-seeing tours, creative tourism offers experiences which can be redefined with changing trends and technologies. Iconic buildings and any sort of physical capital are at the mercy of fashions-trends defining the visitors’ demand and thus will rely on costly marketing strategies to sway or hold market-demands in their favor. On the other hand, the capital of creative tourism can be adapted to market-demands and renewed over time as it is strongly dependent on creative and social capital. For example, while a decrease in interest for traditional art in Provence might negatively affect visits to local museums, the perfume-making experience can redefine the experience it offers by adding ingredients found at emerging local businesses in its concoctions, or opt for decorations aimed at celebrating the landscape of the area if traditional art is not appealing to visitors anymore. Moreover, these creative resources (e.g., classes, workshops, and seminars) are more mobile than physical cultural resources such as landmarks. Creative resources can be offered anywhere. Such resources are not dependent on the presence of particular physical factors, solely on the ability of their consumers to bring their social and creative capital to life in any given context. Creative spaces come as blank slates and are multifunctional. They are thus flexible to serve any function or representation and can be modified in time and space. As Richards and Wilson claim: “there is no need to have lots of built heritage; no need for expensive preservation and maintenance of ageing structures” (2005, p.1215).

Creative tourism also offers a better possibility to preserve the authenticity of tourism destination through its ability to reproduce space. The authenticity of a place is found through its local traditional symbols such as special dishes, music, crafts and the likes and is diffused through symbolic activities such as gastronomic experiences, festivals and exhibitions. In his work on the production of space, Henri Lefebvre claimed every place is the result of complex social constructs, involving an array of stakeholders, which determine practices and perceptions (1974). According to Cloke, creative tourism and its attempt at reproducing space for visitors has led to a transformation in the way in which space is brought into being (2007, p.46-47). The tourists will now be added to the pool of actors that construct its being (2007, p.46-47). Since creative tourism is focused on facilitating the visitors’ becoming of a part of something new and exciting, it seeks to reproduce the essence of place in order to offer tourists the possibility to experience the symbols and their related activities at the essence of a destination’s production. To visitors, the place is conceived as a product to discover and con-
sume. Places are thus conceived by tourists as resources reproduced to satisfy a need for authentic experiences. The places will be lived according to new portfolios, images and symbols by which dwellers and users experience and make sense of it. Places will be perceived as Cloke describes: “as new cohesions played out in terms of practices which provide opportunities for visitors to be involved” (2007, p.46-47). With its aim at reproducing space, creative tourism thus enhances the traditional appeal of locations by re-conceiving the space where the relationship between the local and the visitor occurs. The contact with the local is greater, involving new skills, observations and participation. Successful tourism development will thus come from creating local exciting credentials of interactivity. In her research on food, place and authenticity, Sims claims that local foods are meant to reconnect the consumers with the place where their food has been produced and with the people who made it (2009, p.328). The resulting connection between the visitors and their place of destination is stronger through such activities like sampling local foods because guests then have “personal, sensory memories of consuming them in that setting” (Sims 2009, p.328). Sims concludes that tourists seek to consume such products because of their meaning rather than due to their physical taste (2009, p.333). By trying these foods, visitors connect with the traditions related to a place. Tourists search this type of interactive and three-dimensional authenticity, which enables them to experience a connection to a place, both during and after a visit. Taste is not the only factor of significance in the development of a tourism space. Other sensations such as touch, sound and smell can also play a role, which, besides Sims, a growing number of academic are recognizing (Davidson et al 2005; Boniface 2003; Eastham 2003; Mitchell and Hall 2003; Urry 1995). Besides sensations, Cloke (2007) notes three other ways through which interactivity and involvement can be made at a place. These are: placing, performing creatively and performing interactively (2007, p.41-46). Placing is defined as imaginative creative performance where one can identify with a famous film, life or story by visiting the location where it was set. For instance, adepts of Shakespeare’s work will be interested in visiting his home in Stratford upon Avon. Performing creatively involves learning skills while on holiday. Performing interactively relates to the interactions between humans, technology, discourses, non-humans, and so on. It is how nature performs interactively with humanity in tourism and vice versa (e.g., guided tours on nature trails). Ultimately, reproducing space gives the tourists an opportunity to embody an authentic attribute of interest as it enables them to live an experience that has the potential to transform them.

That creativity can create value for things otherwise not regarded as valuable is another advantage of creative tourism. Value is a matter of perception and thus, by creative means, can be created in order to turn a resource into an object of interest. On this matter, Prentice and Anderson elaborate the concept of valorization (2007). Valorization, they claim is “the process of assigning value to things in order to convert them into resources” (2007, p.96). Valorization means forming an identity around a place or object in order to give it significance. The essentialism of a place or object is what must be valorized according to Prentice and Anderson (2007, p.96-97). Essentialism describes the being of a place or an object in a manner consequent to the culture that surrounds it by presenting it as a symbol. In this sense, valorization enhances the tourists and local residents’ appreciation for what is at the essence of local traditions and cultures. The perfume-making sessions can be used to valorize the many properties of Provence’s lavender and thus diffuses the plant’s role in the region’s traditions. Lavender thus becomes a symbol defining the essence of Provence. Essentialism is extracted through creative interpretation. A means of interpretation must be in place to diffuse the value of local symbols. It must be communicated to the visitor that lavender has soothing and aromatic properties, which make it a staple ingredient in local soaps and perfumes. Justly, Prentice and Anderson advance that animation is necessary to valorization (2007, p.91-105). Animation is defined as involving human beings as interpretive media (e.g., guides leading
walks, workshops, spectacles or concert and any kind of performance). The key role of animators in valorization was researched by the two authors who interviewed animators in French cities asking them to define their function. Answers were such as: “...creating and enhancing public awareness and engagement with both the local built environment and associated heritage. The built form is the point of reference for valorization” and “animation is to present the heritage quality of the building. Animator makes the building “speak”” (2007, p.100-101). Valorization thus exists through everything which is directed to the public in the form of explanations, education and communication used in order to teach and promote awareness of the essence of a place or object (Prentice and Anderson 2007, p.101).

Creative tourism will, therefore, require two types of changes in destination promotion in order to meet those criteria. First, creativity will have to be devised and promoted across three levels of tourism consumption: resources, experience and symbols. It will not be sufficient to offer access to a resource (i.e., to a place, object, species and so on), there will be a need to offer creative ways to experience the resource (i.e., to taste, feel, live, craft and more) and find a value to the activity through symbols (i.e., through skills development, education, valorization and the likes) during a visit. Secondly, it will call for a need to develop the structures necessary for integrating attraction, involvement, place interpretation and promotion. These structures will not only be in terms of buildings and infrastructure, but also of in terms of tools from the creative industry such as media, visual design and the likes, as well as the creative capital of the visitors.

2.3 Conceptual Frameworks

This study wants to establish if the organization of creative resources, symbols and experiences to advance creative tourism can be used to translate tourism into sustainable development. The second part of the theory section is thus used to bring together the sets of theory on sustainability and creative tourism in order to conceptualize how creative tourism can help resolve the challenges of sustainable development. Three conceptual frameworks are derived from the work of literature explored. The main purpose behind conceiving these frameworks is to create a tool to identify actors and their respective goals in the realms of sustainable development and creative tourism, and then conceptualize how beneficial interconnections could exist between the actors and goals. These frameworks are thus insightful as they will serve as tools to work with the case under study. The first framework deals with sustainability and brings back Campbell’s (1996) sustainable planning framework in order to adapt it to the reality of sustainable tourism as a tool for sustainable development. It also brings back the work of the Tourism Sustainability Group (2007) and the academics Moscardo (2008), Lane (2009), Butler (1997), Weaver (2006) and Liu (2003) in order to identify particular goals in sustainability and tourism and their respective challenges. The second framework is designed based on the literature on creative tourism and serves to conceptualize the goals and dynamics of the actors involved in this realm. The theories of Richards and Wilson (2005, 2007), Prentice and Anderson (2007), Sims (2009) and Cloke (2007) serve to build this framework. The third framework is where the two sets of actors and goals are connected. According to this framework, actors involved in sustainable development and creative tourism can connect their goals in a way to benefit each other. This has the potential to ultimately lead to interactions that create sustainable development.

2.3.1 Framework for sustainability

The guiding framework of analysis to conceptualize the actors and goals pertaining to sustainability can be inspired by the model Campbell (1996) built for sustainable city-planning where the conflicting goals of the different disciplines at stake must be resolved through compromises to generate sustainability. The goals of sustainability are roughly the
same for any discipline and thus Campbell’s (1996) framework can be adapted to sustainability in tourism. In the framework adapted for this research, the goals of the different actors find their position also at the ends of the triangle, as can be seen with Figure 5 below. The goals in sustainability and tourism incorporated in this framework also stem from the discourse of the Bruntland Commission (1987) asking for multidisciplinarity in the elaboration of development schemes, most notably asking for consideration to social equity and environmental protection in addition to economic development. Sub-goals under the main objective of environmental protection, social equity and economic development can be identified. The Tourism Sustainability Group pointed out some environmental challenges in tourism which can be perceived as forming three sub-goals in environmental preservation (2007). These are the sub-goals of: reducing waste, reducing pollution and protecting and conserving biological diversity. As Campbell (1996) pointed out in the development of his framework, the goal of social equity will seek to enable an equal access to resources and opportunities in order to alleviate economic disparities. The Sustainability Report Group adds that social equity is also found in the preservation of cultural and natural heritage when it evokes the challenge of finding a balance between the number of visitors and the protection of a heritage space (2007). The goals of economic development in tourism have been identified through their criticism, as critics such as Moscardo (2008), Lane (2009), Butler (1997), Weaver (2006) and Liu (2003) accused it of striving for unilateral profit and growth. The goals for economic development are thus, as for any businesses, to foster their subsistence and generate a profit. Their profit is generated through investments in capital and the production of services and consumption goods to offer to customers. Moreover, economic development in tourism requires a labor force to occur.

Figure 5: Campbell’s (1996) conceptual framework adapted to sustainability in tourism where the challenges (identified through the Tourism Sustainability Group’s (2007) work) stem from conflicts in sustainability’s opposing goals.
The difficulties in sustainability are found in the interactions of its actors. In Figure 5 displayed on the previous page, the one-way arrows pointing at the challenges derive from the different actors’ conflicting goals. The arrows demonstrate the actors’ inability to complement each other in order to fulfill their respective goals. Sustainability is thus found in the middle as a sort of compromise between the actors, which is exemplified in figure 5 by the triangle labeled sustainability in the middle of the framework. In a version of Campbell’s (1996) model adapted to this study, the challenges of tourism identified earlier through an outline of the Tourism Sustainability Group’s (2007) work can be added under the types of conflicts found in city-planning: the property, resource and development conflicts. In figure 5, the conflicts are found in the rounded squares on the sides of the triangle, between the goals of the actors. In the space reserved for conflicts of property between economic development and social justice is the challenge to conserve and give value to natural and cultural heritage. The resource conflict derived from the opposing views of economic development and environmental protection consists of minimizing resource use and production of waste. Lastly, the development conflict created by tensions between environmental protection and goals of social equity relates to maintaining and enhancing community prosperity and quality of life in the face of change.

2.3.2 Framework for creative tourism

In a framework for creative tourism, the actors that can be drawn from the literature presented in the theory section are: the tourists, the tourism businesses and the community. Their goals can be recapitulated as follows. It can be recalled from the theory established by Richards and Wilson (2005, 2007) that the tourists seek spaces of creative tourism such as workshops and volunteer opportunities in order to use their creative skills to discover. It was defined as transcending from Pine and Gilmore’s (1999) theory on the transformation economy that visitors want to participate in memorable experiences customized to their aspirations. Tourists seek authentic connections with place and are receptive to awareness and education on local practices and matters. Prentice and Anderson (2007) outline that the community has a role to play in creative tourism development as they claim that the community’s symbols is at the essence of what the visitors want to discover. Businesses involved in creative tourism will seek to valorize the community’s essence to preserve and offer authenticity. As Sims (2009) and Cloke (2007) claim, authenticity is diffused through an interaction between the local and the visitors. Offering participation in local sensations and venues for performance is necessary to connect the visitors with their destination. None of these practices offered to the visitors are to be staged; they stem from a reproduction of existing practices diffused through creative means by an entrepreneur. In creative tourism, the community’s essence will be reproduced in order to attract the visitors who will, through their participation and consumption, preserve the local heritage and contribute to local livelihoods by contributing to the local market. The contribution to the local market relates to Holmefjord’s (2000) synergies between goals in local development and tourism development and will be elaborated more when the two sets of theories are linked. Businesses catering to creative tourists will, as any other business, seek economic sustainability and profit, which they can acquire by supplying the right memorable, educative, and customized experiences and products. By doing so, businesses in creative tourism will be involved as agent facilitating the connection between the local essence and the visitors.

Firstly, in a framework built to conceptualize the theory on creative tourism outlined above, the three actors are presented as forming a triangle. In this triangle, unlike in Campbell’s (1996) triangle for sustainability, the interactions between the actors (the community, the tourism businesses and the visitors) are two-ways, and without conflicts between them. Creative tourism does not present a set of conflicts, but rather presents beneficial interactions
between its actors. The tourism businesses need the community to generate the essence on which to base the experiences, in the form of sensations and performances, it offers to tourists. From there, the actions of the three actors are inevitably interlinked. Unlike sustainability again, creative tourism does not find its position as a separate entity on the framework which must be reached through compromises. Creative tourism finds itself in the interactions between its actors who, by needing each other to reach their goals, generate creative tourism. This is why creative tourism is placed on the arrows showing the conflict-free relations between the actors. Figure 6 below illustrates the concept.

Figure 6: A framework to conceptualize creative tourism. The complementing goals of the actors in creative tourism leave their interactions conflict-free.

2.3.3 Linking the frameworks

It must be demonstrated how the two sets of actors and their goals, those in sustainability and in creative tourism, can be linked in order to eliminate the challenges found in sustainability outlined through the first framework. This last section of theory will borrow the terms used in both sets of theory to define how the characteristics of creative tourism present solutions to resolve the challenges of sustainable development.

In the first instance, the goals of social equity must meet with the goals of the community in relation with creative tourism. When actors in creative tourism seek to share the essence of a community it must not solely be done to attract tourists, but to preserve the local natural and cultural heritage. The discoveries and connections the tourists experience valorize the local essence (i.e., the village’s causes, its residents and symbols). Through participation
during visits, the visitors are invited to feel a sense of awareness in their discoveries. The essence is meaningful to the tourists’ search for self-development. The desire of the tourists to feel, taste and live local culture will be a means for space reproduction, which will work to preserve local heritage in the tourists’ and in the local inhabitants’ consciousness.

Here, local stakeholders turn cultural capital into spaces for symbolic experiences and transformations in order to present their cultural and natural heritage in a unique manner, giving them a competitive edge over spaces that rely on the simple display of culture. Customized experiences, such as hand-craft workshops, volunteer opportunities and educative tours, and the reproduction of space, such as selling local foods and offering venues to connect with local people, must be seen and designed as tools for economic development. These activities can be used to generate local revenues, stimulate capital investment, promote an exchange of local goods and services and create jobs in the locality. The demand for space reproduction will strengthen local symbols and activities as means for economic subsistence by encouraging product and service development in a community. Holmfjord’s (2000) market synergies are fostered through the reproduction of space since goods and services that are sold on local markets become interesting to a greater audience searching for a connection with local people and their traditions. Creative tourism thus should empower a community to use its cultural capital in an economically viable way while preserving and reviving it for local value.

The community must link its attempt to valorize its space and to offer grounds for experiences with goals of environmentalism. The visitors’ desire to undergo a transformation is an opportunity to diffuse awareness about environmental issues dear to a locality. Creative tourism can be used to convey in an innovative manner practices of environmental sustainability that will be used by the guests in the community during their stay, and which can be taken home as memorable experiences. Integrating the reduction of waste and air pollution and the conservation of bio-diversity in creative tourism can be done as a means to provide an experience. Tourists can volunteer with different environmental projects and local workshops can valorize their environmentally-friendly materials and techniques.

Figure 7 on the next page conceptualizes the two sets of goals linked to complement each other in order to generate sustainable development. Overall, the tourists must be involved in the pursuit of all goals in sustainability. Their desire to live an experience, connect with local traditions and use their creative skills must be put to the use of the community’s goals of natural and cultural preservation, social equity and opportunity and of economic development. The community must seek to valorize its different goals as authentic cultural causes, helped by the tourism businesses which facilitate the connection between the tourists and the community. The aforementioned figure 7 exemplifies the multiple connections to be made between the goals of the actors in sustainability and creative tourism. The lines outlining the connections are representing sustainable development. Sustainable development is thus conceptualized as the result of a multitude of beneficial interactions between two sets of actors instead of as a multitude of conflicting goals to resolve through compromises. The next section, the case study, will use these frameworks in a real life setting in order to demonstrate if the hypothesis under study holds beyond what has been conceived with theory.
### Goals in Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Equal access and opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alleviate economic disparities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cultural and natural preservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Business profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Capital investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Exchange of goods and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Job creation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmentalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Reducing waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reducing air pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Protecting and conserving bio-diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goals in Creative tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Community’s Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Providing an essence in the forms of local symbols and traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing space for experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Tourism Businesses’ Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Facilitating becoming and living an experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facilitates the reproduction and consumption of space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Tourists’ Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Living an experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A connection with local traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Using creative skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 7:** The framework displaying the links to establish between the theory on sustainability and creative tourism in order to foster sustainable development.

### 3 Method: Case Study

The method used to assess the research question of this study is a case study. A case study as a method of research is practical as this study seeks to answer “how” and “why” questions related to a phenomenon that has no clear boundaries between its context and occurrence. The following case study is an analysis of the tourism and sustainable development scheme of Sólheimar eco-village in Iceland. It is used in order to identify how actors in local tourism schemes, the community, the visitors and tourism businesses, use principles of creative tourism such as facilitating an experience, reproducing space and complementing culture, to contribute to the achievement of their economic, social and environmental goals. These actors in sustainability being: the community, the businesses and the environmental activists.

As mentioned above, these conflicts in sustainable development are: conserving and giving value to natural and cultural heritage, minimizing resource use and the production of waste and maintaining and conserving prosperity and quality of life in the face of change. How do actors involved in Sólheimar’s tourism and sustainable development scheme complement each other in their goals and ultimately benefit each other? The case study ultimately serves to facilitate an understanding of the relationship between the goals of sustainability and creative tourism. Furthermore, the case study will help to either prove the relevance of the framework (figure 7) that has been built from established theory or serve to improve upon the framework by adding to the understanding of creative tourism and sustainability.
Sólheimar is an eco-community located in the South-West of Iceland where about a hundred and fifty individuals live and work together. The village is not only a space for the environmentally conscious, it is foremost a space for social integration for adults with mental handicaps. The community is composed of about 45% of adults with mental handicaps. The location of the village is shown on the map of Iceland (figure 8) above. Sólheimar is situated in a valley of grassy and bushy fields where the few neighboring enterprises are family-owned horse and sheep farms. Figures 9 and 10 are pictures showing the village and its surroundings. Sólheimar eco-village is best reached by the use of a car. From Reykjavik, the capital city, to the nearest city Selfoss, there is a regular bus connection in effect during the day, every day of the week. Selfoss is around 40 kilometers south of Sólheimar. The closest one can get to Sólheimar by public transportation beyond Selfoss is to the village of Minniborg, which is 9 kilometers away from Sólheimar. From Minniborg, one must walk, hitchhike or call the staff at Sólheimar for a lift. Inside the village, due to its limited size, every venue, facility and housing unit is close by and thus accessible by foot.

The cultural heritage and ideology of the Sólheimar community is best understood through its history. The village was founded in 1930 by Sesselja Hreindís Sigmundsdóttir (1902-1974) who initially wanted to help orphan children with mental handicaps by creating a space for them to grow and develop. She acquired her knowledge and abilities to care for
children and individuals with special-needs through a six year study period in Denmark, Germany and Switzerland. The theories she got acquainted with and which became the foundation of Sólheimar’s ideology are mostly those of the anthroposophist Rudolf Steiner (Sólheimar 2011). Steiner advocated the existence of a spiritual world accessible through the inner-development of imaginative, intuitive and inspirational faculties (in Hindes 2009). Steiner’s philosophy of anthroposophy is applied particularly in Waldorf education, biodynamism (the first intentional form of organic agriculture), anthroposophical medicine, special needs education and services, eurhythmmy (revealing speech and music through the expression of dance), organic-expressionist architecture and in other areas such as speech and drama, social finance and counselling (in Hindes 2009). Also, in terms of food production, the Sólheimar homepage states in its historic section that Sesselja learned gardening and poultry farming while in Europe and, through anthroposophy, learned how to practice biodynamism in food production (2011). Biodynamism emphasizes the interconnectedness of soil, plants and animals as self-nourishing systems that do not require external input such as pesticides and fertilizers to flourish. She introduced this practice early on at Sólheimar (Sólheimar 2011).

Upon her return to Iceland, Sesselja rented a parcel of land, Hverakot, from the Childcare Committee of the Church of Iceland, there she started raising children. At the beginning of Sólheimar’s existence, Sesselja had a few children under her care, some just for the summer period. The very first children were sent to her from orphanages and had ill, deceased or incapacitated parents. The shelters consisted of tents until later that same year a basement was conceived to host the little community. Five mentally disabled children came the following year, and were integrated with the able ones. These disabled children were the ones with fewer options in society and soon they out-numbered the able children at Sólheimar. In 1934, the count was at 11 able children and 8 disabled, while in 1936 there were 10 able children and 14 disabled ones. Afterwards, Sólheimar hosted solely disabled children, besides the ones who came for the summer period. Though in the Second World War period the community experienced a shortage in staff, the staff increased afterwards with the rising numbers of children. In the following years the number of disabled children rose and in 1952 there were 16, and later in 1964 there were 45 disabled individuals. In her work with special-needs children, Sesselja was greatly inspired by the work of Karl König who, inspired by anthroposophy himself, had started the Camphill movement. The Camphill movement forms
intentional communities and schools for adults and children with learning disabilities, mental health problems and other special needs, where services for working and learning are provided to them (Camphill Worldwide 2011). From König’s work came the concept of “reverse integration” where the needs of the disabled are at the root of community planning and the capable individuals are meant to adapt to this organization (Camphill Worldwide 2011). This ideology embodies the spirit of Sólheimar as can be read on its English homepage: “it has always been that those with the most need have the greatest impact on the activities of Sólheimar. So it always will be. The spirit of Sólheimar is thus best embodied by the concept of “reverse integration.” This means that a community is built around the needs of the disabled and “able-bodied” individuals then adapt to the resulting conditions” (Sólheimar 2011). Over time, Sesselja’s community grew into a village, with a number of facilities to accommodate the aging children, eventually becoming a village for adults with mental disabilities, where these could still find a space for integration and development. The area of the village has today reached 250 hectares and the clients of the village have also come to include other types of individuals in need of social integration such as long-term unemployed people, ex-prisoners and long-term medical patients.

Moreover, as her project flourished, it was important for Sesselja to follow principles of self-subsistence and environmentalism when building her community. Sesselja was a pioneer in Scandinavia in terms of organic cultivation through the anthroposophical practices of biodynamism. Thus early on in Sólheimar, food of high quality was produced as the soil and wildlife were kept nurtured. From its beginning, hot underground sources of water were used to heat up the soil and enable the cultivation of all sorts of plants otherwise inexistent in this part of the world. Sesselja's vision of environmentalism is still present in the community nowadays in its food production, energy distribution and materials use, reuse and recycling. A greenhouse supplies the village with vegetables, a local geothermal borehole supplies the village in hot water, a system of recycling is in place and used materials are often re-used as input in practical or creative work. Furthermore, in its spirit to advocate sound environmental principles, Sólheimar became home to the Sesseljuhus Center for Sustainable Development in 2002. The Sesseljuhus building is a space for education in sustainability, as it is an example of sustainable architecture. The Center has many aspects of a sustainable building such as solar panels, a turf roof, wool and paper insulation, a grey water system, its own geothermal borehole, sustainable and local building materials, no PVC lighting and the building is covered in varnishes made of vegetable oils. (Sólheimar 2011; Sesseljuhus 2011)

Nowadays, for its subsistence, the community relies on subsidies from the state and financial support from businesses and private individuals affiliated to Sólheimar. The Sólheimar Relief Fund is the channel for delivering support, donations and gifts to the community. The Fund subsidizes or lends money for construction work, purchasing tools and instruments, offering education in the field of interests of Sólheimar and for funding leisure activities for the residents (Sólheimar 2011). The Fund is responsible for housing activities in Sólheimar and has the right to buy or build social apartments, vacation homes and other types of housing. The special-needs residents live in houses in the village which are adapted according to their needs. They also get support from residential nursing staff if they need it. There are other special-needs residents who are able enough to live independently and have built their own homes on the land in Sólheimar through financial support from the Fund. The rest of the villagers (the ones with no disabilities) live in houses that belong to the village and pay rent. The village has a limited amount of places for able and disabled residents as it wishes to remain small in scale to conserve its ideology of self-subsistence and social integration for each individual of the community.

A small-sized village such as Sólheimar with a specific delimited area and population was chosen as a case study since it simplified the collection and organization of data and thus
made it easier to come to defined conclusions that could be generalized afterwards. An eco-village is an ideal candidate in a case where the overall goal is to conceptualize sustainable development. It can be assumed that, in a space for eco-living, actors are committed to cooperate to attain their goals, making it thus simpler to conceptualize how links can be created between different goals in sustainability. Furthermore, the Sólheimar community prides itself in its creativity and principles of social inclusion, which makes it ideal to identify attributes of creative tourism, or at least their potential implementation. On the other hand, the case might by difficult to generalize because of its very limited size and because of its high level of commitment to sustainability and social inclusion which might be hard to re-create elsewhere. This possibility is addressed more in detail in the discussion section at the end.

3.1 Methodology

In order to establish the different goals and actors involved in Sólheimar’s development and the links between these actors’ goals, data must be collected. The methodology section outlines how the research on Sólheimar has been carried out. The study relies on qualitative data as the variables under assessment are processes which stress how social experience is created and given meaning. This research seeks answers to questions that define how a certain reality is constructed and lived. The mere analysis of causal relationships between quantitative variables would not explore the meaning behind narratives, encounters, discourses, place and space and visual and material assemblages that are at the heart of a society’s experience. The experience of the actors involved in the reality under assessment is thus better extracted through qualitative means. The methods used to acquire the qualitative data are defined in this section. These methods are surveys, interview and first-hand observations. The use of these particular qualitative methods is justified and the drawbacks of using them clarified.

Surveys

A survey was conceived to extract information from tourists who visited Sólheimar in order to assess if these individuals did seek to satisfy goals particular to creative tourism such as experiencing and self-development by visiting Sólheimar. The survey was aimed to long-term visitors. These are the visitors coming to Sólheimar for a given period of time with a defined purpose, such as interns, volunteers either independent or affiliated to an organization or through Sesseljuhus, and students. The research is interested in these individuals because they are the ones who show signs of creative tourism during their visit. The interns, students and volunteers are defined as tourists since the fact that these people chose to come to work without remuneration and to a certain extent even at their own cost (they pay for their travel expenses, most of their meals and in some cases for lodging) to Sólheimar in order to do more than just observe the community. They are using these positions as opportunities to do more than passive sight-seeing. They could be earning money or spending time on a beach, but they choose to visit a place where they could engage in their destination. Moreover, even if these individuals do not consider themselves as tourists per say, in the eyes of the members of the Sólheimar community they are visitors.

The survey was forwarded to roughly a hundred contacts from Sesseljuhus’s email list of interns, volunteers, students and other participants who actually might not have been part of the target group. There were seventeen participants who took part in responding to the survey. These seventeen respondents were part of the target group as was revealed through a verifying question asking them to state the title of their position (i.e., volunteer, student or intern) and the length of their stay (i.e., a few week, a few months or up to a year). The survey can be viewed in the report’s appendix section at the end of the report.

The survey was designed so that eight statements each defining a different potential purpose of visit to Sólheimar were presented to the respondents. The respondents were asked
to assign a number from one to three to each purpose in order to describe their disposition about each of them. A rating of one meant that the purpose stated was not important at all for the individual when deciding to visit Sólheimar. A rating of two meant it was somewhat important and one of three meant that it was important. A three points system to score the purposes was chosen over one of say five or seven in order to make answering simple for the respondents. Having only three choices to choose from avoided a need to ponder on slight differences in preferences and thus was thought as easing the task for the respondent. These eight purposes of visit are: acquire a learning experience in community-living, meet people with similar interests, acquire a learning experience in eco-living, obtain professional and/or academic credentials, discover Iceland, acquire skills at businesses and workshops, develop community projects, and gain academic and/or professional credentials abroad. The results for each survey questions are compiled and presented in the data collection section on a graph (figure 21 on page 40). On the graph, it will be possible to view how many of each numbers each statements were assigned, helping to determine which of these purposes more commonly define visitors’ interest in Sólheimar. A system where the respondents had to grade each possible purpose was chosen over a system of ranking the purposes as it is possible for an individual to value two or more purposes equally when making a decision. Having the respondents rank the different purposes of visit seemed like it would overlook the possibility that two or more purposes could be equally important in the eyes of the Sólheimar visitors. Having the respondents choose which purposes they valued more could make it difficult for them to respond in a way that truly reflects their disposition. Moreover, the participants in the survey were given the possibility to write if they had a different or additional motivation to come to Sólheimar. This way, if a valid reason to visit Sólheimar was forgotten, the omission could be fixed. It also gave a chance to participants to express additional thoughts on the purpose of their participation they could feel good to mention. Some of the thoughts expressed by the participants are quoted in the data collection. The quotes from the survey participants are cited as the words of particular respondents with the date of the distribution of the survey: the seventh of July 2011.

Though the surveys were designed to make answering less time-consuming and as simple as possible to appeal to the participants, a few drawbacks were unavoidable. It is always a drawback with surveys that one never knows how reliable the answers of the respondents are. There is always a possibility that some respondents did not reflect adequately on what answers to give. The biggest difficulty from using surveys was, in this case, to get responses. The surveys were distributed in the summer period; a time where many people are away. Sending the survey by email makes the connection between the researcher and the respondent impersonal and thus responses will come from the individuals’ good-will. It is possible that many of the individuals inquired did not respond because they did not feel any motivation to contribute to this work. It is also possible that some might have been busy and forgot to respond. More results could have probably turned in if the survey questions would have been done on the phone or in person, but seeing that only email addresses were available, that there was no possibility to meet these people in person and that time was constrained, it was the best means of distribution.

First-hand observations

An observation is something researchers can find occurring in a constant manner. This means a researcher’s own direct knowledge and own judgment on a certain case can be used to provide input to a study. In this regard, the data on the actors at stake in Sólheimar’s tourism development was mostly gathered through direct-observations after residing in the location as an intern for three months. The observations of this study are thus what Angrosina labels as “participant observations” where there has been considerable rapport between the
researcher and the host under study after a long-term immersion of the researcher in the host’s everyday life (2008, p.165). Daily encounters with other visitors and members of the community and of Sesseljuhus, coupled with visual accounts of daily and ritual actions, materials and the place has led to insightful first-hand observations. More specifically, focused observations were incorporated in the study. Focused observations mean that: “the researcher looks only at material that is pertinent to the issue at hand, concentrating on well-defined-categories of group activity” (Angrosina 2008, p.166). The first-hand observations on Sólheimar included in this report have been focused on the discourses, actions, materials and spaces pertaining to the four groups of actors under study: the visitors, the community members, the businesses and the environmental stakeholder, and their relationships.

A drawback from relying on one’s own first-hand observations as a participant is that one can become somewhat biased in his or her observations after engaging with the host under study over a prolonged period. This type of bias can lead to overly positive or negative results distorted from the reality. It was thus important to consider the discussions that had been shared with and between the various actors during the period of observation. These discussions revealed the discourses and meanings that lay underneath the surface of actions, materials and spaces observed and thus helped to keep an objective view. A second difficulty with first-hand observations is to remember details. Indeed, notes can be taken to remember certain observations, but it can be realized in hind-sight that some important details have been left out or not considered well enough. It was possible to counter this difficulty by complementing the first-hand observations with information found on the Internet (the English hompage of the village, local independent businesses like Sesseljuhus and of partner volunteer organizations of Sólheimar were used to find supplementing information) and by re-engaging in conversations with a few actors from the village.

Interview

Interviews are widely used to gather qualitative data. To identify if tourism is beneficial to Sólheimar’s social, environmental and economic development an interview was carried out with a member of the Sólheimar community who is involved in its development. There was a structure in the interview of this research in the sense that the informant, respondent and setting were defined. The questions were designed in advance in order to guide the discussion towards the topics at stake and thus keep a sort of structure along the way. The interview was fairly unstructured when it was carried out since anecdotes, information irrelevant to the research question, inquiries based on the researcher’s curiosity, small-talk and the likes were fairly encouraged. This was done in order to better understand the behavior of the members of the village without imposing any previous categorization that might limit the study. This type of unstructured interview served to shed light on general topics without using close-ended questions or a formal approach to interviewing. The interview was carried out over the phone and was recorded in order to be reheard when necessary. Notes were written down to make quick analysis during the interview. The questions were not highly personal and thus not difficult to extract from the individual. Furthermore, after having been a participant of the village’s culture, it was easier to use language that the respondent would be familiar with during the interview, such as names of buildings, projects, events and the likes.

The interview was carried out after I had spent an extended period of time in the eco-village as an intern. This period of involvement gave me the chance to assess who was best to approach for an interview. Initially four individuals were selected for interviews. The informants I chose were able English speakers and holding top positions in their field of work. Through my own contact list from my time in Sólheimar I found a way to approach these individuals. The contact was established first by email to verify if the individuals selected were willing and available for an interview and thereafter to set a date and time for the phone inter-
view. I presented myself as a previous intern who was now using Sólheimar in a case study for a master’s thesis. Since they knew who I was, it was possible to gain their trust on the purpose of the interview. In the end though, only one of the individuals was interviewed. As it was the summer period when the interview process took place, many selected subjects were either on holiday or busy at work after coming back from or before leaving for holidays, leaving some to cut established contact and others to not respond at all. Interviews of course represent solely the insight of those interviewed and cannot be generalized as a definite pattern of thoughts amongst a community. One subject interviewed is fairly low in comparison with the number of people involved in the livelihood of Sólheimar. The participant in the interview is currently the leader of the wood workshop. She is a young woman in charge of the creative production of one of the village’s workshops who supervises on average six special-needs residents in her workshop’s production process. As a member of the Sólheimar community, contributing to its social and economic well-being, in direct contact with special-needs residents and with visitors coming to her workshop, she had valuable insight for this research. She is referred to through the data collection as the leader of the wood-workshop and her quotes are cited with her surname, Christelle, along with the date of the telephone interview: July 10, 2011.

When designing interviews, the challenge at stake is to conceive interview questions that can assist in extending the established knowledge on the phenomena under investigation. For this to take place, a positive interaction must take place between the researcher and the subject interviewed. A positive interaction is provided when an interview can be carried out as a discussion and, for this to occur, the subjects must understand the questions and their terminology. Through the use of structured interview questions, as well as with the help of follow-up and probing questions, an analysis should come out of the interviews as the subject herself clarifies her understanding of her situation and discovers new relationships during the process. The subject is encouraged to see new meaning in what she experiences and does through her spontaneous descriptions. What she says could be condensed and sent back to check if the meaning was understood. It was important to construct and use throughout the interview sentences that could be understood by the respondent given her non-academic background and given that English was not her first language.

The interview was carried out to acquire additional insight on the relationship between sustainability and creative tourism in Sólheimar. From the initial research question “how do actors involved in Sólheimar’s tourism and sustainable development scheme complement each other in their goals and ultimately benefit each other”, a conversation must occur where connections, or a lack of them, are discovered between the interviewee and the actors in her entourage. In this case, the topic is approached by speaking of the visitors who are after all the central aspect of creative tourism. The subject is asked to discuss the way the visitors that are related to her, by participation in community projects, volunteering at her businesses or by being taken under the supervision of Sesseljuhus, participate in the overall well-being of the village in terms of its social, economic and environmental aspects. Examples of participation, contributions and benefits are to be discussed in order to have substantial information to demonstrate the points that the subjects seek to bring forward. The figure below, figure 11, demonstrates the process by which the research question used in this investigation was simplified and arranged to be used to carry out a fruitful interview.
3.2 Data Collection: Identifying Actors, their Goals and their Relationships

In this section, the data collected is presented. The actors, their goals and the relationships between these actors are identified through a presentation of first-hand observations, the survey results and online information and the information acquired through the interview. The existence of beneficial links between the goals of these actors is then assessed through an analysis presented in the following section.

Following the framework of sustainable development presented in the theory section, actors with stakes in social equity, economic development and environmental protection must be identified in the case of Sólheimar. As for completing the framework in tourism development, the tourists’ goals and those of businesses involved in the village’s tourism scheme must be identified. Briefly put, the actors at stake in the case of Sólheimar’s development and in its tourism, which will be introduced below, are: its community, environmental activists, the visitors and its businesses and workshops. The community is defined as the individuals that part-take in the social and economic life of the village. Most of them reside within the geographical limits of the village, but some reside outside of the village though they work within the community. These individuals are included in the definition of community since they participate in its functionality and well-being. The community has a central role in the village’s tourism as it is its essence, in its culture and traditions, which the visitors seek to experience and discover. The environmental activists are defined as those actors related to advancing and diffusing environmental awareness and best-practices for the sake of the community, but also as a broader goal in the region. In Sólheimar environmental activism is carried out through a center called Sesseljuhus Center for Sustainable Development. The visitors are the individuals coming to the community to experience eco-living for a long-term, either with any organizations, through Sesseljuhus or independently. They are the students, volunteers and interns who come to participate in Sólheimar’s livelihood for a given period of time. The research is interested in these individuals because they are the ones who show signs of creative tourism in their visit. The long-term visitors have a defined purpose of visit and will be engaging with the community. The interns, students and volunteers are defined as tourists since the fact that these people chose to come to work without remuneration and even at their
own cost to Sólheimar in order to do more than just observe the community, can be considered as a sign of creative tourism. They are using these positions as opportunities to do more than passive sight-seeing. Moreover, even if these individuals do not consider themselves as tourists per se, in the eyes of the members of the Sólheimar community they are ultimately visitors. Individuals stopping by as part of a holiday plan to explore the village and those individuals from the region interested in participating in any way to activities in the village often visit Sólheimar. These individuals will be mentioned briefly as to give a complete overview of the actors involved in Sólheimar, but they will not be considered as major actors in the sustainable development of the village through this research. The businesses and workshops are the relevant actors in the economic development of the community. They provide employment opportunities and generate goods and services. In the scheme for creative tourism, these businesses become tourism businesses as they also give the chance to visitors to experience and they produce authentic goods to sell to the visitors. The next section is a detailed account of these actors; their distinct goals and the relationships between them.

The Community

Sesselja’s vision to provide a place of integration for marginalized individuals is still at the foundation of the village. As mentioned earlier, the Sólheimar community is composed of about 45%, of adults with mental handicaps and, more recently, also of individuals in need of social integration such as long-term unemployed people, ex-prisoners and long-term medical patients. The ideology of Sólheimar is described as giving the chance for each individual to grow and develop with a quality of life as good as possible. It is stated on Sólheimar’s website that: “opportunities should be provided to individuals that are not available elsewhere” (2011). Most importantly in the ideology of Sólheimar is the concept of reverse integration where the services are based on the needs and wishes of the disabled individuals of Sólheimar. As it was mentioned earlier “the spirit of Sólheimar is thus best embodied by the concept of “reverse integration”. This means that a community is built around the needs of the disabled and “able-bodied” individuals then adapt to the resulting conditions. This is quite the opposite of most traditional ways of treating disabled persons” (Sólheimar 2011). Sesselja’s founding principles where also based on inner-development and the chance to grow as a unique individual. The community’s goals of social inclusion and of quality living are apparent to the general public. These goals are stated on their promotional material such as pamphlets and their website, they are diffused to visitors as part of an information package and they are apparent in their rituals and livelihood. Examples of Sólheimar’s social commitment are apparent through its morning meetings (see figure 12) where the community gathers for daily information and sign an oath, its community meals and soup on Thursday evenings and through the residents involvement in the development of their own community by working in it.

The village provides a chance for quality growth and living by offering to its community members the possibility to take part in creative work and a strong social life. As part of the concept of reverse integration it is important that the disabled residents find self-worth and empowerment through employment. The residents are hand-crafting the products of the creative workshops and participating in the manual labor at the independent businesses such as the greenhouse and the tree-nursery. The residents in search for integration can also work around the village for its maintenance, carpentry, administration and customer service. The businesses and workshops are headed by fully capacitated coordinators and their staff of the special needs residents of the village. Each business and workshop is supported by three to six residents hand-crafting its products. The capable individuals managing the businesses, workshops and administration of the village reside mostly in Sólheimar, some with their families.
Following the principles of reverse integration, the days are planned according to the capabilities and needs of the special-needs residents. Consistency and routine is very important to these individuals. Working days start at 8:00 from Monday to Friday. At 9:00, during every work day, the villagers assemble in a circle outside or indoors, depending on the weather conditions, and have what they call a morning meeting (see figure 12). It is a chance to diffuse news or concerns to the entire community and to solidify a sense of belonging. A morning song is sung at the end of the meeting as the individuals in the circle hold hands. Lunch is served every day of the week at noon free of charge for the special needs residents and at a price for the rest of the community. Lunch time ends at 13:00 and everyone is expected to return to their work stations. Breaks are taken twice a day also at regular hours. The break in the morning is at 10:00 and the one in the afternoon is at 15:00. Coffee and tea is served to add to the atmosphere of relaxation and well-being. The working day ends at 17:00 for all. The special-needs residents also get weekly exercise sessions organized by individuals from or affiliated to Sólheimar.

That the residents and other villagers uphold a healthy and fulfilling social life is another significant aspect of the Sólheimar community. For recreational and entertainment purposes, the village has a church offering mass every two weeks, a sculpture garden, arboretum, a sports hall, swimming pool with sauna and hot tub and an art gallery. These activities are accessible free of charge to all the members of the community. The residents are also involved in a number of projects coordinated by capable villagers such as a choir group, yearly theatre group, dance evenings and other types of social activities. Visitors are welcomed to the community and these often have great contact with the residents as they can have access to these venues. Visitors often join the residents at lunch time, morning meetings and during other happenings.

**Workshops and businesses**

There are a number of flourishing workshops and businesses in Sólheimar which provide a workspace for the special-needs residents. Moreover, employment provides the special-needs residents a sense of empowerment through valorization and a source of self-earned income. These also stimulate the economic and social livelihood of the community by generating revenue and goods for it. The products of the workshops and businesses (e.g., vegetables from the greenhouse, crafts from the workshops, cakes and jams from the bakery) are sold in the village and at other venues in the region. These goods are also meant to enable the village to be as self-sufficient as possible. For instance, the organic greenhouse is a business which supplies the community in vegetables for its daily meals and at the wood workshop things such as paper towel-supports and knives were made to be used at the village’s dining hall.

Sólheimar operates six creative workshops. These workshops are financially dependent on funds coming from the Sólheimar administration in order to operate and thus are defined as Sólheimar’s workshops. Each of these workshops produces a variety of crafts and goods to sell. These are: a candle, ceramics, weaving and fine art workshop as well as an herbal workshop that makes soaps, creams and the likes. Each workshop is headed by a leader who manages the production and oversees the work and well-being of its special-needs workers. Each workshop is run with the help of three to five special-needs residents. The residents, under the
supervision of the leader, produce each piece of art or craft by hand, avoiding, as stated on Sólheimar’s homepage, mass production and serial reproduction (2011). Hand crafting each piece of art and craft also gives each piece of work its unique character. Figures 13 and 14 illustrate such hand-made crafts made of ceramic and wood. The creativity of the individual is essentially prioritized in production, adding to the disabled residents’ feeling of empowerment brought by being employed. One can observe that these production lines are designed to employ the special-need residents. The individuals are expected to do tasks fit to their level of ability and at their own pace. For instance, the tasks can be to mechanically paint or glue pieces to assemble a final product as it could be to creatively design shapes and figures to incorporate in a final product.

The materials used to produce these crafts are natural and the methods environmentally-friendly. For instance, it has been observed that the weaver uses wool from Icelandic sheep, the soap-workshop uses natural products such as olive oil and lavender as well as uses carton from cereal boxes and locally recycled paper as packaging material, the candle workshop re-uses wax to turn it into new candles, and, the wood workshop uses glues and oils with the least possible amount of chemicals. The workshops always try to innovate by re-using what is left as scrap in their production lines and by re-using scrap that is produced in the community. The leader of the wood workshop adds that: “pieces that are left, we try to re-use them at another workshop or for another purpose around the village. [For instance] the scraps of wood end up in someone’s wood-stove. Another example: at the weaver, they re-use old clothes by tearing them apart to make carpets and bags” (Christelle: telephone interview, 7 July 2011). The idea to use natural materials and environmentally sound principles in production is not solely meant to protect the environment. There is a component of environmental awareness attached with the practice. As the leader of the wood workshop states about her workshop: “we are an eco-friendly workshop because we do everything out of wood, which reduces the consumption of plastic and furthermore teaches that there are alternatives to plastic. Things are done by hand and there is not a big production, this teaches awareness for naturally made crafts” (Christelle: telephone interview, 7 July 2011). This awareness is also found through principles of reducing and re-using in order to extract pure pleasure from nature: “we play with the forms of the pieces of wood material; we are inspired by nature in our work. We try to destroy and throw away the less and to re-use when we can. The toys we make are not overly-designed and leave space for imagination when the child plays with them” (Christelle:
telephone interview, 7 July 2011). Figure 14 shows one of the wooden toys the woodworkshop leader is referring to.

There are also six independent businesses which make their own profit. This profit is used by these businesses for further development of their production process and in order to benefit the Sólheimar community. These businesses also employ the disabled residents of Sólheimar while being led by able members of the community. There is an organic greenhouse, Sunna, which provides a portion of the vegetables for the meals served at lunch time and which also sells its produce on the Icelandic market. The only organic tree nursery of the island, Ölur, is located in Sólheimar. As part of its mandate, Ölur promotes reforestation projects in the village and its surrounding. The tasks at these businesses are more physically demanding, such as picking tomatoes, packaging vegetables, planting trees, trimming plants, weeding, watering and the likes. Groups of volunteers are sometimes invited especially to contribute to these businesses as these require a lot of manual power. From observations, these individuals help out doing the same as the residents and thus get to work alongside the special-needs individuals. See Beyond Borders Iceland (SEED) has for instance sent a group of ten volunteers, over a period of two weeks at the end of August 2010, to help with a reforestation project at Ölur. The participants planted trees at designated areas on the Sólheimar property.

There are other independent businesses in the village like the grocery and souvenir shop called Vala (see figure 15) where villagers can buy their supply of food and hygienic products. Visitors and villagers can also purchase the crafts and products of Sólheimar there. There is a canteen and café, Graena Kanna, where beverages, pastries and light meals are served during certain times in the week and week-ends throughout the year. A local organic bakery, Nærandi, is also operated in the village. It produces bread and traditional Icelandic cakes, but also chutney, salsa and jams. This business relies on local and organic products such as the vegetables from the greenhouse to make its preserves and its own rhubarb patch to make rhubarb cakes. Just as the greenhouse and the tree-nursery, the bakery relies on manual labor from residents and visitors volunteering for its production. Its goods are sold at the local café and grocery store, as well as in some regional stores. The bakery also provides bread for lunch at the meal hall and for soup on Thursday afternoons.

As a space for tourism, Sólheimar offers accommodation to its visitors in the form of two guesthouses: Brekkukot (see figure 16) and Veghús. These are both independent businesses. Brekkukot and Veghús can host in total up to thirty-three people and are open to guests all year round. These guesthouses are independent businesses that have recently been handed down to be managed by Sesseljuhus Center for Sustainable Development. Sesseljuhus aims to establish a stronger connection between itself and the guesthouses, meaning it wants to foster sustainable living in those guesthouses to offer a true experience of sustainable living for guests coming to an eco-village. The guesthouses are in fact labelled as running on “green tourism principles” and are the first guesthouses in Iceland to be certified in the Sustainable Travellers Service Programme from the South Iceland Environment and Health Department (Travelnet 2011). The guesthouses are both equipped with composting and recycling facilities. The energy supply of the guesthouses, just like everywhere in Iceland, comes from renewable energies provided by the state. Hot water comes from the local geothermal borehole. The guesthouses’ energy-saving practices are also part of their physical design: Veghús’s common space has windows from floor to ceiling which brings in natural sunlight and there is a solar room in Brekkukot. The houses are both built so that these common areas are directed towards the south in order to take in as much natural light. The indoor lighting in both of the guesthouses’ common areas can be dimmed in order to save energy. The products used for cleaning are certified as environmentally-friendly and the goods offered in the kitchen (e.g., tea and coffee) are ecological, local or fair-trade products.
Environmental activism

In Sólheimar, there is the independent organization Sesseljúhus Center for Sustainable Development, which was founded in 2002 to create a space to promote sustainable living and education. Figures 17 and 18 are pictures showing the outside and inside of the Sesseljúhus building. This organization is considered as one of Sólheimar’s six independent businesses though it is not traditionally profit-oriented. Sesseljúhus attracts, for educational purposes, students, businesses groups of all sorts and visitors interested to learn about the Center’s sustainable architecture, ongoing projects or about Sólheimar’s history and culture. Sesseljúhus works to promote the Sólheimar community as it offers guided tours and information on the village. A member of the staff at Sesseljúhus takes visitors down to the village and shows them the workshops, businesses and other facilities explaining how these are run and how the community functions. The center diffuses environmental education through the work of staff and interns that educate and also promote sustainability in the village and to visitors. Education is diffused at Sesseljúhus through for example: the creation of poster exhibits on local wildlife and plants, the organization of awareness events on topics such as climate change, and the organization of speakers series focused on local and environmental topics. Accordingly, in its goal to promote education and community development, the Center provides space for meetings, workshops and conferences on related topics. It has smaller rooms for more private meetings or activities and a larger room where computer and video presentations can be held. Sesseljúhus can be rented by groups or individuals wishing to use it as a meeting space. Sesseljúhus makes most of its profit through renting its space.
Besides space, Sesseljuhus also has material resources which are at the disposal of the community and visitors. The attic part of the building is filled with books, DVDs, CDs and video cassettes, which can serve for entertainment and educational purposes. There is also in the coordinator’s office a collection of books on sustainability and other environmental topics. Thus, Sesseljuhus also functions as a space for activities and gatherings for the community members and visitors.

Sesseljuhus also cooperates with local and foreign schools and programs to give education in sustainability. Local Icelandic schools take advantage of the Center for educational purposes. There are some that even come weekly and receive education from the coordinators and volunteer in the community. Foreign schools visiting Iceland for academic purposes find their way to visit Sólheimar through Sesseljuhus. Some visit the village for a guided tour to acquire quick insights on sustainable living and reverse integration, and others use Sesseljuhus as a venue for educational stays. Sesseljuhus is a significant connection between visitors and their involvement in Sólheimar. A program that gives a long-term chance for students to engage in Sólheimar is the Iceland Program of the Center for Ecological Living and Learning (CELL Iceland). CELL is an American program which offers the possibility for university students from the United States to acquire academic credits through experiential service-learning in Iceland or Central America. CELL Iceland participants have been greeted at Sólheimar every year since 2007 in mid-September and stay in the community until late November. They have their own teachers to chaperon them and to give them in-depth courses on environmentalism and sustainability. Sesseljuhus then coordinates their activities and connection to their service-learning in the Sólheimar community and offers the participants Icelandic language and culture courses. These students are meant to volunteer at workshops or businesses as part of their service-learning and also are meant to give back to the community in the form of an academic project or with any creative idea that they might want to concretize and share (e.g., putting up a musical show or a diner, organizing an activity, decorating, socializing at residents’ home).

The visitors

As the community expanded in a world renowned eco-village and became a space for the advancement of sustainability and social integration, it also became a space of touristic interest. Sólheimar receives visitors from around the world. Also Icelandic people from the region are drawn to Sólheimar to participate in events or for enjoying their free-time in the atmosphere of the village. Independent visitors from Iceland and around the world are invited to participate in the community life and events. Sesseljuhus and the common grounds are open free of charge to visitors. The social events and spaces for interactions of the village (e.g., the pool, the café, Sesseljuhus, the lunch hall, the local shop, the morning meetings and the gymnasium) are open to the guests and any visitors in the village. The meals and food offered at the lunch hall and café are at a price. Sólheimar can provide visitors and villagers with locally made souvenirs and locally grown supplies, which encourages visitors to spend money in the village. The guests can buy local vegetables and bakery goods at the local store of the village, Vala. There, guests can also buy souvenirs or crafts made in the village. Making a donation to Sesseljuhus or to the Sólheimar community is another way by which visitors can contribute to local development. Donation boxes are located at the entrance of Sesseljuhus and at the cash-point at the local store. Visitors are welcome to visit the workshops and businesses and get some insight on the products used and created and on the work of the residents.

It is possible to come individually or with a group to volunteer as a laborer at one of the workshops or at the forestry, greenhouse or bakery. Some volunteers come for short-stays of a few days or up to around two weeks. Others come for longer-terms and can stay for up to a
Two examples of volunteer programs affiliated with Sólheimar are: See Beyond Borders Iceland (SEED) and the European Volunteer Program (ESV). SEED Iceland is a volunteer program which recruits young people from around the world to help with cultural and natural projects around Iceland. SEED sends volunteers to Sólheimar on demand when man-power is needed to achieve an event or project. ESV participants are meant to stay for a year in Sólheimar and are financed by the European Union. These youths are placed as volunteers at a specific section of the village either at the bakery to assist with food production and baking, at the grocery store and café for service learning, at the workshops (to do work in weaving, textiles, painting, ceramics, organic soap-making, candle-making, woodwork), at the greenhouse and tree nursery and at maintenance and carpentry. Figure 19 is a picture of two such participants volunteering their time at the bakery. Interns, starting in 2011, will also be accepted to fill these positions around the village. Interns are to be accepted at Sólheimar for a shorter stay and have their lunches during the week and their accommodation funded by the village rather than through an outside organization.

Interns and volunteers have also been accepted at Sesseljuhus since the summer of 2010. These individuals are meant to work on projects related to their field of interest or study. These projects can be their own to develop, follow-ups on other projects or fulfilling something that was needed at Sesseljuhus. Volunteers and interns also work on community projects at Sesseljuhus. These projects are meant to benefit the Sólheimar community socially or environmentally. Beneficial projects carried out at Sesseljuhus vary and can, as was observed be about finding ways to reduce plastic consumption, designing rainwater collecting systems and other beneficial low-tech designs, putting up plays and musical events to entertain the villagers and organizing and helping out at sporting or social events. Figure 20 displays students and interns working on the organization of Climate Action Day which was held at the village on the 10th of October 2010 and involved participants of the region and village in carbon emission reduction awareness. Climate Action Day was a world event initiated by 350.org. The work of these visitors thus enabled Sólheimar to be involved in a greater cause. Even visitors participating in Sesseljuhus for academic purposes are invited to work on community projects. For instance, CELL students are also meant to acquire credits through developing a beneficial project for the community.

Volunteers and interns are housed in a hostel-like accommodation located at the edge of the village. They get a single room equipped with a bathroom and have access to a kitchen and a common area. Their stay is funded either by the organization to which they are affiliated or by the village if they come independently or as interns with Sesseljuhus. The CELL students reside in the guesthouse Brekkukot during their stay in Sólheimar. The students are meant to finance their accommodation in Sólheimar through their own means.
The purposes that were awarded the most threes after the aforementioned purposes were: meeting people with similar interests (scoring 10 threes), acquiring a learning experience in community living (scoring 9 threes) and develop community projects (scoring 6 threes). The purpose acquiring a learning experience in community living was also not awarded any one. This makes acquiring a learning experience in eco-living
and discovering Iceland. The purposes acquiring skills at businesses and workshops and gaining professional and/or academic credentials were assigned mostly twos. Respectively these two purposes received 9 and 7 twos while they were only awarded 2 and 5 threes. Acquiring skills at businesses and workshops actually scored more ones than twos, while gaining professional and/or academic credentials scored an equal number of ones and twos. The purpose gaining professional and/or academic credentials abroad was mostly considered not important in Sólheimar’s long-term visitors’ decision process. It scored mostly ones (9 of them), only 5 threes and 4 twos. Figure 21 below presents in an organized manner the full results of the survey on the purpose of participation of long-term visitors at Sólheimar eco-village.

Figure 21: The graph representing the results from the survey on purpose of participation at Sólheimar eco-village for long-term visitors

These results mean that visitors are mainly coming to Sólheimar for an experience of self-development and learning rather than for purposes associated strictly to their careers or work experience. This type of motivation is embodied in this participant’s quote retrieved from a survey: “this kind of goes with [the purpose] explore Iceland, but I was just looking for a new experience in general - I needed to leave America and do something different than what the rest of my peers at school were working on” (Respondent 1: survey questions, 10 July 2011). That most of these individuals show a strong wish to discover Iceland through their stay in Sólheimar means that they have chosen to participate in the Icelandic society in order to experience it at a deeper level. They have chosen to do more than sight-see and have found in Sólheimar an opportunity to get involved and closer to the root of their curiosity. The relatively high scores of the purposes meeting people with similar interests and acquiring a learning experience in community living demonstrate a wish for involvement in the community visited and a close contact with local people, as the following quote from another survey par-
participant manifests: “I already heard something about Sólheimar years before I got the chance to go there. I just wanted to experience the life with a sustainable and self-supporting community and the people there. My motivation was to help and work for no reason - just being there” (Respondent 2: survey questions, 10 July 2011). The importance of a connection with local people is also apparent through this participant’s quote: “I fell in love with the people there on a previous visit”. (Respondent 3: survey questions, 10 July 2011)

The participants joining are mostly young adults in their twenties. They have just finished school or a university program, or have a few weeks or months holidays and come to Sólheimar for the reasons revealed above. Nonetheless, there are also older people coming to volunteer. During her interview, the wood workshop leader stated that a fifty year old woman is coming for a month to Ölur to volunteer (Christelle: Telephone interview, 7 July 2011). It was also observed that in the SEED group there were thirty to thirty-five year old participants, some who had career jobs and were coming to volunteer as part of their holidays. This observation reinforces the notion that long-term visitors come to Sólheimar to immerse themselves in an experience rather than to seek work experience.

3.3 Data Analysis
The data analysis is a method to find relevance in the information collected. As Brinkmann and Kvale state, the data analysis seeks to clarify: “how do I go about finding out what my data tells me about what I want to know?” (2009, p.192). In this research, the interest is to assess if the links between the different actors and their goals are in fact beneficial to Sólheimar. Do they resolve the usual conflicts encountered in sustainable development? This section on data analysis offers an interpretation of the data outlined in the research. The analysis serves to attach an importance to the information that was found. It serves to make sense of the information in order to draw conclusions and ultimately impose a sort of theoretical order. The meaning behind the information is ultimately something socially constructed with a subject’s reality. Alternative understandings always exist and must be described. The analysis thus needs to demonstrate that the understanding offered in this research is the most plausible.

In the first instance of the analysis process, there is the subjects’ self-understanding where the individuals bring forward their own interpretations as the data is collected. This is what has been presented in the section above on data collection. It was the raw perceptions of the subjects and the researcher’s own observations. Figure 22 is the conceptual framework conceived to link the theory on sustainability and creative tourism and here recapitulates the information about the goals of the different actors in Sólheimar. The information collected can already be organized in categories expressed by short sentences. These short sentences are now used as points of reference to establish if the relationships between the goals they describe do generate positive results in terms of the village’s sustainable development.

As figure 22 on the next page recapitulates, there are nine possible relationships between the two sets of goals. These are indicated by the connecting lines and are: the community’s goal in creative tourism with social equity, the community’s goal in creative tourism with economic development, the community’s goal in creative tourism with environmentalism, the businesses’ goals in creative tourism with social equity, the businesses’ goals in creative tourism with economic development, the businesses’ goals in creative tourism with environmentalism, the visitors’ goals with social equity, visitors’ goals and economic development, and, lastly, the visitors’ goals and environmentalism.
Goals in Sustainability

Social Equity
- Providing a workplace and individual valorization
- Fostering social integration and well-being

Economic Development
- Generating profit and community substance
- Providing individual empowerment through work
- Advocating environmentally friendly methods and labels
- Fostering creative input

Environmentalism
- Educating on issues of sustainability
- Promoting Sólheimar eco-village
- Fostering sustainability projects

Sustainable Development

Goals in Creative tourism

The Community’s Goals
- Valorizing reverse integration
- Promoting sustainable education and living
- Promoting the creations of its residents

The Tourism Businesses' Goals
- Promoting the unique creations of the village
- Facilitating a connection with the residents and the visitors

The Tourists’ Goals
- Living an eco-village experience
- Discovering Iceland
- Living a community experience
- Meeting people with similar interests and skills

Figure 22: The links between the different actors and their goals in Sólheimar’s development presented through the conceptual framework designed to link theory on sustainability and creative tourism.

It must be explored which pieces of the information gathered tell us something about these potential relationships. This is where the theoretical frame is applied in order to extract a meaning out of the information. Categories and themes are generated from this process. It is important to identify salient themes, recurring ideas and language, as well as recurring patterns of belief that link people and their settings. The shift is made from a substantial concept of meaning to a relational one. From there, comes a refined theoretical understanding of the information collected. The method used to organize the data and identify meaningful categories is coding. In line with the theoretical framework designed for this study, a chart was conceived to code every piece of information collected that could represent a fulfillment for one of the possible nine relationships. Through this coding, key words could be drawn from every categories and help establish if links exist, how they are expressed and if they are beneficial. In this section of the report, the code-chart is presented (figure 23) with the key words and phrases drawn from the data. The process of analysis which inspired the coding is defined in more detail in the following paragraphs of this section.
There are many ways in which the actors involved in Sólheimar’s tourism and sustainable development scheme complement each other in their goals to ultimately fulfill these. One of the most obvious links is between the village’s economic development and the visitors’ goals of living an eco-experience. By inviting participants at its businesses, such as its organic greenhouse, tree nursery or at other organic workshops, the village benefits from the extra labor as it supports its subsistence activities. In the meantime, the visitors experience community development. Facilitating the experience of eco and community living for visitors thus becomes a tool in community development for Sólheimar. Furthermore, Sólheimar can benefit in terms of product development through the exchange of knowledge described by the subject in the interview. Visitors participating at the workshops and businesses can connect to the workers and get to know on a personal basis the artisans and the laborers behind the crafts and goods that form the eco-community. These interactions make it possible for individuals with similar interests to meet and exchange knowledge. This type of exchange leaves the possibility to conceive new interesting creations to sell or use locally and to devise more efficient methods of production. This helps Sólheimar to upkeep its goal of fostering creative input. The participants get a feel of the work and the traditions of the community at the same time,
which enables the community experience. Sólheimar further lets visitors be part of the community by giving them the opportunity to have lunch with the members of the community and participate in daily events such as the morning meeting. There is thus an even greater chance for beneficial contact between the visitors and the members of the community. The guesthouses are not venues for production, but their existence, location and the service they offer play a role in the participation and connection of visitors with the village and its products. By keeping visitors in the village, Sólheimar offers a more complete experience and can use the guesthouses to provide local workplaces and revenue.

In terms of the goods that are produced, they are not solely a means of subsistence. They also function to promote the village’s essence of reverse integration, social integration and environmentalism. This portrays Sims’s (2009) claim that the meaning behind a good is even more important than the good itself. Sólheimar gives the chance to its visitors to not only buy products of traditional appeal, but also to connect to the traditions at the essence of the village and to participate in a social and environmental cause. The visitors’ demand for space reproduction has the potential to strengthen local symbols and activities as means for economic subsistence by encouraging product and service development in a community. At Sólheimar, Holmejford’s (2000) market synergies occur through the reproduction of space since goods and services sold locally become interesting to a greater audience searching for a connection with local people and their traditions.

As for Sólheimar’s goals of environmental education, the actors of the village involved in sustainable education also work on complementing their needs with those of tourists. The visitors’ desire to live an eco-village experience is an opportunity to diffuse awareness about issues of sustainability dear to the locality. Creative tourism can be used to convey practices of sustainability that will be used by the guests in the community during their stay, and which will be taken home as the experience becomes memorable. For instance, the guided tour offered by Sesseljuhus demonstrates the waste sorting system and how certain materials are re-used at the workshops around town. The visitors made aware of these processes can contribute to this environmental practice during their stay and even use it as inspiration to sort and re-use their waste once back at home. Furthermore, minimizing resource use and the production of waste is addressed during the Sólheimar-experience by offering experiences that include creating with eco-friendly materials and methods. The experience helps create a sense of environmental responsibility in the visitors, which is not only helpful for the village to reach its goals of environmental awareness, but also helpful for valorizing its identity as a center for sustainability. The goal of minimizing resource use and waste also becomes a product of space reproduction at Sólheimar’s workshops and businesses. As visitors take part in the production process, they discover the environmentally-friendliness behind the goods and become encouraged to purchase them or further participate in their production and development since these goods become meaningful products in their eyes. Here, goals of environmentalism, economic development and experiencing are linked. Sesseljuhus, by inviting individuals from outside with different types of skills and knowledge to contribute to Sólheimar’s development and to promote sustainable education, maximizes its potential to be a vehicle of best and creative practices for the village and for sustainability in general. This venue has the potential to address environmental issues and efficiency in the lines of production or organization by gathering the resources, social and creative, necessary to do so.

The participants involved with Sesseljuhus, as well as any participant involved in the village, are also encouraged to take part and even organize social events which can foster integration and well-being amongst the members of the community, especially amongst the special-needs residents. These visitors are thus not only witnesses of community-living, but can be organizers, which involves them at an even deeper level than through participation. By organizing events and carrying out projects, the visitors integrate the community as members
over-seeing its development. They have a responsibility, just like the actual members, to contribute and can also enjoy the fruits of their efforts. The visitors’ goal of living a community experience can thus be reached.

Through their participation and by receiving information during visits, the visitors are invited to feel a sense of awareness of the space around them. Through their social and environmental discoveries, the visitors will valorize the local essence (e.g., the social and environmental causes of the village’s, its special-needs residents and symbols such as hand-made crafts and the morning song) which will work to preserve local heritage in the tourists’ and in the local inhabitants’ consciousness. Here, local stakeholders have turned cultural capital into spaces for symbolic experiences and transformations in order to diffuse their culture in a competitive manner than simply through display. Creativity thus empowers the Sólheimar community to use their cultural capital in an economically viable way while preserving and reviving it for local value. The valorization process triggered by the visitors also strengthens the valorization process sought after by the Sólheimar administration in its goal as a space for reverse integration. The residents find pride in their work, and that individuals seek to, not only buy, but discover their creations, has the potential to amplify the residents’ feeling of accomplishment. Furthermore, the visitors participating in the village’s businesses and workshops, by synchronizing their work with the work of the residents, promote the latter’s’ creations by ameliorating the final results, but also, once again, by bringing value to the local work by demonstrating an interest in its development and ultimately in the well-being of the individuals behind it.

Discovering Iceland was a purpose of visit that encouraged many volunteers, interns and students to come to Sólheimar. The fact that individuals use Sólheimar as a point of departure to come to Iceland is a chance for the village and its community to go beyond its local goals and promote an essence that is seated deep in their roots. The village is essentially Icelandic and offers insight in the language, norms, culture, traditions, history and reality of the nation. This goal from the participants can be used to complement a wish to diffuse cultural awareness in the village and create ties between the participants and the villagers in order to enable the former to discover Iceland. For instance, a participant interested in the Icelandic language will be attentive to words and expressions used at the village, and will likely develop close contact with local members in order to grasp the language. The village can revitalize its national culture and create social links by hosting such guests. It can also play a role in the touristic development of the rest of the country. It can go beyond its local goals and encourage its participants and visitors to contribute and discover more of Iceland. This way the visitors and other areas can benefit from each other. At the same time, Sólheimar has the potential, most likely through Sesseljúhus, to diffuse an environmental awareness of the country while it promotes Iceland to the visitors, which furthers its goal of educating on sustainability.

Ultimately, by following principles of creative tourism, Sólheimar can use the tools it deems appropriate when shaping and sharing its own cultural identity. The essence of Sólheimar does not depend on physical or even natural landscape to attract visitors. It rather depends on its ability to generate creativity and offer learning experiences related to social inclusion and eco-living. A product synergy ensues from this possibility: activities and facilities which service the community can be valorized as integral aspects of the local culture to appeal to visitors in search for authenticity. For instance, in Sólheimar, the greenhouse is not just a simple production unit. It is a source of the residents’ healthy meals and a space for experimentation on organic horticulture. The identity of the greenhouse becomes appealing to visitors as it makes it an integral element of Sólheimar’s daily-life and a captivating venue for education. In this regard, there is no need to build a venue aimed at diffusing these types of connection or practices to attract tourists since the Sólheimar greenhouse embodies these already. At the same time, the greenhouse serves the community in food and provides some
with a livelihood. The same can be said about many other venues around Sólheimar where the visitors and the locals connect and learn.

As was assessed, the two sets of goals, in development and tourism, do find ways to complement each other. What is noteworthy, in this case, is that the goals in development in Sólheimar display a good level of complementation even without visitors involved. On one hand, creative tourism is added to a set of existing links in order to fill in some of the gaps that cannot be filled completely locally. For instance, knowledge is present in the village and is used for its advancement, but new outlooks and ideas are necessary for renewal. Sólheimar uses principles of creative tourism to attract individuals who have outlooks and ideas that meet with their social and environmental ideology. It can also be said that tourism at Sólheimar strengthens the links the local actors create to establish local sustainability. This phenomenon is discernable in some noteworthy cases. For instance, the local products, which are the fruits of the labor of the individuals of the community, are useful to the community (e.g., vegetables from the greenhouse, baker’s goods from the bakery, decorations and gifts from the workshops). That they satisfy the consuming visitors’ search for products that will make them live an eco-experience (i.e., organic or hand-made goods) serves as an addition to an existing synergy in local development. Also, to have the special-needs residents drive the local economy by working at the workshops and businesses and all around the village is an example of complementing a need for social integration and empowerment with a goal of economic development. In addition, developing organic and hand-made processes to carry out the socio-economic activities contributes to an environmental objective. Unlike what was initially presented in the theoretical section, there seems to be a possibility to not have to heavily rely on compromised outcomes between social, economic and environmental goals. Complementing can be sought after before including a creative tourism scheme to the development equation. Of course, not all goals at Sólheimar complement perfectly each other in their resources. For instance, the village does not produce all its food supply and all its material input, there is waste that is neither re-used nor recycled and social integration can be complicated by personal factors. Nonetheless, the noteworthy examples demonstrate that there is a possibility to head towards such a process. It is also clear that these complements in the village stem mostly from its ground values in nurturing the soul and nature. This is a characteristic not pertinent to all tourism destinations. Therefore, it can be concluded, in the case of Sólheimar, that, overall, actors in sustainability seek to complement their different local goals with the resources available, regardless of tourism. A form of tourism adhering to the principles of creative tourism is then used to strengthen, valorize and amplify the links established and thus contributes to the village’s development schemes.

4 Results

The hypothesis that was proposed held that creative tourism would help resolve the conflicts of sustainable development because it could establish beneficial links between the different goals and resources of the actors involved in sustainability and in tourism. What is mostly seen through the analysis of the case study presented above is that creative tourism does help to connect actors in their different goals, but it better contributes to strengthen established complementation between actors and their goals in sustainability. Creative tourism can be used as a tool to find a way to create stronger and more meaningful links between the social, economic and environmental goals in sustainable development. Creative tourism has this potential since, as it was hypothesized, it promotes the tourists’ active participation in their destinations’ development schemes and it enables communities to valorize local space in creative and complementing ways that preserve cultural and natural integrity. It can be recognized that by using creative tourism, actors in sustainability and tourism can avoid at least
heavy conflict and a continuation of compromised outcomes. This gives them a more likely chance to foster sustainable development.

It is worth exploring the contributions of creative tourism to resolve each of the challenges identified earlier as afflicting sustainability in tourism (see figure 24 for the brief summary of the connections identified between the two concepts). When it comes to maintaining and enhancing community prosperity and quality of life, creativity’s adaptability and ability to complement culture enables spaces to use tourism development in order to preserve their culture without the latter being a hindrance to local development by becoming an object of serial reproduction. With creative tourism, culture can be shaped in an experience, in a means for interactions between the local and the visitors, and thus bring an economic, social and even environmental contribution to the community as it appeals to the customers. The unique experience of self-development sought after by the tourists can be used to let them contribute to the development of local resources and well-being and to the preservation of traditions, habitats, artefacts, causes and so on. The visitors’ desire for authenticity can be used to encourage local product and service development, which reinforces space reproduction as a means to valorize a community.

Minimizing resource use and the production of waste can be turned in an experience of self-development when the transformation is aimed at fostering environmental awareness and at engaging the visitors in genuine causes and practices during a visit. Furthermore, the visitors are likely to bring home valuable lessons in sustainability. This type of participation, in a community’s environmental goals means that local spaces can be valorized and reproduced by encouraging visitors to use best-practices and by focusing on diffusing awareness on the environmental fragility of the place through sound and entertaining animation. The adaptability brought by creativity also encourages local product and service development that follows principles of waste reduction and resources minimization. Valorization used in tourism scheme can be used to diffuse the value of the final products as authentic and worthy of a good cause, reproducing a space that prides itself in resource minimization and waste reduction in its product development.

Providing a space for experience can also contribute to conserving and giving value to natural and cultural heritage as the tourists’ desire to immerse in a local culture can be used to let them contribute to projects aimed at the conservation or restoration of a local heritage. The authentic experience is also generated when an instructor valorizes the products and traditions that form the experience. By participating in the cultural and natural valorization process of a community, visitors preserve and diffuse the local essence. The spread of the local essence becomes a way to create local jobs, education and relations between the visitors and the local. A local heritage can be diffused and preserved with the creative and social capital of local stakeholders in order for it to remain valuable locally and for visitors. The adaptability of creativity makes the latter a valuable tool to conceive and reshape the way in which a local heritage can be presented, through the utilization of local social and physical capital, and thus helps to conserve not only its cultural meaning but also its social, economic and environmental values.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Development -Challenges-</th>
<th>Creative Tourism -Contributions-</th>
<th>Sustainable Development and Creative Tourism -The Connection-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining and enhancing community prosperity and quality of life, in the face of change</td>
<td>Creativity as adaptive; the complement of culture</td>
<td>Creative methods can be used in tourism development so that culture is preserved while not being a hindrance to local development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-development; the unique experience and transformation</td>
<td>The visitors’ desire for an experience can be used to let them contribute to the development of local resources and well-being and the preservation of traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reproducing space; valorizing through animation</td>
<td>The visitors’ desire for authenticity can be used to encourage local product and service development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimizing resource use and production of waste</td>
<td>Self-development; the unique experience and transformation</td>
<td>A transformation can be aimed at fostering environmental awareness, engaging the visitors in genuine causes and practices during a visit. The visitor then brings home valuable lessons in sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reproducing space; valorizing through animation</td>
<td>Using best-practices during the reproduction of space and valorizing the environmental fragility of the place through animation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity as adaptive; the complement of culture</td>
<td>Local product and service can be developed to follow principles of waste reduction and resources minimization. Valorization used in tourism scheme can be used to diffuse the value of the final products as authentic and worthy of a good cause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserving and giving value to natural and cultural heritage</td>
<td>Reproducing space; valorizing through animation</td>
<td>Local culture is preserved in its reproduction by tourists. Authenticity is generated as the instructor valorizes products and traditions in the process of reproduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-development; the unique experience and transformation</td>
<td>The visitors’ desire for an experience can be used to let them contribute to the conservation of local heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity as adaptive; the complement of culture</td>
<td>Culture can be diffused and preserved with the creative and social capital of local stakeholders in order to remain valuable locally and for visitors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 24: The table briefly outlines how each of the challenges of sustainability can be resolved with the help of creative tourism: the connection defined. It does so by explaining the connection between the objectives of the two concepts.
It was also hypothesized that a conceptual framework establishing the links between the two sets of theories could be conceived by using literature outlining the goals of actors in sustainable development and creative tourism. In terms of the final results, it must be recognized that using solely theory to conceive such a framework did lead to the conception of a framework insightful enough to understand the relations between sustainable development and creative tourism. Figure 22, presented earlier served as a useful tool to carry out the investigation of Sólheimar. The framework combined the theories of Moscardo (2008), McCool and Moisey (2008), Liu (2003) and Sharpley (2000), which ultimately stated that tourism must be seen as a tool to development, with the theories of Richards and Wilson (2005, 2007) which advocated that the tourists’ participation at their destination is essential to their experience. The framework displayed earlier as figure 22 thus proposed that visitors be instrumental in a space’s goal in sustainable development through their active participation. In their work on the reproduction of space through sensations and performance, Sims (2009) and Cloke (2007) both claimed the importance of interactivity to generate authentic experiences, which proved linkable to attracting visitors to create what Holmeifjord (2000) called market synergies. Prentice and Anderson’s (2007) theory on valorization was coupled with sustainable development as a means to diffuse the beneficial participation and interactivity which could be fostered between the visitors and the locals. Ultimately, it helped identify the right actors and their relevant goals and it inspired the conception of a coding-chart which led to an analysis that turned the findings into relevant results.

However, as a final framework is to be designed, it must be stressed that the case study brought to light a new understanding about sustainable development which impacts the initial perception that was established about its connection with creative tourism. Analyzing the relationships between the actors involved in Sólheimar’s development permitted to identify sustainability as a form of interaction between the actors rather than as a type of outcome. Sustainability can be identified in this manner because of the complementing nature identified amongst some of the goals of the actors involved in the case under study. Simply put, as two actors benefit from each other in the pursuit of their goals, they create sustainability through their interaction. Sustainability cannot be separated from the two actions to represent two goals. It rather becomes one action. Sustainability is thus to be conceptualized as a form of interaction, not as a goal to reach. Seeing that there exists conflict-free interactions in sustainability and that creative tourism can strengthen these interactions, a framework linking creative tourism and sustainability must display this notion. In the conception of a final framework, sustainability is thus not, as Campbell (1996) conceived, to be put in the middle of the framework as a form of outcome, but rather is ideally to be placed on the arrows as a form of interactivity which resolves in itself the traditional challenges between the three founding goals of sustainable development. These interactions find their sustainability in their ability to complement each other, which in turn avoids the need to compromise. On figure 25 on the next page, this is represented with arrows pointing in the directions of the two goals they link. Since creative tourism generates stronger links between these goals, the arrows representing sustainable interactions are contoured with lines representing the additional benefits that creative tourism can generate. The extra lines representing creative tourism are dashed in order to show that creative tourism is not required for these interactions to exist. Creative tourism does nonetheless have the potential to strengthen the sustainability between the actors which is demonstrated with the bigger size of the arrows if creative tourism is added. Figure 25 below is the representation of the final framework.
Figure 25: The final framework displays how creative tourism can help to strengthen interactions found in sustainable development by presenting sustainability as a form of interaction. The system is conceptualized as conflict-free, even without creative tourism.

4.1 Discussion

This research has departed from theory that stated that sustainability was conflicting and required compromised outcomes (Lane 2009; Rist 2002; Campbell 1996; Romeril 1994; Wheeler 1993; Worster 1993; Redclift 1987), and came to observe that creative tourism could help reconcile these difficulties by involving tourists in local development schemes. The results stipulate that complementing solutions can be devised through creative thinking in order to link local development and tourism schemes. It was understood that these complementing solutions would work at best to strengthen existing links between the actors involved in sustainability. From the final framework (figure 25), it is shown that sustainability stems from the interactions of the actors as these seek to complement their goals and resources. What is left to discuss is the general meaning behind the idea that creative tourism can be used as a tool to create stronger and more meaningful links between the social, economic and environmental goals in sustainable development. This study does not seek to preach that destinations should commit to schemes complete with sustainable interactions. Sólheimar, as good of an example of sustainability it represents, does not even foster a full set of complementation between its different actors’ and their respective goals. The study seeks to demonstrate that creative tourism should be applied where such interactions can be identified. This discussion will also seek to shed light on the limitations and weaknesses of this research as well as what needs to be further investigated.
The results above imply that the tourists must be involved in the pursuit of all goals in sustainability at the destination. Their desire to live an experience, connect with local traditions and use their creative skills must be put to the use of the community’s goals of natural and cultural preservation, social equity and opportunity, and of economic development. The visitors must be conceptualized as actors with a role that reaches beyond mere consumer value. Tourists are potential physical, social and cultural resources, as well as agents of diffusion and awareness. To become agents of diffusion and awareness, the tourists’ participation will need to be joined with a local valorization process where the actors at the destination, such as the residents, activists and businesses, use their own creative skills to promote their causes, values, dreams, in other words: their local essence to visitors. Sólheimar receives individuals that are socially inclined, motivated and creative because it offers the space and resources to let these personal traits flourish. These individuals are invited to merge their values to the value system of Sólheimar, which is most appealing to the visitor and beneficial to the village. Therefore, efforts in public investment interested at using creative tourism as a tool for sustainable development will need to be aimed at strengthening local businesses, activists and community members that diffuse the local essence which is so appealing to tourists.

Tourists must be made aware that everything they do when they visit a space is connected to sustainability. They must be aware that they have a role to play in promoting sustainability when they travel. To foster sustainable interactions, tourism marketing will need to focus on diffusing local causes and advertise the role of the tourist in the space. Marketers will have to be aware of the links that exist in a sustainable community and know where to encourage the involvement of the tourist. Tourism scheme need to depart from the sole focus of appealing to customers and become the middle-man between the different actors seeking to fulfill their goals. In the end, it will always be the community’s decision how many tourists it wants to accept and how involved it would wish them to be. It is important to remind that the visitors must be involved in functional community development schemes to genuinely enable them to better it with their creative capital. The case study has shown that the role of tourists brought benefice to a community which had already found links of sustainable nature between its actors. The community under study had embarked on a development process in the first instance. This it has done before reaching out to tourism to further its development. This research has not touched, at least not strongly, upon the reality that there are organisms that are merely working to give the good-willed tourist a sense of accomplishment, while disregarding the local objectives of development. Such organism disregard if the experience and participation they offer to visitors could be handled with local capacity and resources and thus the involvement of visitors becomes detrimental. The tourists have a responsibility in carefully choosing their destinations and activities. As a traveler seeking experiences and self-development, an individual can become self-centered and unaware of his or her real impact on the space at stake. To avoid this reality, the local community needs to be empowered in its ability to valorize its essence in the way it feels beneficial. The theory outlined earlier has already mentioned the importance of involving local actors in their development process (Lane 2009; Moscardo 2008; McCool and Moisey 2008; Liu 2003), but this research goes further and demonstrates that local actors are essentially at the core of the development process and that not considering them as main actors in the process would defeat the entire purpose of fostering creative tourism. It is the local capacities, interactions and symbols that attract the visitors interested in creative tourism, and that can only be provided by communities in charge of their development process.

The findings also point out that a lot more importance should be placed on creativity during the conception of sustainable development scheme. The interactions that were outlined throughout this research are fuelled and sustained by the creative thinking of actors connected under one vision. Sustainability needs to find its appeal in creativity, in being something else
than the usual. The two concepts share qualities such as adaptability, flexibility, and out-of-the-box thinking. These qualities can be celebrated as problem-solving tools at the reach of any community. Education programs aimed at conceiving development agents, activists and business people will have to consider the importance of creative thinking to generate sustainable interactions and outcomes in order to prepare local actors to foster sustainability. Sustainability in its self can be valorized and celebrated by communities and their marketers through creative capital, methods and events. Using creative methods to diffuse sustainability can preserve an interest, both intellectual and entertaining, in the cause and not render it a tedious task to be performed by travelers. Having visitors follow guidelines from an environmental policy (e.g., asking not to require a clean set of towels every day, having signs to remind to shut the lights, asking to compost and recycle and so on) is of course beneficial for sustainable objectives and by no means should be disregarded. Nonetheless, if these actions are surrounded by a meaning brought through valorization and by an intellectual or entertaining experience brought by creativity, they are more likely to appeal to visitors regardless of their sense of responsibility. In the marketing of destinations aiming to promote creative tourism, it is the sustainability created by the local actors’ creative thinking that must be diffused as the source of touristic interest. This would keep an authenticity to the place as it would promote the local development process.

It must be considered that the ever increasing expansion of the tourism and travel industry could reach its full-capacity in some regions and thus out-weight the benefits of even creative tourism. The phenomenon of expansion could be solved through creative thinking, but it would be problematic if the flow of tourists became overly higher than the communities’ demand for tourists in their location. The growing interest of travellers in creative tourism, which was noted in the literature section (Ek et al. 2008; Richards and Wilson 2007 2005), might lead after all to serial reproduction and environmental degradation as communities get overwhelmed by the increased demand in their local goods and for local experiences such as tour guides, classes and local tastes. Creative tourism could thus be at the hands of similar criticism to mass tourism. Creative tourism could also face similar criticism to alternative tourism in the sense that though it is meant to solve a problem by offering alternatives, it is still part of a bigger and more complex reality which leaves foot-prints nonetheless. At this point, sustainability in tourism would be again focused, as it was with the emergence of sustainable tourism, on indexes and environmental policies aimed to counter the problems caused by its expansion. Furthermore, like it happened with ecotourism and sustainable tourism, creative tourism risks to be marketed to the point of becoming merely a new trend and lose a lot of its initial good intentions. People could end up forgetting that they want an experience because it procures self-development, and just want it because it is the trendy thing to do. Veneer environmentalism, which was presented in the theory section as an attempt by companies and project developers to get customers through impressions of sustainable principles (Weaver 2006), could resurface in the form of travellers seeking to polish their ego through participation in worldly causes.

Veneer environmentalism is a phenomenon to avoid, and the conception of sustainability not as a goal, but rather as a form of interaction, can be seen as an attempt to counter this practice. By conceptualizing sustainability as a type of interactivity it makes its realization more feasible. The findings of this research shed light on solutions individuals conceived according to their needs, not by abiding to a strict environmental policy. By searching for sustainability in interactivity, the importance of labels and brands becomes less meaningful in the definition of sustainability. Here, it is actions between individuals, rather than symbols and discourses, which define the level of sustainability of a destination. The responsibility is on every individual’s behaviour. The solutions to generate sustainability are found in immersing
in beneficial relationships. They are not in unilateral feel-good campaigns. The feel-good moment will come through ones’ own dedication to foster interactions at the location.

The relevance of this research applied in a wider context than in the case of Sólheimar must be discussed. It could be problematic to conceptualize and delimit a space for tourism and identify the people to be involved in it when investigating further in this field of work. The case of Sólheimar had obvious delimitations and it was rather clear who the actors to involve in the interactions were. Elsewhere, the web of actors to consider and their goals might be more complex and may not be well defined. What is difficult to generalize is the type of links that were identified in the Sólheimar community’s local development scheme. These patterns are most likely caused by a general sense of community and environmental awareness amongst the thread of actors which stem from the overall vision and well defined objectives at the foundation of the Sólheimar community. The village is thus a step ahead in fostering local development, whereas other cases where to apply the findings might have to start with creating local complements before using creative tourism as part of their development scheme. It was recognized that the benefits of creative tourism are found in strengthening established local links, but in this research, there could be a too strong emphasis on the benefits of creative tourism in this research. Alternative explanations to understand the results encountered need to be considered. The very strong ideology of Sólheimar eco-village set on social and environmental practices helps it develop, while other spaces striving with a mentality engraved in economic development might show different results. One other way in which too much emphasis could have been placed on creative tourism stems from the reliance of this study on qualitative research methods. Investigation in discourses, narratives, relations, and the likes ultimately result in the researcher’s interpretations. Qualitative research finds its results in analysis, such as through coding charts as was the case in this study, and thus does not offer a way to test quantitative data that can be applied and reproduced in other cases. The analysis could have thus been slightly biased in the favour of creative tourism.

Nonetheless, Sólheimar’s case demonstrates the importance in local development of having an ideology (i.e., an essence, a reason, a cause to diffuse) which goes beyond the mere advancement of tourism. Places that are born out of a vision through which they support social and environmental values are thus better prepared to use tourism as a tool to foster sustainable development. A space should not be developed for the sole purpose of fostering tourism for economic purposes. It should be conceive by actors interested in seeing it become a social and environmental project. Afterwards, it can showcase its best practices to benefit interested individuals and in return benefit from these individuals. Just as natures, cultures and artefacts are resources for the tourists’ consumerism, tourists are resources to the community’s development. This notion reinforces what has been established in the theory section through the work of Moscardo (2008), McCool and Moisey (2008), Weaver (2006) and Liu (2003) that tourism should come as a tool in community development. Here the accent is put on the necessity for these communities to have an ideology in order to use tourism to their advantage in the best manner. The ideology is not meant to be sustainable development itself, it is meant to be more of an essence. It is a commitment to a cause, such as reverse integration seen in Sólheimar or the diffusion of a form of art like it was mentioned in the theory section that New York (2005), Buenos Aires (2007) and Fiskar Village (2011) did.

What can be generalized in this case is that interactions can be multiple and done on a very casual basis since any actors can interact together. As mentioned above, sustainability becomes more accessible to local actors. Sustainability can thus be seen as an assembling concept as Munt (2011) and Campbell (1996) claim. Though now this research adds that it must be regarded as a concept to assemble actors under a commitment to interact with each other, not in trying to reach a vague goal. This forces researchers to encompass more and more parts to the puzzle of local development in order to conceptualize how to increase sus-
tainability. The researchers will have to concentrate on local discourses, narratives, encounters, spaces and visual and material assemblages at the heart of communities in order to understand how to add tourism to the equation of sustainable development. They will have to pay attentions to the complexities of the symbols and interactions that shape the essence of local spaces. Regions need to be considered as wholes by any researcher seeking to investigate in tourism development. Further research could be aimed at finding similar patterns than those identified in Sólheimar at a more complex level than in an eco-village community, such as in an entire touristic region (e.g., the Jämtland region in mid-western Sweden, Provence in Southern France, the Gaspésie area in Eastern Canada).

It must be mentioned that in the case of Sólheimar presented here, it was not considered that having visitors come to the village and eventually leave to be replaced by others could have detrimental effects on the local people. Such aspects were not considered since the research was interested in identifying the existence of benefits and their meanings in the field under study. The negative effects of the village’s use of attributes of creative tourism can be assessed here in order to give a more balanced presentation of the matter. For instance, the effect on the special-needs residents of having good-willed individuals appear and disappear from their lives could be difficult from a psychological point of view. Moreover, while the merits of having a flow of different individuals with a range of creative capital were elaborated upon, this flow also has the potential to disinterest the locals in building meaningful relations with passers-by.

The enchantment of the new-comers might even end up irritating the local actors who are aware of the complex difficulties of their community after having been part of it for an extensive period. It could be argued that it is not possible in a short period like two weeks, or even a month, to sensitize a visitor so that he or she fully grasps the complexities of the village and can work on a successful project. The effect of having to hand-over to other participants’ unfinished projects in the community or at Sesseljuhus also is potentially detrimental. Projects that were given great expectations and towards which a good deal of resources were dedicated could be left unfinished if no further participants are interested in their development. Other ideas brought forth by participants might not lead to the initial results expected as they lose their initial significance in the hands of other participants. This could risk rendering the idea of letting visitors get involved in the community next to obsolete. The duration of the participants’ stay and the extent of the projects they can undertake will be issues the local actors will have to consider as they decide upon their development process. While these challenges exist and must be considered, they do not completely discard the potential of creative tourism to contribute to sustainable development. This research has proven through examples that beneficial projects and exchanges of knowledge have been and are taking place at Sólheimar. There is certainly a possibility to dedicate resources and actors to monitor the involvement of visitors in order to maximize the results of their participation. At Sólheimar, that role was undertaken by Sesseljuhus as it welcomed participants and offered them the space, resources and guidance to advance projects. It will be these monitoring actors’ task to foresee that there is an awareness process before projects are undertaken and that these projects are kept in the limits of the possible given time and resources.

This research has focused on solely three types of challenges in sustainability caused by tourism, but there are more. Further research would need to demonstrate how the aspects of creativity (its adaptability, flexibility and ability to complement culture and reproduce space) can help solve other issues related to tourism in general. The Sustainability Report Program has also outlined challenges in tourism due to transport emissions, job opportunity and the seasonality of work in tourism (2007). Transportation, notably from air travel and motorized vehicles, has become a sector of great concern in the debate over climate change and greenhouse gas emissions. The tourism sector is unavoidably linked with the transportation of
people, goods and building materials and therefore is a source of air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. The Sustainable Tourism Group believes that decoupling the dependence of the tourism sector on high-emissions means of transportation will be achieved by tourism businesses and planners through practices such as: the installations of pricing mechanisms to reflect environmental costs, organizing appropriate infrastructure to offer alternative modes of transportation such as bicycling and walking and public transportation and considering connections and accessibility when planning location (2007). In terms of creative tourism, these solutions outlined are to be coupled with creative thinking. Creativity gives an opportunity for re-inventing since it can give meaning to initially blank slates. An attraction, product or activity in creative tourism can be given anywhere, in any manner, as it does not need a particular physical space or process. Local transport efficiency can thus be considered by actors when identifying and developing tourism location. Examples would be: materials to be imported can be exchanged by local ones, activities such as courses, exhibitions and social events can be condensed in an area to avoid using vehicles, and bicycle tours can become the experience to live instead of reaching a destination for sight-seeing. Once again, the valorization of local spaces will play a role in giving an appealing meaning to the actions the community judges beneficial in its attempt to reduce transport emissions.

The seasonality of some touristic attractions can prevent year round employment for its staff which can decrease the quality of jobs in tourism. According to the Tourism Sustainability Group it is recognized that the tourism sector can be an opportunity for unskilled labor to obtain employment opportunities (2007). A job in tourism can also represent an individual’s first contact with the working-world by providing part-time or holiday employment opportunities to young people. On the other hand, a mass flow of tourists at peak-season can lead to long and irregular working hours in a week and only offer part-time work at other times. Moreover, career opportunities in tourism are often low. Tourism employment is often in the form of customer service, maintenance and cleaning, and can thus represent, as it is unskilled, below average salary levels and social security. The prospect creative tourism offers to resolve this challenge stems from the fact that it focuses on the work of local actors as the attractions. Individuals choosing to work in creative tourism become animators and instructors, such as craft-makers, ski-instructors or chefs, therefore choosing a career path which is more of a lifestyle than a constraint. These types of career present more opportunities for long-term employment and generating local revenue as they form local entrepreneurs instead of adding to the unskilled labour force.

The excess pressure on natural resources often has its root in the seasonality of demand affecting tourism destinations. The concentration of tourists in a confined period of time can have detrimental effects by placing large amounts of pressure on local resources during a certain period of time and at other times leaving a vacuum of unemployment and low profit. The ensuing challenge is to plan and manage the provision of tourism facilities efficiently and creatively so that demand is stimulated for low-seasons, avoiding a peak in growth demand and using capacity more diffusely over a year. Here again, as a flexible space, a destination for creative tourism can be re-invented to offer experiences that attract visitors during otherwise low-seasons. With some creativity, there does not need to be a dependence on warm weather or snow falls. For example, outdoor winter survival courses can be given during cold and snowy periods in wooden areas that are traditionally open for summer activities. A ski station can transform itself in a venue for environmental education in the summer period by hosting courses and exhibits in its main building and natural surroundings.
4.2 Summary and Conclusion

This research has departed from the notion that sustainability is a conflicting concept. The three founding fields of sustainability, social equity, economic development and environmental protection, strive for opposing goals. In the search for sustainable development, the differences of these disciplines are more often likely to lead to compromised solutions between their actors, than to any type of holistic sustainable outcome. This reality transcends to the debate of sustainability in tourism. The history of tourism presented showed how its expansion has led to the phenomenon of mass tourism. Responses to mass tourism gave way to forms of tourism such as alternative and sustainable tourism. These types of tourism were criticized just like sustainable development for asking for an unachievable balance between three opposing disciplines. Tourism must be seen as a tool for development, which it can only become through the reconciliation of its actors. The question at stake was interested in solving if creative tourism could be used by actors in local tourism schemes, such as community members, the tourists and tourism businesses, in order to resolve the conflicts between the three goals of sustainability. Given the nature of creative tourism, it was hypothesized that the latter concept could resolve the conflicts of sustainable development because it would help to establish beneficial links between the different goals and resources of the actors involved in sustainability and in tourism. Creative tourism enables complementation of this kind because it promotes the tourists’ active participation in their destinations’ development schemes and it enables communities to valorize local space in creative and complementing ways that preserve cultural and natural integrity. By using creative tourism in this way, actors in sustainability and tourism avoid conflict and the need for compromised outcomes and are more likely to head towards sustainable development schemes. From there, it was also claimed that a framework coupling the two sets of theory could be built as theory unfolded. Qualitative research on the case study of Sólheimar eco-village served to clarify the hypothesis. Sólheimar was presented as an eco-community with strong social and environmental values home to a hundred and fifty or so inhabitants located in the south-west of Iceland. It was asked: how do actors involved in Sólheimar’s tourism and sustainable development scheme complement each other in their goals and ultimately benefit each other? The research was carried out with first-hand observations, an interview and the distribution of a survey. The reliance on qualitative means was justified in the methodology. This research sought answers to questions that defined how a certain reality is constructed and lived, and thus did not expect that the mere analysis of causal relationships between quantitative variables would fully explore the meaning behind narratives, encounters, discourses, place and space, visual and material assemblages and technologies that are at the heart of a society’s experience. From there, the information necessary to facilitate an understanding of the relationship between the goals of sustainability and creative tourism could be drawn. The analysis was done through a coding-chart where every piece of information collected was classified as fulfilling one of the possible relationships between the goals under study. Through this coding, key words were drawn from every category and helped establish if links existed, how they were expressed and if they were beneficial. It was established that Sólheimar fosters a variety of links between its community members, businesses and workshops, environmental activists and visitors. It was nonetheless revealed that creative tourism was rather contributing to strengthen existing complementation between goals in sustainability at the village. The overall results established that creative tourism can be used as a tool to find a way to create stronger and more meaningful links between the social, economic and environmental goals in sustainable development.

The findings have shed light on a few points. Firstly, the focus of actors involved in sustainable development should be on complementing each others’ goals rather than compromising. Sustainability is not a goal to reach, it is rather found in the interactions between its actors. The final framework, figure 25, serves to conceptualize how sustainability is a form of
interaction that can be solidified through creative tourism. Thus the level of local sustainability is better assessed through how these actors link each others’ resources to each others’ objectives. By conceptualizing sustainability as a form of interaction, the concretization of the concept becomes more accessible to local actors. The advancement of sustainability does not solely depend on following policies and regulations which could be superficial, costly and tedious for anyone to follow. Moreover, tourism must contribute to development, and thus tourists have a responsibility in the process when they become participants in a community. It will be the community’s decision how it wants to promote its essence, to what extent it wants to open up to tourists and what role it is willing to let them play in their local development. Spaces will find their essence in their causes and ideology. They will be ready to open to creative tourism once they have established their vision.

Further research on the links between sustainability and creative tourism needs to focus its attention on the essence of the community to further assess local possibilities in sustainable development. More examples of how actors involved in local sustainable development scheme can valorize, in a creative manner, their local essence in their pursuit of sustainability need to be put forward and analysed. Further research could be aimed at finding similar patterns than those identified in Sólheimar at a more complex level than in an eco-village community, such as in an entire touristic region (e.g., the Jämtland region in mid-western Sweden, Provence in Southern France, the Gaspésie area in Eastern Canada). Further research needs also to consider the challenges left unelaborated in this work. These issues were those of emissions due to transportation, the disadvantages of working in the tourism sector, as well as those challenges that creative tourism could create, such as superficial relations between the participant and the host and a lack of continuation in projects.

Overall, the attention of this research was focused on the potential of creative thinking to resolve challenges in sustainability by contributing to the creation of beneficial links between local and visiting actors. The importance of creativity as an agent to foster interactivity should be understood by every actor involved in the process of sustainable development. It is worth reminding that the researchers in this field will have to concentrate on local discourses, narratives, encounters, spaces and visual and material assemblages at the heart of communities in order to understand how to add tourism to the equation of sustainable development. They will have to pay attentions to the complexities of the symbols and interactions that shape the essence of local spaces. Regions need to be considered as wholes by any researcher seeking to investigate in tourism development. In terms of education, marketing, national and regional policy, there is a need to promote adaptability, flexibility, valorization and transformation in development schemes. These terms need to be part of the language of the planner and entrepreneur just as much as those used in environmental policies. Ultimately, spaces for tourism will have to become spaces for creative interactivity to truly march on the path of tourism as a tool for sustainable development.
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6 Appendices

6.1 Interview questions for the wood workshop leader in Sólheimar

1. How do interns/students/volunteers/visitors coming to the wood workshop contribute to the workshop? How is this contribution beneficial to the wood workshop and even to other workshops and businesses? How is this contribution beneficial to the special-needs residents? Do you have examples to describe such contributions? Do you have examples to describe such contributions at other workshops and businesses?

2. How does the wood workshop invite its interns/students/volunteers/visitors to participate in the daily life (events, rituals, work and the likes) of the village? How is this participation beneficial to the general livelihood of the village? How is this participation beneficial to the special-needs residents? Do you have any examples of such participation? Do you have any examples of such participation at other workshops and businesses?

3. How do interns/students/volunteers/visitors’ contribute to the environmental vision and best – practices of Sólheimar by participating at the wood workshop? How is this contribution beneficial to the general livelihood of the village? How is this contribution beneficial to the special-needs residents? Do you have examples to describe such contributions? Do you have examples to describe such contributions at other workshops and businesses?
6.2 Survey on purposes of participation for visitors at Sólheimar

Survey on Purposes of Participation at Sólheimar Eco-Village

Answer the following questions regarding your time in Sólheimar as an intern, volunteer or student. For each question, choose the number you feel describes best your intentions.

The numbers represent:
1 not important at all  2 somewhat important  3 important

When you decided to come to Sólheimar, how important was it for you to:

1) Obtain a learning experience and insight in community-living
   1  2  3

2) Obtain a learning experience and insight in eco-living and environmentalism
   1  2  3

3) Acquire professional and/or academic credentials
   1  2  3

4) Discover Iceland
   1  2  3

5) Meet new people with similar interests as yours
   1  2  3

6) Acquire skills at the different workshops and businesses (e.g. greenhouse, forestry, bakery, etc)
   1  2  3

7) Have the chance to develop a project for the Sólheimar community
   1  2  3

8) Acquire professional or academic credentials abroad
   1  2  3
9) If you had a different or other main purpose as your motivation to come to Sólheimar, please write it here:

Now that you are or have come to Sólheimar, how important do you feel was:

11) Your contribution to the Sólheimar community’s development and/or well-being
   1  2  3

12) Your contribution to best-practices in sustainable development
   1  2  3

13) Are you satisfied with your experience at Sólheimar? (i.e.: did your experience meet with your expectations)
   1  2  3

Highlight the statement that describes your situation when you visited or as you visit Sólheimar

14) What word describes best the purpose of your stay?

   o Professional (internship at Sesseljuhus, volunteer with professional skills, etc.)
   o Academic
   o Visitor/tourist
   o Participant (in seminars, conferences, events, etc.)
   o Labor volunteer (labor work at greenhouse, forestry, workshops, etc.)

15) How long was your stay?

   o Under a day
   o 2 to 7 days
   o Between two weeks to a month
   o Three months to a year
   o A year and more