

Actor involvement in protected landscapes: evidence from the Peak District National Park, UK

Mehnen, Nora

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Mehnen, N. (2013). Actor involvement in protected landscapes: evidence from the Peak District National Park, UK. *Europa Regional*, 19.2011(1), 3-18. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-360090>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Actor involvement in protected landscapes – Evidence from the Peak District National Park, UK

NORA MEHNEN

Abstract

The English National Parks are designated to conserve, enhance and promote the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of areas of outstanding landscape value. The first national park to be designated was the Peak District National Park (PDNP) in 1951. The complexity of uses, involved interests and actors, and the external and internal pressures have increased significantly since then. The Peak District has been influenced and shaped by human habitation for thousands of years. The diversity of the present actors requires policies as (social) learning processes, and in order to be able to influence behaviour, governments and governance need to adapt to the motives and goals of the different actors. The role of coalitions and cooperation, as forms of interactive decision-making among actors, is crucial. Especially because the different actors have different interests and time horizons, and profess different discourses, such coalitions and cooperation must be attractive for all actors from every sector (state, economy and civil society). In this paper our research in the PDNP takes its inspiration from research by THOMPSON (2005) who adopted FOUCAULT's 'governmentality' approach and CLARK & CLARKE (2010) who used the concept of adaptive governance. We conclude that coalitions, cooperation and projects must be seen as a process, an immediate result is sometimes less important.

Actors, English National Parks, Peak District, Governance

Zusammenfassung

Akteursbeteiligung in geschützten Landschaften – Belege aus dem Peak District Nationalpark

Die englischen National Parks wurden ausgewiesen, um die natürliche Schönheit und das Natur- und Kulturerbe von Gebieten mit außergewöhnlichem landschaftlichem Wert zu erhalten, zu verbessern und zu fördern. Der erste Nationalpark, der ausgewiesen wurde, war der Peak District Nationalpark (PDNP) im Jahr 1951. Die Komplexität der Nutzungen, der beteiligten Interessen und der Akteure sowie der externe und interne Druck haben sich seither deutlich erhöht. Der Peak District wurde durch die menschliche Besiedlung seit Tausenden von Jahren beeinflusst und geformt. Die Vielfalt der heutigen Akteure erfordert eine Politik als (sozialen) Lernprozess und sie muss in der Lage sein, das Verhalten beeinflussen zu können; Government und Governance müssen sich an Motive und Ziele der verschiedenen Akteure anpassen. Die Rolle von Koalitionen und Kooperationen, als Formen der interaktiven Entscheidungsfindung zwischen den Akteuren ist entscheidend. Vor allem, weil die verschiedenen Akteure unterschiedliche Interessen und Zeithorizonte haben und zu verschiedenen Diskursen gehören, müssen solche Koalitionen und Kooperationen attraktiver für alle Akteure aus allen Bereichen (Staat, Wirtschaft und Zivilgesellschaft) werden. In diesem Beitrag stellen wir unsere Forschung im PDNP in Bezug zur Forschung von THOMPSON (2005), die FOUCAULTS Gouvernementalitäts-Ansatz verwendete und CLARK & CLARKE (2010), die das Konzept der adaptiven Governance verwendeten. Wir schlussfolgern, dass Koalitionen, Kooperationen und Projekte als Prozesse gesehen werden müssen, ein sofortiges Ergebnis ist manchmal weniger wichtig.

Akteure, Englische National Parks, Peak District, Governance

Introduction

Beliefs, feelings and values towards protected areas worldwide are undergoing a fundamental series of changes with respect to their objectives and their performances (STOLTON & DUDLEY 2000, p. 1). Two issues are of particular relevance. First, the increased emphasis on protected landscapes and seascapes¹ and the acceptance that not all protected areas are strictly one-dimensional single-objective nature reserves, but that they include other human land uses as integral elements (AMEND et al. 2008; BROWN et al. 2004; LUCAS 1992; PHILLIPS 2002). Common activities in IUCN category V² protected areas include farming, fishing, subsistence hunting, forestry, residential use and also small industries. Quite a number of protected areas of Western Europe are based on this model, e.g. the nature parks in Austria and in Germany or the regional nature parks in France. The English national parks are a prominent example within this category. Second, there is a growing awareness of the importance of good management within protected areas and recognition that this is often not being achieved (STOLL-KLEEMANN 2010; HOCKINGS et al. 2006; NOLTE et al. 2010). Coupled with this is a move to develop ways of measuring the effectiveness of management as a first stage in both identifying the problems and the ways in which these could be addressed (STOLTON & DUDLEY 2000, p. 1). Recently a third issue has emerged in the discourse of protected areas, namely its governance (ABRAMS et al. 2003; BORRINI-FEYERABEND 2003; BORRINI-FEYERABEND et al. 2006; BALLOFFET & MARTIN 2007;

DEARDEN et al. 2005; GRAHAM et al. 2003; BRENNER & JOB 2012).

Because of geographical and historical characteristics, social structures, political organizations and planning cultures, European protected landscapes are highly heterogeneous. They show many differences, e.g. in the number of designated areas they have established, their legal structures, their tasks, as well as in their size in proportion to the country's surface area. However, they have certain characteristics in common. They almost always involve (rural) landscapes that are important for their traditional, often recreational and less intensive, land use.

Until now there has been little knowledge about the English approach to landscapes on the European continent and vice versa. For example, cooperation between national partner organizations and associations such as the Association of National Park Authorities (ANPA), the Fédération des Parcs Naturels Régionaux de France or the Association of Austrian Nature Parks (VNÖ) is not well developed. So on both sides improvements are required. The EUROPARC Federation, the umbrella federation of Europe's protected areas tries to stimulate this cooperation. The aim of this paper is to provide some insight into the English way of protecting inhabited landscapes.

The English national parks are designated for the conservation of the natural beauty and cultural heritage of areas of outstanding landscape value and the promotion of opportunities for public appreciation and enjoyment of the parks' special qualities (NATIONAL PARKS AND ACCESS TO THE COUNTRYSIDE ACT 1949). Since 1995 they have had the additional purpose of promoting the economic and social well-being of park communities, and this is one of the reasons why they are classified under IUCN category V. Although they come under the local government, each national park has its own authority with responsibility for planning, conservation and recreation management. Thus, national parks focus on conservation and environmental education, while the National Park Authorities also

have the duty of fostering social and economic well-being in the discharge of their two main responsibilities (ENVIRONMENT ACT 1995).

There are currently 15 national parks in England and Wales. Ten were designated in the 1950s following the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, the Broads was created in 1989, and the New Forest in 2005. The new South Downs National Park was designated on 31 March 2010, but the Authority had a year to prepare itself before it became fully operational in April 2011, including becoming the statutory Planning and Access Authority. The first national park to be designated was the Peak District National Park (PDNP) in 1951.

The parks cover about 10 % of the total land area of England and Wales: 9 % of England and 20 % of Wales. They attract around 100 million visitors a year. The two Scottish national parks cover 7 % of the land area of Scotland. At present Northern Ireland has no national park (see http://www.statistics.gov.uk/geography/nat_parks.asp).

The National Park Authorities must account for their performance to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra). They are not accountable to local authorities and local residents. They are free-standing local authorities, possessing some of the functions of conventional local authorities, but they also have many of the characteristics of non-departmental government bodies (THOMPSON 2008).

Since last year the English national parks have faced spending cuts of up to 30 %. This means that the National Park Authorities have to make the difficult decision on which area of work they eliminate. Communities, as well as policy makers and visitors, need to realize that a positive economic outlook for the people who live and work within the national parks is intrinsically linked to how well the parks are managed and funded. All National Parks are funded by the central government (PDNP about £ 8 million), plus income from sales, charges and fees and external funding. Related to this is a debate

1 According to the IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) Guidelines, the definition of a protected landscape/seascape (IUCN category V) is 'a protected area where the interaction of people and nature over time has produced an area of distinct character with significant ecological, biological, cultural and scenic value and where safeguarding the integrity of this interaction is vital to protecting and sustaining the area and its associated nature conservation and other values' (DUDLEY 2008).

2 The IUCN has defined six categories of protected areas based on increasing human influence: form strict nature reserves (Ia) to protected areas with sustainable use of natural resources (VI) (IUCN 1994; DUDLEY 2008; www.iucn.org). National parks classified under IUCN category V are quite different from national parks classified under IUCN category II (National park) in Europe or the US.

about the influence of the duty to promote economic and social well-being on the other objectives (such as protecting the landscape and promoting public enjoyment). The current situation has a major impact on the development of parks and their governance. Hence, the specific aim of this paper is to examine how to involve actors in protected landscapes, based on empirical evidence from the Peak District National Park, UK.

We³ compare our results with existing research by THOMPSON (2005) who used FOUCAULT'S governmentality approach and CLARK & CLARKE (2010) who applied the concept of adaptive governance. We want to answer the question of how actors can be involved in the governance of protected landscapes, and how they can create the capacity to act at the local level, something which was addressed by CLARK & CLARKE (2010) or THOMPSON (2005). The reasons and criteria for choosing the Peak District National Park (PDNP) are manifold. It was selected because it is classified as an IUCN category V area⁴ it carries an immense diversity of land use activities (conservation, farming, tourism, water supply, quarrying, game/fishing, housing), and it faces a wide range of social, economic, political and environmental pressures. The Peak District is a typical UK upland and mountainous region in Europe, which tends to be economically marginal, environmentally sensitive and subject to many often conflicting types of land use. The competing demands of conservation, water supply, recreation and tourism, agriculture, quarrying and game management have led to conflicts of interests between many actors.

In the next sub-section we introduce the theoretical concepts of governmentality and adaptive governance. We also pre-

sent our theoretical framework. Then we describe the Peak District National Park. In the section which follows, we explain the methodological framework and reveal the results of our analysis. We conclude with recommendations for how to involve actors in governance processes in protected landscapes.

Theoretical considerations

Governmentality was introduced by FOUCAULT to study the autonomous individual's capacity for self-control and how this is linked to forms of political rule and economic exploitation (FOUCAULT 1991). Governmentality can be understood as the art of government in a broader sense, i.e. with an idea of government that is not limited to state politics alone, that includes a wide range of techniques of control, and that applies to a wide variety of objects, from one's control of the self to the control of populations. Another understanding is the organized practices (mentalities, rationalities, and techniques) through which subjects are governed (MAYHEW 2004). FOUCAULT'S concept has been redefined by others, for example by HUNT & WICKHAM (1994), KERR (1999) or DEAN (1999).

THOMPSON (2005) adopts the governmentality approach to understand change within government. She argues that a focus on behaviours, practices and conduct is highly applicable to the analysis of inter-institutional relations (THOMPSON 2005, p. 324). In THOMPSON'S understanding, FOUCAULT'S concept of governmentality is concerned with the study of the operation of government, both in terms of the institutions of the state and the power relations that permeate society. THOMPSON differentiates between two approaches to the use of governmentality in rural governance. The first, the 'classical approach', involves the adoption of FOUCAULT'S ideas of how government collects information in order to be able to act upon the population and justify its interventions. As a typical example she introduced the study by MURDOCH & WARD (1997) of the 'National Farm' in post-war Britain. The second

type of study is what THOMPSON calls 'neo-Foucauldian' studies which have emerged since the late 1990s and involve highlighting how government increasingly acts through populations, consciously blurring the boundary between 'the government' and 'the population' (MURDOCH 1997). These studies of the role of government in rural localities highlight how the state uses various techniques of partnership, consultation and devolved responsibility in order to directly implicate non-state actors in the act of governing. As an example of 'neo-Foucauldian' studies of governmentality, THOMPSON (2005) presented MURDOCH'S (1997) analyses of the English Rural White Paper of 1995 and the rationalities employed by government in shifting responsibility for service delivery from 'the government' to 'the population'. Our position is that the use of the governmentality approach is interesting and unique in the context of protected landscapes; although FOUCAULT did not write specifically about environmental issues, his work on power and governmentality provides useful insights in the examination and clarification of these themes.

When defining adaptive governance many researchers (e.g. FOLKE et al. 2005; OLSEN et al. 2006) cite the work of LEE (2003) who refers to adaptive systems of governance as the new governance and defines it as a form of social coordination in which actions are coordinated voluntarily by individuals and organizations with self-organizing and self-enforcing capabilities. Adaptive governance relies on networks that connect individuals, organizations, agencies, and institutions at multiple organizational levels (FOLKE et al. 2005). This form of governance also provides for collaborative, flexible, learning-based approaches to managing ecosystems, also referred to as 'adaptive co-management' (FOLKE et al. 2003; OLSSON et al. 2004).

CLARK & CLARKE (2010) considered the utility of adaptive governance in shedding light on local sustainability projects in European protected landscapes. They focused on the example of England,

3 This paper is part of a PhD research conducted at the University of Groningen and supervised by Prof. Dr. Dirk Strijker (University of Groningen, The Netherlands) and Prof. Dr. Ingo Mose (Carl von Ossietzky University Oldenburg, Germany).

4 The English and Welsh national parks are effectively 'managed landscapes', and are classified as IUCN Category V Protected Landscapes because of this. This study was part of a broader project regarding protected landscapes in Europe.

and studied its national parks (NP) and areas of outstanding natural beauty (AONB). Adaptive governance speaks directly to the debates about the involvement of actors. CLARK & CLARKE (2010) have used the definition from FOLKE et al. (2005, p. 441) who defined adaptive gov-

of “successful” sustainability projects. The exploration of these sustainability processes requires going beyond consideration of actor involvement, scientific and public learning and problem responsiveness and to consider underlying power relations animating these projects.

tutionalism (SCHARPF 1997), the concept of policy arrangements (VAN TATENHOVE et al. 2000) and the concept of political modernization (ARTS et al. 2006; see also LEIBENATH et al. 2010), and it is grouped according to three levels: institution, actors and area. Each of these levels con-




Figure 1: Theoretical framework

ernance as one that ‘connect[s] individuals, organisations, agencies, and institutions at multiple organisational levels’, comprising ‘social networks with teams and actor groups that draw on various knowledge systems and experiences for the development of a common understanding of policies’. CLARK & CLARKE state that ‘it is less clear whether adaptive governance prescriptions can be used to furnish more complete understandings of the cross-scale/cross-level interactions underpinning the spatialities

Whether this is possible using the adaptive governance “tool kit” will require further detailed consideration in other empirical contexts’ (CLARK & CLARKE 2010, p. 323).

Our research aims to contribute to the field by analysing the governance structures, power relations and interests of the different actors and by making concrete recommendations for the involvement of actors. Our theoretical framework derives from broader, more general concepts or frameworks, such as actor-centred insti-

sists of various elements (see Figure 1).

The overarching principle is governance. Governance concerns how social relations and interactions are coordinated. Moreover, governance as ‘social coordination’ (MAYNTZ 1998) is also understood as the combination of different mechanisms of coordination and network-like structures involving different actors from the public and private sector. FÜRST et al. (2006) differentiate between actors of the three sectors, ‘state’, ‘economy’ and ‘civil society’. We adopt this clas-

sification because of its applicability to actors in protected landscapes. Regional governance emphasizes the increasing importance of coordinating actions of different actors and regulation processes for common problem-solving at the regional level (POLLERMANN 2006; FÜRST 2006).

Institutional level

Institutions are recognized as ‘relatively stable collections of communicative practices and rules defining appropriate behaviour for specific groups of actors in specific situations’ (RISSE 2002, p. 604). They encompass ‘not only formal legal rules that are sanctioned by the court system and machinery of the state, but also social norms that actors will generally respect and whose violation will be sanctioned by loss of reputation, social disapproval, withdrawal of cooperation and rewards’ (SCHARPF 1997, p. 45). HELMKE & LEVITSKY (2004) define informal institutions as ‘socially shared rules, usually unwritten, that are created, communicated, and enforced outside of officially sanctioned channels’ (HELMKE & LEVITSKY 2004, p. 727). They define formal institutions as follows: ‘formal institutions are rules and procedures that are created, communicated, and enforced through channels widely accepted as official’ (HELMKE & LEVITSKY 2004, p. 727). While a stable formal institutional framework is a pre-condition for sustainable management, informal institutions play a crucial role in most areas.

Actor level

Actors are by definition of central importance. They may or may not be genuinely interested in a project, and they may or may not possess personal characteristics conducive to cooperation, such as language skills and intercultural competence or resources in terms of time, knowledge, money or authority (SKELCHER & SULLIVAN 2008; DERKZEN 2008; LEIBENATH et al. 2010). In this context the stakeholder theory is highly pertinent. It provides a solid basis for identifying, classifying and categorizing stakeholders and understanding their behaviour. The basic idea

of the stakeholder theory is that the organization has relationships with many constituent groups, and that it can engender and maintain the support of these groups by considering and balancing their relevant interests (FREEMAN 1984; JONES & WICKS 1999). While having its origins in strategic management, stakeholder theory has been applied to a number of fields. Furthermore, it has been presented and used in a number of ways that are quite distinct and that involve very different methodologies, concepts, types of evidence and criteria of appraisal (DONALDSON & PRESTON 1995). In literature there are numerous definitions of stakeholders. In this context we wish to introduce the definition from the project management standard (PMI 2008), which defines stakeholders as ‘individuals and organizations that are actively involved in the project or whose interest may be affected as a result of project execution or project completion’, and the common definition formulated by FREEMAN (1984) that is, ‘any group or individual who is affected by or can affect the achievement of an organization’s objectives’.

The concepts of power are also crucial. In a different context (television production networks) MOSSIG (2004) differentiates between, firstly, power through superiority and strength (to which resources are related); secondly, power and influence through relationships (which are related to good connections and information); and thirdly collective ordinal forces and mechanisms (which are related to the power of actor groups).

Sense of place, place attachment, belonging and identity are also important with regard to protected areas. CARRUS et al. (2005) show the positive role of general and specific pro-environmental attitudes, as well as that of regional identity, in predicting support for the protected areas considered. A sense of place is defined by JORGENSEN & STEDMAN (2001) as the meaning that is attached to a spatial environment – a place – by (groups of) people. They distinguish three dimensions of sense of place: place attachment, place identity and place dependency (see

also VANCLAY et al. 2008). According to place theorists, individuals who are emotionally, cognitively or functionally attached to a place will act to protect that place (TUAN 1977; RELPH 1976). Empirical research has shown that this is true in several different contexts. These settings include neighbourhoods and communities (MESCH & MANOR 1998; SHUMAKER & TAYLOR 1983), heritage sites (HAWKE 2010; DICKS 2000; ASHWORTH et al. 2007), parks and protected areas (KALTENBORN & WILLIAMS 2002; WALKER & CHAPMAN 2003), forests (MÜLLER 2011), and recreational landscapes (BRICKER & KERSTETTER 2002; KALTENBORN 1998; KYLE et al. 2005; STEDMAN 2002; VASKE & KOBRIN 2001; VORKINN & RIESE 2001).

Actor constellation represents groups of actors using the same technical language and sharing the same knowledge (the same discourse), but eventually working in different and competing contexts, such as government agencies, interest groups, consultancies and NGOs (see also VAN BOMMEL 2008; DERKZEN 2008).

Modes of interaction can be distinguished after SCHARPF (1997) as ‘mutual adjustment’, ‘negotiated agreement’, ‘voting’ and ‘hierarchical direction’. In addition, the concepts of negotiation theory (see FISHER et al. 1991) or conflict theory (see BARTOS & WEHR 2002; SCHLEE 2004) have to be considered. Learning processes are directly related to interaction and they are essential to governance processes (HALL 1993; SABATIER 1993; BENNETT & HOWLETT 1992). The concepts of participation (see REED 2008; O’ROURKE & MACEY 2003) and leadership (HORLINGS 2010a; HORLINGS 2010b; HORLINGS & MARSDEN 2010; MITCHELL et al. 2002) are also crucial.

In the governance economists and sociologists in particular focus on rules (ROSENAU & CZEMPIEL 1992; WILLIAMSON 1996), whereas political scientists concentrate more on networks (RHODES 1997).

Area level

Different structural and situational char-

acteristics play a role in the performance of the park. They are mostly non-institutional factors. Aspects of the structural context are, for example, the geographical size of the protected landscape, the quality of transport systems and communication infrastructures, and the level of economic development (LEIBENATH et al. 2010). The existing policy environment also belongs to this level.

The Peak District National Park

The Peak District is an upland area in central and northern England, lying mainly in northern Derbyshire, but also covering parts of Cheshire, Greater Manchester, Staffordshire, and South and West Yorkshire. Most of the area falls within the Peak District National Park, whose designation in 1951 made it the first national park in the British Isles. The PDNP is located at the southern end of the Pennine Chain between Sheffield and

composition is gritstone, and the southern White Peak, where most of the population live and where the soil is mainly limestone-based. In previous years a visitor number of 22 to 26 million visitors per year was estimated and it was commonly stated that the Peak District is thought to be the second or third most-visited national park in the world (see for example McCABE & STOKOE 2004). Today the Association of National Park Authorities calculated a more moderate number of 8,4 million visitors per year (ANPA, 2011). To have a comparison, both large German Wadden Sea National Parks attract over 20 million visitors each year (see for example JOB 2008). The PDNP had always faced challenges and had to deal with difficulties such as visitor pressure (and related to that the loss of habitats and species), overgrazing and acid rain – the last two mentions are now on the decline, but climate change is an in-

cluded). Housing is relatively expensive, so most people who work in the Peak District live outside the park. Sixteen million people (32.6 % of the UK population) live within an hour's travelling time of the National Park boundary. The PDNP is highly valued for recreation, and one reason for that is the short distance from the cities of Manchester, Sheffield and Leeds. The PDNP is important for water supply and carbon storage. Housing and economic development within the National Park are subject to restrictive zoning requirements. Tourism is the major local employment for park inhabitants (24 %), with manufacturing industries (19 %) and quarrying (12 %) also being important; only 12 % are employed in agriculture. The cement works at Hope is the largest single employer within the Park. It is estimated that tourism provides more than 2,000 jobs in hotels and catering, and thousands more in shops and other tourism-related service industries (PDNP Authority 2010a). The main farm enterprises are those engaged in livestock farming of sheep and cattle.

Methods

Our empirical analysis of the PDNP focuses in particular on forms of governance as well as informal and decentralized institutions.

It rests on three pillars:

- A document analysis of existing literature, plans and concepts;
- A series of semi-structured, open-ended, in-depth interviews;
- Various on-site visits in the national park region.

The in-depth interviews were based on a guideline with thematic topics and specific questions. The issues and questions were derived from the theoretical framework. We conducted in-depth interviews with actors from the state, civil society and economy.

We also used the SWOT analysis and the stakeholder analysis. SWOT analysis is a strategic method used to evaluate the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats involved in a project or in business venture (HUMPHREY 2005; KOO &




Figure 2: The Peak District National Park

Manchester and covers 1438 square km (see Figure 2).

The area is conventionally split into the northern Dark Peak, where most of the moorland is found and whose geological

creating concern (MOSE 1990; CROUCH et al. 2009). About 38,000 people live in the area. Some of them work in the park, and some work in the surrounding cities (often employed in jobs for the higher edu-

KOO 2007; MORRISSON 2006). The Stakeholder analysis is a form of analysis that aims to identify the stakeholders that are likely to be affected by the activities and outcomes of a project. For a detailed overview, see REED et al. (2009). It is a snapshot of a current situation (one in which actors come and go, power relationships are changing and so on).

The study by CLARK & CLARKE (2010) is based on a national survey of sustainability projects in English NPs, undertaken in 2006-2007. CLARK & CLARKE selected five best practice examples based on detailed data collection. Field visits were undertaken to the good practice projects in order to formulate objective appraisals of sustainability outcomes and to meet with local community groups and entrepreneurs who had formulated, developed or otherwise participated in these sustainable projects. THOMPSON (2005) used different methods for her research (interviews, document analysis) and conducted field work in Northumberland NPA.

Analysis

Institutional level

(institutional settings)

Organizational structure

The responsible body of the Peak District National Park is the National Park Authority. The PDNP has possibly the most complex local and regional government structure of any UK national park. It covers parts of four government regions (which have been abolished), three county councils, nine district, borough, city and metropolitan borough councils and 125 parishes. The National Park Authority has a number of appointed members, selected by the Secretary of State, local councils and parish councils (30 persons in the PDNP). The role of members is to provide leadership, scrutiny and direction for the National Park Authority.

Furthermore, there is a number of paid staff who carries out the work necessary to run the National Park. For the Peak District National Park about 160 persons are working in full-time jobs, several in job-share, part-time or seasonal. The positions in the

National Park range from rangers and ecologists to planners and education teams.

Ownership

Land within an English national park is largely in private ownership and has been worked by humans for thousands of years. Over 90 % of the land in the Peak District National Park is privately owned. The biggest private landowners are the National Trust, which owns 12 % (17,507 hectares), and three water companies which own 11 % (16,943 hectares). The Peak District National Park Authority owns just 5 % (6,957 hectares) (PDNP Authority, 2010b). The largest individual landowners in the British National Parks generally, however, are public organizations: the Forestry Commission, National Trust, Water Companies, Ministry of Defence, Duchy of Cornwall and Welsh Office, in that order. These ownership structures compared to IUCN II national parks are really specific. In Germany the national parks are mainly owned by the federal states (Länder) and the federal government (Bund). For example, around 91 % of the area of the Harz National park (IUCN category II) is owned by the states of Lower Saxony and Saxony-Anhalt, 7 % are still federal property, and almost 2 % private or corporate ownership (NATIONALPARKVERWALTUNG HARZ 2011). A high level of private landownership does not mean low levels of access; for example the National Trust owns land in order to provide access for everyone and access to permanently protected places of natural beauty or historic interest for the benefit of the nation.

Plans and Strategies

The Management Plan (2006-2011) was prepared with the support of the following people/stakeholder groups:

- Public – ten open public meetings in 2004 and 2005;
- Public – surveys in 2004;
- Parish Councils – Peak Park Parishes Forums in 2003 and 2004;
- National Park Authority members – workshops in 2004, 2005 and 2006;
- Stakeholders – Help Shape the Future

partner event May 2005;

- Six-week consultation on Help Shape the Future Issues and Options Document in May and June 2005 and ten-week consultation on Help Shape the Future: National Park Management Plan Consultation Draft June 2006.

The new National Park Management Plan for the next period of time is now under review and several actors are included in the process (e.g. the National Farmers Union). Other important strategies and plans are the Local Development Framework, the Recreation Strategy and Action Plan for the Peak District National Park 2010–2020, the Cultural Heritage Strategy and the Minerals Strategic Action Plan. These plans and strategies are important as formal institutions and rules.

Actor level

The actors, that is, individuals, groups and organizations bearing distinct interests and concerns about the PDNP, are very diverse (see Figure 3). They have different resources, orientations and interests.

There are actors who command power through superiority and strength (e.g. some actors from the economic sector with sufficient resources), other actors have fewer resources but carry strong influence because of their relationships (because they have good connections and information, e.g. actors from civil society or some state actors) and collective ordinal forces and mechanisms (which are related to the power of actor groups).

The committee structures and organizational structure of the Peak District National Park is very complex (see Figure 4).

The members of PDNP Authority can be appointed by local authorities or by the Secretary of State for the Environment, and/or they can be parish representatives appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment. Almost every actor interviewed feels strongly attached to the National Park region (between 9 and 10; judgment of place attachment on a scale from 1-10). There are people who are strongly attached to the region (often farmers) and whose family has lived there for years. But there are also people



Figure 3: Actors in the PDNP, according to interests and functions

who can afford to move to the park and do so because of the 'nice' landscape.

Cooperation

Partnership is vital to achieving the outcomes of the National Park Management Plan through the wide range of administrative bodies (the National Park incorporates 4 Regions, 11 Metropolitan, District and County Councils, 125 Parishes, 7 Highway Authorities) and several community groups. There is a long history of working in partnership with others, for example the utility companies and the Forestry Commission, which pre-dates that legislation. With other organizations, there have been partnerships based on a shared set of objectives, for instance with English Heritage and the National Trust.

Where nature and landscape are concerned, the Peak District National Park

collaborates with Natural England, the Wildlife Trust, and the forestry commission. There are also forms of cooperation with private forest owners. An important role is played by cooperation with the Environment Agency. Farmers play an important role in the PDNP. But they were not always involved in the management. In the field of tourism the national park works together with Visit Peak District & Derbyshire, and touristic service providers. The Peak District National Park Environmental Quality Mark designates environmentally friendly businesses. In the field of communication and education the National Park Authority supports local schools and teachers. An important feature was its own education centre 'Losehill Hall' that now belongs to the YHA (Youth Hostels Association). The Peak District National Park works together

with the local, regional and national media. Cooperative organizations engaged in sustainable regional development involve national park partners and the entrepreneurs, who produce and deliver local products (Peak District Food and Peak District Cuisine.)

Hence, the main important forms of cooperation of the National Park Authority are with local authorities, local residents and NGOs. Volunteers, who are engaged in the protection of the park's values, are very important. Examples are: the volunteer ranger/warden service (including youth rangers), education services, individual site management, participation in the production of the management plan, help in interpreting, picking up litter and so on.

There is a LEADER group in the Peak District. The Peak District Rural Action Zone has secured £ 1.9 million in RDPE funding from the EU and Defra through the East Midlands Development Agency (Emda) and Advantage West Midlands. But it is not very well known and some projects face some problems (such as long application processes or high personal contributions).

Formal and informal co-operations and networks

The most important formal networks are the Network of English National Parks, in which the Association of National Park Authorities (ANPA) brings together the 15 National Park Authorities in the UK to raise the profile of the national parks and to promote cooperation as well as the EUROPARC Federation. EUROPARC represents approximately 440 members. These include bodies responsible for protected areas, governmental departments, NGOs and businesses in 36 countries, which themselves manage some parts of the land, sea, mountains, forests, rivers and cultural heritage of Europe. But up till now there has been hardly any cooperation with the partner associations on continental Europe.

Live & Work Rural is the flagship project of the Peak District National Park, helping people to take care of the environment by living and working in sus-




Figure 4: Committee structure and organizational structure of the Peak District National

tainable ways. Peak District Community Planning has funded a wide variety of projects. As one of the partners, the Peak District National Park Authority has worked closely with a number of villages to help them achieve many of the aims set out in their village plans. The following are a selection from some of the achievements so far: Birchover Roadside Improvements, Castleton War Memorial, Monyash Mere, Parwich Well Restoration and Brook Course, Peak Forest Reading Rooms and Play Area, and Waterfall Pin-fold Restoration.

Area level

Different structural and situational characteristics play a role in the Peak District

National Park. The geographic size of the PDNP, the quality of transport systems and communication infrastructure, and the level of economic development are distinctive; e.g. the Park stretches across several counties, has planning authority for the whole area etc. In this context the implementation of the park's plans and principals is crucial.

We will turn to the analysis of specific features of the PDNP with reference to regional governance, which was carried out by using SWOT analysis and a stakeholder analysis.

The SWOT analysis summarizes the key elements of the case study with regard to regional governance. The advantage of our approach is its holistic approach, which means that all actors (state, civil society and economy) and their interests are taken into account.

The PDNP has attained global importance and recognition because of its historical and touristic significance. It plays a key role in ensuring the protection of nature and the landscape of the region.

Therefore, governance can enhance the PDNP's development and effective functioning by exploiting its strengths and opportunities.

The following stakeholder analysis was not conducted with a specific project or a current event in mind, but it rather provides an overview of actors in the Peak District.

The Peak District National Park Authority has the most influence and is definitely the key actor in the park area. Central actors are also the nature conservation authorities and agencies and environment and nature conservation organizations. Because of the diverse own-

SWOT-Analysis

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possibility of concentrating on management rather than on providing tourism and education services • Exploring sources of alternative sustainable funding | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing financial problems (funding cuts) • Public costs under pressure (e.g. running Tourist Information Centres, locating matching funding for projects) • Pressure from surrounding areas trough e.g. increasing urbanization, infrastructure and demand for recreation |
|--|---|

Source: own draft

Table 1: SWOT-Analysis

Stakeholder Analysis Matrix

Stakeholder/ Actor/Interest group	Sector	Goal	Influence	Concern	Legal status	Spatial ties/levels	Resources
National Park Authority	State/civil society/economy	Nature and cultural heritage protection (Sustainability and partnerships)	high	high	public body	national/ regional/ local	medium - low
Nature conservation authorities and agencies (DEFRA, EA)	State (policy/administration)	Nature protection	high	medium	government department/ public body	national	medium - high
Environment and nature conservation organizations (Natural England, Wildlife Trust etc.)	Civil society	Nature protection	high	high	public body/ charity	local/ regional	medium
Local industry (quarries, water companies etc.)	Economy (businesses/companies)	Economic benefit	medium	high	individual businesses	local	medium
Local trade/economic associations (Country Land and Business Association etc.)	Civil society	Regional economic development	medium	medium	membership organization	local	medium
Economic authorities and agencies (e.g. Emda, Chamber of Commerce)	State (policy/administration)	Economic development	high	high	development agency	local/ regional	medium
Municipal councils (Districts and County Councils, Parish and Town Councils)	State (policy/administration)	Administration/ public service	high	high	elected administrative body	local/ regional	medium
Landowners (e.g. Chatsworth)	Civil society	Economic benefit (Heritage and landscape protection)	high	high	individuals	local/ regional	medium - high
Tourism organizations (Visit Peak District & Derbyshire Destination, etc.)	Economy/civil society	Tourism, marketing of the region	high	medium	tourist board	regional/ local	medium
Tourism entrepreneurs	Economy	Utilization of tourism facilities, economic benefit	medium	medium	individual businesses	local	medium
National Farmers Union	Economy/civil society	Representation and services to farmer and grower members	medium	high	trade association	local/ regional	medium
Farmers	Economy	Economic profit from agriculture landscape management	high	high	individual businesses	local	low
Forestry Commission	Economy	Sustainable forestry	medium	medium	government department	local/ regional	medium
Forestry entrepreneurs	Economy	Economic profit through forestry	medium	medium	individual businesses	local	low
Social/cultural associations (e.g. Local historical Societies, English Heritage etc.)	Civil society	Cultural heritage protection	medium	medium	registered charities	local	low - medium
Local population	Civil society	Well-being	medium	high	individuals	local	medium
Universities	Civil Society	Scientific research	medium	medium	public - government	regional	medium

Source: own draft

Table 2: Stakeholder Analysis Matrix

ership structure land owners like Chatsworth have also high influence on park developments. The interests, resources

and skills of actors are significant for successful (regional) governance. For example, SCHERER (2006) differentiates

between supporting and constraining factors in (regional) governance, but he also states that there are some neces-

sary basic conditions and requirements, for instance, the central actor group should have a high societal acceptance and there should be a good and easy accessibility to the network. An important point is the existence of an internal control and rule system and high regional steering competences of the authority. Supporting factors are, for example, the availability of resources and capacities and positive personal relationships between all actors. Shared values and shared knowledge as motivation also support the exercise/administration of

is aware of that problem and sees the increasing importance of partnerships (PDNPA 2011, pp. 7ff.).

For the involvement of different actor groups different forms of participation should be used. For example, for the directly affected inhabitants personal consultation is very important, whereas the broader public can be informed through channels such as the Internet or public meetings. Other important ways of involving actors are interviews or surveys. Recently focus groups have become significant. For a detailed overview of histories and typologies of participation, see REED (2008). Table 4 shows the actors and the most important forms of participation.

Based on our analysis, we compare the current situation with an ideal situation: The current situation can be characterized as follows. There is a lack of resour-

ment new measures. The National Park Authority would provide for conservation, enhancement and promotion of the park’s natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and support the promotion of the economic and social well-being of park communities.

Conclusion

Respect for private property in the Peak District is of high importance. As such, the whole negotiation system is based on reaching agreements with landowners and investors. But by being responsible for town and country planning within their boundaries, the Peak District National Park can more easily control the development processes as compared with other European protected landscapes. In terms of resilience, hence the robustness of the protected landscape, diversity is much more important than efficiency. Besides collaboration and co-

Factors for Regional Governance	
	PDNP
Supporting factors	
Availability of resources and capacities	--
Positive personal relationships between all actors	-+
Shared values and shared knowledge as motivation	-+
Support from policy	-
Support from inhabitants	-
Good communication structures	++
Constraining factors	
Lack of leadership	--
Lack of capacities	++
Lack of willingness of cooperating bodies	--
Some necessary basic conditions and requirements	
Central actor group with high societal acceptance	+
Accessibility of the network/management	+
Existence of an intern control and rule system	+
Regional steering competences	++
++ very strong/positive -/+ more or less -- very weak/negative Source: Adapted from SCHERER 2006	

Table 3: Factors for Regional Governance

regional governance. Crucial constraining factors are a lack of leadership, a lack of capacities and a lack of willingness on the part of cooperating bodies (see Table 3).

The main problem connected with regional governance is the lower availability of resources and capacities due to the funding cuts. However, the business and performance plan for 2011 and 2012 shows that the National Park Authority

Actors and forms of participation	
Actors	Forms of participation
Materialistic concerned and organized interest groups	Personal consultation and information
Local population	Information, workshops, surveys, public meetings
Administrative authorities and agencies	Personal contacts, consultation and support group
All actors	Information via homepage or public meetings
Source: Adapted from Hostmann et al. 2005	

Table 4: Actors and forms of participation

ces and capacities, and since the financial cuts some of the former national park duties have been reduced, but the National Park Authority is still strong and has a relatively high social acceptance. There are good communication structures, a culture of volunteering and partnerships. But because of a high degree of private ownership it is sometimes difficult to reach specific goals; negotiation and compromise have become crucial.

An ideal situation would be characterized by the involvement of all actors and interest groups in decision-making processes, enough financial and personnel resources and capacities to conduct creative and innovative projects and to imple-

operation, a culture of partnerships and volunteer groups is very much alive.

It is nothing new that planners, policy-makers, managers and other professionals need to acknowledge the diverse needs and interests of actors when attempting to implement the objectives of a national park. It is crucial to encourage collective learning processes, in which the diverse actors can contribute and participate. However, it is important to be aware of unequal power relations between particular interests in the region that can legitimize groups’ efforts to construct and promote their own agendas. Networks may be structured in a hierarchical manner, with unequal access to

information and unfair dissemination of knowledge (SAXENA 2005).

We conclude that coalitions and collaborative projects must be seen as a process, as the outcome is sometimes less important. Governance systems do not replace 'classical' administrative structures but complement them (SCHERER 2006). The question is no longer whether (regional) governance occurs but rather one of how to deal with it. Especially with the involvement of the (often strong) economic actors, negotiation and bargaining become crucial, so that other interests do not lose their entitlement.

THOMPSON'S research found a willingness to engage at this level as evidence by membership by the regional institutions in various regional networks and committees and by input in documents produced during and after the crisis surrounding the outbreak of the foot and mouth disease in 2001.

CLARK & CLARKE (2010) introduced five examples of best practice in sustainable development and their role for adaptive governance. They state that there is a positive correlation between local sustainability and adaptive governance processes in the five good practice examples.

Both adaptive governance and Foucault's governmentality approaches are helpful theoretical concepts and using them with regard to protected landscapes is of immense importance. Both can help us to understand the influence of different actors and their interests. Our theoretical framework is much broader, and it provides a detailed picture of the governance structures.

So how can one involve different actors? There is a vast body of literature concerning involvement and participation of actors (e.g. PARKS 2002; LYNAM et al. 2007; DOUGILL et al. 2006; TINCH et al. 2009; CROUCH et al. 2009). In general, different categories of factors regarding actor involvement need to be taken into account. Individual factors relate to knowledge, resources, personal interests and personal commitment (sense of place) and relations. There are institutional factors, such as open arenas and institution-

al arrangements. But there are also socio-cultural factors which support the involvement of actors, such as a high level of willingness to work together or a positive climate of cooperation. In general, effective management requires the integration of the full diversity of actors and takes into account the differing ways in which they are impacted by and impact upon protected areas. The long-term success of governance of these areas depends on the suitability of the institutional arrangements. Given the limited human and financial resources available for protected area management, transparent processes of negotiation are required to determine how much participation is possible as well as the level of priority of the objectives. The governance of protected areas in general, and of the Peak District National Park in particular, must yield appreciable benefits for all actors.

References

- ABRAMS, P., G. BORRINI-FEYERABEND, J. GARDNER & P. HEYLINGS (2003): Evaluating Governance – A Handbook to Accompany a Participatory Process for a Protected Area. PARKS CANADA and TILCEPA – Theme on Indigenous and Local Communities, Equity and Protected Areas of IUCN CEESP/WCPA.
- AMEND, T., J. BROWN, A. KOTHARI, A. PHILLIPS & S. STOLTON (eds.) (2008): Protected Landscapes and Agrobiodiversity Values. Volume 1 in the series, Protected Landscapes and Seascapes, IUCN & GTZ. Heidelberg.
- ANPA – ASSOCIATION OF NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITIES (2011): National Parks: Britain's Breathing Space. National Park facts and figures. Visitor numbers and visitor spend figures taken from STEAM reports, mostly from 2009. Figures updated on 3 October 2012. <http://www.nationalparks.gov.uk/learningabout/whatisanationalpark/factsandfigures.htm> [accessed 25/04/2013].
- ARTS, B., P. LEROY & J. VAN TATENHOVE (2006): Political Modernisation and Policy Arrangements: A Framework for Understanding Environmental Policy Change. *Public Organization Review* 6, pp. 93-106. DOI: 10.1007/s11115-006-0001-4.
- ASHWORTH, G. J., J. E. TUNBRIDGE & B. J. GRAHAM (2007): *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies*. London.
- BALLOFFET, N. M. & A. S. MARTIN (2007): *Governance Trends in Protected Areas: Experiences from the Parks in Peril Program in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Parks in Peril Innovations in Conservation Series. Arlington, Virginia, USA.
- BARTOS, O. J. & P. WEHR (2002): *Using Conflict Theory*. Cambridge.
- BENNETT, C. J. & M. HOWLETT (1992): The lessons of learning: reconciling theories of policy learning and policy change. *Policy Sciences* 25 (3), pp. 275-294. DOI: 10.1007/BF00138786.
- BORRINI-FEYERABEND, G. (2003): Governance of protected areas – innovations in the air... In: *Policy Matters* 12, pp. 92-101.
- BORRINI-FEYERABEND, G., J. JOHNSTON & D. PANSKY (2006): Governance of Protected Areas. In: Lockwood, M., G. Worboys & A. Kothari (eds.): *Managing Protected Areas: A Global Guide*. Earthscan, London, UK and USA, pp. 116-145.
- BRENNER, L. & H. JOB (2012) Challenges to actor-oriented Environmental Governance: Examples from three Mexican Biosphere Reserves. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*. 103 (1), pp. 1-19. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9663.2011.00671.x.
- BRICKER, K. S. & D. L. KERSTETTER (2002): An interpretation of special place meanings whitewater recreationists attach to the South Fork of the American River. *Tourism Geographies* 4 (4), pp. 396-425. DOI: 10.1080/14616680210158146.
- BROWN, J., N. MITCHELL & M. BERESFORD (eds.) (2004): *The Protected Landscape Approach: Linking Nature, Culture and Community*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. xv + 270 pp. plus 12 colour plates.
- CARRUS, G., M. BONAUTO & M. BONNES (2005): Environmental Concern, Regional Identity and Support for Protected Areas in Italy. *Environment and Behavior* 37 (2), pp. 237-257. DOI:

- 10.1177/0013916504269644.
- CLARK, J. R. A. & R. CLARKE (2010): Local sustainability initiatives in English National Parks: What role for adaptive governance? *Land Use Policy* 28, pp. 314-324.
- CROUCH, D., D. MARSON, G. SHIRT, R. TRESIDDER & P. WILTSHIER (2009): The Peak District National Park UK – Contemporary complexities and challenges. In: Frost, W. & C.M. Hall (eds.) (2009): *Tourism and National Parks – International perspectives on development, histories and change* Abingdon, UK, pp. 167-183.
- DEAN, M. (1999): *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London.
- DEARDEN, P., M. BENNETT & J. JOHNSTON (2005): Trends in Protected Area Governance 1992-2002. *Environmental Management*, Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 89-100.
- DERKZEN, P. (2008): The politics of rural governance. Case studies of rural partnerships in the Netherlands and Wales. PhD thesis, Wageningen University, the Netherlands.
- DICKS, B. (2000): *Heritage, Place and Community*. Cardiff.
- DONALDSON, T. & L. PRESTON (1995): The stakeholder theory of the corporation – Concepts, evidence, and implications. *Acad. Management Rev.* 20 (1), pp. 65-91.
- DOUGILL, A. J., E. D. G. FRASER, J. HOLDEN, K. HUBACEK, C. PRELL, M. S. REED, S. STAGL & L. C. STRINGER (2006): Learning from Doing Participatory Rural Research: Lessons from the Peak District National Park. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 57, No. 2, pp. 1-17.
- DUDLEY, N. (ed.) (2008): *Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories*, x + 86 pp. (Gland, Switzerland: IUCN).
- FISHER, R., W. URY & B. PATTON (1991): *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. 2nd ed. Boston.
- FOLKE, C., J. COLDING & F. BERKES (2003): Synthesis: building resilience and adaptive capacity in social ecological systems. In: Berkes, F., J. Colding & C. Folke (eds.) (2003): *Navigating Social-Ecological Systems: Building Resilience for Complexity and Change*. Cambridge, UK, pp. 352-87.
- FOLKE, C., TH. HAHN, P. OLSSON & J. NORBERG (2005): Adaptive Governance of social-ecological systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, Vol. 30, pp. 441-473.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1991): Governmentality. In: Burchell, G., C. Gordon & P. Miller (eds.): *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. London.
- FREEMAN, R. E. (1984): *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Basic Books. New York.
- FÜRST, D. (2006): Regional Governance: Lernprozess zur Selbststeuerung. In: RAUM 63 (6), pp. 28-30.
- FÜRST, D., M. LAHNER & K. POLLERMANN (2006): Entstehung und Funktionsweise von Regional Governance bei dem Gemeinschaftsgut Natur und Landschaft – Analysen von Place-making- und Governance-Prozessen in Biosphärenreservaten in Deutschland und Großbritannien. *Beiträge zur räumlichen Planung* 82. Hannover.
- GAILING, L. & K. D. KEIM (2006): Analyse von informellen und dezentralen Institutionen und Public Governance mit kulturlandschaftlichem Hintergrund in der Beispielregion Barnim. Berlin.
- GRAHAM, J., B. AMOS & T. PLUMTRE (2003): *Governance Principles for Protected Areas in the 21st Century*. Institute On Governance, Ontario, Canada. Paper presented at the Vth World Congress on Protected Areas. Durban, South Africa.
- HALL, P. A. (1993): Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State. *Comparative Politics* 25 (3), pp. 239-255. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/422246> [accessed 10/05/2011].
- HAWKE, S. K. (2010): Belonging: The contribution of heritage to sense of place. In *Heritage 2010: Heritage and Sustainable Development*. Evora, Portugal, pp. 1331-1339.
- HELMKE, G. & S. LEVITSKY (2004): Informal institutions and comparative politics: A research agenda. *Perspect. Polit.* 4, pp. 725-740.
- HOCKINGS, M., S. STOLTON, F. LEVERINGTON, N. DUDLEY & J. COURRAU (2006): Evaluating effectiveness: A framework for assessing management effectiveness of protected areas. *Best practice protected area guidelines Series No. 14* (2nd edition), IUCN, Gland, Cambridge.
- HORLINGS, I. (ed.) (2010a): How to generate sustainable European rural regions: The role of social capital, leadership and policy arrangements. *Regions*, No. 280, pp. 8-12.
- HORLINGS, I. (ed.) (2010b): *Vital coalitions, vital regions: Partnerships for sustainable, regional development*. Wageningen.
- HORLINGS, I. & T. MARSDEN (2010): The role of social capital, leadership and policy arrangements in European rural regional development, BRASS working paper. Cardiff.
- HOSTMANN, M., M. BUCHECKER, O. EJDERYAN, U. GEISER, B. JUNKER, S. SCHWEIZER, B. TRUFFER & M. ZAUGG STERN (2005): *Wasserbauprojekte gemeinsam planen. Handbuch für die Partizipation und Entscheidungsfindung bei Wasserbauprojekten*. Eawag, WSL, LCH-EPFL, VAW-ETHZ.
- HUMPHREY, A. S. (2005): *SWOT Analysis*. <http://www.businessballs.com/swot-analysis/freetemplate.htm> [accessed 28/07/2011].
- HUNT, H. & G. WICKHAM (1994): *Foucault and Law*. London.
- IUCN (1994): *Guidelines for Protected Area Management Categories*. CNPPA with the assistance of WCMC. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK, available at <http://data.iucn.org/dbtw-wpd/edocs/1994-007-En.pdf> [accessed 27/09/2011].
- JOB, H. (2008): Estimating the regional economic impact of tourism to national parks: two case studies from Germany. *GAIA* 17 (S1), pp. 134-142.
- JONES, T. & A. WICKS (1999): Convergent stakeholder theory. *Acad. Management Rev.* 24 (2), pp. 206-221.
- JORGENSEN, B. S. & R. C. STEDMAN (2001): Sense of place as an attitude: Lakeshore owners attitudes toward their properties. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 21, pp. 233-248. DOI: 10.1006/jevp.2001.0226.
- KALTENBORN, B. P. (1998): Effects of sense of place on responses to environmental

- impacts: A study among residents in Svalbard in the Norwegian high Arctic. *Applied Geography* 18 (2), pp. 169-189. DOI: 10.1016/S0143-6228(98)00002-2.
- KALTENBORN, B. P. & D. R. WILLIAMS (2002): The meaning of place: attachments to Femundsmarka National Park, Norway, among tourists and locals. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift – Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 56, pp. 189-198.
- KERR, D. (1999): Beheading the king and enthroning the market: A critique of Foucauldian governmentality. *Science & Society*, New York: v. 63, i. 2, pp. 173-203.
- KOO, L. C. & H. KOO (2007): Holistic approach for diagnosing, prioritising, implementing and monitoring effective strategies through synergetic fusion of SWOT, Balanced Scorecard and QFD. *World Review of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 62-78.
- KYLE, G. T., A. R. GRAEFE & R. E. MANNING (2005): Testing the dimensionality of place attachment in recreation settings. *Environment and Behavior* 37, pp. 153-177. DOI: 10.1177/0013916504269654.
- LEE, M. (2003): Conceptualizing the new governance: a new institution of social coordination. Paper presented at the Institutional Analysis and Development, Mini-Conference, 3-5 May, Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA.
- LEIBENATH, M., A. BLUM & S. STUTZRIEMER (2010): Transboundary cooperation in establishing ecological networks: The case of Germany's external borders. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 94 (2), pp. 84-93. DOI: 10.1016/j.landurbplan.2009.08.002.
- LUCAS, P. H. C. (1992): *Protected Landscapes. A Guide for Policy-makers and Planners*. London.
- LYNAM, T., W. DE JONG, D. SHEIL, T. KUSUMANTO & K. EVANS (2007): A review of tools for incorporating community knowledge, preferences, and values into decisionmaking in natural resources management. *Ecology & Society* 12 (1), 5 [online]. URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol12/iss1/art5/> [accessed 07/06/2011].
- MAYHEW, S. (ed.) (2004): *A Dictionary of Geography* (Article: Governance; Article: Governmentality). Oxford.
- MAYNTZ, R. (1998): *New Challenges to Governance Theory*. (= Jean Monnet Chair Paper, 50). Florence.
- MCCABE, S. & E. H. STOKOE (2004): Place and Identity in Tourists'Accounts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 601-622. DOI: 10.1016/j.annals.2004.01.005.
- MESCH, G. S. & G. MANOR (1998): Social ties, environmental perception and local attachment. *Environment and Behavior* 30, pp. 504-519. DOI: 10.1177/001391659803000405.
- MITCHELL, N., B. SLAIBY & M. BENEDICT (2002): Local community leadership: Building partnerships for conservation in North America. *Parks*, 12 (2), pp. 55-66. <http://iucn.org/themes/wcpa/pubs/pdfs/PARKS/parks12.2.pdf> [accessed 07/06/2011].
- MORRISON, M. (2006): *SWOT Analysis*. <http://www.rapidbi.com/created/SWOTanalysis.html> [accessed 28/07/2011].
- MOSE, I. (1990): Verfall und Neubelebung im Englischen Bergland: Das Beispiel des Peak Districts. *Unterrichtsmaterialien für die Sekundarstufe II*. In: *Geographie und Schule* 12, H. 67, S. 20-33.
- MOSSIG, I. (2004): Steuerung lokalisierter Projektnetzwerke am Beispiel der Produktion von TV-Sendungen in den Medienclustern München und Köln. In: *Erdkunde*, 58. Jg. (3), S. 252-268.
- MÜLLER, M. (2011): How natural disturbance triggers political conflict: bark beetles and the meaning of landscape in the Bavarian Forest. *Global Environmental Change* 2, pp. 935-946.
- MURDOCH, J. (1997): The shifting territory of government: some insights from the rural white paper. *Area*, 29, pp. 109-18.
- MURDOCH, J. & N. WARD (1997): Government and territoriality: the statistical manufacture of Britain's 'national farm'. *Political Geography* 16, pp. 307-324.
- NATIONALPARKVERWALTUNG HARZ (2011): *Nationalparkplan für den Nationalpark Harz 2011-2020*. Wernigerode. http://www.nationalpark-harz.de/de/downloads/?we_objectID=969&refIID=350&refTID=dd#infobox [accessed 08/03/2012].
- NOLTE, C., F. LEVERINGTON, A. KETTNER, M. MARR, G. NIELSEN, B. BOMHARD, S. STOLTON, S. STOLL-KLEEMANN & M. HOCKINGS (2010): Protected area management effectiveness assessments in Europe: A review of application, methods and results. BfN-Skripten 271a, Bundesamt für Naturschutz (BfN). Bonn, Germany.
- OLSSON, P., C. FOLKE & T. HAHN (2004): Social-ecological transformation for ecosystem management: The development of adaptive co-management of a wetland landscape in southern Sweden. *Ecol. Soc.* 9 (4), p. 2. <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol9/iss4/art2/>.
- OLSSON, P., L. H. GUNDERSON, S. R. CARPENTER, P. RYAN, L. LEBEL, C. FOLKE & C. S. HOLLING (2006): Shooting the rapids: navigating transitions to adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Ecology and Society* 11 (1), p. 18. [online]. URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol11/iss1/art18/>.
- O'ROURKE, D. & G. P. MACEY (2003): Community environmental policies: assessing new strategies of public participation in environmental regulation. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 22 (3), pp. 383-414.
- PARKS (2002): *Local communities and protected areas*. Vol. 12, No. 2.
- PDNP Authority (2010a): *Factsheet 2: Tourism in the Peak District National Park*. <http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/index/learning-about/factsheets.htm> [accessed 07/06/2011].
- PDNP Authority (2010b): *Factsheet 1: The Peak District National Park*. <http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/index/learning-about/factsheets.htm> [accessed 07/06/2011].
- PDNP Authority (2011): *Performance and Business Plan 2011-2012*. http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/_data/as

- sets/pdf_file/0017/123920/Business-Plan2011.pdf [accessed 08/08/2011].
- PHILLIPS, A. (2002): Management Guidelines for IUCN Category V Protected Areas. Protected Landscapes/ Seascapes. Best Practice. Protected Areas Guidelines Series No. 9. Cardiff University, IUCN/WCPA. (see also http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/pag_009.pdf).
- POLLERMANN, K. (2006): Regional Governance and Biosphere Reserves – Empiric results from case-studies in Germany and Great Britain. http://www.ttef.org.uk/Braunton_Burrows_File/TTEF%20-%20Biosphere%20Reserve%20-%20Regional%20Governance%20-%20English%20Summary.pdf [accessed 29/09/2011].
- PROJECT MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE (PMI) (2008): A Guide to the Project Management Book of Knowledge (PMBOK), fourth ed. Project Management Institute, Newtown Square, PA.
- REED, M. (2008): Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review, *Biol. Conserv.* DOI:10.1016/j.biocon.2008.07.014.
- REED, M. S., A. GRAVES, D. NORMAN, H. POSTHUMUS, K. HUBACEK, J. MORRIS, C. PRELL, CH. QUINN & L. C. STRINGER (2009): Who's in and why? A typology of stakeholder analysis methods for natural resource management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 90 (5), pp. 1933-1949. DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2009.01.001.
- RELPH, E. (1976): Place and placelessness. London.
- RHODES, R.A.W. (1997): Understanding Governance. Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability. Buckingham.
- RISSE, T. (2002): Constructivism and International Institutions. Toward Conversations Across Paradigm. In: Katznelson, I. & H. Milner (eds.): Political Science as Discipline. Reconsidering Power, Choice, and the State at Century's End. New York, pp. 597-623.
- ROSENAU, J. N. & E.-O. CZEMPIEL (eds.) (1992): Governance without Government. 2. Aufl., New York.
- SABATIER, P. A. (1993): Advocacy-Koalitionen, Policy-Wandel und Policy-Lernen: Eine Alternative zur Phrasenheuristik. In: Héritier, A. (ed.): Policy-Analyse. Kritik und Neuorientierung, PVS Sonderheft 24. Opladen, S. 116-148.
- SAXENA, G. (2005): Relationships, networks and the learning regions: Case evidence from the Peak District National Park. *Tourism Management* 26, pp. 277-289.
- SCHARPF, F. W. (1997): Games real actors play: Actor-centered institutionalism in policy research. Boulder.
- SCHERER, R. (2006): Regionale Innovationskoalitionen: Bedeutung und Erfolgsfaktoren von regionalen Governance-Systemen. Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Öffentliche Dienstleistungen und Tourismus. Beiträge zur Regionalwirtschaft. Bern.
- SCHLEE, G. (2004): Taking sides and constructing identities: Reflections on conflict theory. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 10 (1), pp. 135-156. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3804101>.
- SHUMAKER, S. A. & R. B. TAYLOR (1983): Toward a clarification of people-place relationships: A model of attachment to place. In: Fieman, N. R. & E. S. Geller (eds.): Environmental Psychology: Directions and Perspective. New York, pp. 219-251.
- SKELCHER, C. & H. SULLIVAN (2008): Theory-driven approaches to analysing collaborative performance. *Public Management Review* 10, pp. 751-771.
- STEAD, S. M. & D. J. MCGLASHAN (2006): A Coastal and Marine National Park for Scotland in partnership with Integrated Coastal Zone Management, *Ocean & Coastal Management*, Volume 49, Issues 1-2, pp. 22-41. DOI: 10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2005.08.005.
- STEDMAN, R. C. (2002): Toward a social psychology of place: Predicting behavior from place-based cognitions, attitude, and identity. *Environment and Behavior* 34 (5), pp. 561-581. DOI: 10.1177/0013916502034005001.
- STOLL-KLEEMANN, S. (2010): Evaluation of management effectiveness in protected areas: Methodologies and results. *Basic and Applied Ecology* 11, pp. 377-382.
- STOLTON, S. & N. DUDLEY (2000): The use of certification of sustainable management systems and their possible application to protected area management. IUCN/WWF Forest Innovations project. A paper prepared for the WWF conference Beyond the Trees, Bangkok, May 8-11 2000. <http://www.equilibrium-consultants.com/upload/document/pacertificationpaper.pdf>.
- THOMPSON, N. (2005): Inter-institutional relations in the governance of England's national parks: A governmentality perspective. *Journal of Rural Studies* 21 (3), pp. 323-334.
- THOMPSON, N. (2006): Governing England's National Parks: challenges for the 21st century. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science and Management* 2 3, pp. 193-195.
- THOMPSON, N. (2008): National Parks and the governance of the rural environment. In: Woods, M. (ed.): New Labour's Countryside, Rural Policy in Britain since 1997. Bristol.
- TINCH, D., N. HANLEY, M. DALLIMER, P. POSEN, S. ACS, K. J. GASTON & P. R. ARMSWORTH (2009): Historical perspectives on the development of multifunctional landscapes: A case study from the UK uplands. In: Brouwer, F. & M. van der Heide (eds.): Multifunctional Rural Land Management: Economics and Policies. London, UK, pp. 277-294.
- TUAN, Y. F. (1977): Space and Place: The perspective of experience. Minneapolis.
- VAN BOMMEL, S. (2008): Understanding experts and Expertise in different governance contexts: The case of nature conservation in the Drenthe Aa area in the Netherlands. PhD thesis, Wageningen University, the Netherlands.
- VANCLAY, F., M. HIGGINS & A. BLACKSHAW (eds.) (2008): Making Sense of Place. Canberra.
- VAN TATENHOVE, J., B. ARTS & P. LEROY (2000): Policy arrangements. In: Van Tatenhove, J., B. Arts and P. Leroy (eds.): Political Modernisation and the Environment: The Renewal of Environmental Policy Arrangements. Dordrecht, pp. 53-70.

- VASKE, J. J. & K. C. KOBRIN (2001): Place attachment and environmentally responsible behavior. *The Journal of Environmental Education* 32 (4), pp. 16-21. DOI: 10.1080/00958960109598658.
- VORKINN, M. & H. RIESE (2001): Environmental concern in a local context: The significance of place attachment. *Environment and Behavior* 33 (2), pp. 249-263. DOI: 10.1177/00139160121972972.
- WALKER, G. J. & R. CHAPMAN (2003): Thinking like a park: The effects of sense of place, perspective-taking, and empathy on pro-environment intentions. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration* 21 (4), pp. 71-86.
- WILLIAMSON, O. E. (1996): *The mechanism of governance*. New York/Oxford.

NORA MEHNEN
University of Groningen
Faculty of Spatial Sciences
Department of Cultural Geography
PO Box 800
9700 AV Groningen
The Netherlands
N.Mehnen@rug.nl

Résumé

NORA MEHNEN

Implication des acteurs dans les paysages préservés – Exemple des acteurs agissant sur dans le parc national Peak District National Park, Royaume-Uni

Les parcs nationaux anglais ont été désignés pour conserver, améliorer et promouvoir la beauté naturelle, la faune et le patrimoine culturel des territoires de valeur paysagère exceptionnelle. Depuis la création du premier parc national anglais en 1951 – le Peak District National Park (PDNP) –, la complexité des usages, des intérêts et des acteurs concernés, ainsi que la pression à l'extérieur et l'intérieur de ces espaces, a considérablement augmentée. Le Peak District a été influencé et façonné par la présence de vie humaine depuis des milliers d'années. La diversité des acteurs agissant sur ce parc exige des politiques conçues comme un processus d'apprentissage (social), et les gouvernements et la gouvernance, afin d'être capables d'influencer les comportements de cette pluralité d'acteurs, doivent s'adapter à leurs motivations et objectifs. Le rôle des coalitions et des coopérations, en tant que formes de prise de décision interactive est essentiel. Etant donné la présence d'acteurs aux intérêts, discours et horizons temporels multiples, ces coalitions et ces coopérations doivent être attractives pour chaque acteur et secteur concerné (Etat, économie et société civile). Cet article examine le cas du PDNP à la lumière d'une contribution de THOMPSON (2005), notamment son approche sur la gouvernabilité construite à partir des travaux de Foucault, et du concept de gouvernance adaptative mobilisé par CLARK & CLARKE (2010). On conclue que les coalitions, les coopérations et les projets doivent être vus comme un processus, et qu'un résultat immédiat est parfois moins important.

Acteurs, parcs nationaux anglais, Peak District, gouvernance

Резюме

НОРА МЕНЕН

Участие основных игроков в развитии охраняемых ландшафтов – на примере данных по национальному парку «Скалистый край»

Национальные парки Великобритании были предназначены для сохранения, улучшения и поддержания естественной красоты, природного и культурного наследия территорий, обладающих исключительной ландшафтной ценностью. Первый национальный парк – «Скалистый край» (PDNP) – образован в 1951 г.

Комплексность использования, многообразие конфликтов интересов и задействованных участников, а также внешнее и внутреннее давление с тех пор значительно возросло. Район нацпарка «Скалистый край» в течение тысяч лет формировался под антропогенным воздействием. Разнообразие сегодняшних акторов подразумевает процесс политики как (социального) обучения, причём правительство и управление должны адаптироваться к мотивам и целям различных субъектов. Роль коалиций и партнерств как форм интерактивного поиска решений между заинтересованными сторонами является при этом решающей. Главным образом потому, что различные заинтересованные стороны имеют разные интересы и временные рамки и принадлежат к разным дискурсам, эти коалиции и партнёрства должны стать привлекательнее для акторов всех секторов (государство, экономика и гражданское общество). В данной статье при исследованиях по национальному парку «Скалистый край» (PDNP) приводятся ссылки на работы THOMPSON 2005 и CLARK & CLARKE 2010, в которых использованы соответственно аналитические подходы Фуко и понятие адаптивного управления. Вывод заключается в том, что коалиции, партнёрства и проекты должны рассматриваться как процессы, а непосредственный результат иногда имеет меньшее значение.

Заинтересованные стороны, акторы, национальные парки Великобритании, национальный парк «Скалистый край», управление