Framing by opening up: Approaching matters of concern in nature-based tourism

Brynhild Granås, Mats J. Hoel and June A. Røsbø, UiT The Arctic University of Norway

Introduction

As inhabitants of northern Norway, we witness a growing use of northern landscapes for production of commercial nature experiences. This is the region in Norway that recently has experienced the strongest growth in nature-based tourism (Stensland et. al 2018; NHO 2018). Outdoor activities offered to paying customers are numerous and include hiking, climbing, snowmobiling, skiing, and much more. Like in the rest of the Nordic Arctic, this tourism is unevenly distributed in time and space (Jóhannesson et. al 2022, 12). Accordingly, people may experience overcrowding in Lofoten, while the tourism growth is felt less in western Finnmark throughout all seasons. Moreover, and inspired by traditions, new technologies, and outdoor trends, tourists are offered access to ever more and diverse nature experiences.

All these are changes that we ourselves experience when we go hiking, skiing, berry picking, and more. In the Nordic Arctic, outdoor recreation is referred to as *friluftsliv* (free/open air life) (Ween & Abram 2012). In Norway, the concept indicates a national identity that assesses Norway as a nation of outdoor people (Breivik 1978; Goksøyr 1994; Gurholt 2008). As commercial nature experiences are produced, they interweave with friluftsliv as well as convoluted traditional and new landscape practices that prevail in Norwegian landscapes. *Allemannsretten* (everyone's right), meaning people's right in the Nordic north to roam the outfields of land owned by others, is embedded in the Outdoor Recreation Act (*Friluftsloven*) of 1957. The right is the treasured cultural twin that facilitates Norwegian *friluftsliv* in accordance with the egalitarian democratic principles that this tradition entails (Gurholt 2008). Notably, the modern roaming right from 1957, accommodates mobile lives and is neither for locals nor Norwegians only. More so, any visitor can use the right, and so can any guide or entrepreneur who would like to make a living by selling nature experiences in Norway. Thus, the rivers and mountains we ourselves cross in our outdoor lives and the infrastructure we make use of are the same as those of vacationists, nature guides, and paying customers. So are the floras, faunas, and people we encounter along the way.

When in the outdoors, who or what is touristic is not always easy to assess – when is a skier a tourist? Moreover, the tourist identity may lose some of its significance in nature encounters, like for reindeers who are disturbed by skiers, or villagers who are annoyed by hikers who cross

their gardens or infields. Thus, the concept ‘tourism’ seldom mirrors opaque on-ground realities. Neither does the concept ‘nature’. More so, enactments of nature-based tourism are culturally and materially saturated at the same time. Different practices that come together in landscapes are full of all kinds of lives, histories, and meanings, and thus imply situations where the realms indicated by binary distinctions like nature – culture or local – tourist come together.

Altogether, nature-based tourism is imbued with ambiguities that tell of tourism as deeply intertwined in the development of northern places. It is commonly acknowledged that tourism affects places, and vice versa. The question of how the two entangle however denote grey zones of world-making that, for good and for bad, condition the development of tourism businesses as well as communities. Our research on commercial nature guiding in Lofoten and western Finnmark, tell of mixtures of footloose and place-committed small-scale entrepreneurs and guides that engage there. When they meet up in northern places, they involve in practices that construct tourism economies and transform places from below. While doing so, they take part in and make use of the “material and cultural relationships” of globalisation, and the “places and people, distant and nearby” to which they are connected (Clifford, 2013, 6). Thus, and as with the places where they operate, the product they sell become within a wider geography and history than the here and now of a nature experience tell of (cf. Massey 1994; 2005).

When considering the sustainability of nature-based tourism and place development in the Arctic, all the encounters, connections, and relations denoted above are significant. With the entwined relation between tourism and place as a point of departure, this chapter suggests for researchers to attend to nature-based tourism as an open relational historical-geographical phenomenon. Methodologically, we argue for studying tourism practices up-close and in place, to tap into the relational dynamics of the commercial nature experiences that are enacted there, including relations to the different materialities and more than human living involved. A constituent aspect of the approach is historical-geographical, and acknowledges commercial nature experiences as contingent on where and when they are enacted. Altogether, we are inspired by the idea of framing research by opening up instead of closing down, as outlined by Krzywoszynska (2023, 397) and Stirling (2008). The logics of the approach is in line with the idea of seeing nature-based tourism as a dynamic and porous formation (Franklin & Crang 2001; Huijbens & Müller 2022). Based on experiences from northern Norway, we specify and explore methodological implications of such logics, and demonstrate the matters of concern they may bring into focus in power-relevant research on Arctic tourism, such as relations of care for people, places, and ecologies.

We start the chapter by presenting our methodological argument in more detail. Then, and assisted by the periphery concept, we outline some of the historical-geographical relations that become significant in the nature-based tourism we study. Further, we present empirical examples from ongoing ethnographic studies in Lofoten and Western Finnmark respectively, to demonstrate the value of the approach we suggest for. Finally, we discuss some of the implications that the open framing of nature-based tourism may have for research in the Arctic in the time to come.

Opening up and getting close to address matters of concern

Our way of reasoning relates to the recent critique from tourism scholars towards "the narrow focus on capitalist tourism systems" (Rantala & Höckert 2024, 63) and towards approaches that have made tourism "fetishized as a thing, a product, a behaviour" (Franklin & Crang 2001, 6). Our experiences tell of enigmas found at the fringes of what is institutionally and policy-wise regarded as nature-based tourism, based on frames that acknowledge the close relation between tourism and place but nevertheless attends to tourism as a closed phenomenon. Such experiences encourage us to pursue ideas that help us unpack tourism's contingent relations to place processes and ecologies. Krzywoszynska's conceptualization of soils as relational "dynamic assemblages between different materials and organisms (including humans), which co-constitute one another" (Krzywoszynska 2023, 397), inspire us to consider nature-based tourism along related lines and as an open relational phenomenon in place. Krzywoszynska's conceptualization opens up soil and thus helps her in her aim to illuminate "what matters" within soil assemblages (Krzywoszynska 2023, 398) and "how to care for the needs of soil" (Ibid, 397). Similarly, we open up nature-based tourism with the aim of understanding better what is at stake within relations where nature experiences are created. This way, and as Krzywoszynska puts it with reference to Latour (2004), we transform 'matters of fact' within nature-based tourism into 'matters of concern'.

Further, and based on Anna L. Tsing's assemblage thinking (2015), we consider the creation of nature experiences as an outcome of relations that assemble in place. When experiences are produced within place assemblages, guides, paying customers, and other people involved are joined by more than humans, such as snow, plants, reindeer, cell phones, and more. We take interest in what is at stake – for whom and for what – within the relations of the assemblage where experiences are produced, instead of pursuing all those and that involved as the stakeholders of tourism (Mitchell et al., 1997; Kaltenborn & Linell, 2019; Choi & Wang, 2019; Tallberg, Garcia-Rosell, and Haanpää 2022; Starik 1997). Who or what is involved in the

production of nature experiences is an empirical question, and so is the stakeholder-related question of who or what affects who or what. Accordingly, power relations, relations of control, and subject and object positions are shifting within processes where commercial nature experiences come to life.

When such experiences are practiced, the many involved connect to times and places that tell of ideas and meanings that become part of experiences while remaking places at the same time (Clifford 2013; Massey 1994; 2005). Nature-based tourism implies that different values that come with for example local traditions for nature use, new outdoor trends, a national outdoor recreation culture, or wilderness perceptions of landscapes, intersect in place (Massey 2005), based on the humans and more than humans that are present there, and the times and places they relate the place and the nature experience to. Similarly, different nature cosmologies and ethical approaches to interactions with other livelihoods and lives are brought together. As an ecological, moral, and political historical configuration, places are where different lives, ways of life, and interests meet and are negotiated (Massey 2005). One example would be when the female reindeers with calves encounter skiers who are moved by their presence and goes too close to take their picture. Another would be when farmers feel their livelihood is disrespected by summer hikers who cross their infields on their way into the mountains. Altogether, nature-based tourism is marked by constitutive encounters and productive frictions (Tsing 2005) that may spur innovation, learning, and moral growth as well as situations of regret, conflict, and loss.

As Stirling (2008) as well as Krzywoszynska (2023) emphasise, a critical element in opening up concerns bringing new voices and marginalized perspectives in. This highlighting reflects Donna Haraway's argument that "It matters what stories tell stories; it matters whose stories tell stories" (Haraway 2019, 570). Opening up is also a heuristic analytic move that involves "exploring previously ignored attachments or conceptualizations" (Krzywoszynska 2023, 398). Further, the open framing that comes with a relational emphasis acknowledges tourism as ontologically messy (Ren et. al 2021, 1), and requires researchers to "stay with the trouble" (Haraway 2016; Rantala et. al 2023, 8). This includes enduring the uncomfortable feeling that may come with sticking to an anti-reductive approach that offers no comforting numbers. At the same time, the open framing is where science matter through the attendance given to matters of concern (Latour 2004), and to matter as "simultaneously fluid and solid" (Haraway 2019, 120).

Epistemologically, framing by opening up implies addressing the wider ranges of relations that can unveil matters of concern. To enable such observations, researchers must attend to

encounters, attendances, and interactions, and the relations they tell of. This altogether calls for not limiting oneself methodologically (Vannini 2015, 318-319) and for embracing proximity (Rantala et. al 2023). When relations and concerns are identified in specific places, research findings can be of general interest and have local value. Still, the dynamics of a specific assemblage that produce nature experiences are ungeneralizable.

Rather, commercial nature experiences are historically, geographically, and materially contingent outcomes of encounters in place. Our attentiveness to where and when tourism is practiced is reflected the chapter's attendance to the centre-periphery relation and to the juridical-cultural allemannsretten in research on tourism in northern Norway. This does not delimit the relevance of our argument to research in areas that are enacted as peripheries or areas where allemannsretten prevails. More so, we address the significance of history and geography in tourism development, as denoted by allemannsretten as well as by the relational geography within which the places we study are identified as peripheries.

With concerns for the climate- and nature crisis and with the future of Arctic places as ecological, moral, and political configurations at stake, framing nature-based tourism by opening up implies an epistemology of getting close as well as an axiology of addressing matters of concern in tourism development, as empirical examples will demonstrate. The examples are taken from ethnographic fieldworks where the researcher's corporeal presence in landscapes establishes a decisive proximity that comes with "staying geographically near" and affectively close (Rantala et. al 2023, 6). There, relations are noticed, and meanings, values, and concerns of those and that involved are sensed, in processes where tourism manifests in place and become part of historical-geographical transformations there.

Centre-periphery relations in nature-based tourism of the historical-geographical north

Northern Norway, which is located as far away from the capital of Norway as one gets, makes up around 35% of the nation's land, but holds only a little over 9% of its population. With its "few people and much nature", northern Norway has developed within centre-periphery relations all throughout modernity (Müller & Viken 2017; Granås & Mathisen 2022), meaning that the region has been denoted as the periphery of others, by others, within a geography of asymmetrical power relations. National and international interested parties have practiced northern natures as capitalist-economic resources within fisheries, fish farming, and extractive industries. Such relational geographical enactments continue in the times of climate crisis, as the region is exposed to industrial green transition in terms of wind power plants and other land

intensive forms of production. When considering the lack of control with the unpredictable tourism flows towards the north (cf. Massey 1994, 149-150), and bearing in mind that visitors and entrepreneurs located elsewhere value northern places as recreation areas, playgrounds, and sources of income (Viken 2023, 217), tourism add further layers to the practicing of northern places as peripheries.

The low inhabitant numbers of northern Norway's cities and towns, and the distances between villages and settlements, make space for what in a European context are relatively extensive landscapes on and off the coast with little or no permanent settlements. On maps, in photos, and through art and media, representations of landscapes that seem more or less "untouched by humans" have spread universal wilderness perceptions (Tsing 2005, 100) of the area for centuries (Hastrup 2009; Huijbens & Benediktsson 2009). Today, tourism marketing frame northern landscapes along similar lines and as fit for the contemplative and playful engagements that nature-based tourism can offer. At the same time, such representations smooth the way for continued enactments of northern landscapes as suitable for extractive industries (Herva et. al 2020; Granås 2018; Granås & Mathisen 2022).

Landscape representations, which make up what Olwig (2019) calls 'abstract landscapes', are nevertheless reductive and do not mirror the compound realities of the 'practiced landscapes' (Olwig 2019). Northern landscapes have been practiced by humans for thousands of years, since after the last glacial period. Premodern traditional outdoor practices still prevail in landscapes where inhabitants continue to make a living and a life through hunting, gathering, fishing, farming, reindeer herding, and the like. More so, many inhabitants, be they ethnically rooted in the Norwegian, Kven/Norwegian-Finnish, or indigenous Sami culture which have made up the multi-ethnic landscapes of the region for centuries, connect to the friluftsliv tradition and enjoy the outdoors for recreational purposes as part of their everyday lives. Among them are inhabitants who bring northern nature experiences to the market place.

While landscape imaginaries make northern Norway comprehensible and interesting for tourists, the region is made accessible in highly practical terms. For different historical reasons and with varying emphasis, the Norwegian state has pursued rural development ideas to ensure continued settlements in the north from early on. Within the neoliberal paradigm, rural development policies have nevertheless been weakened, and deregulations as well as centralization processes have entangled places in competitive networks of a global range (Harvey 1989; Hall 2001). During the last decades, the north has been marked by out migration, aging populations, and economic recession. Still, the transport- and welfare infrastructure of the Norwegian welfare state continue to provide tourists' access to northern Norway. Adding

to this, the moderate sub-Arctic climate makes stays here endurable for more people. Varied physical topographies along the extensive coastline accommodate diverse activities for customers in nature-based tourism with different preferences, skills, and desires. Conditioned by allemannsretten, the northern periphery is indeed up for grabs in tourism development.

Touristic enactments of northern places as peripheries unfold within asymmetrical relations and are related with colonialism in the ways they imply dynamics that ‘other’ northerners in general and indigenous Sami people in particular. Othering processes continue to imprint on how inhabitants are understood by others and understand themselves (Mathisen 2017), as a little less important and a little less civilized (Paulgaard 2008), but also as fascinating and exotic (Kramvig 2017; Herva et. al 2020).

Such understandings become part of host-guest relational dynamics. For good and for bad, they energize communities in their welcoming and appreciation of tourism (Müller & Jansson 2007; Müller & Viken, 2017; Hujibens & Jóhannesson, 2019). Narratives of crises in terms of depopulation and recession have dominated development discourses in the area for decades. Thus, we witness how tourism entangles in place processes where inhabitants are experiencing that the future of place livelihoods is at stake. Tourism reminds of a development potential that bring hope and may propose a “softer” and “greener” alternative to extractive industries. Considering the climate crisis and biodiversity loss, marginalization however prepares inhabitants to embrace any hope that can strengthen the local economy (Granås and Mathisen 2021). Altogether, the spaces for northern communities to prioritize and take responsibility for the nature crisis of our times are limited.

The delight of tourism for many northerners is the chances tourism offer for highly welcomed and encouraging attention and recognition. Nature-based tourism may inspire more inhabitants to acknowledge the qualities of their places and the possibilities they offer, not least for nature experiences. Still, the positivity-discourse that follows tourism development makes it hard to relate to tourism in critical ways on behalf of one’s own community and the ecologies that traditional livelihoods there rely on. This delimited space for critical discussions hampers the questioning of how nature-based tourism actually contributes with local employment and revenues. Altogether, the periphery status of northern places makes them vulnerable in the meeting with nature-based tourism. Thus, concerns for sustainability can be put at hold.

In the following, we provide examples from the ethnographic fieldworks of Mats’ and June’s ongoing PhD research in Lofoten and western Finnmark respectively. The examples demonstrate the value of the methodological working mode that, based on an open framing, goes up-close to observe the relational practicing of nature-based tourism in places marked by

the historical and geographical dynamics described above. The elaborations do not pay justice to the depth and with of neither of the studies. Similarly, they do not aim at providing a full overview of matters of concern in northern nature-based tourism today.

Exploring the value of framing openly and getting close to unveil matters of concern

Who produce commercial experiences where allemannsretten prevails?

In the middle of her fieldwork, a friend called June one day to let her know there was a ski & sail boat in the area. June drove straight to the harbour in the municipal centre of Øksfjord in western Finnmark to locate them. At this point, she found herself part of a "hunt" together with some of the nature guides in the area. The hunt involved figuring out what other guides were there, since it is difficult to keep overview of who the commercial landscape users around are. People knew about June's hunt, and acquaintances had started calling her to help her out. When arriving at the harbour, she could not see any skiers or sailors. Instead, she met an old fisherman and acquaintance of her. The man turned out to have a lot to tell about the entrepreneurs and guides in ski & sail tourism in Western Finnmark. They had called him for advice on several occasions and he had established a cooperation with some of them. These days, he was selling them stock fish. Ski & sail is a commercial concept where customers are accommodated on a boat that docs along the coast and guides guests on ski touring in alpine mountains. Thus, they integrate less in the land-based infrastructure of villages and towns. In western Finnmark, the challenge of keeping an overview of commercial operators concerns the ski & sail actors in particular.

June's corporeal presence and participation in the field illuminates a simple, but important question in tourism in Norwegian landscapes: With allemannsretten, nature-based tourism is notably unregulated. In accordance with the right, neither public authorities, DMOs, nor landowners have any formal authority to control who can sell nature experiences. Accordingly, any record keeping on the matter is difficult. Even nature guides and other outdoor people who stroll an area regularly struggle to get a full overview, in a quest which is like adding puzzles to a puzzle with no frame. Of concern is the power-geometry involved and the lack of control in the receiving end of nature-based tourism flows (Massey 1994, 149-150) that are spurred by allemannsretten and energized further by continuous wilderness depictions of northern landscapes.

Sensing concerns at the quay and in the mountain

It is possible to gather considerate information about who produces nature experiences by reading business registers and conducting different types of interviews (see e.g. Stensland et. al 2018). However, participant observation can provide substantive knowledge about how nature-based tourism is enacted. More specifically, a researcher that is present in the landscape can get to know not only who are selling nature experiences there, but who meets up when experiences are practiced there and how these encounters play out.

One example that can illustrate how closeness and presence can provide such knowledge, was when June went by motor boat to a small settlement in one of the fjords of western Finnmark in May one year, to go skiing there with friends. As they docked at the quay they usually make use of, and when her friends left the boat, the owners came down to let them know that this is a private quay. As June came off the boat, the owners recognized her – hey, is it you? They told her that there had been so many sail boats there this winter, arriving at all hours. Some of the visitors had been crossing social boundaries and altogether made the public use of their quay problematic. They stood there talking for a while, before June led her group onboard again and decided to anchor the boat in the fjord, which is a less convenient way of accessing the landscape.

This incident reminds of how difficult it can be to identify commercial actors among the many landscape users of an area. Further, the situation at the quay enables a sensing of relations at play in encounters where commercial nature experiences are practiced, and the frictions (cf. Tsing 2005) they may imply where matters of intimacy, ownership, and control is at stake. The meeting with the quay owners was a constitutive encounter (Tsing 2015, 292-293) for June that provided new insight and made her understand better the substantive quality of further landscape encounters involved in the tourism-place nexus of her field. The methodological point is that June's presence and partaking implied learning, and that the knowledge produced was an outcome of her corporeal presence in a place assemblage (cf. Tsing 2015). Her leaving the quay was an effect of staying affectively close (Rantala et. al 2023, 6).

During summer, Mats spent time around the famous climb and popular recreational area Svolværgeita in Lofoten. Safety concerns restrict guides from bringing more than two tourists climbing at the time. Given the season's economic importance, Mats was mindful to not ask to replace paying clients. Instead, he stayed at a considerate distance, and monitored the climbing through his binoculars. Afterwards, his observations became a point of departure in a conversation with the guide, who explained how his company had installed the rope there and was maintaining the trail. The next day, the guide unexpectedly invited him to come along. Right before they were to start the climb, two foreign hikers passed them on the track below.

As the hikers were about to continue up the mountain, the guide intervened and told them that their planned route was dangerous, and then redirected them to a safer point. He told Mats that he had contacted the authorities and requested them to remove this track from public maps. Despite the numerous rescues that he and his colleagues had conducted here as volunteers, the authorities had ignored him. Mats realized that the man was not only a guide, but a visitor manager and custodian of other hikers' and climbers' safety.

It was the intimacy of participation that made these observations possible and enabled Mats to sense the man's worries and frustrations. He noticed the engagements and the care of a guide that is committed within relations (Puig de la Bellacasa 2017; Krzywoszynska 2020) in an area and has to "stay with the trouble" (cf. Haraway 2019) in the collective practicing of a landscape. Guides' potential involvement in informal management of landscapes is however ignored in public conversation and research on nature-based tourism, where concerns for the technicalities of guiding and ensuring of safety dominate in Norway. In this way, Mats attends to matters of concern (Latour 2004) in nature-based tourism by unveiling "previously ignored attachments" (Krzywoszynska 2023, 398) of the phenomenon. Altogether, the situation from Svolværgeita tell of how the distinction between tourism and place may dissolve when guides practice a landscape.

"Light in the houses" of the tourism-place nexus

When Mats asked about his hopes for the collaboration within his research, one of the ski guides in Lofoten told him that his main worry is not about the technical skills needed to move around safely – what frustrates him is not having the right tools to deal with sustainability. As part of landscapes where the concerns that come with tourism are obviously related to more than littering, the guide found the sustainability-concept altogether fuzzy. More experiences from Lofoten tell of guides that worry about the lack of governance and local job creation in tourism. The underlying concern for sustainability connects to a growth in nature-based tourism that is unpredictable and out of control (cf. Massey 1994, 149-150).

The ethnographic insights above tell of matters at stake that responsible governmental institutions, such as for example municipalities, may not request knowledge about. Still, the knowledge of relational frictions that come with an open framing of nature-based tourism, speaks back to the concerns of guides. If municipalities are to pursue sustainable development of nature-based tourism, in-depth knowledge of the relational enactments of nature experiences is highly relevant. First, to know who the commercial actors are, concerns the important topic "*lys i husan"* (light in the houses), which is a commonly used phrase in the north. In this context,

the phrase addresses the local revenues of nature-based tourism, and whether the phenomenon lead to more inhabited ‘lit’ houses throughout the year. Further, knowledge about and cooperation with the commercial actors is decisive for municipalities that are to deal with the downsides of nature-based tourism, as problems with littering, use of the outdoors for toilet purposes, degradation of vegetation, disturbing of local faunas, farming, and reindeer herding, etc. appear. Moreover, relations and matters of concern at play in commercial nature experiences tell of the pros and cons of tourism development for communities. Accordingly, such knowledge concerns sustainability in place development.

Altogether, the grey zones of world-making that condition the development of tourism businesses as well as places, entail matters of concern for people and ecologies of relevance to different institutionally responsible parties. In northern places marked by recession, this may inspire localist ideas about the particular value of companies that are solidly place-bound and provide local jobs and thus “light in the houses”. Further insights from western Finnmark as well as Lofoten however indicate that this picture is less black and white.

Concluding remarks

> But be careful... about the capitalist interests and the private interests. Don't let them wiggle their way into the framework. That's my one piece of advice from the US.
>
> – nature guide, Lofoten

Framing processes denote power struggles (Krzywoszynska 2023, 398) in tourism. This is where researchers depart on different routes within tourism studies – what matters to us when we formulate research questions? Our framing by opening up, takes us to situations where we can sense varieties of concerns and mutual dependencies on-ground. Among them we find a guide who worries that mobile capitalism may “wiggle into the framework” in Lofoten landscapes. In landscape assemblages we observe face-to-face negotiations, based on physical presences and interdependencies, commitments, and care (Puig de la Bellacasa 2017) that togetherness in place can imply. If uncommitted entrepreneurs, be they footloose, faceless, or opportunists in the waves of tourism growth should “reap the rewards” (cf. Tsing 2005, 27) of northern landscapes, ways of life based on allemannsretten within and outside of the tourism economy would be at stake. So would the sustainability of tourism and place development.

So far, tourism in Norway has been weakly governed. The Official Norwegian Report (NOU 2023:10) *To live and experience – destinations for a sustainable future*, however

addresses the issue explicitly. In the wake of the report, political signals have suggested for more regulations. Tourist taxation is a key element in the report (cf. Viken 2023). The NOU however stresses the significance of preserving allemannsretten. So far, municipalities have hesitated to use the right that the Outdoor Recreation Act of 1957 provides them with to restrict allemannsretten. Recently, some have nevertheless used this opportunity, like in Lofoten, where tenting has been banned several places. A signal in the NOU is that municipalities should take more responsibility in visitor management in the time to come. At the same time, DMOs position themselves as representatives in the flourishing field of visitor managers.

With visitor management, institutional expert regimes make demands on positions to manage landscapes from above. Meanwhile, guides continue to negotiate their presence within landscapes where experiences are produced and vulnerable northern places are transformed. Among the guides are those that take responsibility in place development and in informal management of nature as well as visitors, while "staying with the trouble". It is this response-ability (Haraway 2016) and trouble we suggest for institutional actors to acknowledge and for researchers to take interest in, through opening up nature-based tourism and engaging in explorations up-close. As Stirling (2008) emphasizes, "Instead of focusing on unitary prescriptive recommendations," opening up means posing "alternative questions, [that] focuses on neglected issues, includes marginalized perspectives, (...) considers ignored uncertainties, examines different possibilities, and highlights new options" (Stirling 2008, 279-280). This way, research can represent other connections and voices than the expert systems in landscape management and tourism development, through alternative and critical ways of nuancing tourism.

Literature

Breivik, G. (1978). To tradisjoner i norsk friluftsliv. In G. Breivik and H. Løvmo (Eds.) *Friluftsliv fra Fridtjof Nansen til våre dager*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. 7-16.

Choi, J., & Wang, H. (2009). Stakeholder relations and the persistence of corporate financial performance. *Strategic management journal*, *30*(8), 895-907.

Clifford, J. (2013). *Returns. Becoming Indigenous in the Twenty-first Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Franklin, A. & Crang, M. (2001). The Trouble with Tourism and Travel Theory? *Tourist Studies*, 1(1), 5-22.

Goksøyr, M. (1994). Nasjonal identitetsbygging gjennom idrett og frilufts-liv. *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift* 2, 181-193.

Gurholt, K.P. (2008). Norwegian friluftsliv and ideals of becoming an 'educated man'. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning* 8(1), 55-70.

Granås, B. (2018). Destinizing Finnmark: Place making through dogsledding. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 72, 48-57.

Granås, B., & Mathisen, L. (2022). Unfinished indigenous geographies: The endurances and becomings of a Sámi tourism venture. *Polar Record*, 58.

Hall, T. (2001). *Urban Geography*. Florence, KY, USA: Routledge.

Haraway, D. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: making kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press.

Haraway, D. (2019). It Matters What Stories Tell Stories; It Matters Whose Stories Tell Stories. *Auto/Biography Studies*, 35(3), 565-575.

Harvey, D. (1989). From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: The transformation of Urban Governance in Late Capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography* 71(1), 3-17.

Hastrup, K. (2009). Images of Thule: Maps and metaphors in Polar explorations. In S. Jakobsson (Ed.) *Images of the North: Histories, Identities, Ideas*. Amsterdam: Brill, 103-116.

Herva, V.-P., Varnajot, A., & Pashkevich, A. (2020). Bad Santa: Cultural heritage, mystification of the Arctic, and tourism as an extractive industry, *The Polar Journal*, 10(2), 375–396.

Huijbens, E. & Benediktsson, K. (2009). Geared for the sublime. Mobile images of the north. In S. Jakobsson (Ed.) *Images of the North: Histories, Identities, Ideas*. Amsterdam: Brill, 117-130.

Hujibens, E.H., & Jóhannesson, G.T. (2019). Tending to destinations: Conceptualising tourism's transformative capacities. *Tourist Studies*, 19 (3), 279–294.

Huijbens, E. H., & Müller, D.K. (2022). The Socio-Spatial Articulations of Tourism Studies in Nordic Geography. In P. Jakobsen, E. Jönsson, & H.G. Larsen (Eds.), *The Socio-Spatial Articulations of Tourism Studies in Nordic Geography*. Cham: Springer, 169-190.

Jóhannesson, G. T., Welling, J., Müller, D. K., Lundmark, L., Nilsson, R. O., de la Barre, S., Granås, B., Kvidal-Røvik, T., Rantala, O., Tervo-Kankare, K., & Maher, P. (2022). Arctic tourism in times of change. Uncertain Futures – From Overtourism to Re-starting Tourism. Nordic Council of Ministers.

Kaltenborn, B.P. & Linnell, John D. C. (2019). Who are legitimate stakeholders? National and local perceptions of environmental change in the Lofoten islands, Norway. *Polar Geography*, 42(4), 236-252.

Kramvig, B. (2017). Orientalism or cultural encounters? Tourism assemblages in cultures, capital, and identities. In A. Viken & D. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism and Indigeneity in the Arctic*. Bristol: Channel View Publications, 169–187.

Krzywoszynska, A. (2020). To know, to dwell, to care: Towards and actionable, place-based knowledge of soils. In J.F. Salazar, C. Granjou, M. Kearns, A. Krzywoszynska, M. Tironi (Eds.) *Thinking with Soils. Material Politics and Social Theory*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 89-106.

Krzywoszynska, A. (2023). Taking Soil Care Seriously: A proposition. In: N. Patzel, S. Grunwald, E.C. Brevik, & C. Feller (Eds.), *Cultural Understanding of Soils. The importance of cultural diversity and the inner world*. Cham: Springer International Publishing AG, 395-408.

Latour, B. (2004). Why has Critique run out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern. *Critical Inquiry*, 30(2), 225–248.

Mathisen, S.R. (2017). Mellom borealisme og orientalisme. Fortellinger og forestillinger om de andre i nordlysturismen. *Tidsskrift for kulturforskning* 16(1), 55-70.

Massey, D. (1994). *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Massey, D. (2005). *For space*. London: Sage Publications.

Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of management review*, *22*(4), 853-886.

Müller, D. & Jansson, B. (2007). The difficult business of making pleasure peripheries prosperous. Perspectives on space, place, and environment. In D. Müller & B. Jansson (Eds.) *Tourism in peripheries. Perspectives from the far north and south*. Oxfordshire, UK: CAB International, 3-18.

Müller, D., & Viken, A. (2017). Indigenous tourism in the Arctic. In A. Viken, & D. Müller (Eds.), *Tourism and Indigeneity in the Arctic*. Bristol: Channel View, 3-15.

NHO reiseliv (2018). Nordnorsk reiselivsstatistikk. Retreived August 2023 at https://www.reiselivinord.no/2018/09/nordnorsk-reiselivsstatistikk-2018/

NOU 2023:10 (2023). To live and experience – destinations for a sustainable future. Regjeringen. Retrieved December 2023 at https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/nou-2023-10/id2968657/

Olwig, K. (2019). *The meanings of landscape: Essays on place, space, environment and justice*. Routledge.

Paulgaard, G. (2008). Re-centring periphery: Negotiating identities in time and space. In B. Granås, & J.O. Bærenholdt (Eds.), *Mobility and Place: Enacting Northern European Peripheries* (pp. 49-59). London: Ashgate.

Puig de la Bellacasa, M. (2017). *Matters of Care: Speculative Ethics in More Than Human Worlds. Minneapolis*, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Rantala, O., Kinnunen, V., Höckert, E., Grimwood, B. S., Hurst, C. E., Jóhannesson, G. T., Salla, J., Ren, C., Stinson, M.J., Valtonen, A., & Vola, J. (2023). Staying Proximate. In *Researching with Proximity: Relational methodologies for the Anthropocene*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 1-19.

Ren, C., van der Duim, R., & Jóhannesson, G.T. (2021). Messy realities and collaborative knowledge production in tourism. *Tourist Studies* 21 (2), 143-155.

Starik, M. (1995). Should Trees Have Managerial Standing? Toward Stakeholder Status for Non-Human Nature. *Journal of Business Ethics* 14, 207–17.

Stensland, S., Fossgard, K., Hansen, B.B., Fredman, P., Morken, I.-B., Thyrrestrup, G. & Haukeland, J.V. (2018). *Naturbaserte reiselivsbedrifter i Norge. Statusoversikt, resultater og metode fra en nasjonal spørreundersøkelse*. MINA fagrapport 52. Ås: NMBU.

Stirling, A. (2008). 'Opening up' and 'closing down'. Power, participation, and pluralism in the social appraisal of technology. *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 33, 262–294.

Tallberg, L., García-Rosell, J.-C., & Haanpää, M. (2022). Human–Animal Relations in Business and Society: Advancing the Feminist Interpretation of Stakeholder Theory. *Journal of Business Ethics* 180, 1, 1–16.

Tsing, A.L. (2005). *Frictions. An ethnography of global connection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tsing, A.L. (2015). *The mushroom at the end of the world: On the possibility of life in capitalist ruin.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Vannini, P. (2015). Non-representational ethnography: new ways of animating lifeworlds. *Cultural Geographies*, 22(2), 317–327.

Viken, A. (2023). Turisme, naturressurser og grunnrenteskatt. In R.E. Nilsen, O. Brox, E. Eythorsson, and S. Jentoft (Eds.) *Allmenningsressurser i nord. Fellesskap og grunnrente*. Stamsund: Orkana Akademiske, 215-240.

Ween, G. & Abram, S. (2012). The Norwegian Trekking Association: Trekking as constituting the nation. *Landscape Research*, 37(2), 155-171.