



AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Aalborg Universitet

Sustainability and cruise tourism in the Arctic: stakeholder perspectives from Ísafjörður, Iceland and Qaqortoq, Greenland

James, Laura; Olsen, Lise Smed; Karlsdottir, Anna

Published in:
Journal of Sustainable Tourism

DOI (link to publication from Publisher):
[10.1080/09669582.2020.1745213](https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1745213)

Creative Commons License
Unspecified

Publication date:
2020

Document Version
Accepted author manuscript, peer reviewed version

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
James, L., Olsen, L. S., & Karlsdottir, A. (2020). Sustainability and cruise tourism in the Arctic: stakeholder perspectives from Ísafjörður, Iceland and Qaqortoq, Greenland. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(9), 1425-1441. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1745213>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Sustainability and cruise tourism in the Arctic: stakeholder perspectives from Ísafjörður, Iceland and Qaqortoq, Greenland

Journal:	<i>Journal of Sustainable Tourism</i>
Manuscript ID	JOST-4906.R2
Manuscript Type:	Standard Issue Paper
Keywords:	Cruise tourism, Destination planning, Stakeholders, Sustainable tourism
Abstract:	<p>This paper compares two Arctic cruise destinations – Ísafjörður in Iceland, and Qaqortoq in Greenland – focusing on stakeholders’ perceptions of the sustainability of cruise tourism, and how they are managing the development of the industry in the context of imbalances in power between place-bound local stakeholders and global cruise lines. Drawing on interviews with local stakeholders, the paper argues that destination development stage and the relative importance of land-based tourism frame the ways in which stakeholders perceive the sustainability of cruise tourism. While there were differences in the emphasis placed on environmental, socio-cultural and economic aspects of sustainability in each destination, there were similarities in the ways in which stakeholders conceptualised relations between the different aspects in terms of trade-offs and competition, together with a lack of a holistic perspective and concern about economic dependence on global cruise lines. The findings suggest that intergovernmental agreements are needed to address regulatory issues and that national coordination may help to improve collaboration between destinations.</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Location of Qaqortoq, Greenland and Ísafjörður, Iceland

207x177mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Sustainability and cruise tourism in the Arctic: stakeholder perspectives from Ísafjörður, Iceland and Qaqortoq, Greenland

Abstract

This paper compares two Arctic cruise destinations – Ísafjörður in Iceland, and Qaqortoq in Greenland – focusing on stakeholders' perceptions of the sustainability of cruise tourism, and how they are managing the development of the industry in the context of imbalances in power between place-bound local stakeholders and global cruise lines. Drawing on interviews with local stakeholders, the paper argues that destination development stage and the relative importance of land-based tourism frame the ways in which stakeholders perceive the sustainability of cruise tourism. While there were differences in the emphasis placed on environmental, socio-cultural and economic aspects of sustainability in each destination, there were similarities in the ways in which stakeholders conceptualised relations between the different aspects in terms of trade-offs and competition, together with a lack of a holistic perspective and concern about economic dependence on global cruise lines. The findings suggest that intergovernmental agreements are needed to address regulatory issues and that national coordination may help to improve collaboration between destinations.

Keywords: cruise tourism, sustainability, Arctic destinations, Iceland, Greenland

Introduction

In recent years cruise tourism has expanded significantly in the Arctic region, with cruise ships visiting destinations such as Svalbard, Iceland, Greenland and the Eastern Canadian Arctic (Maher, 2012; Lamers & Pashkevich, 2015; Lück, Maher, & Stewart, 2010). This growth has prompted considerable debate regarding the sustainability of cruise tourism and how it can be managed (Lester & Weeden, 2004; Klein, 2011). The Arctic expedition cruise sector is largely self-regulated by the Association of Arctic Expedition Cruise Operators (AECO). This organisation was set up to represent the interests of the cruise industry and to minimize negative impacts (van Bets et al, 2017a; Dawson et al, 2014). It manages the activities of its members through a set of by-laws and guidelines that dictate appropriate

1
2
3 behaviour for tourists and operators. However, as McCarthy (2018, p.289) has noted, the literature on
4 the impacts of cruise tourism is limited in relation to small and medium destinations away from the
5 Caribbean and Mediterranean. Arctic destinations face particular challenges in managing cruise
6 tourism due to their remoteness, the harsh environment, unpredictable weather conditions, and lack
7 of infrastructure. In addition, the social and economic impacts are likely to differ from those in less
8 isolated destinations, and the focus of Arctic cruises on nature-based experiences means that they may
9 have a greater direct impact on vulnerable environments and wildlife than other types of cruise
10 tourism. Moreover, we know relatively little about the views of stakeholders in the Arctic communities
11 directly affected, and how they conceptualise sustainability; for example, whether it is perceived
12 narrowly in terms of economic, social and environmental impacts within a destination, or more
13 holistically in terms of the resilience of wider socio-ecological systems (Saarinen, 2014; Hall, 2019).
14 This is important because it has implications for the way that local stakeholders try to manage and
15 develop cruise destinations.
16
17

18
19
20 This article contributes to the literature by investigating how the sustainability of cruise tourism is
21 understood and managed by stakeholders involved in the operation and development of cruise
22 tourism in two Arctic destinations - Qaqortoq in Greenland and Ísafjörður in Iceland. The findings show
23 that the sustainability of cruise tourism is primarily conceptualised as a series of trade-offs between
24 local-scale economic, environmental and socio-cultural impacts, expressed most often in terms of a
25 destination carrying capacity. However, there are also important differences between the
26 destinations, and we argue that destination development stage and the status of alternative tourism
27 development paths shape local stakeholders' attitudes towards cruise tourism impacts and
28 sustainability issues. We also argue that the imbalance of power between local communities and global
29 cruise lines negatively affects the ability of local stakeholders to develop cruise destinations
30 collaboratively.
31
32
33

34
35
36 The article is structured as follows. The second and third sections comprise a review of research on the
37 sustainability of cruise tourism and local stakeholders. The fourth section sets out the methodology
38 and introduces the case studies. The fifth section presents an analysis of different stakeholders' views
39 on the sustainability of cruise tourism in Qaqortoq and Ísafjörður, and their attempts to manage
40 conflicts about the development of the destinations. The sixth section discusses the findings in the
41 context of the wider literature on sustainability and cruise tourism. The final section presents the main
42 conclusions and discusses the implications for the management of Arctic cruise destinations.
43
44
45

46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 **Framing sustainability and cruise tourism**

1
2
3 Sustainability is a complex and contested concept. It first gained widespread attention in the late
4 1980s, following the publication of the so-called Brundtland report, “Our Common Future”, which
5 defined sustainable development as ‘development that meets the needs of the present without
6 compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ (World Commission on
7 Environment and Development, 1987, p43). However, as MacKenzie and Gannon (2019) have argued
8 in their historical analysis of the antecedents and legitimisation of sustainability in hospitality and
9 tourism, there is little consensus regarding the key characteristics of sustainability. Jones et al (2016)
10 similarly argue that often it seems to mean ‘all things to all people’. Many definitions, however, try to
11 integrate environmental, social and economic dimensions (Buckley, 2012) and the UNEP and WTO
12 follow this ‘triple bottom line’ approach in their definition of sustainable tourism as: ‘tourism that takes
13 full account of its current and future economic, social and environmental impacts, addressing the
14 needs of visitors, the industry, the environment and host communities’ (UNEP-WTO, 2005, p.12).
15 However, this impact-based approach is only one of many that have been developed since the early
16 1990s and excludes other fundamental principles such as futurity, equity and holism (Redcliffe and
17 Woodgate, 1997; Butler, 1999; Moscardo and Murphy, 2014).

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29 Saarinen (2006; 2014) identifies three main traditions in the conceptualisation of sustainable tourism,
30 which vary in the way that they define acceptable and unacceptable changes to socio-ecological
31 systems, and how tourism should be managed. The *resource-based* tradition draws on the notion of
32 an objective scientifically defined carrying capacity; i.e., the maximum number of tourists a destination
33 can support without serious negative impacts on the natural and socio-cultural environment. It
34 developed from the broader debates about environmental carrying capacity that emerged in the 1970s
35 (Butler, 1999). The *activity-based* tradition operates with a more dynamic view of the limits to growth,
36 which are dependent on the tourism industry itself and its capacity to adapt and manage tourism to
37 minimise unacceptable changes. It encompasses the neo-liberal ecological management approach
38 critiqued by Hall (2019), which is framed in terms of technical solutions to enable continued tourism
39 growth. Finally, the *community-based* tradition focuses on the perspectives of stakeholders,
40 particularly local communities, and their perception of acceptable or unacceptable changes caused by
41 tourism. It emphasises local control and empowerment in relation to tourism development and is
42 exemplified by the local, community-based tourism development, which typifies the ‘smaller is better’
43 understanding of sustainable tourism (McCool et al, 2013).

44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55 A growing literature on the sustainability of cruise tourism takes an impact-based approach,
56 documenting the environmental, economic and social impacts of cruise ships and passengers in
57 different destinations, including some research in the Arctic (e.g., McCarthy, 2018; Dawson, et al, 2014,
58 2016, 2017; Stewart et al, 2015). In relation to environmental impacts, for example, researchers have
59
60

1
2
3 identified issues including pollution from vessels, discharge of organic and hazardous waste, air
4 emissions, the destruction of natural habitats, and the disturbance of wildlife (MacNeill and Wozniak,
5 2018; Adams, 2010; Davenport and Davenport, 2006; Klein, 2011; Carić and Mackelworth, 2014). With
6 regard to social and cultural impacts, overcrowding and competition for resources are frequently
7 noted (Brida and Zapata Aguirre, 2010), with the worst effects in small destinations where large
8 numbers of passengers come ashore at the same time. There are also concerns about a shift from
9 locally owned shops to international franchises, and negative impacts on local culture and heritage
10 due to mass cruise tourism (e.g., Hritz and Cecil, 2008; Maher, 2012; Pino and Peluso, 2018). More
11 positively in relation to Arctic destinations, some studies have found that community engagement and
12 educational opportunities are associated with cruise tourism (Schonka & Schweitser, 2004; Stewart et
13 al 2015).

14
15
16 In relation to economic impacts, there is considerable debate about the benefits for local communities
17 (Torbianelli, 2012; Rodrigue and Notteboom, 2013). One of the main reasons that cruise visits are
18 attractive for ports is the potential for large numbers of passengers to come ashore and spend money
19 on local goods and services. However, the cruise industry has a very high level of ownership
20 concentration, with the three largest parent companies (Carnival, Royal Caribbean and Norwegian)
21 enjoying a 96% market share, measured by the number of passengers (Cruise Marketwatch, 2018).
22 These companies hold a powerful position in relation to potential cruise destinations as they are able
23 to change their itineraries according to the attractiveness of different ports; for example, in relation to
24 natural attractions and potential excursions for passengers, or taxes and regulations. Cruise lines also
25 exercise a high degree of control over onshore excursions by making agreements with local providers
26 to sell tours and other activities to passengers. The cruise ship usually keeps 50% or more of the price
27 passengers pay on board, affecting the profitability of local tourism businesses (Klein, 2011; Brida &
28 Zapata, 2010; Diedrich, 2010; Joao & Dredge, 2018). Several studies have also indicated that cruise
29 tourists spend less money than land-based tourists, partly because they have relatively little time
30 ashore (Satta et al, 2014, 2015; Larsen et al, 2013; Larsen and Wolff, 2016; Penco and Di Vaio, 2014).

31 **Stakeholder views on the sustainability of cruise tourism**

32
33 Documenting the environmental, economic and socio-cultural impacts of cruise tourism on local
34 destinations is an important task and the literature identifies some key issues that are likely to concern
35 stakeholders in Arctic destinations. However, it is unclear how the stakeholders involved in managing
36 cruise tourism in such destinations conceptualise sustainability themselves; for example, whether they
37 operate with a resource, activity or community-based perspective, or if they consider the broader
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 principles of holism and futurity. As commentators have noted in relation to other types of tourism,
4 the holistic approach often disintegrates in practice into trade-offs between environmental, economic
5 and social goals (Balslev Clausen and Gyimóthy, 2016), and present-day needs tend to take priority
6 over more uncertain future consequences, undermining the principle of futurity (McCool et al, 2013).
7
8 This is important because it has implications for the way that stakeholders approach the management
9 and regulation of cruise tourism.
10
11
12

13
14 There is evidence of conflicting opinions about sustainability issues among local stakeholders in
15 relation to cruise tourism generally (e.g. van Bets et al, 2017b; Diedrich, 2010) but only a very small
16 number of studies have investigated the views of stakeholders in Arctic destinations, and these – like
17 the wider literature on sustainability and cruise tourism – focus on managing impacts at the destination
18 level. Van Bets et al. (2017a), for example, document the tensions between different stakeholders in
19 relation to environmental regulation in the context of the collective self-governance of cruise tourism
20 at Svalbard, demonstrating the difficulties involved. Another study by Stewart, Dawson and Draper
21 (2011) examined stakeholder attitudes towards cruise tourism in Nunavut and Cambridge Bay in the
22 Canadian Arctic. They found more positive attitudes towards cruise tourism in Cambridge Bay where
23 cruise tourism is at an early stage of development, but also that in both destinations environmental
24 issues were downplayed in relation to the perceived economic and cultural impacts (ibid, p. 104).
25 However, in a later piece of research, which included stakeholders from Arctic communities across
26 Canada, Dawson et al (2016) concluded that there was a clear desire to manage cruise tourism in a
27 way that balances socio-economic and environmental imperatives.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 As Budeanu, et al (2016, p.288) note, the notion that community engagement and stakeholder
39 involvement is crucial to the implementation of sustainable tourism is widespread, but stakeholders
40 often hold different views on what sustainability means and how important it is. In a different tourism
41 context, Balslev Clausen and Gyimóthy's (2016) study of the Mexican national tourism program
42 *Pueblos Magicos* showed how different groups bargain on behalf of 'the community' and promote
43 incompatible visions of sustainability and tourism development. They emphasise that local
44 communities are not necessarily homogeneous or cohesive. Hatipoglu et al's (2016) research on
45 tourism planning in Turkey also concluded that a major issue is finding a common understanding of
46 what sustainable tourism is or could be. Indeed, they concluded that 'stakeholders' narrow vision, lack
47 of strategic orientation and financial focus based on self-interest may impede the realization of
48 sustainable tourism despite the local community's involvement in the planning process' (ibid, p. 306).
49 Saarinen (2006, p.1133) reminds us that 'local communities do not have automatic privileges over the
50 ethical or sustainable aspects of tourism, nor do they necessarily have any intrinsic knowledge of the
51 impacts and the scale of these impacts on the environment'.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In the case of cruise tourism, there are additional problems, even where local communities agree on
4 how to develop and manage tourism, because the flows and impacts of cruise ships are difficult to
5 regulate by place-bound and state authorities, such as ports or environmental agencies (van Bets et
6 al., 2017a; Johnson, Dawson & Stewart, 2017). The power of cruise lines to change itineraries, and the
7 consequences thereof, is a recurring theme in the literature on cruise tourism (Esteve-Perez & Garcia-
8 Sanchez, 2015). Dawson, Johnson and Stewart (2017) express concern that 'over-regulation' of the
9 Canadian Arctic might lead to cruise ships choosing itineraries around Greenland or Norway instead,
10 and Adams (2010) study of Haines in Alaska documents the economic devastation caused by the rapid
11 decline of visitors after the Royal Caribbean cruise line dropped the port from its itinerary.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 To summarise, the so-called 'three pillars' of environmental, social and economic impact are a common
20 way to conceptualise and study the sustainability of cruise tourism, although this understanding of
21 sustainable tourism is contested (Butler, 1999; Sharpley, 2000; Liu, 2003). Commentators such as
22 McCool et al (2013, p.218), for example, have argued that 'overly simplistic models and panaceas—
23 such as finding the intersection of ecological sensitivity, economic feasibility and cultural
24 acceptability—are deceptive'. The debate has developed further to include ideas about complex
25 adaptive systems and resilience as alternative frameworks, and more radical agendas such as
26 degrowing tourism (Dwyer, 2018; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2019) but we know little about whether these
27 ideas have gained traction among those involved in tourism development. Research on sustainability
28 and tourism in a range of contexts indicates that local communities are heterogeneous, and different
29 groups of stakeholders have conflicting views regarding the definition and management of sustainable
30 tourism. However, there has been little research on how stakeholders involved in cruise tourism
31 conceptualise sustainability and what the implications are for how they try to manage its development.
32 The literature on stakeholders' general perceptions of cruise tourism indicate that destination
33 development stage and power relations between global cruise lines and local communities shape the
34 way that management issues are framed, and it seems likely that they will also influence stakeholder
35 perspectives on sustainability. These issues are explored in the following analysis.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Methods**

52
53 The following sections present an analysis of stakeholder perceptions of the sustainability of cruise
54 tourism in Qaqortoq, Greenland and Ísafjörður, Iceland. A multiple case study method is applied,
55 comprising two case studies that have been selected based on their contrasting growth profiles in
56 relation to cruise tourism. This is because previous research in the Canadian Arctic has shown that
57 stakeholder views on cruise tourism more generally are affected by overall visitor numbers (Stewart,
58
59
60

1
2
3 Dawson & Draper, 2011). Whilst both are relatively isolated Arctic destinations, with populations of
4 approximately 3,000 people, Ísafjörður has a much larger number of cruise calls and overnight stays.
5 Thus, the case studies have been selected with a view to theoretical replication (Yin, 2009) in which
6 contrasting results are expected due to the differing contexts of the case studies. Table 1 provides an
7 overview of tourism in the two destinations and Figure 1 shows their location.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 Table 1 here

16
17 Figure 1 here
18
19
20
21

22 ***Qaqortoq, Greenland***

23
24 Qaqortoq is the principal town of Kujalleq municipality, which was formed in 2009, comprising the
25 previous municipalities of Narsaq, Nanortalik and Qaqortoq in South Greenland. The municipality has
26 around 6,900 inhabitants, of which 3,000 live in Qaqortoq. In the Municipality's development plan
27 from 2017 a renewed emphasis is placed on developing the fisheries industry, including ambitions to
28 start local fish processing. Tourism is also a strategic focus area and, in relation to cruise tourism,
29 improving the conditions for port access is a priority (Kujalleq Municipality, 2017). South Greenland
30 has one airport in the town of Narsarsuaq, which receives smaller flights from Iceland and other
31 airports in Greenland. Qaqortoq is accessible by helicopter and by boat. The boat traffic between
32 towns and settlements in South Greenland is managed by a privately-owned operator, which also
33 serves as a tourist information office in Narsarsuaq and offers package tours for overnight tourists.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Qaqortoq, along with other destinations in the South and south west, generally attracts more medium-
43 sized and larger cruise vessels of 500-2,500 passengers, whereas the destinations in the northern part
44 of Greenland attract more expedition cruise ships. Part of the reason for this is that Qaqortoq is
45 included in itineraries between the North America and Europe.
46
47
48
49

50 In Greenland, cruise tourism is managed by individual operators in the local destinations, supported
51 by the national tourist board Visit Greenland. Passenger-related services for cruise ships are managed
52 by three different tour operators who make agreements directly with the cruise companies. The
53 activities of cruise tourists are centred on the town and include boat tours, the museum, the Great
54 Greenland tannery, traditional "kaffemik" visits to local homes, and tasting menus at the hotel. Local
55 handicraft producers sell their products at the harbour.
56
57
58
59
60

Ísafjörður, Iceland

Ísafjörður is the principal town of the Westfjords peninsula, in the North West of Iceland, and has a population of approximately 3,000. Traditionally, the fishing industry has been the mainstay of all the towns and villages in the Westfjords. In recent years the importance of tourism has increased and there has been rapid growth in cruise tourism (Vinnumálastofnun, 2015). The Westfjords is a remote destination that is not easily accessible by car, and therefore cruise tourism is seen as important for the tourism industry in the area. In addition, the number of ships calling each year is known in advance, which provides security in terms of hiring staff for the tourism season.

Cruise tourism in Iceland is managed by two Reykjavik-based cruise destination management companies – Iceland Travel and Atlantik – which compete for contracts with the cruise companies. These two firms in turn either manage the local tour operation for cruise ships or contract a local operator. In Ísafjörður the main tour operator is West Tours which collaborates with other local stakeholders, including bus companies, guides, the museum and people in the surrounding villages. There is well-established collaboration between public and private stakeholders in relation to cruise tourism in Ísafjörður. The harbour (part-owned by the municipality) manages bookings from the cruise companies, and all suppliers that are involved in cruise tourism are called to a meeting before the start of the season. At this meeting the cruise schedule for the summer is discussed, especially the challenges related to the so-called ‘red days’, which refer to days where more than 2,500 cruise tourists visit the town.

Data collection

[The aim of this project was to develop an in-depth understanding of stakeholders’ perspectives on sustainability and cruise tourism. A qualitative research strategy based primarily on individual interviews was therefore employed in order to explore the complexity of the situation in the destination in depth with stakeholders \(Richie et al, 2014\).](#) Documentary information in the form of project documents, national tourism plans and local strategy documents, as well as news websites were used to gather background information in preparation for interviews. The desk research and informal conversations with local stakeholders indicated that in both destinations there were potentially sensitive issues and a degree of conflict related to cruise tourism and sustainability (for example, around destination management, passenger numbers and local impacts). In this respect, being ‘outsiders’ to both destinations, uninvolved in local conflicts, was an advantage. Interviews were

1
2
3 carried out with 23 cruise tourism stakeholders in (or in the case of the national destination
4 organisations, working with) the two destinations. The same types of stakeholders were interviewed
5 in the two case study areas, as far as possible. Interviewees were selected on the basis of their
6 involvement in cruise tourism using an initial web-based search supplemented with a snowballing
7 technique to identify important stakeholders in each destination. These are very small destinations
8 and the main stakeholders involved in planning, managing and servicing cruise tourism in each were
9 interviewed. The interviewees were asked about their views on the different impacts of cruise tourism
10 and its sustainability, and how local actors managed the opportunities and challenges related to its
11 development. Table 2 provides an overview of interviewees in the two case studies.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Table 2 here

Most of the interviews were conducted face-to-face, but due to geographical distance and challenges of logistics, some interviews took place via Skype. The interviews were conducted in Danish in Greenland. In one case the interviewee preferred to speak Greenlandic and an interpreter was used. In Iceland the interviews were conducted in English. Ethical issues are raised by conducting research in small destinations, because it is challenging to ensure anonymity. It was agreed that when quoting from interviews, stakeholder categories would be used without reference to the specific organisation which the stakeholder represents. However, interviewees may still be identifiable locally, and this may have affected how open they were about conflicts within the destination. A limitation of the research is that only stakeholders directly involved in cruise tourism were interviewed, and their views may well differ from other stakeholder groups (see Stewart, Dawson and Draper, 2011).

Stakeholder perceptions of cruise tourism sustainability in Ísafjörður and Qaqortoq

In the following sections we explore the ways that stakeholders in the two destinations construct and relate different aspects of sustainability to each other. We compare the views of stakeholders in Ísafjörður and Qaqortoq regarding the economic, socio-cultural and environmental sustainability of cruise tourism, and the extent to which they manage the development of cruise tourism collaboratively. In the discussion section, we set stakeholders' perceptions of the sustainability of cruise tourism in the context of empirical findings from other destinations and the broader literature on sustainability and cruise tourism.

Economic sustainability

In both Ísafjörður and Qaqortoq the economic sustainability of cruise tourism was an important concern for most stakeholders. There were, however, important differences between the two destinations. Ísafjörður is generally seen as an economically successful cruise destination by both national and local stakeholders, and cruise ships are considered to be an important source of income for both the harbour and other local businesses. Cruise ships typically stay in port for eight hours with tours to nearby fishing villages and other attractions at relatively short distances from town. Three tours of three hours duration to different locations are usually organised simultaneously and the same tours can be organised both in the morning and in the afternoon. This means that the cruise tourists can spend half a day in town and half a day on a tour. This arrangement is popular because it maximises income for both the tour operators and local businesses, as well as spreading out tourists across a wider area:

‘One thing that is done well is that we work with the neighbouring towns. We have a bus tour around Ísafjörður visiting the heritage museum, the forest, the church. The Arctic fox tour. So the money does not only stay within one company but is spread around the region’. (Tourism business, Ísafjörður)

The tour operators are competitors, but they also have a well-functioning collaboration, which is facilitated by the large number of cruise tourists coming to the area. Since they are nearly always fully booked, tour operators are happy to refer customers to other firms when they cannot accommodate cruise passengers on their own tours.

In Qaqortoq, the situation is quite different. The overall number of cruise ships calling at the port is much lower and cruise tourism is not seen as such a significant activity for the town although passenger numbers are increasing. While some stakeholders were concerned about capacity in the future, others suggested that taxation and changing regulation of cruise ships may in fact reduce passenger numbers. The introduction of new environmental regulations means that vessels of more than 400 passengers are required to have two ice pilots on-board when travelling to Greenland, making the destination more expensive for cruise lines. Stakeholders suggested, for example, that one of the large cruise lines had stopped calling at Qaqortoq as a result of the higher costs (and, according to some stakeholders, lack of improvements to the harbour facilities).

Cruise tourism has become a source of conflict between tour operators who compete for tourists and staff. The locally based tour operator (which also serves as a tourist information centre in Qaqortoq)

1
2
3 managed the majority of cruise calls for many years, with the remainder managed by a Danish-based
4 tour operator. However, a new operator, based in Sisimiut, has started a business that provides
5 passenger related services to cruise companies at destinations all along the coast. This entrepreneur
6 has been successful in negotiating contracts with many of the cruise ships arriving at Qaqortoq and
7 maintains a network of guides in every harbour where they operate – approximately 50 people along
8 the coast. In Qaqortoq there are a limited number of tourist guides, so this is of concern for the local
9 tour operators, and a key area of conflict:

15
16 ‘Sometimes guides are not there when I need them because they have got a better
17 offer from another tour operator that can afford to pay them better (...) I have spent
18 time and resources training the young people and it upsets me when someone comes
19 in and takes them away’ (Tour operator, Qaqortoq).

22
23 The guide education programme based in Qaqortoq has increased the supply of guides, but for most
24 it is a side activity to other occupations.

26
27 Another challenge faced by the tour operators is the number of boats available to take tourists on
28 tours. When cruise ships arrive in Qaqortoq, passengers have often already booked tours through the
29 cruise line that require boat transport. The number of boats authorised to take passengers is limited
30 to two private boats in town and the boat company which manages most of the boat passenger
31 transport in South Greenland. This company prioritises local residents and tourists arriving by air,
32 which means that its boats can usually not be booked on days with flight arrivals.

34
35 In Ísafjörður there are also problems accommodating both cruise and land-based tourists. On cruise
36 days all tours are fully booked, preventing other tourists from taking them:

37
38 ‘For me the cruise tourists are mainly a nuisance to the other tourists. They get off the
39 boat for a couple of hours to be able to say they have been here. The other tourists
40 genuinely want to experience the country’ (Tourism business, Qaqortoq)

41
42 In addition, some stakeholders worried that their businesses were too dependent on cruise ships that
43 squeeze the operators’ margins:

44
45 ‘I know what tours cost on board the cruise ships and it is much higher than what I am
46 selling directly to my customers. Every season you are fighting for the percentages but
47 on the other hand I’m now able to plan according to the number of cruises. If we did
48 not have the cruise ships it would be more shaky to invest in staff. The cruise ships are
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 driving the revenue. It is good but also bad, because so many eggs are in one basket'
4
5 (Tour operator, Ísafjörður).
6

7 A related issue, which is common to both destinations, is concern over the spending patterns of cruise
8 tourists compared with land-based tourists, although stakeholders in both destinations still considered
9 cruise tourists to be beneficial to the local economy. In Qaqortoq, for example, cruise passengers
10 provide a market for local products:
11
12

13
14 'There are many who sell handicrafts at the stalls. You can feel that they are benefitting.
15 They often ask for currency conversion, so they know how much they can take for the
16 goods' (Tourism business, Qaqortoq).
17
18
19

20 Stakeholders also mentioned fishermen taking tourists on tours, visits to local homes for 'kaffemik',
21 and local food tasting sessions. Other stakeholders, however, suggested that cruise passengers spend
22 relatively little:
23
24

25
26 'We do not make money on cruise tourists: they live out there...We have a restaurant
27 and cafe all year round. About 90% of guests in the cafe are locals' (Tourism business,
28 Qaqortoq).
29
30
31

32 In Ísafjörður, several stakeholders also expressed a preference for larger cruise ships that stop in the
33 port, rather than expedition vessels, which may not stop in the harbour of Ísafjörður but instead travel
34 directly to the local nature reserve. Since they do not dock at the harbour, the municipality loses
35 harbour fees and local businesses lose the opportunity to sell to cruise tourists. This is difficult to
36 resolve because legally the municipality is not able to prevent the expedition cruise ships from entering
37 the nature reserve. Similar concerns were voiced by some stakeholders in Qaqortoq but one important
38 difference between the destinations is that in Greenland all harbour fees are transferred to the Self
39 Rule government, whilst in Ísafjörður they are retained locally and used to develop the harbour. This
40 is a source of frustration for stakeholders in Qaqortoq who would like the small harbour to be
41 improved.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 ***Socio-cultural sustainability*** 53

54
55 Social and cultural issues in each destination were also very clearly linked by the interviewees to cruise
56 passenger numbers. In Ísafjörður there were concerns about the impacts of large numbers of tourists
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 on the days when cruise ships dock, whilst in Qaqortoq stakeholders were more focused on the role
4 that cruise tourism might play in counteracting outmigration, particularly of younger people.
5
6

7
8 Most stakeholders in Ísafjörður discussed the disruption caused to local people when large numbers
9 of cruise passengers arrive on one day and fill the town centre. As one stakeholder describes it:
10
11

12
13 ‘Everything is put on hold when the ships come in. It is a conflict. To everyone else we
14 are saying come and experience the solitude, off the beaten track...800-1,500 we can
15 service at a comfortable level. We can spread them out so there are not too many at
16 the same time in one place. With 2,000 we manage but it is putting stress on guides,
17 busses, stops’.
18
19

20
21
22 Most interviewees mentioned crowding when large numbers of passengers come ashore but some
23 also said that it was nice when the town was livelier in the summer months due to the visitors. In
24 Qaqortoq, where the number of tourists is much lower, there were not perceived to be any particular
25 difficulties or conflicts between locals and tourists:
26
27

28
29
30 ‘I think the locals are good at accepting the passengers. It is only those about four
31 months, and it is not like they are there all the time’ (Economic development officer,
32 Qaqortoq).
33
34

35
36 However, stakeholders in Qaqortoq were more concerned about the social consequences of part-time
37 employment, which means that very few people can make a living from tourism, and the reluctance of
38 some tour operators to hire local people as guides. This issue was linked by interviewees to the
39 activities of Danish tour operators who bring in Danish guides for the season. The Danish tour operator
40 present in the region and the local boat company both bring in seasonal employees from Denmark and
41 elsewhere. Other tour operators, however, highlighted their priority to engage local people. This is
42 done in order to support local employment but also to provide a better experience for the tourists:
43
44

45
46
47 ‘I only use local guides. It does not matter where they are from as long as they live in
48 Greenland and can talk about what it is like living here. The Danish companies send
49 guides up here for two to three months. They cannot give the tourists the real story’
50 (Tour operator, Qaqortoq).
51
52

53
54
55 Some stakeholders argued that the local population does not benefit enough from cruise tourism and
56 linked this to the colonial relationship between Denmark and Greenland. However, other stakeholders
57 mentioned that the local population could also show more initiative when cruise ships arrive. For
58
59
60

1
2
3 example, there are stalls located by the harbour where handicrafts and other products can be sold.
4 The tour operators have found that there is a high demand for locally produced handicrafts, but they
5 are not always available when the passengers arrive.
6
7

8
9 The only other socio-cultural issue mentioned by interviewees was the presentation of local culture
10 and traditions. In both destinations cruise tourism was seen as positive in this regard as it provided a
11 market for local food and drink and souvenirs, as well as supporting local museums.
12
13
14

15 16 17 ***Environmental sustainability*** 18

19
20 As with the other aspects of sustainability, environmental issues in each destination were interpreted
21 in relation to cruise passenger numbers. In Qaqortoq, environmental impacts were seen as low and
22 manageable by the vast majority of interviewees:
23
24

25
26 'There is nothing environmentally problematic. If we got 1 million tourists a year it
27 would probably look different, but when we just get the 50,000 or how many it is' (Tour
28 operator, Qaqortoq).
29
30
31

32
33 Very few stakeholders mentioned any specific issues that concerned them. Those stakeholders
34 involved in the regulation and inspection of cruise ship activities in the harbour thought that existing
35 environmental regulations were sufficient, but admitted that they knew little about the impacts on
36 wildlife:
37
38

39
40 'We have rules. No waste or waste oil. The waste they burn on board. I don't know how
41 the wildlife is affected. If they are going to leave waste here, we have made an
42 agreement in advance, and then they pay for it. Foreign rates are more expensive than
43 for locals' (Harbour, Qaqortoq).
44
45
46

47
48 However, some stakeholders were concerned about potential accidents. As one interviewee in
49 Ísafjörður put it:

50
51 'We don't have the manpower to do anything if a cruise ship is stranded, there is an oil
52 leak or something like that' (Tour operator, Ísafjörður).
53
54
55

56 In Ísafjörður environmental concerns were more prominent and several stakeholders discussed issues
57 related to the dramatic increase in the number of tourists and, in particular, the impacts on the local
58 nature reserve. Expedition cruise ships sometimes docked at the reserve instead of the harbour and
59
60

1
2
3 several stakeholders argued that this is damaging to the natural environment and also interferes with
4 the experience of the local population and land-based tourists hiking in the area. Some stakeholders
5 thought that cruise ships should be required to take a local guide who knew the area and wildlife:
6
7

8
9 'Hornstrandir nature reserve which has been protected for 40 years, a problem is cruise
10 ships going directly there. It is very hard to control it...The municipality is getting a ton
11 of money from cruise ships and it is difficult to say no' (Tour operator, Ísafjörður).
12
13

14
15 'They don't have a local knowledge of the area, they don't have a local guide. We need
16 to find a way to ensure they don't dock' (Destination Management Organisation,
17 Ísafjörður).
18
19

20
21 In general, there was consensus that most local stakeholders wanted to develop tourism in a way that
22 limited negative environmental impacts. They pointed to some successes in this regard, such as
23 preventing helicopter flights, but it was also apparent that local stakeholders feel relatively powerless
24 to control development:
25
26

27
28 'Local tourist companies said they want to focus on sustainability. We made big noise
29 for example last year when we had a helicopter company that wanted to come here
30 and fly around Hornstrandir. We managed to convince them not to come, it doesn't fit
31 with what we do. If they had insisted, we could not have stopped them' (Destination
32 Management Organisation, Ísafjörður).
33
34
35
36

37
38 Overall, most stakeholders in both Ísafjörður and Qaqortoq conceptualised environmental
39 sustainability in terms of some kind of relatively fixed carrying capacity. In Ísafjörður many
40 stakeholders argued that extremely rapid growth in the number of cruise ships visiting the port had
41 created huge pressure on local resources and that the limit had been reached. As one interviewee put
42 it:
43
44
45

46
47 'we are having days where, for example, twice this summer more than 5,000
48 passengers coming on one day. It is dawning that there are limits' (Destination
49 Management Organisation, Ísafjörður).
50
51

52
53 There have been discussions between the stakeholders regarding the possibilities of capping the
54 number of cruise ships but no agreement, which most interviewees attributed to the prioritisation of
55 economic development. In Qaqortoq, the number of visitors is much lower. Although some
56 interviewees mentioned that the small harbour can lead to capacity problems in summer when cruise
57
58
59
60

ships and fishing boats need access at the same time, the vast majority of stakeholders wanted to increase the number of cruise calls, and did not have concerns about environmental impacts.

Discussion

In both Qaqortoq and Ísafjörður, stakeholders have concerns about the sustainability of cruise tourism that are similar to those reported in cruise destinations elsewhere, although stakeholders also raised specific issues related to the local context. In common with other studies (e.g., Larsen et al, 2013; Penco and Di Vaio, 2014; Satta et al, 2024; 2015), stakeholders perceived cruise tourism positively in terms of economic sustainability but there were concerns about the lower spending of cruise tourists compared with land-based visitors. In Ísafjörður there was also concern about over-reliance on cruise tourism. In Qaqortoq, by contrast, lower numbers of cruise passengers contributed to conflicts between tourism businesses who compete for customers and employees.

Cruise passenger numbers were a constant reference point for interviewees in both destinations and also framed their understandings of other aspects of sustainability. In Ísafjörður, stakeholders were concerned about over-crowding during the summer months, whilst in Qaqortoq the lack of full-time employment opportunities and competition between Danish and Greenlandic workers for a small number of guiding jobs were of greater concern. The number of passengers also informed perceptions of environmental sustainability, with many stakeholders in Ísafjörður referring to an absolute limit to the number of passengers that could be accommodated. In Qaqortoq very few stakeholders perceived any environmental problems due to the relatively low number of cruise ship calls.

The findings from Qaqortoq and Ísafjörður support the argument that destination development stage affects perceptions of sustainability (see Stewart, Dawson and Draper, 2011). However, the data also suggest that the sustainability of cruise tourism is conceptualised in relation to other forms of tourism. In both destinations, stakeholders discussed the sustainability of cruise tourism explicitly in relation to land-based alternatives, which are perceived by the stakeholders to be more economically, socially and environmentally sustainable at a local scale. One of the biggest concerns about cruise tourism is that the large numbers of passengers who come ashore over a short period of time disrupt the experience of land-based tourists who spend a longer time and more money in the destination. Land-based tourists are also preferred because they are considered to have a more genuine interest in Arctic nature, cultures and societies. Although other studies have considered the relationship between tourism and other economic activities in Arctic destinations (Ren and Chimirri, 2017), our findings suggest that distinguishing between different types of tourism is also important.

1
2
3 In neither case did stakeholders take a broader or more holistic perspective on the sustainability of
4 cruise tourism; for example, considering impacts outside the destination. Our findings suggest that, as
5 Saarinen (2014) argued, a holistic orientation is not common, much less an understanding of
6 sustainability based, for example, on resilience or complex systems (McCool et al, 2013; Hall, 2019).
7
8 Instead, interviewees in both destinations tended to discuss cruise tourism in terms of local trade-offs
9 between different types of sustainability and perceived limits to growth. Some stakeholders referred
10 to absolute limits while others discussed adaptations to the organisation of cruise tourism activities.
11 Our findings therefore suggest that the resource- and activity-based perspectives discussed by
12 Saarinen (2006; 2014), conceptualised at a local scale, are most prevalent in these destinations.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Most stakeholders also indicated that short term economic growth is prioritised over environmental
20 and socio-cultural issues. Thus, for example, stakeholders in both destinations expressed concerns that
21 environmental regulations had or would impact negatively on the number of cruise calls, and in
22 Ísafjörður this was seen as the main impediment to agreeing a cap on the number of cruise ships
23 visiting each season. In this sense, the findings reported here are similar to those from other studies,
24 such as Dawson, Stewart and Johns (2016) and van Bets et al (2017a), which also found that the power
25 of cruise lines to change itineraries is seen as a constant economic threat and makes agreement on
26 regulation more difficult. Many stakeholders expressed a sense of powerlessness in relation to the
27 future direction of cruise tourism, since cruise lines determine, to a large extent, the type and number
28 of tourists who visit. In this sense, a community-based approach to developing cruise tourism more
29 sustainably was not seen as realistic by the stakeholders.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 These case studies also suggest that collaborative governance arrangements - or the lack thereof -
39 appear to be an important factor in the management of cruise tourism and the potential for developing
40 it in a more sustainable way; for example, in the areas of education, development of tourism products,
41 marketing, involvement of the local community, and environmental regulation. In the case of
42 Ísafjörður, well-functioning local stakeholder collaboration between tour operators and suppliers is in
43 place to manage the cruise calls. However, current stakeholder discussions concerning potential limits
44 to growth and reducing the number of cruise ship arrivals is challenged by the economic dependence
45 of the destination on global cruise lines. Stakeholders from the municipality express awareness and
46 concern for the increasing social and environmental impacts from cruise tourism, but the dependence
47 on the income from the harbour and maintaining jobs in the area carries more weight in decision-
48 making. Economic development is the overriding concern for the Municipality that has the authority
49 to limit the growth of cruise tourism.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Collaboration is not so successful in Qaqortoq due to rivalry between tour operators and the limited
4 number of guides and boats available in the area. Another reason for the lack of collaboration seems
5 to be that there is not a convenor in place who is seen as legitimate by most stakeholders. While
6 individual suppliers to cruise tourism collaborate with the tour operators, there is no overall public-
7 private structure in place to manage Qaqortoq as a cruise destination, although a destination
8 management organisation has recently been established. The stakeholders express different
9 perspectives on the management of cruise tourism and its future. The national tourist board believes
10 that Qaqortoq should prepare and develop nature and culture-based products targeted at smaller
11 expedition ships, because Greenland is likely to see fewer large ships and more expedition ships in
12 future due to regulations and increasing costs. The local tour operator, however, disagrees and wishes
13 to continue focusing on large ships. The tour operators are in ongoing conflict and competition about
14 winning agreements with ships, employing the local guides, and getting access to tour boats.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 In neither case is there agreement between the stakeholders on how to manage cruise tourism, but
25 the higher passenger numbers in Ísafjörður make it easier for stakeholders to collaborate. Although
26 the dynamics of collaboration are different in the two destinations, they are both affected by the
27 imbalance of power between global cruise lines and local stakeholders. In relation to cruise tourism
28 more generally, this imbalance is an important consideration in the context of debates regarding the
29 importance of local stakeholder engagement in the implementation of sustainable tourism (Budeanu,
30 et al, 2016), and suggests that coordination at a national and international scale is required.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Conclusions**

41 The aim of this article was to compare Qaqortoq, Greenland and Ísafjörður, Iceland in terms of
42 stakeholders' views about the sustainability of cruise tourism, and how they are attempting to manage
43 its development in the context of an imbalance in power between place-bound local stakeholders and
44 global cruise lines. The findings provide evidence that stakeholders in small Arctic cruise destinations
45 share some of the concerns expressed in other parts of the world, but that there are also context-
46 specific issues. In both destinations, economic and socio-cultural impacts were most commonly
47 mentioned, with environmental sustainability apparently a lesser concern. Furthermore,
48 environmental and socio-cultural sustainability were seen in opposition to economic sustainability
49 rather than in a holistic way. Stakeholders typically conceptualized sustainability in terms of trade-offs
50 between different types of impacts at a local scale.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The overall development stage of cruise tourism in terms of passenger numbers shaped stakeholders'
4 views on sustainability in both destinations. In Ísafjörður, cruise passenger and overnight visitor
5 numbers have increased significantly. This has resulted in stakeholder discussions about limiting the
6 number of cruise ships, which are framed in terms of the social and environmental carrying capacity
7 of the destination. In Qaqortoq, the numbers of cruise passengers and land-based visitors are much
8 lower (but growing), and this contributes to conflicts between tour operators who compete for the
9 limited number of customers. The findings also suggest that conceptualisations of cruise tourism
10 sustainability are shaped by the relationship between different types of tourism. In small and remote
11 Arctic destinations, limited resources (tour guides, transport, amenities) mean that there is very clear
12 competition between different forms of tourism, and the acceptability of the various impacts of cruise
13 ships and their passengers are assessed in relation to land-based alternatives. Thus, stakeholders'
14 perceptions of sustainability, like those of tourism impacts more generally, are context-dependent,
15 dynamic, and relational. Longitudinal research would improve our understanding of how they change
16 as cruise destinations develop over time. [A limitation of this research is that only stakeholders directly
17 involved in cruise tourism have been interviewed. Including local residents and other businesses would
18 provide a more comprehensive understanding of how local communities understand and engage with
19 sustainability and cruise tourism.](#)

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 Our findings are also important in relation to policymaking, because stakeholders' perceptions of
33 sustainability issues affect how they collaborate to manage and regulate cruise tourism, particularly in
34 relation to the prioritisation of local economic growth and their willingness to regulate cruise ships in
35 different ways. Both Qaqortoq and Ísafjörður illustrate the tension between local policymaking and
36 multinational cruise lines discussed in other studies of cruise tourism destinations (van Bets et al
37 2017a, 2017b). Local stakeholders referred repeatedly to the power of cruise ships to simply go
38 elsewhere if regulation becomes too onerous or harbour fees are too high. This involves both
39 competition between destinations within the same country and between different territories in the
40 Arctic, which the current self-regulation of the industry does not address.

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 Agreements between national governments with Arctic territories on the harmonisation of fees
49 charged by local harbours and a set of common guidelines and requirements for cruise ships would be
50 an important step in reducing the imbalance of power between cruise lines and local destinations. In
51 2017, the North Atlantic Think Tank published recommendations to maximise the benefits of cruise
52 tourism. They call for enhanced intergovernmental cooperation to harmonise tax regimes and set
53 common environmental standards, to avoid a damaging race to the bottom in terms of local regulation.
54 Initial steps have been taken in the intergovernmental cooperation between Greenland, Iceland, the
55 Faroe Islands and coastal Norway, and this would appear to be the most promising way forward.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

For Peer Review

References

- Adams, A. W. (2010). Planning for Cruise Ship Resilience: An Approach to Managing Cruise Ship Impacts in Haines, Alaska. *Coastal Management*, 38(6), 654–664.
- Balslev Clausen, H., & Gyimóthy, S. (2016). Seizing community participation in sustainable development: pueblos Mágicos of Mexico. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 111, 318-326.
- Brida, J. G., & Zapata Aguirre, S. (2010). Cruise tourism: economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts. *International Journal of Leisure and Tourism Marketing*, 1(3), 205-226.
- [Buckley, R. \(2012\). Sustainable tourism: Research and reality. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39\(2\), 528-546.](#)
- Budeanu, A., Miller, G., Moscardo, G., & Ooi, C.-S. (2016). Sustainable tourism, progress, challenges and opportunities: an introduction. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 111, 285-294.
- Butler, R. W. (1999). Sustainable tourism: A state-of-the-art review. *Tourism Geographies*, 1, 7-25.
- Carić, H., & Mackelworth, P. (2014). Cruise tourism environmental impacts – The perspective from the Adriatic Sea. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 102, 350-363.
- Cruise Iceland (2019) <http://www.cruiseiceland.com/about-us/statistics/>
Last accessed 09/05/2019
- Cruise Marketwatch (2018) '2018 Worldwide Cruise Line Market Share'.
<https://cruisemarketwatch.com/market-share/>
Last accessed 09/05/2019
- Davenport, J., & Davenport, J. (2006). The impact of tourism and personal leisure transport on coastal environments: A review. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 67(1-2), 280-292.
- Dawson, J., Johnston, M. E., & Stewart, E. J. (2014). Governance of Arctic expedition cruise ships in a time of rapid environmental and economic change. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 89, 88–99.
- Dawson, J., Stewart, E. J., Johnston, M. E., & Lemieux, C. J. (2016). Identifying and evaluating adaptation strategies for cruise tourism in Arctic Canada. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(10), 1425-1441.

- 1
2
3 Dawson, J., Johnston, M., & Stewart, E. (2017). The unintended consequences of regulatory
4 complexity: The case of cruise tourism in Arctic Canada. *Marine Policy*, 76, 71-78.
5
6
7 Diedrich, A. (2010). Cruise ship tourism in Belize: The implications of developing cruise ship tourism in
8 an ecotourism destination. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 53(5-6), 234–244.
9
10
11 Dwyer, L. (2018). Saluting while the ship sinks: the necessity for tourism paradigm change. *Journal of*
12 *Sustainable Tourism*, 26(1), 29-48.
13
14
15 Esteve-Perez, J., & Garcia-Sanchez, A. (2015). Cruise market: stakeholders and the role of ports and
16 tourist hinterlands. *Maritime Economics and Logistics*, 17(3), 371-388.
17
18
19 Hall, C. M. (2019). Constructing sustainable tourism development: The 2030 agenda and the
20 managerial ecology of sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(7), 1044-1060.
21
22
23 Hatipoglu, B., Alvarez, M. D., & Ertuna, B. (2016). Barriers to stakeholder involvement in the planning
24 of sustainable tourism: the case of the Thrace region in Turkey. *Journal of Cleaner Production*,
25 111, 306-317.
26
27
28 Higgins-Desbiolles, F., Carnicelli, S., Krolkowski, C., Wijesinghe, G., & Boluk, K. (2019). Degrowing
29 tourism: rethinking tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Online early.
30
31
32 Hritz, N., & Cecil, A. K. (2008). Investigating the Sustainability of Cruise Tourism: A Case Study of Key
33 West. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(2), 168-181.
34
35
36 Ísafjörður.is. (2016). *Welcome to Isafjordur*. <http://www.isafjordur.is/home/> Last accessed
37 09/05/2019
38
39
40 João Lopes, M., & Dredge, D. (2018). Cruise tourism shore excursions: value for destinations? *Journal*
41 *of Tourism Planning and Development*. Online Early.
42
43
44 Jones, P., Hillier, D., & Comfort, D. (2016). Sustainability in the hospitality industry. *International*
45 *Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(1), 36-67.
46
47
48
49
50
51 Johnston, M. E., Dawson, J., & Maher, P. T. (2017). Strategic Development Challenges in Marine
52 Tourism in Nunavut. *Resources*, 6(3), 1-15.
53
54
55 Klein, R. A. (2011). Responsible Cruise Tourism: Issues of Cruise Tourism and Sustainability. *Journal of*
56 *Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 18, 107–116.
57
58
59 Kujalleq Municipality. (2017). Kommuneplan 2017-2028 for Kommune Kujalleq. <http://kujalleq->
60

kp17.cowi.webhouse.dk/dk/hent_planen_som_pdf.htm Last accessed 09/05/2019

- Larsen, S., Wolff, K., Marnburg, E., & Øgaard, T. (2013). Belly full, purse closed. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 6, 142-148.
- Larsen, S., & Wolff, K. (2016). Exploring assumptions about cruise tourists' visits to ports. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 17, 44-49.
- Lamers, M., & Pashkevich, A. (2015). Short-circuiting cruise tourism practices along the Russian Barents Sea coast? The case of Arkhangelsk. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(4), 440-454.
- Lester, J.-A., & Weeden, C. (2004). Stakeholders, the natural environment and the future of Caribbean cruise tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 6(1), 39–50.
- Liu, Z. (2003). Sustainable Tourism Development: A Critique. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 11, 459–475.
- Lück, M., Maher, P. T., & Stewart, E. J. (2010). Setting the Scene: Polar Cruise Tourism in the 21st Century. In M. Lück, P. T. Maher, & E. J. Stewart (Eds.), *Cruise Tourism in Polar Regions: Promoting Environmental and Social Sustainability?* (pp. 1–10). London: Earthscan.
- [MacKenzie, N., & Gannon, M. J. \(2019\). Exploring the antecedents of sustainable tourism development. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*.](#)
- MacNeill, T., & Wozniak, D. (2018). The economic, social, and environmental impacts of cruise tourism. *Tourism Management*, 66, 387-404.
- Maher, P. T. (2012). Expedition cruise visits to protected areas in the Canadian Arctic: Issues of sustainability and change for an emerging market. *Tourism*, 60(1), 55–70.
- McCarthy, J. (2018). Maximising cruise tourism outcomes in small-medium cruise ports: lessons from Atlantic Canada. *Urban Research & Practice*, 11(4), 289-313.
- McCool, S., Butler, R., Buckley, R., Weaver, D., & Wheeler, B. (2013). Is Concept of Sustainability Utopian: Ideally Perfect but Impracticable. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 38(2), 213-242.
- Moscardo, G., & Murphy, L., (2014). There Is No Such Thing as Sustainable Tourism: Re-Conceptualizing Tourism as a Tool for Sustainability, *Sustainability*, 6, 2538-2561.
- North Atlantic Think Tank (2017) En anbefaling fra Nordatlantisk tankesmie: Felles krav til cruiseindustrien. NORA. https://nora.fo/north-atlantic-think-tank?_l=en Last accessed

09/05/2019

- Penco, L., & Di Vaio, A. (2014). Monetary and non-monetary value creation in cruise port destinations: an empirical assessment. *Maritime Policy & Management*, 41, 501–513.
- Pino, G., & Peluso, A. M. (2018). The development of cruise tourism in emerging destinations: Evidence from Salento, Italy. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 18(1), 15-27.
- Redcliffe, M & Woodgate, G. (1997). Sustainability and Social Construction. In *The International Handbook of Environmental Sociology*; Redcliffe, M., Woodgate, G., Eds.; Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, UK, 1997; pp. 55–67.
- Ren, C., & Chimirri, D. (2017). *Turismeudvikling I Grønland - Afdækning og Inspiration*. Aalborg: Institut for Kultur og Globale Studier, Aalborg Universitet.
- Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C. M., & Ormston, R. (2014). *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Rodrigue, J.P., Notteboom, T. (2013) The geography of cruises: Itineraries, not destinations. *Applied Geography*, 38, 31-42.
- Saarinen, J. (2006). Traditions of sustainability in tourism studies. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(4), 1121–1140.
- Saarinen, J. (2014). Nordic Perspectives on Tourism and Climate Change Issues. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 14(1), 1–5.
- Satta, G., Parola, F., Penco, L., & Persico, L. (2014). Destination satisfaction as a predictor of cruiser expenditures and behavioural intentions. Paper presented at the IAME 2014 Conference, Norfolk, Virginia, July 15–18 (Paper ID 114).
- Satta, G., Parola, F., Penco, L., & Persico, L. (2015). Word of mouth and satisfaction in cruise port destinations. *Tourism Geographies*, 17, 54–75.
- Schonka, Y., and Schweitser, P. (2004) Societies and Cultures: Change and Persistence. In Einarson, N., Nymand Larsen, J., Nilsson, A., & Young, O. (eds.), *Arctic Human Development Report*. Akureyri: Stefansson Arctic Institute & SDWG Arctic Council, pp 45-68.
- Sharpley, R. (2000). Tourism and Sustainable Development: Exploring the Theoretical Divide, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8(1):1-19.

1
2
3 Statistics Greenland (2018) Tourism Statistics Report Greenland 2018. <http://www.tourismstat.gl> Last
4 Accessed 23/11/2019

5
6 Statistics Greenland (2019) *2018 Cruise Ship Statistics*.

7
8 <http://www.stat.gl/dialog/main.asp?lang=en&sc=TU&version=201909> Last Accessed 23/11/2019
9

10
11
12 Statistics Iceland (2018) '4% increase in overnight stays in December'

13
14 [https://www.statice.is/publications/news-archive/tourism/overnight-stays-in-hotels-in-december-
15 2018/](https://www.statice.is/publications/news-archive/tourism/overnight-stays-in-hotels-in-december-2018/) Last accessed 23/11/2019

16
17 Stewart, E. J., Dawson, J., & Draper, D. (2011). Cruise Tourism and Residents in Arctic Canada:
18 Development of a Resident Attitude Typology. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*,
19 18(1), 95-106.

20
21
22 Stewart, E., Dawson, J., & Johnston, M. (2015). Risks and opportunities associated with change in the
23 cruise tourism sector: community perspectives from Arctic Canada. *The Polar Journal*, 5(2), 403-
24 427.

25
26
27 Torbianelli, V. (2012). The local economic impact of cruises: From figures to the active policies of the
28 European harbor cities. *Scientific Journal of Maritime Research*, 26(1), 139–150.

29
30
31 van Bets, L., Lamers, M.A.J., Van Tatenhove, J.P.M (2017a). Collective self-governance in a marine
32 community: expedition cruise tourism at Svalbard. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(11), 1583-
33 1599.

34
35
36 van Bets, L. K. J., Lamers, M. A. J., & van Tatenhove, J. P. M. (2017b). Governing cruise tourism at
37 Bonaire: a networks and flows approach. *Mobilities*, 12(5), 778-793.

38
39
40 Vinnuálastofnun (2015). Atvinnuleysistöður í Excelskjöllum - Greining á atvinnuleysistöðum eftir
41 bakgrunni. [https://www.vinnuálastofnun.is/um-okkur/tolfraedi-og-utgefing-
42 efni/atvinnuleysistolur-i-excelskjolum](https://www.vinnuálastofnun.is/um-okkur/tolfraedi-og-utgefing/efni/atvinnuleysistolur-i-excelskjolum) Last accessed 09/05/2019

43
44
45 Visit Greenland (2018). *Tourism Statistics Report Greenland 2017*.
46 [http://www.tourismstat.gl/resources/reports/en/r15/Tourism%20Statistics%20Report%20Gree
47 nland%202017.pdf](http://www.tourismstat.gl/resources/reports/en/r15/Tourism%20Statistics%20Report%20Greenland%202017.pdf) Last accessed 09/05/2019

48
49
50 Visit Greenland (2019) *Cruise Call List*. <https://traveltrade.visitgreenland.com/cruise-call-list/>

51
52
53 Last accessed 23/11/2019
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

[World Commission on Environment and Development \(1987\), "Our common future", available at:](#)

www.un-documents.net/ocf-02.htm

[Last accessed 21/02/2020](#)

United Nations Environment Programme & World Tourism Organization (UNEP-WTO) (2005). *Making Tourism More Sustainable*. Paris: United Nations Environment Programme.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research, design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Table 1 Overview of tourism in Ísafjörður and Qaqortoq, 2018

	Qaqortoq	Ísafjörður
Number of cruise calls	27	110
Number of passengers	28,025	80,000
Number of overnight stays (South Greenland & Westfjords & West Region, Iceland)	10,563	227,278

Source: Visit Greenland (2018; 2019); Statistics Greenland (2018, 2019); Cruise Iceland (2019); Statistics Iceland (2018).

Table 2 Number and type of stakeholder interviewees in each destination

Stakeholder	Ísafjörður	Qaqortoq
National destination management organisation	1	1
Local destination management organisation	1	N/A
Economic development and planning	3	2
Harbour	1	1
National cruise destination management company	2	1
Local tour operator	1	1
Local tourism businesses	3	4
Tourism education	N/A	2
Total	11	12

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Summary of changes

Comment	Action
Add explicit recognition that sustainability is a contested concept	Added paragraph introducing sustainability more generally, emphasizing that it is a contested concept
Include recent work in International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management	Added references to some relevant work on sustainability in tourism and hospitality from International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management
Add short rationale for methodological approach	Added a short rationale at beginning of data collection section
Comment on limitations of the work	Added comment on limitations to conclusion

For Peer Review