Journal of Rural and Community Development

Navigating Tourism Development in Emerging Destinations in Atlantic Canada: Local Benefits, Extra-local Challenges

Authors: Mark C. J. Stoddart, Gary Catano, & Howard Ramos

Navigating Tourism Development in Emerging Destinations in Atlantic Canada: Local Benefits, Extra-local Challenges

Mark C. J. Stoddart
Department of Sociology
Memorial University
St John's, Newfoundland, Canada
mstoddart@mun.ca

Gary Catano
Department of Sociology
Memorial University
St John's, Newfoundland, Canada
gpc478@mun.ca

Howard Ramos
Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology
Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
Howard.Ramos@Dal.Ca

Abstract

Over the past two decades, rural coastal communities in Atlantic Canada have turned to tourism as a means of economic diversification and revitalization. We examine how communities in relatively remote, emerging tourism destinations interpret the benefits and challenges of tourism development through studies of two sites in Newfoundland and Labrador: the Burin Peninsula and Battle Harbour. Tourism development is seen as having the potential to make positive contributions to the economic and social-cultural wellbeing of rural communities. At the same time, tourism stakeholders are aware of the challenges that their communities must navigate in order to connect these local places to broader networks of tourist travel. Furthermore, while the benefits of tourism are experienced locally, many of the challenges are extra-local and beyond the control of individual communities. For rural tourism regions, this highlights the need to develop multi-scalar approaches to tourism development and governance.

Keywords: tourism development; rural tourism; rural community wellbeing; Atlantic Canada; Newfoundland and Labrador

———————————————————

1.0 Introduction

Following the decline of Atlantic Canada's fisheries-based economy, rural coastal communities in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador, like others in the

region, have turned to resource extraction, such as offshore oil, and tourism as dual projects for economic diversification and revitalization (Ommer, 2007; Overton, 2007; Rockett & Ramsey, 2016; Sullivan & Mitchell, 2012). Tourism in the province has grown significantly, from approximately 264,000 visitors in 1992 to approximately 518,000 visitors in 2010 (Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, 2010). A large body of research highlights a range of potential positive and negative economic, social-cultural and environmental impacts of tourism for rural host communities. However, after more than two decades of fostering tourism development, few studies have examined how the various benefits and challenges are understood within the rural host communities in Newfoundland and Labrador that are working to become better connected as tourism destinations. The question of local understandings of tourism development is important because many development projects do not successfully tap into what works at the community level. Understanding local engagement with tourism development matters because if local residents don't support or engage in these projects they are unlikely to contribute to the wellbeing of host communities.

We examine perceptions of the economic, social-cultural and environmental dimensions of tourism in two regions of the province: the St. Lewis Inlet and the Burin Peninsula. This allows us to better understand the social benefits and challenges of connecting rural communities and landscapes to large-scale tourism networks. Our guiding question is: How do rural tourism host communities understand and navigate the economic, social-cultural, and environmental benefits and challenges of tourism development?

2.0 Literature Review

There is an increasing interest in cultural tourism, eco-tourism and other forms of "tourisms of body and nature" (Franklin, 2003, p. 175). In rural areas, traditional culture and natural landscapes can be used as a resource for economic development through community-based partnerships that promote tourism (Gerritsen, 2014; Kimmel, Perlstein, Mortimer, Zhou, & Robertson, 2015; Rockett & Ramsey, 2016; Strzelecka, 2015; Sullivan & Mitchell, 2012). In the context of Newfoundland and Labrador, tourism development builds on anchors like historic sites, museums and National Parks, as well as activities like whale, puffin and iceberg viewing, or sea kayaking, diving and hiking.

In his study of the Hunza region of Pakistan, Hussain notes that the remoteness and wilderness of the area—once seen as a challenge—increasingly becomes part of the allure for tourists as it offers a counterpart to the "excesses and flaws of the modern world" (Hussain, 2015, p. 2). As Hussain notes, tourists that seek out remote destinations reproduce the notion that "the solution to the fundamental problems created by modernity lies outside modernity; in remote areas we can find the answers to our central problems" (Hussain, 2015, p. 89). While less remote than Hunza, the province of Newfoundland and Labrador also connects to tourism networks by emphasizing natural landscapes alongside traditional rural lifestyles and culture (Rockett & Ramsey, 2016; Stoddart & Graham, 2016; Stoddart & Sodero, 2015; Sullivan & Mitchell, 2012). For example, Rockett and Ramsey`s (2016) study of tourism on Fogo Island and Change Islands, Newfoundland and Labrador, shows how tourism development is built upon the—often idealized—histories of traditional fisheries-based cultures and economies of outport communities. Similarly, Sullivan and Mitchell (2012) focus on the community of

Ferryland, where an archaeological site and tourism amenities were developed and created a new 'heritage-scape identity' for the town in the dual interests of economic development and heritage preservation.

Research on cultural and natural heritage tourism identifies positive and negative impacts for host communities. From an economic perspective, tourism helps create alternative development strategies for communities that are losing their resource extraction or industrial economic base (Ommer, 2007; Reed & Gill, 1997). Through tourism development, host communities attempt to connect to flows of capital from one of the world's largest industries (Urry & Larsen, 2011). In their study of an emerging tourism region in rural China, Kimmel et al. (2015) find that tourism development has made a significant impact in terms of employment, livelihood and standards of living, so is viewed positively by the local community. Rockett and Ramsey`s (2016) research on Fogo Island and Change Islands finds that community members are broadly supportive of tourism development, whether or not they are directly involved in the tourism sector. Their community member participants would like to see more tourism traffic, due to its economic employment benefits, as well as because tourism development had helped improve local infrastructure for residents (Rockett & Ramsey, 2016).

There are also important non-economic impacts related to the social-cultural and environmental dimensions of tourism. Tourism may increase the social capital of local residents through engaging with visitors and developing new skills (George & Reid, 2005). Essentially, social connections can be formed with visitors as they interact with members of host communities, which can lead to innovation in tourist regions as new ideas are shared by those visiting. Sullivan and Mitchell's (2012) research on the Newfoundland community of Ferryland finds that the community used tourism to pursue the dual goals of heritage preservation and economic development with relatively little tension between these interests. Their results further show that community members held a largely positive opinion of tourism based on the new 'heritage-scape identity' for the town. This illustrates how the collective identities of communities can be enriched through the meaning making that is associated with creating tourist destinations.

Tourism development can lead to protecting local culture, history, ecosystems and wildlife, to the benefit of host communities as well as visitors. As Gerritsen′s research on women's participation in a tourism project in rural Mexico indicates, community-based tourism development approaches can support a ″revalorization of local natural and cultural resources″ (Gerritsen, 2014, p. 248). Research on nature-oriented tourism further indicates that such tourism may enhance a sense of connection to local environments and provide a rationale for environmental protection (Hennessy & McCleary, 2011; Waitt & Cook, 2007).

These findings contrast with more pessimistic accounts of rural tourism development. As several researchers in Atlantic Canada and elsewhere note, tourism development also carries potential economic challenges and drawbacks. Tourism work is often seasonal and is generally lower-paying than jobs in extractive industries (Ommer, 2007). When tourism development is not directed by local interests, income from tourism often leaves local communities (Laudati, 2010; Rothman, 1998). Tourism development can also take priority over community wellbeing, as demonstrated by the history of relocation in order to establish National Parks as tourism anchors in Atlantic Canada (MacEachern, 2001; Overton, 1996).

There are also potential non-economic drawbacks. Critics of tourism note that the social character of host communities often changes to meet the expectations of tourists (George & Reid, 2005; Overton, 1996; Rothman, 1998; Urry & Larsen, 2011). For example, the tourism industry's commodification of local cultures and histories often works to mummify rural societies, distract attention from deeper political economic problems in rural areas, or promote inaccurate representations of local history and culture (George & Reid, 2005; Overton, 2007).

Furthermore, as destinations become popular, tourism can produce environmental problems like overflows of waste, or ecological degradation from the overuse of local environments (Meletis & Campbell, 2009). In their study of Ping'an, Kimmel et al. (2015) note that tourism to this rural heritage destination depends on "socio-cultural, ecological, and economic systems [that] are symbiotic" (p. 127), but that increasing flows of tourism traffic are putting stress on the local environment that is an integral part of the symbiotic system that draws tourists in the first place.

Questions of how host communities navigate the positive and negative impacts of tourism are linked to issues of tourism governance. Furthermore, the social and economic sustainability of tourism development projects is also largely dependent on engagement and support from host communities, which is secured—or not—through tourism governance. This is a key reason why it is important to look at community-level interpretations of the benefits and challenges of tourism development. Joppe, Brooker, and Thomas (2014) define tourism governance as "a holistic and complex process of co-ordination of the public, private and non-profit sectors″ (p. 49). Strzelecka (2015) similarly describes tourism governance as the process through which "legitimate actors undertake leadership roles and make required tourism decisions" (p. 79) and thereby manage the pace and substance of tourism development. Even where tourism is already largely viewed in a positive light, tensions around tourism governance may still emerge. Sullivan and Mitchell (2012), for example, point to conflict between community members and government over the process of doing roadwork that was necessary to protect the Ferryland archaeological site. Rockett and Ramsey (2016) also observe that although community members are broadly supportive of tourism, there is some tension around the leadership role of the Shorefast Foundation, which is driving much of the local tourism development.

Based on their results, Rockett and Ramsey (2016) recommend efforts to increase collaboration, engagement with community members, and creating longer-term strategies for tourism development to ensure that it continues in ways that are consistent with community interests and values. As Tucker, Gibson, Vodden, and Holley (2011) similarly observe, building regional tourism networks among tourism operators and promoters, local communities, and provincial tourism agencies facilitates connections to broader tourism mobility networks by greater sharing of resources and information. However, attempts at regional network-building for tourism development are not necessarily straightforward. Strzelecka (2015) notes that focusing rural tourism governance on "including the community voice in development decision-making is a relatively new approach that became an indispensable element of the sustainability process" (p. 79). In her research on community engagement for rural tourism development in Poland, Strzelecka finds that the LEADER initiative in rural Poland had mixed results in terms of its intended goals to increase the level of engagement of local community members in tourism governance and to redress histories of top-down rural development with limited input from rural communities. Though the initiative sought to create new spaces for

community engagement in tourism governance, participation largely built upon pre-existing informal social networks and patterns of community leadership and influence, further highlighting the importance of connecting with community-level understandings of tourism development (Strzelecka, 2015).

Hall, Muller, and Saarinen (2009, p. 69) outline a typology of five approaches to tourism planning and governance that orient community attempts to navigate the benefits and challenges of tourism development. The first is 'boosterism' which is the notion that tourism is considered inherently good and worth pursuing for its own sake. The second is an economic development orientation that focuses primarily on economic and industry related issues. The third is a community development orientation that emphasizes the role that communities play in fostering capacity building, as well as the potential for tourism to enhance the social wellbeing of communities. The fourth is an environmental orientation that focuses on the local environment and resources needed to preserve the ecological basis of tourism development. Last, there is a sustainable tourism orientation, which strikes a balance among economic, social, and environmental considerations as multiple dimensions of tourism development. As this sustainable tourism orientation highlights, the economic, social, cultural and environmental dimensions are embedded together in social practices. Although these dimensions can be distinguished analytically, as we do in our presentation of results, we are also aware that they are intrinsically connected.

Through our analysis of two tourism regions in Newfoundland and Labrador we gain insight into the economic, social-cultural and environmental benefits and challenges faced by rural host communities as they pursue tourism development. By examining the benefits and challenges of tourism for relatively remote, rural coastal communities, we also gain a better understanding of how rural communities might structure tourism governance to navigate the benefits and challenges in order to contribute to economic, social-cultural and environmental wellbeing.

3.0 Overview of the Research Sites

We focus on two emerging tourism regions. Battle Harbour National Historic District is on a small island in the St. Lewis Inlet, which is located in coastal southern Labrador. Though it never had a large permanent population, Battle Harbour historically served as an important commercial and service centre for the Labrador fishery, with significant seasonal populations. The last permanent residents of the island were relocated in the 1960s as part of the provincial government's campaign to 'resettle' remote fisheries communities and centralize the population of the province. Despite the resettlement of Battle Harbour, it continued to serve an important role as a seasonal hub for the fishery until the cod fishing moratorium in 1992. Almost immediately after the moratorium, the restoration of the island as a historic site began, and in 1996 Battle Harbour was declared a National Historic Site (Applin, 2010). At present, Battle Harbour has no permanent year-round residents, but does have summer residences and is the main tourism attractor for the St. Lewis Inlet region—which includes the towns of Mary's Harbour, Lodge Bay and St. Lewis. Along with the Red Bay historic site (a recently declared UNESCO World Heritage Site), which presents the history of Basque whaling in the region, Battle Harbour is also a key tourism attractor for the larger Labrador Straits region.

The Burin Peninsula is located on of the island of Newfoundland, a few hours' drive from the provincial capital of St. John's. While it is not as remote as the Labrador

Straits region, in terms of airplane or car travel, it is well off the TransCanada highway, which is the major road across the island. Marystown—population approximately 6,280—is the largest town and main service centre for the region and is also a site for construction and service work related to the offshore oil industry (Community Accounts, 2015). Several communities on the Burin Peninsula are working to increase tourism, in conjunction with the Heritage Run Tourism Association, an umbrella organization dedicated to regional tourism promotion and development. There are several tourism attractors, including the Seaman's Museum in the town of Grand Bank and the historic district in the town of Burin. The Burin Peninsula is also the route to the French islands of Saint Pierre and Miquelon, and many tourists travel through the Burin Peninsula to reach the ferry terminal in the town of Fortune.

This brief overview of the research sites provides an important context for interpreting our results. As a qualification to our findings, some of the contrasts between Battle Harbour and the Burin Peninsula likely reflect some of the key differences between the two sites. The Burin is relatively closer to the major population, economic, and political urban hub of the province (St. John's), while Battle Harbour is significantly more remote. Furthermore, the Burin Peninsula includes several communities that are engaged in a broader range of tourism activities, while Battle Harbour is a single anchor attraction that operates seasonally, though there are multiple rural host communities in proximity to the site.

4.0 Methodology

The studies of Battle Harbour and the Burin Peninsula were initially designed to work as stand-alone research projects. As such, somewhat different methodologies were used for each of the studies. Qualitative data from both studies were manually coded and analysed with the assistance of NVIVO software for qualitative analysis. The synthesis of results from the two case studies was done using qualitative comparison tables, where summary notes on each study were organized along theoretically-defined points of comparison in order to identify key similarities and differences across the cases.

The Battle Harbour study involved a mixed-method approach to data collection that combined a telephone survey of communities surrounding Battle Harbour, the results of which are presented elsewhere (Ramos, Stoddart, & Chafe, 2016), and field research. For the field research phase of the project, six days of field research was carried out at the Battle Harbour National Historic District during August 2013. This provided an opportunity to conduct in-depth semi-structured interviews with four key informants involved with the site. Field notes were also written during each day at the site, which reflected several informal conversations with Battle Harbour employees and tourists. These informal conversations were not recorded and identifying information was not collected from site visitors. Interview questions and field notes focused on: participants' history of engagement with Battle Harbour; the messages the site conveys to visitors about local history, culture and the environment; and the economic, social-cultural, and environmental benefits or challenges of the Battle Harbour site for the surrounding communities.

Data collection in the Burin Peninsula took place between November 2012 and August 2013. In November 2012, the first author attended a two-day regional workshop hosted by the Harris Centre (Memorial University) in the role of participant observer in a tourism working group. This was followed by field research trips. The first trip took place in April 2013 and involved a series of focus group

interviews in Fortune and Marystown with 12 key tourism stakeholders. These meetings were audio recorded. To ensure participants′ confidentiality within the focus group format, we did not create verbatim transcripts of these meetings. Instead, summary transcripts were made which captured the ideas raised in conversation, without attributing these to identifiable individuals. Excerpts from this data used in our results are from these summary transcripts, which reflect group conversation in these meetings. The second research trip in August 2013 consisted of three days of unobtrusive observation at a series of tourist sites identified as significant by the focus groups. Field notes focused on the following dimensions: themes and images used at sites to define local history, cultural and the environment; the main features that draw visitors to the sites; how visitors engage with the sites; the social, cultural or economic benefits of the sites for local communities; and indications of local-provincial collaboration at the sites.

For both studies, summary reports of the findings were circulated to research participants and other key stakeholders. We also returned to the study regions to present the results. The Battle Harbour findings were presented at a Regional Collaboration workshop in the Labrador Straits in October 2014. The first author returned to the Burin Peninsula region April 2014, where preliminary results were shared with participants and other interested stakeholders through two meetings. Responses to the summary reports and follow-up discussion about the findings served as a means of checking the validity of results with participants and provided insight for further analysis.

5.0 Results

We examine local understandings of tourism development along three analytical dimensions: economic, social-cultural, and environmental. It is analytically useful to separate these dimensions in presenting our results. However, following Hall et al.`s (2009) sustainable tourism orientation, though we address these dimensions sequentially, it is important to note that these dimensions are intertwined and embedded in the social practices of tourism development.

5.1 Economic Dimensions of Tourism Development

Research on tourism and rural development points to the potential for positive economic impacts, for example through new employment opportunities, as well as challenges, including seasonality or tourism revenues that flow out of communities. In both of our research sites, tourism development is valued for its positive economic impacts. At Battle Harbour, most people who work at the site are from the area, and their tourism work allows them to remain in the region. The role of the site in contributing to community embeddedness is illustrated by a participant who notes:

> Well, if I wasn't here [at Battle Harbour], I would have had to take the job
>
> [outside the region]. So, I would have had to leave my community….We're
>
> seasonal workers, but every year, you know, you got your job to come out to
>
> here. So some of those people have been here since the site opened (Battle
>
> Harbour key informant interview #2).

Although work at the site is seasonal, it provides a cyclical income that allows this participant to stay in her home community. This is a common narrative among site workers. A key economic benefit of successfully connecting local communities to broader networks of tourism travel is that it can allow people the choice to remain in their home communities, rather than leaving the region for economic opportunities elsewhere.

We see more of an emphasis on the economic importance of tourism on the Burin Peninsula than in the Battle Harbour study. A likely explanation for this is that tourist spending and the direct economic impacts of tourism development are diffused to a broader range of businesses compared with Battle Harbour. Tourism is also viewed as having the potential to provide employment that can help retain people in the community. At a Burin Peninsula regional workshop organized by the Harris Centre at Memorial University, much of the discussion around tourism was grounded in concerns about population decline and aging. Much of the interest in building up tourism in the region centres on its potential to contribute to youth embeddedness in the community, as well as to contribute to the development of skills and social capital. The ability for members of host communities to connect their local place to broader flows of tourism is seen to have potential economic benefits for a region that has seen the decline of natural resource economies and a high level of out-migration, especially of youth. As at Battle Harbour, successfully linking local places to tourism mobility networks is seen as having the potential to give community residents greater control over their own mobility and immobility.

Another significant positive economic impact highlighted on the Burin Peninsula is the flow of money into the region from travellers. For example, the following excerpt from a focus group interview describes the region's golf course and OHV (Off-Highway Vehicle) trails as important tourism attractors that draw repeat visitors and contribute to local employment:

> The course employs 8–10 people from May through November. We can't get people to come from Montreal every year to play golf, but we can certainly get people from all over the island. And they do come. You see the same faces year after year. I say the same things about [OHV] trails. If we do the trails the right way, people will keep coming back (Burin Peninsula focus group interview #4).

The seasonal nature of tourism is also acknowledged by participants, but there is also an assertion of the value of the tourism cycle for community employment. Similarly, the economic value of regional OHV and snowmobile trails are noted in another focus group, where a participant points to how this money is spent in the region: "These tourists spend money on accommodation, restaurants and fuel" (Burin Peninsula focus group interview #2). Furthermore, these excerpts show the range of nature-oriented tourism that resonates with these communities and the people who visit them. Whereas activities like whale watching and hiking feature more prominently in provincial tourism promotion imagery, at the local level in the Burin Peninsula golf courses and OHV trails are also viewed as important attractors.

Across both study regions, the ability of host communities to connect to broader tourism networks is viewed as having potential economic benefits for regions that have seen the decline of natural resource economies and a high level of out-migration. This is similar to research on tourism development elsewhere in rural Newfoundland and Labrador, where the economic benefits of tourism are also discussed in terms of contributing to community embeddedness by providing local employment opportunities (Rockett & Ramsey, 2016). However, there are also challenges to pursuing tourism as an economic development strategy. One of these is the ability to build regional tourism networks among rural tourism operators and promoters, local communities, and regional tourism agencies in order to better connect local places to broader tourism flows. As other research highlights, regional tourism networks increase the sharing of resources and information and make it more likely that communities will see the economic benefits of tourism (Tucker et al., 2011).

Battle Harbour is a key tourism attractor for the Labrador Straits region. However, visitors during our field research did not talk much about interaction with people in host communities, other than their interactions with the staff and people on Battle Harbour. There were also repeated comments from visitors and site workers that visitors go only to the main tourist anchors. This indicates that the direct economic impacts of tourism are not being diffused throughout the region but tend to be concentrated on a few specific sites—including Battle Harbour, but also the nearby Red Bay historic site. There are potential indirect benefits as income generated through these sites may be diffused broadly throughout surrounding communities. However, these indirect impacts are not as visible in our participants` interpretations of the economic benefits of the site. As one of our Battle Harbour participants notes:

> We need some tourism development of other things, so people could come and make this whole corridor more of a destination. So I think once we get solidly on our feet I think you'll see some interest in doing other things there (Battle Harbour, key informant interview #1).

A strong regional tourism network for Labrador Straits could build upon Battle Harbour and Red Bay as existing hubs, while also incorporating other attractions in the media and promotional material that circulates to potential visitors.

Similar issues with regional network building are demonstrated in the Burin Peninsula case. For example, when asked about regional collaboration and engagement with the provincial government around tourism development, our summary transcript of the group discussion captures the following perspective:

> As for doing it all together [tourism development] we're in the infancy stages. It's going to take time. Heritage Run is there … but they're just visitor information. … Heritage Run is all run by volunteers. We need to have someone able to take the initiative and see it through to have things coordinated … There is no buy-in from [many] communities and municipalities to work together on tourism (Burin Peninsula focus group interview #1).

The Heritage Run Tourism Association (HRTA) provides a framework for building regional tourism networks. However, among many participants, there is a sense that

the Burin is marginalized from tourism marketing efforts at the provincial level, which corresponds to a lack of access to provincial economic resources for tourism development. As expressed during one of the focus group interviews, ″The government says it wants to double tourism by 2020, and there is a significant amount of money spent in some places, but some are not impressed by the amount of funds sent to the Burin Peninsula″ (Burin Peninsula focus group interview #4). During our return visit to the region in April 2014 to present emergent results, there were repeated expressions of optimism about the creation of the Eastern Destination Management Organization. This is a provincial government agency that promises to coordinate tourism development for the Eastern region of the province, thereby playing a key role in 'network weaving' (Tucker et al., 2011) across tourism host communities in order to diffuse the economic benefits of tourism development to more regions throughout the province.

While our data from the two study regions certainly point to challenges associated with the economic dimensions of tourism development, our findings indicate that overall tourism is viewed positively and valued for its potential economic impacts.

5.2 Social-Cultural Benefits Dimensions of Tourism Development

Beyond the economic impacts, tourism has social-cultural impacts for host communities that may be either positive or negative. On the positive side, tourism development can help support heritage preservation and interactions between hosts and visitors may help build local social capital. Conversely, many critical scholars argue that tourism creates mummified versions of local culture that are inauthentic and result in the cultural transformation of local communities to appeal to tourist expectations.

While the economic benefits are viewed as important in the Battle Harbour study, the social-cultural benefits often receive even greater emphasis. Battle Harbour is seen as an important site for preserving the history of the region and the Labrador fishery because it preserves historic buildings, the wharf, and the artefacts of the Labrador fishery, including "over six hundred artefacts that are specific to the Labrador fishery" (Battle Harbour key informant interview #3).

While Battle Harbour is valued for protecting the material history of the Labrador Straits, it also provides a space for the ongoing practice of intangible heritage, which involves training and skill development for tourism workers. The practice of intangible heritage at Battle Harbour takes three distinct forms. First, many of the staff at Battle Harbour were trained in heritage carpentry. Heritage carpentry has been practiced over the past twenty years through the initial project of building restoration, but also through ongoing site maintenance and the development of new projects. Those trained in heritage carpentry have also passed on their training and skills to new employees over the years and some workers have also been able to apply their expertise at other sites.

Second, tours of the site are guided by staff with long-term personal connections and family histories at Battle Harbour. Rather than performing from script, guides bring a storytelling dimension to the tours, which skilfully integrate personal stories with the material culture of the site. Third, cooking at Battle Harbour can also be considered a form of intangible heritage. The menu is based on traditional Newfoundland and Labrador food (i.e., cod, halibut, jig`s dinner, partridgeberry cake) and has been further developed through training from a visiting chef. Tourism critics, such as Rothman (1998), George and Reid (2005), or Overton (2007) might

interpret these as examples of how tourism reconfigures communities to meet the expectations of tourists. However, our interview and field research data indicates that site workers often value interactions with visitors and the space Battle Harbour provides for protecting and practicing 'traditional' skills in rural Labrador. Our results are closer to the view of Sullivan and Mitchell (2012), or Rockett and Ramsey (2016) that although tourism often relies on an idealized form of history, it can nevertheless help prevent "the destruction through abandonment of the built heritage and outmigration that inevitably ensues" (Rockett & Ramsey, 2016, p. 8), as well as the abandonment of intangible heritage.

Furthermore, the opportunity to connect with new people also came up repeatedly as one of the benefits of working at the site. The experience of interacting with tourists is often described as an exchange, with tourism workers and visitors learning from each other. Tourists and site workers intersect with each other in ways that are often seen as mutually beneficial. Other benefits of tourist-community interaction are that tourists bring ideas to help improve business practices at the site, that interacting with tourists provides local community members the opportunity to learn about places that visitors come from, and that interaction with tourists provides a framework for sharing local culture and history. For example, a participant describes her experience working at the site as follows:

> When I got a call asking me to go to work…I was coming back home to work. And then when I started meeting all those people from all over the world, and telling stories, I mean you don't know how happy you made them, and it makes you happy too (Battle Harbour key informant interview #2).

This quote illustrates how participating in tourism can be interpreted as rewarding, not just from an economic perspective, but also from a relational and emotional perspective. The Battle Harbour study shows how tourism may produce social-cultural benefits for host communities that are distinct from—but may complement—the economic impacts.

The economic dimension of tourism was the main focus in the Burin Peninsula data. However, less prevalent themes highlight that the social-cultural dimension of tourism development is also valued in this region. For example, one focus group discussion emphasized that the main benefits are economic, but there are:

> Social and cultural benefits as well. These are achieved, by making the history and identity of the region part of the visitor experience. Tourism can invigorate the community and get people to identify who they are and what they do. This can be reinforced by increased tourism revenues. Historical skills like baking bread can come to good use for the tourists. Tourism provides an opportunity for passing down traditional skills to younger generations (Burin Peninsula focus group interview #1).

As this excerpt from the focus group discussion illustrates, museums, historic sites, and theatre and musical performances are valued not only as attractors that draw visitors and generate income. Rather, tourism is also viewed as something that can

be leveraged to preserve the history and culture of the region, particularly when this is reinforced by its economic impacts.

Our group discussions on the Burin Peninsula further illustrates how tourism might be harnessed to create amenities that improve the quality of life for the region. Specific examples include the multi-use hiking and Off-Highway Vehicle Trails at Chamber's Cove that lead visitors to the "memorial cross, plaque, and interpretation signs at the top of the trail, overlooking the cove where the ships [U.S. Naval ships USS Truxton and USS Pollux] sank" (Burin Peninsula field notes, August 13, 2013) during World War Two. Other examples include the Burin Trailway ATV trails, the Grande Meadows golf course, and the Grand Bank Regional Theatre Festival. Participants describe the social-cultural benefits of tourism as follows:

> It strengthens your sense of place. Most of the components of tourism are also the components for healthy living, for great communities to live in. When you build the blocks of tourism, like trails and experiences, you are looking after your community setting too (Burin Peninsula focus group interview #3).

Tourism stakeholders in both research sites give voice to an optimistic view of tourism as a project that helps foster a sense of collective pride as local residents share the positive features of the community with visitors.

However, just as host communities face challenges related to the economic dimensions of tourism, there are also challenges related to the social-cultural dimension of tourism development. A particular challenge of tourism development in both regions is creating infrastructure that meets visitor expectations. At Battle Harbour, tourism infrastructure is often discussed within broader conversations about preserving the material history and culture of the site. There is a tension between preserving the history and perceived authenticity of the site, on one hand, and the desire of many visitors for modern amenities, on the other hand. This point of tension is captured in the following comments from a participant who noted that:

> People don't mind that there's no street lights and you can't have street lights.…People are enamoured with the fact that it [represents a point in] time. And a couple of the older cottages [where visitors stay]…I guess one of the requirements we should say for that building, "If you're over five foot eight, don't go in" because [laughter] all the ceilings are [short] like this and we had the gentleman, like, six foot four. But that had the magic and the charm of the houses still there from an old building perspective. So when you get the people who really want to go back in time, they'll stay there. But…people want a big bed and a nice shower (Battle Harbour key informant interview #1).

While the accommodations on the site offer a sense of history, there is feeling that most tourists would prefer to have modernized, private washrooms instead of the rustic, shared facilities that are currently in place. This illustrates that there are limits to tourists' desire to engage in more 'authentic' encounters with historical tourist

sites. It is also consistent with the view that staging tourism involves ongoing negotiation among tourists and host communities (Croes, Lee, & Olson, 2013). Overton (2007) argues that within neo-liberalism the heritage that is preserved through tourism is that which is most marketable. Here, we also see how heritage tourism infrastructure is also remade to accommodate changing expectations and norms among tourists.

The challenges of tourism infrastructure are not only localized at specific tourism sites but are often connected to the broader transportation networks that link local places to flows of visitors. In both sites, regional infrastructure creates difficulties for tourist access, while further highlighting the connections between tourism and community development. Battle Harbour is a remote tourist destination. Getting there requires a significant amount of travel time by highway and then by two ferries. In other words, tourists to Battle Harbour need to be highly motivated and committed to visiting the site in order to navigate the challenging and multimodal mobility system required to reach the site. Many participants noted the poor state of the gravel road that links the community to others. This repeatedly came up as a major deterrent to tourist travel to Battle Harbour and it is also a major challenge of living in the St. Lewis Inlet area in general. As one participant puts it:

> A lot of the people don't come because of the gravel road [the Labrador Highway from Red Bay to Mary's Harbour]. They don't come past the pavement. They'll come as far as the pavement then will go back. It is isolated, and a lot of people that come here don't know what to expect … Now, when they get here, they see it as we see it, right? And it is an isolated area (Battle Harbour key informant interview #2).

This quote points to another paradox highlighted by the Battle Harbour study. Part of the appeal of this emergent destination is its perceived 'remoteness' from the urban centres that are identified with modernity (Hussain, 2015). However, there are trade-offs between the degree of remoteness, characterized here by the gravel highway, and the flow of visitors. While remoteness is part of the appeal of the site, it is also poses challenges. From participants' perspectives, anything that can be done to ease the challenges of travelling to this remote destination—thereby decreasing its sense of remoteness—is seen as desirable.

Similarly, discussion about the challenges of tourism development on the Burin Peninsula often centre on transportation. One of the main issues that came up repeatedly is the long drive between the Trans-Canada highway and the Burin Peninsula. As it was put during one of the focus group discussions:

> The Burin is some distance off from the TransCanada. Visitors need to have information on what they see along the way in advance. When they get to [the town of] Fortune it is too late. Better signage needed so that it's all a part of the "package" (Burin Peninsula focus group interview #1).

In talking about the challenges of transportation, possibilities for re-organizing the landscape to meet the desires of tourists is not viewed negatively as something that introduces unwanted changes to the community. Rather, altering the landscape to

increase the flow of visitors is also seen as benefitting communities by improving transportation infrastructure for local residents. Notably, the issue of transportation infrastructure also comes up as a particular challenge for tourism development for Fogo Island and Change Islands, particularly around ferry service (Rockett & Ramsey, 2016). This highlights that the perceived remoteness of a destination is intertwined with transportation infrastructure and routing. This appears to be a common issue for many rural communities that are attempting to increase their tourism flows.

Similar to the economic dimensions of tourism, we see that there is generally a positive view tourism as a mode of development that can be leveraged for social-cultural goals. Again, our data show that community members are not naïve about the challenges of tourism development. Rather, awareness of the challenges does not lead to adopting a critical stance towards tourism and its potential to contribute to community development.

5.3 *Environmental Dimensions of Tourism Development*

Previous research on tourism and community development also points to potential positive or negative impacts for local environments. This may include providing a rationale for environmental preservation or providing spaces for environmental education, as well as potential negative impacts from increased waste or enclosures of community environmental resources for the sake of tourists.

As elsewhere in Newfoundland and Labrador, at Battle Harbour and the Burin Peninsula, the non-human environment and wildlife are invoked as key tourism attractors. As we examine in depth elsewhere, provincial tourism discourse and imagery focuses on a constellation of elements that includes: whales, seabirds and other wildlife; barren, rocky coastlines, National Parks, dramatic seascapes and icebergs; and rural, outport fishing villages and historic sites (Stoddart & Graham, 2016; Stoddart & Sodero, 2015). Similar to other rural tourism destinations, rural coastal communities in Newfoundland and Labrador promote a 'symbiotic' grouping of "socio-cultural, ecological, and economic systems" (Kimmel et al., 2015, p. 127). As such, we would expect to see attention to the environmental dimensions of tourism development as well. Contrary to these expectations, while the natural environment and wildlife used as tourism attractors, an explicit focus on potential environmental benefits or costs of tourism tend to receive less attention than the economic or social-cultural dimensions.

At Battle Harbour, the rural landscape of Battle Island and the surrounding seascape of the Strait of Belle Isle are invoked to create narratives of community survival and resilience in a harsh, remote environment. For many visitors, possible encounters with wildlife and icebergs are also part of the draw to this tourism destination. Visitors often talked about seeing whales or dolphins as part of their experience, while clothing sold at the souvenir shop on the island emphasizes whales and polar bears as iconic wildlife. For visitors and site workers, there is a strong sense that the natural environment of the region is important to creating a successful tourism experience. Environmental issues and awareness are also sometimes woven into the tourism experience by workers at the site. The 1990s cod fishery collapse and moratorium are discussed as a social-ecological disaster for the region. Tour guides also occasionally talk about current local environmental change, including shorter winters, less sea ice, fewer icebergs coming in, and warmer water temperatures in the harbour. Though attention to the environmental dimension of tourism is less prevalent than the focus on economic or social-cultural dimensions, it is

present at Battle Harbour in the form of periodic attempts to use tourism as a site of environmental discussion.

An explicit focus on the environmental dimension of tourism development is less visible in the Burin Peninsula, even though both historic sites and the natural environment help draw visitors. Nature-oriented tourism attractors include spectacular coastal landscapes, the Fortune Head Ecological Reserve (which focuses on the distinctive geological history of the region), and outdoor recreation, including hiking, golfing and riding Off-Highway Vehicles. However, explicit connections between tourism and environmental sustainability, or attempts to cultivate environmental awareness among visitors are less visible in this region.

In summary, while the natural environment is important as a tourism attractor in both of our study regions, the environmental dimensions of tourism development receive less attention than the economic and social-cultural dimensions. While there is a generally positive view of the economic and social-cultural impacts of tourism, as well as cognisance of the challenges, there is less attention to either the positive or negative environmental implications of tourism development for host communities.

6.0 Conclusion

Both of our study regions may be characterized as emerging tourism destinations and are relatively remote sites within global flows of tourist travel. Similar to other remote tourist destinations, they use the characteristics of their remoteness, including the natural environment and perceived historical and cultural authenticity, in order to appeal to visitors (Hussain, 2015; Kimmel et al., 2015; Rockett & Ramsey, 2016; Sullivan & Mitchell, 2012). At the same time, these destinations are relatively difficult and costly to access and are not particularly well known by potential visitors. As emerging regions work to connect to global flows of tourist travel, it is important to understand local-level community interpretations of the potential benefits and challenges to tourism development. The ability to connect local places to global tourism networks and to leverage tourism development for community wellbeing depends to a large extent on the support and engagement of host communities. As such, our comparison of two emerging tourism regions has focused on local understandings of the economic, social-cultural and environmental dimensions of tourism development. While we have analytically separated these three dimensions, as Hall et al. (2009) argue, all three dimensions are embedded in the social practices of tourism development and need to be integrated to achieve a sustainable model of tourism development for host communities.

Examining these study regions along economic, social-cultural and environmental dimensions highlights the different ways in which emerging tourism regions are oriented towards tourism development. In the Battle Harbour region, tourism benefits are interpreted primarily along social-cultural and economic dimensions. By contrast, on the Burin Peninsula, though there is recognition of the cultural and social benefits of tourism, more emphasis is placed on the economic dimension. This likely reflects the more visible direct economic impacts on the Burin Peninsula, while much of the economic impact of Battle Harbour on surrounding host communities are indirect and so is less immediately visible. Recalling Hall et al.'s (2009) typology of tourism development orientations, neither of our study regions can be characterized by a truly sustainable tourism orientation, where tourism governance is structured to balance economic, community and environmental wellbeing, though the Battle Harbour region comes closer to this ideal type. Using

Kimmel et al.'s (2015) terminology, both regions draw tourists based on their symbiosis of "socio-cultural, ecological, and economic systems″ (Kimmel et al., 2015, p. 127). As such, we argue there is value in developing forms of tourism governance that are better aligned with a sustainable tourism orientation that manages tourism development in the interests of economic, social-cultural and environmental wellbeing.

Interpretations of tourism in these regions are consistent with the position that tourism development may create positive economic and social-cultural impacts, which outweigh the potential negative impacts examined by tourism critics. However, for local tourism and community development interests, this also means navigating the challenges of connecting to transnational flows of tourism travel. A key difference between tourism benefits and challenges is that the economic and social-cultural benefits of tourism are largely experienced locally, while the challenges are often extra-local. Our participants are keenly aware of many of the challenges associated with rural tourism development. However, the challenges are often beyond the control of local tourism operators and promoters. In particular, the ability to improve accessibility and infrastructure for airplane, ferry or car transportation networks depends on decisions and resource allocations by governments and private corporations that operate well beyond the control of individual tourism host communities. Similarly, gaining greater visibility for local places through tourism promotion, whether in traditional mass media or newer forms of digital media, means carving out space in increasingly crowded global communication networks (Urry & Larsen, 2011). This may be especially difficult for emerging tourism destinations in remote regions at the margins of transnational media networks.

This points to a tension within rural tourism development. In general, rural development has been turning towards more participatory, localized, and community-led initiatives. However, as Krawchenko (2014) argues, in order to be successful, moves to democratize and localize rural development need to be coupled with flows of resources into local communities, especially in areas that are struggling with issues like infrastructure maintenance, out-migration, and aging populations. Tourism development can create social, cultural and economic benefits, most of which are mostly experienced locally. However, many of the challenges of navigating tourism development in remote and emerging regions are extra-local and beyond the control of individual communities. Tourism benefits can be managed through local governance and tourism development. However, addressing the challenges means building tourist governance that bridges scales from local-regional-global in order to increase the visibility of—and thus tourist travel to—emerging destinations. As Joppe et al. (2014) note, "a common difficulty of governance is making it work in a synergistic way from the national to the local levels" (p. 49). While recognizing the challenges inherent to building multi-level forms of tourism governance, our findings underline the importance of thinking about tourism development across interconnected scales that make connections across local rural host communities and environments, provincial and national advertising campaigns and policy processes, and global flows of people, media imagery, capital, transportation technologies and environmental impacts.

Acknowledgements

References

Applin, M. (2010). Strategic analysis and sustainability planning. Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada: Battle Harbour Historic Trust Inc.

Community Accounts. (n.d.). Local area 19: Mortier Bay profiles. Retrieved 2015 from http://nl.communityaccounts.ca/profiles.asp?_=vb7En4WVgaai03KW

Croes, R., Lee, S. H., & Olson, E. D. (2013). Authenticity in tourism in small island destinations: A local perspective. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change, 11*(1–2), 1–20.

Franklin, A. (2003). *Tourism: An introduction*. London, United Kingdom: Sage

George, E. W., & Reid, D. G. (2005). The power of tourism: A metamorphosis of community culture. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change, 3*(2), 88–107.

Gerritsen, P. R. W. (2014). Working with indigenous women on multifunctionality and sustainable rural tourism in western Mexico. *Journal of Rural and Community Development, 9*(3), 243–257.

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. (2010). Annual non-resident visitation and expenditures by mode of travel, Newfoundland and Labrador: 1973–2010. Retrieved January, 2012, from https://www.gov.nl.ca/faq/Non%20Resident%20Visitors%20by%20mode%20of%20travel%201973%20to%202010.pdf

Hall, C. M., Muller, D. K., & Saarinen, J. (2009). *Nordic tourism: Issues and cases*. Bristol, United Kingdom: Channel View Publications.

Hennessy, E., & McCleary, A. L. (2011). Nature's Eden? The production and effects of 'pristine' nature in the Galápagos Islands. *Island Studies Journal, 6*(2), 131–156.

Hussain, S. (2015). *Remoteness and modernity: Transformation and continuity in northern Pakistan.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Joppe, M., Brooker, E., & Thomas, K. (2014). Drivers of innovation in rural tourism: The role of good governance and engaged entrepreneurs. *Journal of Rural and Community Development, 9*(4), 49–63.

Kimmel, C., Perlstein, A., Mortimer, M., Zhou, D., & Robertson, D. (2015). Sustainability of tourism as development strategy for cultural-landscapes in China: Case study of Ping'an Village. *Journal of Rural and Community Development, 10*(2), 121–135.

Krawchenko, T. (2014). Bringing municipalities into rural community and economic development: Cases from Atlantic Canada. *Journal of Rural and Community Development, 9*(3), 78–96.

Laudati, A. (2010). Ecotourism: The modern predator? Implications of gorilla tourism on local livelihoods in Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Uganda. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 28*(4), 726–743.

MacEachern, A. (2001). *Natural selections: National parks in Atlantic Canada, 1935–1970*. Montreal, Quebec & Kingston, Ontario, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Meletis, Z. A., & Campbell, L. M. (2009). Benevolent and benign? Using environmental justice to investigate waste-related impacts of ecotourism in destination communities. *Antipode, 41*(4), 741–780.

Ommer, R. E. (2007). *Coasts under stress: Restructuring and social-ecological health*. Montreal, Quebec & Kingston, Ontario, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Overton, J. (1996). *Making a world of difference: Essays on tourism, culture and development in Newfoundland*. St. John's, NL, Canada: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Overton, J. (2007). "A future in the past"? Tourism development, outport archaeology, and the politics of deindustrialization in Newfoundland and Labrador in the 1990s. *Urban History Review, 35*(2), 60–74.

Ramos, H., Stoddart, M. C. J., & Chafe, D. (2016). Assessing the tangible and intangible benefits of tourism: Perceptions of economic, social, and cultural impacts in Labrador's Battle Harbour Historic District. *Island Studies Journal, 11*(1), 209-226.

Reed, M. G., & Gill, A. M. (1997). Tourism, recreational, and amenity values in land allocation: An analysis of institutional arrangements in the postproductivist era. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, 29*(11), 2019–2040.

Rockett, J., & Ramsey, D. (2016). Resident perceptions of rural tourism development: The case of Fogo Island and Change Islands, Newfoundland, Canada. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change, 15*(4), 299–318. doi: 10.1080/14766825.2016.1150287

Rothman, H. K. (1998). *Devil's bargains: Tourism in the twentieth-century American west*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Stoddart, M. C. J., & Graham, P. 2016. Nature, history, and culture as tourism attractors: The double translation of insider and outsider media. *Nature and Culture, 11*(1), 22–43.

Stoddart, M. C. J. & Sodero, S. 2015. From fisheries decline to tourism destination: Mass media, tourism mobility, and the Newfoundland coastal environment. *Mobilities, 10*(3), 445-465.

Strzelecka, M. (2015). The prospects for empowerment through local governance for tourism—the LEADER approach. *Journal of Rural and Community Development, 10*(3), 78–97.

Sullivan, C., & Mitchell, C. (2012). From fish to folk art: Creating a heritage-based place identity in Ferryland, Newfoundland and Labrador. *Journal of Rural and Community Development, 7*(2), 37–56.

Tucker, A., Gibson, R., Vodden, K, & Holley, J. (2011). *Network weaving for regional development on the tip of the Northern Peninsula*. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/278786059_Network_weaving_for_r egional_development_on_the_Tip_of_the_Northern_Peninsula

Urry, J., & Larsen, J. (2011). *The tourist gaze 3.0*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Waitt, G., & Cook, L. (2007). Leaving nothing but ripples on the water: Performing ecotourism natures. *Social & Cultural Geography, 8*(4), 535–550.