

Osajulkaisu II

Harju-Myllyaho, A., & Jutila, S. (2021). Inclusion in tourism strategies: Setting the stage for inclusive tourism development in tourism destinations. Teoksessa A. Harju-Myllyaho & S. Jutila (toim.), *Inclusive tourism futures* (s. 59–77). Channel View Publications.

Artikkeli julkaistaan uudestaan väitöskirjan osana artikkelin alkuperäisten tekijänoikeuksien haltijan ystävällisellä luvalla.

This chapter was previously published as: Harju-Myllyaho, A. and Jutila, S. (2021) Inclusion in tourism strategies: Setting the stage for inclusive tourism development in tourism destinations. In A. Harju-Myllyaho and S. Jutila (eds) *Inclusive Tourism Futures* (pp. 59-79). Channel View Publications.

3 Inclusion in Tourism Strategies: Setting the Stage for Inclusive Tourism Development in Tourism Destinations

Anu Harju-Myllyaho and Salla Jutila

Introduction

Inclusion, as a term, relates to something that integrates us to become part of society, regardless of who we are. Biddulph and Scheyvens (2018: 584) define inclusive tourism as transformative tourism engaging marginalised groups in the production and consumption of tourism and the sharing of its benefits. Thus, inclusion stresses both guest and host viewpoints. Accessibility, in turn, emphasises the consumer's point of view. According to the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO, 2016), accessible tourism requires any tourism product to be designed irrespective of age, gender or ability, and with no additional costs for customers with disabilities or specific access requirements. Thus, accessible tourism can be seen as part of inclusive tourism. The aim of this chapter is to analyse how inclusive tourism futures are constructed in tourism strategies.

According to Dredge *et al.* (2011: 3), in Western economies, tourism planning and policymaking are linked to changes in the ideological and sociopolitical landscape. Western governments' commitment to neoliberal economic management and globalisation has focused on increasing growth in the name of economic well-being. Moreover, Dredge *et al.* (2011: 2) state that, as social processes, tourism planning and policy-making can be affected by personal and/or group values, interests and ideology. The approach in this chapter is based on this line of thought, which is then continued with notions of the policy metaphors developed by Vallis and Inayatullah (2016). According to them, the ways we perceive things and think and act are – in the end – metaphorical. The way we

experience the world is thus metaphorical. However, like so many things that take place in our daily lives, the metaphors become invisible (Vallis & Inayatullah, 2016: 1). In terms of policymaking, it is important to search for deeper insights into the processes by seeking understanding of the underlying metaphors. Indeed, according to Vallis and Inayatullah (2016: 2), powerful metaphors not only describe our reality, but also build it. Consequently, this would mean that in order to build inclusive tourism futures, close attention should be paid to the way they are articulated.

The research material used for this chapter was tourism strategies and policy papers from areas that can be regarded as peripheral. The areas under examination are Finland, Lapland, Portugal, Madeira, Scotland and the Scottish Highlands and Islands. These regions were chosen because they represent popular tourism destinations located far from the European centre.

The strategies were analysed using causal layered analysis (CLA) as a method. CLA is a futures research method that has also been used in strategic planning. It provides a tool for challenging conventional thinking, facilitating multidimensional conversations and gaining a better understanding of our own worldviews and sense-making processes. CLA can also be used in constructing shared visions and ensuring that existing plans include deep and diverse perspectives (see Inayatullah, 2004). In the work for this chapter, CLA was used for (1) recognising and deepening our understanding of the ways in which tourism strategies guide thinking and (2) identifying the underlying worldviews behind the strategies themselves and how they affect the way inclusion is seen in the tourism industry. CLA can be used in various ways, as pointed out by Vallis and Inayatullah (2016: 2). Our aim here is to study the way inclusion is perceived and articulated in tourism strategy papers. Alternative futures are not built within this chapter – instead, we leave the task of imagining different futures to the reader.

In general, the purpose of strategy papers is to pave the way to different futures and, as such, they can be considered as actions that construct the future. The futures images proposed in tourism strategies are projections of the dominant values in the present, and those values are realised through conventions and actions. Kamppinen and Malaska (2003: 98) write that the future has a different ontological status than the past and the present. The future is neither here for us to observe, nor does it exist as memories; consequently, its ontological status is mental (Kamppinen & Malaska, 1999: 98). Thus, strategy papers, which aim to prepare for the future, are based on the mental futures images of their creators. Futures images, or images of the futures, are images of the various possible futures (Sitra, 2019). De Jouvenel (2019) uses the term ‘futuribles’ to describe these alternative images, which are partially known (or at least somewhat certain) and in part imaginary (see De Jouvenel, 2019; Söderlund & Kuusi, 2003: 281).

Inclusion and Hospitality

In tourism, various terms and concepts relate to inclusion, such as inclusive tourism, tourism for all, universal tourism, barrier-free tourism and accessible tourism (Darcy & Buhalis, 2011a: 10). All these concepts have the same goal, which is to transform tourism from an exclusive luxury that can be only afforded by a few individuals to an inclusive activity that is open to all. Affordability in this case is more than an economic concept – it also includes social and cultural capital, for instance. Accessible tourism is the most common term that is used when referring to inclusiveness from a tourist's point of view. One aspect of accessibility is surely economic. However, other barriers might also prevent people from taking part in tourism. In addition to economic barriers, there are also physical, political, social or cultural barriers, as well as communicative barriers. These are all interrelated. For instance, a person might have a disability, which can also lead to economic downfall, preventing tourism and leisure activities. Awareness and reverence of difference, as well as the desire to serve every tourist, can be seen as aspects of socially and culturally accessible tourism, that can significantly remove physical barriers or barriers in communication (Darcy & Buhalis, 2011b: 27; Jutila & Harju-Myllyaho, 2017: 225). Harju-Myllyaho and Kyryä (2013: 16) use the term accessible hospitality to describe their attitude and approach.

Sedgley *et al.* (2012) write about tourism poverty, which in the contexts of this chapter can be understood both from the viewpoint of the tourist and from the viewpoint of the host. A person who is in one way or another restricted from making decisions might not be able to start a company or even work in the tourism industry. The reasons for this can vary in a similar way to if the person was a tourist coming to a destination. There can be economic, social, cultural or even political factors that limit freedom of choice. Sedgley *et al.* (2012) write that tourism poverty is often discussed in the context of developing countries, but is not commonly addressed in more affluent countries.

Although inclusion is not a synonym for freedom, from the viewpoint of freedom of choice, the two terms are very much related. Tourism as an activity has become quite a common part of life, at least in Western societies. This means that being excluded from tourism is one aspect of being excluded from daily life (Harju-Myllyaho, 2018: 23–24).

Even though there are innumerable amounts of people who for one reason or another are not able to travel, tourism can be seen at least as a social right, if not a human right (McCabe *et al.*, 2012: 3). This viewpoint is based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that all people have the right to movement and leisure (United Nations, 1948). It has to be pointed out, though, that the declaration was proclaimed in 1948 and the times then were quite different compared to today.

Post-structuralist Approach to Inclusion

Inclusion is an umbrella term with various viewpoints. These viewpoints make specific definitions challenging, but they also help to form multifaceted and multidisciplinary conversations (Isola *et al.*, 2017: 3). According to Isola *et al.*, inclusion consists of involvement, relatedness, belonging and togetherness. It also relates to participation, representation and democracy. In project Sokra (a coordination project for social inclusion), inclusion is seen as being part of an entity, where a person can attend to different sources of wellness and create meaningful relationships. Thus, inclusion is being able to influence one's own life, possibilities, activities services and certain decisions (2017: 3). In tourism, inclusion often refers to accessible tourism – in other words, the possibility to make the decision to travel without limitations. Tourism creates possibilities, but they are not equally available to all. Inclusion means not only the possibility to travel and participate in tourism as a consumer, but also the possibility for locals to take part in decision-making and tourism development.

The way inclusion is seen in the context of this chapter is based on the idea that inclusion is partly formed around a sense of welcoming (e.g. Höckert, 2015), which we all perceive in different ways depending on who we are, our identity or our subject position. Höckert (2015) used hospitality as a way of approaching participation in tourism. She writes that both terms – hospitality and participation – require openness towards others (2015: 91). According to Selwyn (2000: 19), besides the obvious (serving food, drinks and accommodation), hospitality includes the notion that its function is to promote an established relationship. Therefore, hospitality acts symbolically affirm structures of relations or transform such structures. Selwyn (2000: 19) states that hospitality converts strangers into acquaintances, enemies into friends and friends into even better friends, and points out that these principles apply in ethnographic descriptions of a wide variety of social systems.

According to Isola *et al.* (2017: 3) goal-oriented agency and a 'wilful mind' are born in the interaction of inner and outer possibilities. Inner possibilities include, for example, salaries, social security, living conditions, education and hobbies. Outer possibilities include received education and learning, as well as individual talents and personal history. Inclusion has also faced some criticism. According to research, inclusion as participation, in particular, has been under criticism, since it has been seen as 'forced participation' (Isola *et al.*, 2017: 3).

Post-structuralism as a theoretical approach complements structuralism by adding a viewpoint that argues that, even though we acknowledge that our view of the world is socially structured, the way we see and study those constructions is also constructed in a certain way (Inayatullah, 1990: 129–130). Inayatullah (1990) sees the post-structuralist approach as

leading us to consider critically the trends that are given to us by traditional futures research literature: 'The issue is not only what are other events/trends that could have been put forth, but how an issue has been constructed as an event or trend in the first place ...' (Inayatullah, 2004: 12). Inayatullah also notes that taking different epistemological viewpoints, such as those of different civilizations, is one of the most useful ways of creating distance from the present (Inayatullah, 2004: 12). The post-structuralist viewpoint suggests that even if we write about inclusion and acknowledge it, it is important to note that the way we perceive inclusion is also already structured and, in a way, restricted since it is based on certain presumptions. We thus come to the notion that we should in fact examine the epistemological assumptions of the real when discussing planning efforts such as strategy papers.

Post-structuralist thought problematises the existing *status quo* and conventional thinking by highlighting socially and culturally constructed viewpoints and mental models that are inherited and built within us in a profound way. In other words, inclusion and exclusion gain ground in the socially constructed way of seeing the world, understanding what is normal and leaving out things that do not fit to the frame of normality. Social and cultural norms define who is accepted as a full member of society. Following Isola *et al.* (2017), inclusion is built on social background, economic affluence, gender, ethnic background and physical disabilities, for instance.

Tourism Strategies and Inclusion

In a Delphi study, Harju-Myllyaho and Jutila (2018) noted that developing accessible tourism (i.e. customer inclusion) is dependent on how society, community and industry understand difference and are committed to defending equality and equity. Furthermore, it is a question of how people with access needs are taken into consideration in development work. Behind the decision-making system, there are different opinions, worldviews and ideologies, which guide our behaviour and attitudes towards others and the world in general. These are manifested in the ideologies of political parties, for instance. Exploring the 'meta level' deepens our understanding of people's personal and common beliefs that belong to them by nature. At this level of myths and metaphors, the views are so deeply rooted in history and culture that they are difficult to change, or they change only very slowly.

The tourism decision-making process is by no means rational. It is often thought that political decisions are justified with reason, that they are somehow rational. However, these important decisions are also made with ideologies, intuition and 'gut feeling' (Dredge *et al.*, 2011: 2; Hall, 1994: 3). Hence, if we wish to understand the problems and bottlenecks of tourism inclusion, we must first study the ideas behind them. It is

noteworthy that tourism policymaking is based on both ideologies and intuition, and functions as a question of power. The political framework in which decision-making takes place should be acknowledged and, to do so, various theoretical viewpoints and academic traditions are required (Hall, 1994: 14).

As noted by Hakkarainen and Tuulentie (2008: 5), the strategy process always has its conventions and representations. According to these authors, tourism strategies not only describe certain systems, but are also actively creating them. In addition to paying attention to what is written in the strategies, we should also note what has not been said and what has been excluded. The power of these documents is important to consider (Hakkarainen & Tuulentie, 2008: 5–6).

Inayatullah (1990) writes that, in traditional strategic thinking, time is something that must be tamed. Unless we have knowledge about the future, we lose market shares, are unable to acquire funding or fail in fulfilling the requirements of a modern institution. Usually, the general aim of a futures project is to seek better quantitative, dynamic or otherwise understandable ways to form a picture of the future possibilities to be able to make better decisions. The methods must be scientific and objective, and the researcher should not influence the results. Planning is seen as an elemental part of modern Western society and as a way towards the desired world but, as Inayatullah (1990: 116) states, ‘every effort to plan the future is submerged in an overarching politics of the real’. In other words, building strategies and planning activities belong to the liberal Western world, where progress is measured by numbers and where the future is tamed and steered with strategies and plans. Planning is a sign of a progressive society. However, the way our societies and thoughts are organised might hinder and challenge the planning – or at least realisation of the plans.

Globalisation and the economic order (constant demand for growth) create homogenised ways of thinking; consequently, this renders different viewpoints coming from other cultures less believable. As Inayatullah (1990: 137) writes: ‘If we don’t transform, we create the used future’. A critical approach reveals some of the structures of power and enables the deconstructing and reconstructing of possible pasts, presents and futures (Inayatullah, 1990: 137).

Research Material

The research material for this study was tourism strategies and policy papers from areas in Europe that can be seen as peripheral – Portugal/Madeira, Scotland/Scottish Highlands and Islands and Finland/Lapland. Portugal is located in the southwest corner of Europe. It also includes Madeira and the Azores, both located in the Atlantic Ocean. Madeira is a 1.5-hour plane flight from Lisbon (Visit Portugal, 2019). Scotland is situated in the mid-west of Europe and is the northernmost part of the United

Kingdom. It has some 800 islands, including Shetland and Orkney (STA, 2019). Finland, located in the northeast part of Europe, is a considerably large geographical area. The distance between the northernmost and southernmost points is 1157 km. The average population density in the country is 18.1/km² (Visit Finland, 2019). Geographically, Lapland covers almost one-third of the area of Finland. In terms of population, only slightly more than 3% inhabitants of Finland live in the northernmost region (Statistics Finland, 2019).

Despite the distances between these countries, there are common issues that concern them. One common factor is that these countries have remote areas and nature attractions. On the other hand, they are different in terms of history, culture and social structures. Thus, the analysed strategies all belong to areas that are characterised by accessibility challenges and unique, yet fragile, environments. They are also dependent on tourism at least in the sense that tourism is considered as a provider of work and livelihoods in sparsely populated areas. From social and ecological perspectives, the role of tourism in these regions is significant. Nevertheless, the purpose of this study is not to compare the strategies, but to understand the picture of the present that the strategies are painting in terms of inclusive tourism.

The Portuguese tourism strategy is compiled by Turismo de Portugal (TDP), which is a public institution under the Ministry of Economy. The responsible actor for Madeira's strategy is Secretaria Regional da Economia, Turismo e Cultura (SRETC), under the regional government of Madeira. Scotland's tourism strategy was established by the Scottish Tourism Alliance (STA), which is the representative body of the Scottish tourism industry. The tourism strategy of the Highlands and Islands is created by the Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE), an organisation integrating economic and community development with a remit from the Scottish government. The responsible official for the Finnish national tourism strategy is the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment and Lapland's tourism strategy is devised by the Regional Council of Lapland (RCL). These strategies are described in greater detail as part of our CLA in the litany level of our analysis.

Causal Layered Analysis

According to Inayatullah, CLA is a method for opening the past and present to create alternative futures. It enables the horizontal spatiality of futures and vertical layers of analysis (Inayatullah, 1998: 815). In this chapter, we use the verticality layers to explore the different ways of knowing about the futures (i.e. the epistemic and methodological approach), which are not predetermined and thus remain unknown (De Jovenel, 2019: 15) (understanding the ontological status of the future). We see horizontal spatiality as a wider perspective on the possible futures.

The benefits of CLA include, for instance, the fact that when used in a workshop setting, it leads to the inclusion of different ways of knowing among participants and moves the discussion to a deeper level. CLA not only tries to make predictions based on calculations, it aims to problematise the units of analysis (Inayatullah, 1998: 816–817). This is a very important viewpoint considering that tourism is a phenomenon with various impacts besides economic ones. Thus, it is important to identify new ways to measure the impacts of tourism.

CLA is a method that facilitates the examination of fixed mental models and provokes new ideas. According to Inayatullah (1998: 816–817), the aim of critical research is to disturb existing power relations through problematising our existing categories and evoking other places or scenarios of the future. CLA draws from post-structuralism as it emphasises the deconstruction of texts and their meanings (Inayatullah, 1998: 818). In practice, CLA has previously been used in exploring Singapore's national tourism strategy, young people's images of the future (Kaboli & Tapio, 2017) and value co-creation (Ketonen-Oksi, 2018), to mention just a few recent studies.

As already noted, in this study, the texts to be deconstructed are strategy papers. Moving between the different layers of the texts (tourism strategies in this case) allows for a deeper understanding of the discourses that have been dominant constituting the present. Post-structuralism, and thus CLA, allows researchers to ask questions such as 'Which future is privileged? How has the present been constructed? What could be the genealogies of the future?' (Inayatullah, 1998: 818). All these questions can be asked in terms of tourism strategies and inclusion.

Based on the theoretical discussions above, the concepts and issues that we see as part of inclusive tourism development were gathered. These concepts form the framework for the CLA (Table 3.1). The tourism strategies are reflected against this framework on different levels of the analysis. For the analysis, the different viewpoints were simplified to key terms: host–guest relationship, accessibility, participation, inner and outer possibilities, and hospitality. Table 3.1 can be read horizontally or vertically; in this chapter, we use the vertical perspective.

Based on Table 3.1, the chosen tourism strategies are described in more detail in the following. In the litany level, the obvious contents of the strategies – those that can be seen without conducting a deeper analysis of the content, meanings or connections – are described. In the systemic level, the societal structures and systems of tourism in the strategies are discussed.

Litany

According to Inayatullah (1998: 820), 'litany is the first level, which consists of quantitative trends presented by news and media. This layer

Table 3.1 Literature-based framework for CLA – analysis

Category	Layer	Systemic	Worldview	Metaphor/myth
General	Litany Common policy talk	- Policy-centred, policy-driven - Tourism is an industry	- Liberal, growth-based - The economy is based on growth, tourism needs growth, tourism should grow	- Leading the market 'We weren't born to follow' - Winning the competition for customers
Host-guest relationship	- Tourism is developed to benefit the regions - Locals are a part of the strategy	- Tourism as a system is exclusive and people are invited or included in it - The system includes the tourism actors	- Western, customer-oriented and partly customer-centred - Focus on foreseeing the needs of the customer	- There is a line between guests and hosts: front desk and backstage - Both locals and tourists are invited to the strategy as guests, making the strategy one of the many stages where tourism takes place
Accessibility	Accessibility is seen often as accessibility to the regions (flight routes etc.), though there are some exceptions	- Tourism as a system is dependent on accessible routes - Transportation is a part of the tourism system	Tourism is seen as everyone's right	'Yes you can' - Everyone is able to travel
Participation	- Collaboration - Diverse contributions - Open and participative - Collaboration is encouraged to better serve customers	- Tourism is mainly detached from other industries - Connection to other industries is seen in terms of product development and land use - As part of the tourism system, locals are seen as targets of the system	- People are active and participating by nature. They have the capacity and capability to participate - The chances to participate in tourism are equal - Participatory approach is very limited in terms of who is invited to participate	'The customer is always right' 'The customer is the most important participant'
Inner and outer possibilities; possibility to impact one's future	The possibilities of tourism are seen through economic lenses	- Tourism relies on the current economic system/order - By developing tourism, regions and people benefit and have better prospects	Western, liberal and individualistic: everyone has equal possibilities to take part in tourism	- People want to be employed in tourism. Tourism work is desirable. 'Anyone can do it' - Tourism creates possibilities
Hospitality	Hospitality is customer service	Hospitality is a one-way road: hosts produce hospitality, customers consume it	- Caretaking, customer-centred - Hospitality is written in practices and conventions, and also in policy work	- Locals are unique in their hospitality 'Special hospitality' - Ethos of hospitality and participation

does not consist of holistic or connected elements, but instead, they appear disconnected and discontinuous'. It is the 'official unquestioned view of the reality' (Inaytaullah, 2004: 8).

In this study, this level consists of the obvious content of the strategies, describing the strategy papers on a superficial level for the reader to understand the content and structure of the strategies. Thus, in this level, we have not sought to conduct a deep analysis of the strategies, but rather to describe the strategies as they are presented. In general, the litany level in the strategies follows a common strategy language or even a pattern. The timespans vary between the strategies, as they are written for different periods and in different years. However, all the strategies were valid when the analysis was conducted.

The Portuguese tourism strategy was written in 2017 and is valid until the year 2027 (TDP, 2017). It is a 66-page document in Portuguese. TDP also provides a summary (32 PowerPoint slides) in English (TDP, 2016). Due to language barriers, the English version was mainly used for analysis in this study. Madeira's tourism strategy is for the years 2017–2021, amounting to 136 pages in Portuguese (SRETC, 2016). None of the authors of this chapter speak Portuguese, but Google Translate and other available sources were used to understand the content.

Scotland's tourism strategy was published in 2012; it is 18 pages long and addresses the strategy until the year 2020 (STA, 2012). The HIE is an organisation with a remit from the Scottish government that integrates economic and community development. As HIE has defined tourism as one of the crucial, growing sectors in the area, they also have determined the aims and focus of the tourism industry over the course of the years 2016–2019. The HIE website (HIE, 2019) was considered as the official tourism strategy of the Highlands and Islands in this study. After the analysis process for this study had already been completed, the STA also produced a separate action plan for the Highlands and Islands (STA, 2019) for implementing the Scotland tourism strategy. However, this action plan supports the results of the analysis of the website.

The tourism strategy for Finland is 43 pages long, with all attachments, and is valid until 2020 (Visit Finland, 2010). The first version of the strategy was published in 2006, but it was updated in 2009 and 2010. The Lapland tourism strategy was valid for the years 2015–2018 (RCL, 2015); a new strategy was being updated during the period of our analysis (spring and summer 2019) and we therefore viewed the initial policy as still valid. Despite the short time period covered, Lapland's tourism strategy is 59 pages long. The tourism strategy for Madeira is longest in terms of pages, while Finland's strategy covers the longest timespan.

The policy structure is similar in each strategy. The papers start with *status quo* analysis, including strengths and challenges. The *status quo* provides a basis for setting objectives and goals that are followed by steps to achieve the objectives. Additionally, cross-cutting themes of priorities

are defined in each strategy, as well as plans for measuring and monitoring the success of the strategy.

In the strategy papers, tourism as an industry is described and measured in numbers and volumes. For instance, the Highlands and Islands action plan for tourism (STA, 2019: 4) states the following.

We will use a robust set of key performance indicators to measure this:
Dedicated Highland research using the ‘DREAM’ model which includes:

- Direct spend
- Indirect spend
- Visitor numbers
- Tourism employment

In some of the strategies, inclusion is mentioned briefly in terms of accessibility or local participation. Accessibility refers mainly to possibilities to reach the country or region. None of the strategies has a clear focus on inclusion.

Sustainable tourism has become a part of tourism development and current trends are moving towards more inclusive tourism development in terms of local people. In addition, climate change issues act as drivers for ecological sustainability. According to Dredge *et al.* (2011: 4), sustainability as a viewpoint has been a part of tourism planning, along with the dominant neoliberal discourse. This is seen in the strategy papers as well. For instance, the tourism strategy action plan of the Scotland’s tourism strategy (STA, 2012: 14) explicitly states the following.

Sustainable tourism

With sustainable economic growth as our goal, we must seek to maximise our operational efficiency and environmental performance, minimise our impact on the local environment and connect with our communities to deliver real benefits.

Sustainable tourism is seen as a significant part of the tourism industry and a basis for growth in Scotland’s tourism strategy (STA, 2012: 15). In the Madeiran strategy, there is a focus on sustainable tourism and committing to the ethical values of the World Code of Tourism Ethics (SRETC, 2016: 15).

Systemic/social causes

Inayatullah (1998: 820) writes ‘in this level, interpretation is given to quantitative data and the analysis is often provided by policy institutes...’. ‘The data or the research material can be explained more deeply or questioned in this level’ (Inayatullah, 2004: 8).

In the litany level, we began the discussion of how tourism is described in terms of numbers and volumes. In the systemic level, we discuss how

the revenues, overnights and target groups – among other things – form a complex system we call tourism and how they describe inclusion as a part of this system.

The strategies describe the tourism system as an industry, which is measured by the number of participants (tourists and overnights) and revenue. On a systemic level, it is notable how the strategies describe tourism as an industry, which is concomitantly a part of the modern market economy and a closed system detached from other industries. Peculiarly, as a system, tourism seems to be policy-oriented or at times even policy-centred. The Scottish tourism strategy states:

Building on the good work being done by local tourism groups, local authorities and others, this action plan will provide a fresh challenge to all of us in the industry, with the STA playing a central role in encouraging businesses, destinations, sectors and other stakeholders to get involved. (STA, 2012: 12)

It can be said that inclusion cannot be found in the strategies on a systemic level, even though it is mentioned occasionally, for example accessible hospitality in Lapland's strategy (RCL, 2015: 26). The strategies do not suggest systemic solutions for changing the system to be a more inclusive industry, nor do they describe tourism as an inclusive system. Lapland's tourism strategy also describes the development process as follows.

Nine regional meetings were organized during the process in different parts of Lapland. Great number of tourism entrepreneurs and developers took part in these events and gave their input to the strategy. In addition, a number of stakeholder meetings were organized. (RCL, 2015: 4)

As a system, tourism tends to be exclusive in nature. This is seen, for instance, in the way that tourism destinations and companies include different target groups and simultaneously exclude others. This is natural and unavoidable for the growth of the businesses and the entire industry.

The Portuguese strategy mentions accessibility. It is proposed in the strategy that one of the goals should be to strengthen accessibility to Portugal and within the country (TDP, 2017: 9). Therefore, inclusion appears in the form of geographical accessibility. The understanding of the participation process, however, seems to be rather narrow: 'Participation process, expanded by diverse contributions, including players from the main markets' (TDP, 2017: 3).

On a systemic level, inclusion can be understood as related to participation, but those are seen as part of the system are already involved in tourism and have existing status as 'key players'. It is also thought that, with the support of public authorities and economic incentives, tourism

can be developed towards the desired, more profitable direction. On the other hand, the strategies call for the active participation of local inhabitants (e.g. RCL, 2015: 54).

On a systemic level, it can be seen that the strategies 'speak' to the tourism stakeholders who are able to understand the language of the strategies, who can interpret overnights, revenues and target groups and who are aware of documents such as the World Code of Tourism Ethics and their contents. The entrepreneurs, developers and 'key players' are seen as the stakeholders who provide input to the strategy and to the industry. The output is the products provided to the main markets and, in the end, the growth of the businesses.

As discovered in the litany level, sustainability is one of the key issues in the strategies. However, even if sustainability is a building block in the strategies, it is unclear how it is followed through and how it is measured. In the case of the Scotland tourism strategy, sustainable tourism is considered a significant part of the industry, but then again, in the action plan that followed (for the Highlands and Islands), it is mentioned as an issue to be developed, but there are no measures or means described in the document.

Worldview

According to Inayatullah (1998: 820) 'the third level takes the analysis to a deeper level, since it concerns the structure and the worldview that legitimates or supports the structure. On this level, one can study different discourses (economic, cultural, religious etc.) and how they actually do more than cause or mediate the issue. They constitute it. By drawing from different discourses, various scenarios can be created'.

The third level therefore consists of the unconscious, ideological assumptions and explores how different stakeholders see and construct the litany (Inayatullah, 2004: 8). In this study, we used this level to understand the cultural standpoint of the strategies and the dominant ideologies beneath the obvious content of the strategies. It has to be kept in mind that our realities are constructed through our own mental images. According to Inayatullah (2004: 11), the future is patterned and chaotic and it can be known and unknown at the same time. This means that even if the future is unknown – that even if everyone has the possibility to impact the future – the structures define the individual and, thus, create restrictions that prevent the individual from making a choice (Inayatullah, 2004: 11).

In the tourism strategies, the worldviews are dominantly liberal and growth-based. Even if defined as a mature tourism destination, the objectives in the strategies are to strengthen the growth cycle of the destination, as in the Madeira tourism strategy (SRETC, 2016). It appears in the strategies that a successful tourism industry recognises the role of locals and hosts. However, the strategies focus on customers and satisfying their needs. This, in the end, however, brings prosperity to locals, as well.

A strong tourism sector in the Highlands and Islands can help create more resilient rural communities. If we get it right, tourism will help support a vibrant regional identity which attracts people to live, work, invest and visit our region. (HIE, 2019)

A liberal standpoint not only seeks growth in numbers, but also assumes that hosts and locals are able to engage with tourism activities and that they wish to do so. A liberal management has been, in the latter half of the 20th century, a part of Western governmental politics, as pointed out by Dredge and Jenkins (2011). They add that sustainable tourism has become a part of the discussion, but that it has remained on a rhetorical level rather than becoming a set of guiding principles or actions (Dredge & Jenkins, 2011: 3–4).

Even though the strategies are mostly participatory in nature, locals and hosts are seen as invited guests to the tourism scene (as described in Höckert's (2015) dissertation). For instance, the Scottish strategy clearly states that tourism development must be taken into consideration by tourism actors *and* also by the companies who do not seek growth or expansion (STA, 2012: 13). This means that the ethos of growth touches everyone – including those who do not consider themselves to need it. Consequently, having ownership of the development process does not belong to the participating local actors. Instead, they are invited to support the cause even if they are not particularly interested. The Finnish strategy suggests moving school holidays in order to improve conditions for tourism companies – schoolchildren and their families are not speaking out about what this would mean for them.

Many companies offering summer tourism services close their doors in the middle of European holiday season. This decreases the attractiveness of Finland as a summer destination, profitability of tourism companies as well as tax revenue. Moving summer holidays forward with two weeks would significantly improve the situation. (Visit Finland, 2010: 31)

Participatory development is a considered aspect in each of the strategies. However, it seems that the time of the participation takes place in the implementation phase. In other words, some stakeholders are invited to implement the strategy, but their part has already been written for them. As the Madeiran strategy states, stakeholders 'feel involved and identify with the strategy' (SRETC, 2016: 64). Thus, everyone is not involved in the strategy process, even though they are considered to be an important stakeholder group or even a profound part of the industry's offerings. Indeed, in Lapland and Scotland, for instance, the emphasis is on the exceptional hospitality of the local people (RCL, 2015: 26; STA, 2012: 5).

It is also worth noting that 'relevant stakeholders' is an expression used in each strategy, but none of the strategies reveal how and why certain stakeholders are actually seen as relevant while others are not.

Relevant stakeholders include those considered to be ‘important’, while others are excluded. The stakeholders mentioned most frequently in the strategies are distinctly different authorities and officials. Regional organisations, destination management organisations and producers of statistics are examples of the most emphasised actors. Tourism companies, research institutes, associations and municipalities, as well as tourism resorts, are also present in each strategy, but they receive less attention than the authorities. Local people, as well as other livelihoods (besides tourism), are mentioned only a few times in the strategies, but they are positioned as objects of the discourse, not as active subjects. For instance, in the Lapland tourism strategy, it states that in terms of marketing:

Cooperation brings new and interesting content and interesting meeting opportunities. Versatile content is needed for targeting image marketing locals, potential tourism workers and investors, in addition to the tourists. (RCL, 2015: 23)

In terms of inner and outer possibilities (the possibility to impact one’s own future and circumstances), the strategies seem to have an inbuilt idea that the different stakeholders have a similar possibility to take part in the strategy process. For instance, the strategy of Madeira stresses the importance of reflecting the strategy with the ‘will and commitment of all stakeholders in sustainable tourism development’ (SRETC, 2016: 64). This would mean that people are active and participative in nature and that they want to be part of (sustainable) tourism development. The idea that the possibilities of participation are similar for all is a somewhat Western-liberal notion in the sense that it does not take into consideration the different backgrounds of the expected participants. Having said that, it must be acknowledged that all the strategies recognise the importance of different stakeholders participating in development. For example, the Portuguese strategy emphasises the open and participatory strategy process, and invites readers to join the strategy at the end of the document (TDP, 2017: 26, 32). The policy orientation is noteworthy, however: such a view would suggest that the participants are the guests, not the hosts.

Hospitality in the strategy papers is seen as customer service. In that sense, the worldview is very familiar for hospitality industries, which are proud of their traditions, customs and professionalism. Local communities are seen as providers of hospitable services to tourists and, peculiarly enough, it can also be seen that inclusion is partly realised through hospitable attitude. This kind of approach has connotations of openness and honesty, which are respectable values (RCL, 2015: 26). The strategies wish to honour local environments and culture, while offering hospitable services. From this viewpoint, it could be concluded that hospitality is a central part of the worldview in the strategies, defining attitudes towards tourists as well as the quality of tourism services. It is with the same

hospitality that the tourism industry invites locals to be a part of tourism development. Indeed, the role of locals is that of guests, and ownership of the development process has not been defined as being possessed by the locals. Could we even question whether the hospitable worldview hinges on or promotes inclusion within the development processes of tourism and hospitality?

Myths, metaphors and deep stories

According to (Inayatullah, 1998: 820), in the fourth layer, ‘analysis is at the deep level of a myth or a metaphor. This layer is formed by the unconscious dimensions of the problem, the collective archetypes. The language in this level is less specific. This level aims in “touching the heart instead of reading the head”’.

In this level, we identified the metaphors and myths that lie behind the strategies. These metaphors help to understand the strategies and the issues that lie beneath the obvious content. They help to translate the spirit of the strategies and make it visible.

A myth that could describe the strategies on a general level would be that of the need for continuous growth. In other words, the commonly accepted principles of the Western market economy are the drivers behind the strategies. This is not surprising because tourism strategies are created to support the destinations in navigating the competitive environment. Consequently, the competitive environment is one of the most important tourism development drivers. It is important to recognise the regions that are competitors in the same market and win customers’ attention from these markets. The strategy of Lapland proudly states – following Jon Bon Jovi – ‘we weren’t born to follow’ (RCL, 2015: 2). There is a race, and the various regions each want to finish it first and reach the customers. Relating to this, there is the mentality that ‘the customer is always right’, which in tourism and other service industries is something that is considered to be an elemental part of the industry. Although this sort of straightforward thinking has also started to gain more critical voices in scholarship and in the regions, customers are not welcomed ‘as they are’. Considering the well-being of locals has gained ground, along with environmental viewpoints. In older strategies, the focus has not turned towards sustainability, at least not very strongly.

The host–guest relationship in the strategies reflects the myth of feminine care-taking. The purpose of hosts is to take care of customers and their needs. There is a line between guests and hosts – between the front desk and backstage. However, both locals and tourists are invited to the strategy as guests, making the strategy one of the many stages in which tourism takes place. Indeed, interestingly enough, the staged process of tourism continues from the staged tourism experience (see MacCannell, 1973; Cohen, 1988) to staged policymaking and implementation. Equal conversation between

different stakeholders might turn out to be superficial if locals are invited to the collaboration as guests. Hospitality towards guests is one of the valued features of the industry, but the host–guest relationship is changing, and this most likely has implications for strategy development in the future.

In terms of participation, the common idea is that equality in tourism exists – that participation is a matter of choice. The ‘yes you can’ type of attitude can be noted in the strategies, even if it is not articulated as such. Everyone can travel and everyone is able to host. Again, this is an implication of the liberal thought that replicates the common myth concerning the industry. Seen from outside the industry, it might seem that tourism work is desirable and that anyone can perform this kind of work. Skills and knowhow have important roles in the strategies (although this varies between the different ones), but the underlying thought is that tourism brings employment to locals who are willing and able to work in the industry.

At the myth level, it could be concluded that the regions rely on a special notion of hospitality. Furthermore, ideas of cultural differences and special features, even stereotypes, of people in different regions play a part in building the notion of location-specific hospitality (for instance, Finns are quiet and honest; people in rural regions are more hospitable, and so on). Relying on this special kind of hospitality includes the idea that locals, who are the producers of this special kind of hospitality, are also interested in producing tourism.

Hospitality becomes intertwined with the notion of participation in the context of tourism policymaking, creating a set for staged participation. Behind this lies an idea that is common in the Western world: participation can be organised. It can be concluded that this continues the art of staging known in the industry in the context of customer participation.

Conclusion

This chapter presented an analysis concerning the tourism strategies of regions that can be considered peripheral (Finland, Lapland, Portugal, Madeira, Scotland and the Scottish Highlands and Islands). To do this, CLA was used. The purpose of CLA as a method is to provide deeper insight into tourism strategies and to understand how strategies construct present and future tourism development in peripheral regions. As articulated by Inayatullah (1998: 817), language, in the post-structuralist approach, constitutes reality more so than merely symbolising reality.

In general, it can be concluded that the tourism strategies considered in this study are highly homogenous and do not differ from each other significantly. Analysis on the litany level noted that the strategy papers differ in terms of length and timespan, but their content is mostly similar. Tourism is mainly described and measured in terms of numbers and

volumes. None of the strategies has a focus on inclusion, even though it is mentioned briefly in some in terms of accessibility or local participation. Neoliberal discourse about sustainability is visible in the general aims and alignments of the strategies.

When examining the strategies on a systemic level, it becomes clear that tourism is seen as detached from other industries. In addition, local people are not seen as an active part of the tourism system. Rather, they are seen as targets of the system: by developing tourism, the regions and people living there benefit and have better prospects. The strategies do not suggest systemic solutions for changing the system towards a more inclusive industry, nor do they describe tourism as an inclusive system.

The worldviews existing behind the strategies are liberal and growth-based: tourism needs to grow and should grow. The strategies are more or less participatory in nature, as the participation of relevant stakeholders is considered an important aspect in all strategies. However, Western liberal and individualistic worldviews also appear in the assumptions about the ability and willingness of different stakeholders to participate in tourism development. Participation is staged in such a way that assumes that everyone has similar possibilities to take part in the strategy process. Meanwhile, the strategy papers themselves designate which relevant stakeholders are to be invited to tourism development. Furthermore, stakeholders are invited by those considered to be tourism experts, such as tourism developers. Thus, invited stakeholders are guests in tourism development, while ownership stays with those leading the process.

The collective archetypes, myths and metaphors behind the strategies are also related to Western ideas of growth and individualism. A common idea in the strategies is that equality in tourism exists and that participation is a matter of choice. ‘Yes you can’ is a myth that leads to an understanding of participation throughout the strategies. It embraces tourists, local people, employees, tourism companies, authorities, regions and all who are considered as tourism stakeholders. This leads to assumptions about the possibilities created by tourism, desirable tourism work, the regions and companies competing for the number of tourists and, finally, hospitable local people. Interestingly, the staged shape of tourism seems to continue from staged authenticity and staged tourism experiences (MacCannell, 1973; Cohen, 1988; Wang, 1999) to staged policymaking and implementation.

The myth of the participatory nature of tourism development in the strategies could be described by the term *staged participation*. On the one hand, the strategies are staged and ready for people to join and participate; on the other, tourism in general is staged as something innately participative that different stakeholders should, want and can take part in.

It can be assumed that when phenomena such as over-tourism and antagonism among local people towards tourists receive more attention globally, future strategies will not consider participation as self-evident (as

the present ones do). It is desirable that the myth of capability, as well as staged participation, will turn into more inclusive worldviews and systems. It is worth pondering how the discussions and processes would change if the issue of staged participation was up-ended. What about accepting that everyone does not have similar possibilities, abilities, resources or desires to participate in tourism development? What about understanding tourism work as a career and an opportunity for self-development, instead of seeing it as a fun job attracting adventurous people to work for one season? These are examples of questions that would merit further consideration when creating alternative futures based on CLA of tourism strategies.

References

- Biddulph, R. and Scheyvens, R. (2018) Introducing inclusive tourism. *Tourism Geographies* 20 (4), 583–588.
- Cohen, E. (1988) Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 15 (3), 371–386, doi: 10.1016/0160-7383(88)90028-X/10.1016/0160-7383(88)90028-X.
- Darcy, S. and Buhalis, D. (2011a) Introduction: From disabled tourists to accessible tourism. In D. Buhalis and S. Darcy (eds) *Accessible Tourism: Concepts and Issues* (pp. 1–20). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Darcy, S. and Buhalis, D. (2011b) Conceptualising disability. In D. Buhalis and S. Darcy (eds) *Accessible Tourism: Concepts and Issues* (pp. 21–45). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- De Jouvenel, H. (2019) Futuribles: Origins, philosophy, and practices – Anticipation for action. *World Futures Review* 11 (1), 8–18.
- Dredge, D., Jenkins, J. and Whitford, M. (2011) Tourism planning and policy: Historical development and contemporary challenges. In D. Dredge and J. Jenkins (eds) *Stories of Practice: Tourism Policy and Planning* (pp. 13–35). Farnham: Ashgate.
- Hakkarainen, M. and Tuulentie, S. (2008) Tourism's role in rural development of Finnish Lapland: Interpreting national and regional strategy documents. *Fennia* 186 (1), 3–13.
- Hall, C.M. (1994) *Tourism and Politics: Policy, Power and Place*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Harju-Myllyaho, A. (2018) Towards accessible hospitality: Intersectional approach to rainbow tourism. Master's thesis, University of Lapland.
- Harju-Myllyaho, A. and Jutila, S. (2018) The meaning of accessible tourism. In M. Gorenak and A. Trdina (eds) *Responsible Hospitality: Inclusive, Active, Green* (pp. 9–20). Slovenia: University of Maribor Press.
- Harju-Myllyaho, A. and Kyrrä, S. (2013) Megatrendit ja esteetön vieraanvaraisuus. In S. Jutila and H. Ilola (eds) *Matkailua kaikille? Näkökulmia matkailun ennakointiin, osa II* (pp. 8–18). Rovaniemi: Erweko.
- HIE (Highlands and Islands Enterprise) (2019) See <https://www.hie.co.uk/our-region/> (accessed January 2020).
- Höckert, E. (2015) Ethics of hospitality: Participatory tourism encounters in the northern highlands of Nicaragua. PhD dissertation, University of Lapland.
- Inayatullah, S. (1990) Deconstructing and reconstructing the future: Predictive, cultural and critical epistemologies. *Futures* 22 (2), 115–141.
- Inayatullah, S. (1998) Causal layered analysis: Poststructuralism as a method. *Futures* 30 (8), 815–829.
- Inayatullah, S. (ed.) (2004) *The Causal Layered Analysis (CLA) Reader. Theory and Case Studies of an Integrative and Transformative Methodology*. Taipei: Tamkang University Press.

- Isola, A.-M., Kaartinen, H., Leeman, L., Lääperi, R., Schneider, T., Valtari, S. and Keto-Tokoi, A. (2017) *Mitä osallisuus on? Osallisuuden viitekehyistä rakentamassa*. Working paper. Helsinki: Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare.
- Jutila, S. and Harju-Myllyaho, A. (2017) Esteettömyys matkailussa. In J. Edelman and H. Ilola (eds) *Matkailututkimuksen avainkäsitteet* (pp. 223–228). Rovaniemi: Lapland University Press.
- Kaboli, A. and Tapio, P. (2017) How late-modern nomads imagine tomorrow? A causal layered analysis practice to explore the images of the future of young adults. *Futures* 96, 36–43.
- Kamppinen, M. and Malaska, P. (2003) Mahdolliset maailmat ja niistä tietäminen. In M. Kamppinen, O. Kuusi and S. Söderlund (eds) *Tulevaisuudentutkimus. Perusteet ja sovellukset* (pp. 55–116). Helsinki: Suomen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Ketonen-Oksi, S. (2018) Creating a shared narrative: The use of causal layered analysis to explore value co-creation in a novel service ecosystem. *European Journal of Futures Research* 6 (1), 1–12.
- MacCannell, D. (1973) Staged authenticity: Arrangements of social space in tourist settings. *American Journal of Sociology* 79, 589–603.
- McCabe, S., Minnaert, L. and Diekmann, A. (2012) Introduction. In S. McCabe, L. Minnaert and A. Diekmann (eds) *Social Tourism in Europe: Theory and Practice* (pp. 1–12). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- RCL (Regional Council of Lapland) (2015) Lapland tourism strategy 2015–2018. See https://issuu.com/lapinliitto/docs/lapin_matkailustrategia_2015-2018
- Sedgley, D., Pritchard, A. and Morgan, N. (2012) ‘Tourism poverty’ in affluent societies: voices from inner-city London. *Tourism Management* 33, 951–960.
- Selwyn, T. (2000) An anthropology of hospitality. In C. Lashley and A. Morrison (eds) *In Search of Hospitality. Theoretical Perspectives and Debates*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Sitra (2019) Images of futures. See <https://www.sitra.fi/en/dictionary/images-of-futures/> (accessed March 2020).
- Söderlund, S. and Kuusi, O. (2003) Tulevaisuudentutkimuksen historia, nykytila ja tulevaisuus. In M. Kamppinen, O. Kuusi and S. Söderlund (eds) *Tulevaisuudentutkimus. Perusteet ja sovellukset*. Helsinki: Suomen kirjallisuuden seura.
- SRETC (Secretaria Regional da Economia, Turismo e Cultura) (2016) Madeira tourism strategy 2017–2021. See <http://www.visitmadeira.pt/Admin/Public/Download.aspx?file=Files%2FFiles%2FVisitMadeira%2FEstudos%2FDOCUMENTO-ESTRATEGICO-2017-21.pdf> (accessed March 2020).
- STA (Scottish Tourism Alliance) (2012) Tourism Scotland 2020. See <https://scottishtourismalliance.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Tourism-Scotland-2020-final.pdf> (accessed March 2020).
- STA (Scottish Tourism Alliance) (2019) Scotland is Now. See <https://www.scotland.org/about-scotland/where-is-scotland/map-of-scotland> (accessed March 2019).
- Statistics Finland (2019) See https://www.tilastokeskus.fi/index_en.html (accessed March 2020).
- TDP (Turismo de Portugal) (2016) Estratégia de Turismo Portugal 2027. International focus group English Market. See https://estrategia.turismodeportugal.pt/sites/default/files/letalgarve_files/ET_27_apresentacao_ru_v_completa_fotos_novas.pdf (accessed November 2019).
- TDP (Turismo de Portugal) (2017) Portuguese tourism strategy 2027. See <https://travelbi.turismodeportugal.pt/en-us/Documents/Strategy/estrategia-turismo-2027.pdf> (accessed January 2021).
- United Nations (1948) Universal Declaration of Human Rights. See https://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/eng.pdf (accessed March 2020).

- UNWTO (2016) Messages of the World Committee on Tourism Ethics on Accessible Tourism. See <https://webunwto.s3.eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/2019-10/wctemessagesonaccessibletourism.pdf> (accessed March 2020).
- Vallis, R. and Inayatullah, S. (2016) Policy metaphors: From the tuberculosis crusade to the obesity apocalypse. *Futures* 84, 133–144.
- Visit Finland (2019) Finland in facts. See <https://finland.fi/facts-stats-and-info/finland-in-facts-2/> (accessed March 2020).
- Visit Finland (2010) Finland tourism strategy 2020. See http://www.visitfinland.fi/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Matkailustrategia_020610.pdf (accessed March 2020).
- Visit Portugal (2019) All about Portugal. See <https://www.visitportugal.com/en/sobre-portugal/biportugal> (accessed March 2020).
- Wang, N. (1999) Rethinking authenticity in tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26, 349–370, doi:10.1016/S0160-7383(98)00103-0.