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Abstract

The UNESCO World heritage inscription has become popular with 1000+ sites nowadays, when it was introduced after the Second World War in order to protect significant areas such as landscapes and buildings. The popularity is visible in terms of touristic benefits and shows an attractive feature for the designated site, transforming the World Heritage label into a brand. However, this research finds the World Heritage brand is becoming weak in its ability to attract tourists which is in contrast with prevailing views found in preceding studies. The point of departure of this research is the situation on World Heritage Southern Öland what has influenced the scope of research focusing mainly on Nordic perspectives (Sweden, Denmark and Germany). The purpose of this paper is to call for improved stakeholder management at World Heritage sites to improve the brand and analyses the situation and practices in Sweden, Denmark and to a very limited extent, Germany. The research is based on theoretical stakeholder framework and cross-case analysis based on two case studies done in Denmark and Sweden employing data collection by interviews and questionnaires. It describes the stakeholder management and networking as contributors to the branding of the World Heritage sites. This paper shows various limitations of using the World Heritage brand and how World Heritage sites may attempt to strengthen themselves by creating a common network as well as using it as a local destination brand for commercial purpose.
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1. Background

After the Second World War, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization was created within a founding principle of intellectual solidarity and moral of humanity (UNESCO, 2015), in order to create networks between nations and thus promoting international collaboration through education, science and culture (Purdy, 2013). We will concentrate our future explanations on the UNESCO’s cultural aspect, as a result of which the World Heritage convention held in 1972 represents a real tool for promoting cooperation among nations and protecting the outstanding value of heritage sites through the world (UNESCO, 2015). World Heritage sites could be generally divided into three groups: Cultural & historical heritages and natural heritage as well as a mix of both: mixed heritage sites (UNESCO, 2015).

“Cultural heritage is the legacy of physical artefacts and intangible attributes of a group or society that are inherited from past generations, maintained in the present and bestowed for the benefit of future generations.” (UNESCO, 2015).

“Natural World Heritage sites are inscribed because of their superlative values relating to scenery and other superb natural phenomena geology, ecosystems and/or biodiversity.” (UNESCO, 2015). There is a list of ten selection criteria – 6 cultural and 4 natural – and sites which are to be included on the World Heritage list must meet at least one of them in addition to showing an outstanding universal value (UNESCO, 2015). Today, 1007 sites are inscribed on the World Heritage list across 161 states parties (UNESCO, 2015).

1.1 The World heritage as a brand

This field of research was decided after a meeting with business climate developer in municipality of Mörbylånga on Swedish island Öland, where World Heritage site Agricultural Landscape of Southern Öland is located. Despite having high hopes from the inscription, the site has only benefited scarcely in terms of economic benefits; even fifteen years after its
inscription. Previously, the municipality had not taken initiative in using the World Heritage brand for tourism promotion and only recently started doing so - for the benefit of the local community. The meeting ended up in a question if the brand is actually able to attract tourists and is as strong as assumed by the municipality (Lind, 2014). Therefore evaluation of UNESCO World Heritage brand strength and how to manage a UNESCO World Heritage brand are the scope of the research. This research is geographically delimited to Sweden and Denmark due to its geographical and cultural proximity and in a limited extent to Germany due to reported high numbers of German tourists visiting Swedish World Heritage sites (Lind, 2014; Holtorf, 2015).

The World Heritage is a globally recognized phrase and although considered as a top brand by many (e.g. Buckley, 2002; Cochrane & Tapper, 2006; Shackley, 1998), recent studies have turned away from this perception and started to view it in a rather critical light (e.g. King & Halpenny, 2014;Marcotte & Bourdeau, 2006; Yan & Morisson, 2007; Reinius & Fredman, 2007; Poria et al., 2011). UNESCO (2015) uses strong positive adjectives as ‘unique’, ‘irreplaceable’ and ‘possessing an outstanding universal value’ to signal a high level of quality attributed to the sites.

World Heritages in Denmark and Sweden tend to overlook the ability of the brand to attract tourists, but hold the traditional view of World Heritage as leverage towards advanced protection and preservation (Holtorf, 2015). In cases they are aware of the promise of increase in tourism, they come across a lack of guidance and vision (ibid.).

Since the Council of Europe’s Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention) in 2005, several novelties have been introduced in the understanding of the purpose of the cultural heritages to society. Cultural heritages, the World Heritages among them, should bear social benefits to the society – being inclusive, not exclusive to local communities. It calls for „greater democracy, strengthened citizen
participation and better governance” (Council of Europe, 2015). Social benefits can stream from economic development built around the heritages. Focus of this paper is limited to the economic benefit of the World Heritage listing, not the protection and preservation sides, although they are indivisible parts of the World Heritage concept.

Similarly, UNESCO promotes the World Heritage properties as having great potential for local economic development if „managed properly“ (UNESCO, 2014). It is true to some extent that inscription on the World Heritage list can result in an increased amount of tourists. However this does not apply to every World Heritage site (Jacquot & Gravari-Barbas, 2010; Chih-Hai Yanga, 2010; Van der Aa, 2005) and the statement cannot be generalized.

1.2 The World Heritage and tourism

UNESCO has often been criticised for attracting mass tourism despite its purpose to the contrary, not to attract mass tourism (Global Heritage Fund, 2015; Hunt, 2012; Usborne, 2009), which may create damage to the World Heritage (e.g. loss of cultural heritage, economic dependence, ecological degradation, intentional damage) (Fien, et al., 2015; Drdácký & Drdácký, 2011). Nowadays, UNESCO emphasizes sustainable tourism, which is defined as “tourism that respects both local people and the traveller, cultural heritage and the environment” (Fien, et al., 2015). Sustainable tourism is regarded as the “new“ tourism with tourists more interested in environmental protection and expect the tourism industry to take responsibility and become long-term protection oriented (Pedersen, 2002). UNESCO developed an action plan for sustainable tourism in the period between 2013 and 2015 (UNESCO, 2012). However, the shift from general tourism to sustainable tourism is still in progress and this paper will not specifically focus on sustainable tourism, but acknowledges its importance in respecting the heritage sites and its inhabitants.
1.3 A challenging research

In line with the literature review presented in the background, this study aims to aid the World Heritage sites which do not succeed in using the UNESCO World Heritage brand in promotion of tourism resulting in economic development.

We are limiting ourselves to use stakeholder approach with brand management as the key aspect. Stakeholder approach is used due to its inclusion of stakeholders’ interests and utilizing stakeholder engagement process in reaching the set goals. The inclusion of stakeholders’ interests is in line with the sustainable tourism trend, which includes local communities and their importance in decision making. Brand management refers to the World Heritage brand on international as well as on national and local levels. The involvement of stakeholders in the management process has become important in the past years (Landorf, 2009; Leask & Fyall, 2006; Phillips, 2002; 2003; Wijesuriya, et al., 2013). Also, Corporate Excellence, a centre for leadership, argues that co-creation (stakeholders involvement) is key in brand management since it is not only the company that owns the brand but also its stakeholders (Corporate Excellence, 2014). It actually strenghtens the brand (ibid).

1.3.1 Research Question & purpose

Becoming a World Heritage site does not always result in the expected increase of tourism for economic development reasons. UNESCO also states that the site needs to be managed properly. In our case, we want to focus on what a World Heritage brand ‘managed properly’ through stakeholders management might mean and what effects it may have.

Our research question thereby is:

Does stakeholder management improve the management of tourism and economic growth on UNESCO World Heritage Sites?
This research question is divided into two sub-questions:

1. How do Swedish and Danish World Heritage sites perceive the UNESCO world heritage brand?
2. What is the role of stakeholders management on branding the UNESCO World Heritage site in terms of managing tourism and economic growth?

Our purpose is to identify and evaluate the influence of stakeholders management on brand management by investigating the impact of brand management on tourism and economic growth for UNESCO World Heritage Sites.

1.3.2 Research approach

The research is mainly qualitative due to interview methods and mostly open answer questionnaires (Creswell, 2014). The study is a case-study which is further elaborated in the methods chapter. We work from a positivistic approach starting with theories, respecting neutrality (Total publishing, 2004). According to positivistic case study requirements, we construct validity – multiple data leads to same conclusions and establish evidence (Shanks & Parr, 2003; Rowley, 2002). Also external validity, which is necessary for generalisation and reliability – data collection method can be repeated, which considered as important in this study (Rowley, 2002). Finally, this study still sees reality as subjective with multiple interpretations possible as it is seen by the participants in our study where we use quotes. However, we are also taking into consideration the external validity to enable generalisation (Creswell, 2013; Rowley, 2002).
1.4 Outline

We have introduced UNESCO World heritage and the brand, its contribution and limitations in use for tourism promotion, exemplified on the case of Southern Öland. We argue that strengthening the brand can be achieved by stakeholder approach – organizing & involving the stakeholders and creating tight networks.

In section two we elaborate on the introduced issues of World Heritage as a brand through literature review and evaluate it using concept of brand equity. Following, we present the importance of stakeholder approach to building a strong brand and the theoretical framework. In section three, we argue for using case study as the research strategy with interviews and questionnaires as selected methods of data collection and describe the operationalization – practical development from a theoretical basis that has affected the form of data collection. Section four presents the collected data from World Heritage sites in Sweden, Denmark and Germany, which are analysed and discussed in section five. The final section summarizes the findings with respect to the limitations and possible bias, shows its importance to the practitioners as well as the academia and sets recommendations for future research.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 World Heritage Site as a brand

King and Halpenny (2014, p.781), after conducting several studies in Australia and Hawaii, considers the brand to be poorly presented by the World Heritage sites, thus failing to build positive brand equity. This has been further exemplified on surveys conducted on World Heritage sites Historic District of Old Québec (Marcotte & Bourdeau, 2006, p. 8), Huangshan, Xidi and Hongcun in China (Yan & Morrison, 2007, p. 187), Lapland (Reinius & Fredman, 2007, p. 847) and five sites in Queensland in Australia (King & Halpenny, 2014, p. 777). On these sites the researchers surveyed visitors awareness of the World Heritage status prior to the
visit. Positive answers were 55%, 41.6%, 58%, 56% respectively (Marcotte & Bourdeau, 2006; Yan & Morrison, 2007; Reinius & Fredman, 2007; King & Halpenny, 2014).

The World Heritage brand is one consisting of a combination of the symbol and a name and according to Kotler and Keller (2012), a brand not only differentiates the product or service from other products and services satisfying the same need, but also signals a certain level of quality. This provides predictability of demand and higher customer loyalty. The expression of the brand, the World Heritage logo was designed to increase awareness and recognition of the brand and also for customers to create positive associations with it (King & Halpenny, 2014). The logo, associated with standard of quality and a promise of high satisfaction for visitors, is recognized very little when used plain - stripped of the circular writing ‘WORLD HERITAGE’ (ibid.). According to Aaker (1996, p.84) “A strong symbol can provide cohesion and structure to an identity and make it much easier to gain recognition and recall.”, but this symbol has to be connected to the brand’s identity in the customers’ minds.

Some earlier research have uncritically considered the World Heritage Site brand to be a powerful brand, i.e. ‘In the nature and cultural tourism market it is the top brand, a guarantee of superior quality’ (Buckley, 2002, p. 2); or ‘global recognition of the World Heritage ‘brand’ can be an important selling point’ (Cochrane & Tapper, 2006, p. 102) and “the term ‘World Heritage Site’ is instantly recognized as designating something very special, in tourism terms a definite ‘must see’ (...) enrolment of a new property on the World Heritage List, with the concomitant publicity, is virtually a guarantee that visitor numbers will increase” (Shackley, 1998, p. 13). The authors, however, fail to support their claims with empirical data.

As contrast more contemporary research, which claim the opposite effect and their claim is to a larger extent supported by empirical research. One example is Poria et. al. who found no significant differences between designated and non-designated sites and conclude that ‘the title WHS does not serve as a magnet for tourists’ (Poria, et al., 2011). King & Halpenny (2014,
p.782) concluded similarly, when researching the WHS logo in Australia and Hawaii on 6 control sites: ‘the World Heritage symbol is failing to communicate any message’, and put the blame on weak WHS branding from side of site managers. The brand value is diluted by ever-increasing number of sites (Fyall & Rakic, 2006), especially as the quality cannot be maintained, due to often politicized designations (Holtorf, 2015) (Fyall & Rakic, 2006) and inconsistency in the brand usage by sites across the World. Some World Heritage site managers decide not to use the brand in their marketing at all, about 37% as reported by Hall & Piggin (2001).

All in all, this later research is effectively challenging the views portraying WHS as an instant-wonder brand. The dilution of the brand calls for a better stakeholder management (Fyall & Rakic, 2006), which could bring consistency to the brand usage. It is a difficult task to accomplish worldwide, but more manageable locally.

### 2.1.1 Brand Equity

According to Aaker (1991, p. 15-20) brand equity is “set of five assets (and liabilities) linked to a brand’s name and symbol that adds (or subtracts from) to the value provided by a service to the customers” – also known as the Aaker Model. Brand equity is connected to name and symbol of the brand. The assets are brand loyalty; name awareness; perceived quality; brand associations and other proprietary brand assets. Positive brand equity provides value both to customers and firms. To customers, by enhancing their experiences; affecting confidence in purchase decisions and helping them with interpretation of information from large number of products and brands. To firms, by enhancing the brand loyalty and to increase the efficiency of marketing programs, brand extensions and trade leverage thereby improving their competitive advantage (ibid.).
In the case of UNESCO World Heritages, the name awareness is however often very low as shown by several studies (cf. e.g. Poria, et al., 2011; King & Halpenny, 2014). Perceived quality is being diluted by the incoherent standard of quality across the ever-increasing amount of World Heritages. In connection to brand equity, “brand identity is the set of assets the organisation is trying to maintain. It should help establish a relationship between the brand and the customer by generating a value proposition“ (Aaker, 1991, p. 68). As such, the World Heritage brand identity may be confusing for the customers by being too broad and vague and even for the World Heritage sites themselves, as their identity and value propositions may not be in line with the identity assessed by UNESCO. The sites end up in a brand identity trap of a conflict between how the brand is perceived and how the brand strategists at UNESCO want it to be perceived and at the same time the sites alone are powerless to affect identity of the brand they are using.

Kladou and Kahegias (2014) have elaborated on the Aaker’s brand equity model, applying it on cultural tourist destinations and testing the implications of cultural destination brand dimensions (i.e. cultural brand assets, awareness of the cultural destination brand, positive associations, quality of the cultural destination brand, customer loyalty) on the brand equity. They found that “five brand equity dimensions have a statistically significant impact on destination brand equity” (Kladou & Kehagias, 2014). They furthermore found that cultural brand assets have a positive impact on customer awareness, quality of the brand and positive associations have impact on customer loyalty.

Kladou’s and Kahegias’ study found that Aaker’s model of brand equity is applicable on cultural heritage sites and due to significant impact of brand equity on customers, we find it as a crucial part of this paper and we will later discuss the brand equity of UNESCO World Heritage brand and its implications on the sites.
2.2 Stakeholder approach

The stakeholder theory mainly focuses on firms and its stakeholders, but it is also useful for tourism development on World Heritage sites (Jawahar & Mclaughlin, 2001; Freeman & McVea, 2001; Stieb, 2009; Strand, 2015; Gibson, 2000; Freeman, 1984; Nicholas, et al., 2009; Freeman, 1994). The stakeholder theory framework has been created by Freeman (1984) as a reaction to turbulent times in business. Freeman sees a stakeholder as any individual or a group who can influence or is affected by organisational achievements while reaching the objectives (Freeman & McVea, 2001; Jawahar & Mclaughlin, 2001). Stakeholders can be from any kind, such as government, customers, tourists, competitors, et cetera (Freeman & McVea, 2001) arguing that corporations should be managed in stakeholders interests (Freeman, 1994). In academics, researchers often use Freeman’s (1984) theory as a starting point for definitions and mention the interdependence between the firm and its stakeholders (Jawahar & Mclaughlin, 2001). It is noted that without continuing relationships with primary stakeholders, an organisation will not be able to survive in a turbulent world (ibid). Gibson (2000) argues that enterprises should also consider secondary stakeholders, such as labour organisations that may affect the firm in a more indirect way, since they can become a direct stakeholder through different types of actions. A stakeholder can help but also hurt an enterprise (ibid). The stakeholder theory is meant to break the confusing circle (avoiding problems), it is a strategic management process and not management planning process, is about the survival of the firm, is focusing on long-term successes and relationships with stakeholders. It builds on concrete facts and analysis where stakeholders are not ‘just’ given but are names and faces, whether it is an individual or an organisation (Freeman & McVea, 2001). Management of stakeholders results in better consequences, a better respect of human rights and a better human character (Stieb, 2009, p. 407). Also the importance of the stakeholder theory may not be ignored since the society becomes more aware and claiming towards corporations when they ask for moral
behaviour, high company standards and openness about information for instance (Strand, 2015). Based on latter the stakeholders theory has reached its point of ‘smartness’ since it unites groups of people, societies empowering them to reach their goals. An important task laying ahead is redefining as well as redeveloping the stakeholder theory in order to benefit from this trend as much as possible (ibid).

While the stakeholder theory is originally focusing on business management, it can also be transferred into the World Heritage context (Nicholas, et al., 2009). Nicholas, et al. (2009) mention the destination community’s assets as a sharing opportunity by tourists, locals as well as the public and private sector. The tourism development becomes a public and social good to be shared by different stakeholders in a specific destination (ibid). This requires much more collaboration between management and stakeholders as practised today what can be seen as a link with the stakeholder theory and steady tourism development (Nicholas, et al., p. 393).

Content in following section 2.2.1-2.2.3 intends to support the stakeholder theory in the context of World Heritage. First of all, the shift towards a more stakeholder oriented approach in World Heritage management has been highlighted. This part mostly focus on the decision making process and the differences as how it was before and here-and-now. Then the long-term perspective of the stakeholder approach has been mentioned arguing that the management focus should be more on stakeholder satisfaction to obtain a steady tourism growth by appreciation of the World Heritage. Lastly, the stakeholder approach has placed under the attention of entrepreneurship. Stakeholders could take entrepreneurial actions from the bottom of a network. It has been argued that further research is needed.
2.2.1 The decision making process: from top-down to stakeholder approach

The view on how to manage World heritage sites is changing from an exclusive to an inclusive approach in relation to local societies as it is shown in table 1 (Wijesuriya, et al., 2013) & (Phillips, 2002; 2003).

Table 1: A new paradigm for protected areas (taken from A. Phillips, 2002; 2003 & Wijesuriya, et al., 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>As it was: protected areas were…</th>
<th>As it is becoming: protected areas are…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>1. Set aside for conservation;</td>
<td>1. Run also with social and economic objectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Established mainly for spectacular wildlife and scenic protection;</td>
<td>2. Often set up for scientific, economic and cultural reasons;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Managed mainly for visitors and tourists;</td>
<td>3. Managed with local people more in mind;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Valued as wilderness;</td>
<td>4. Valued for the cultural importance of so-called ‘wilderness’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. About protection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td>Run by central government.</td>
<td>Run by partners and involve an array of stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local people</strong></td>
<td>1. Planned and managed against people;</td>
<td>1. Run with, for, and in some cases by local people;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Managed without regards to local opinions.</td>
<td>2. Managed to meet the needs of local people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wider context</strong></td>
<td>1. Developed separately;</td>
<td>1. Planned as part of national, regional and international systems;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Managed as ‘islands’.</td>
<td>2. Developed as ‘networks’ (strictly protected areas, buffered and linked by green corridors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions</strong></td>
<td>1. Viewed primarily as a national asset;</td>
<td>1. Viewed also as a community asset;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Viewed only as a national concern.</td>
<td>2. Viewed also as an international concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management techniques</strong></td>
<td>1. Managed reactively within a short timescale;</td>
<td>1. Managed adaptively in a long-term perspective;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Managed reactively within a short timescale.</td>
<td>2. Managed with political considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance</strong></td>
<td>Paid for by taxpayer</td>
<td>Paid for from many resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The shift has been proven by Swensen & Sætren (2014) where they mention in their case study the importance of collaboration between the local community and owners. Also Leask & Fyall (2006) explains that until recently a limited amount of stakeholders were involved in decision making who were mainly governments, conservation experts and local authorities. The local society, businesses, groups of people, tour companies and visitors were largely left out in the process (ibid).

Critics of the stakeholder approach argue that involving stakeholders with different interests could cause problems or slow down the decision making process, but there is not directly a negative effect of local participation (De Brucker, et al., 2013; Schultz, et al., 2011). It is important to have the right stakeholders at the right place (ibid; ibid). Than the efficiency increased, accuracy was improved, legitimacy has been strengthened and landscape services were enhanced (Fagerholm, et al., 2012; Schultz, et al., 2011).

### 2.2.2 Managing tourism with and through stakeholders

Another aspect is the change from the short-term into the long-term management perspective as mentioned in 2.2.1 (Wijesuriya, et al., 2013) & (Phillips, 2002; 2003). The reasoning behind becoming a World Heritage site has often been the expected tourism increase and economic considerations (Ryan & Silvanto, 2014). However, that differs among countries, regions and the amount of World Heritage sites in an area and is mainly short-term (Huang, et al., 2012) & (Su & Lin, 2014). Referring to what has been said before, the focus should be more on support to the private tourism sector (and society) to obtain steady development of the tourism sector on World Heritage sites (Cuccia, et al., 2014).
In addition to the long-term perspective, the destination identity and image of a World Heritage site is important to communicate to stakeholders where stakeholder involvement and partnerships with their satisfaction of goals and needs are key in successful destination branding (Baker & Cameron, 2008; Hankinson, 2009; UNWTO, 2013). In short, the stakeholder theory may help for stakeholder awareness as well as rebranding the UNESCO World Heritage brand and local brands.

### 2.2.3 Stakeholders theory versus entrepreneurship

Considering the literature written above the stakeholder theory is seen as a management theory in general, however, entrepreneurship can be combined as well. Combining the stakeholder theory with entrepreneurship has been done for the reason of a call made by Sarasvathy & Dew (2007) to do more research on stakeholder theory combined with entrepreneurship. In modern societies, entrepreneurship and innovation are key for increased welfare of countries (Sarasvathy & Dew, 2007). The authors mentioned in the last reference argue that innovation comes through uncertainty what challenges stakeholders (ibid); some stakeholders benefit while others lose in society (ibid).

Entrepreneurship can be generally distinguished by Tönnies’ (1887) Gemeinschaft-Gesselschaft social types dichotomy as Gessellschaft (Civil Society) principles which is

---

Figure 1: Dynamic model of the effectual stakeholder network (Sarasvathy & Dew, 2007, p. 275)
top-down entrepreneurship and the Gemeinschaft (Community) principles which is also called ‘mobilising entrepreneurship’ and is a bottom-up approach (Berglund & Johannisson, 2012).

An addition to the stakeholder theory is societal entrepreneurship where mobilised entrepreneurship is crucial (ibid). Mobilised entrepreneurship in this sense means the mobilisation of initiatives, value creation and as said before innovation (ibid). Sarasvathy and Dew (2007) have created the effectual stakeholder network (see figure 1), useful to combine stakeholder theory with entrepreneurship.

To conclude this sub-section, the intersection between the stakeholder theory and entrepreneurial innovation, highly relevant for World Heritage sites while watching the developments as described earlier in this chapter, is potentially a rich arena for research (Sarasvathy & Dew, 2007).

2.3 Bridging the theories

The literature review showed two groundings of the research: the brand literature and the stakeholder approach. Both have been placed in the World Heritage context. The literature has found that the World Heritage brand is not as effective as expected by researchers and sites. Also research has indicated that the difference by designated and non-designated sites is not large (Poria, et al., 2011). Therefore rebranding protected areas is a must to attract tourists and increase economic development. Leask & Fyall (2006) also argue for rebranding where places and people are combined or in other words: visualising the brand. This connects the branding theory with the stakeholder theory. Using the stakeholder approach enables collaboration among stakeholders and unites them in strenghtening the brand whether it is on local brand or World Heritage brand level. This will be verified or tested in the emperical chapter.
3. Methodology

3.1 Deductive Qualitative research

The research is done as a deductive study, a logical process in which a conclusion is based on premises that are assumed to be true (Hurley, 2000). The premises here are the Stakeholder approach as the key in branding of the World Heritage sites and the previous researches on topic of World Heritage brand strength and recognisability. We elaborated upon these to conduct a qualitative research on World Heritage sites in Sweden, Denmark and Germany to identify and describe the phenomena affecting the brand and the stakeholders.

3.2 Research Strategy: Case study

This research aims at explaining a complex social phenomena – behaviour of the Danish and Swedish World Heritage sites and their stakeholders in regards to the brand. Based on Yin (2014), case study is appropriate to answer ‘why’ and ‘how’ research questions, which is in line with our research question and sub-questions, as they can be translated into a ‘how’ form. Therefore a case study is the chosen strategy for our research.

Conducting a case study allows us to have a more in-depth understanding of the overall situation in Denmark, Sweden and Germany and reasoning behind decision making of the World Heritage sites. Chosen design of the case study is descriptive embedded two-case instead of a multiple case study, which would be appropriate considering large number of chosen World Heritage sites. This is however not viable due to time and resource constraints, which do not allow us to thoroughly and rigorously present each World Heritage site as a separate replicated case. Instead, each of the World Heritage sites is embedded in the cases as units of analysis (Rowley, 2002). Two cases are: Case study of Swedish World Heritage sites and Case study of Danish World Heritage sites, which will follow replicated design. The case
uses multiple sources of evidence – World Heritage sites in Denmark and Sweden as well as Swedish National Heritage board and Danish Agency for Culture (Yin, 2014).

Due to the descriptive nature of the case study, the research question is translated into the following proposition:

*Stakeholder management improves management of tourism and economic growth on UNESCO World Heritage Sites.*

### 3.3 Data Collection Methods

The basis for our case are the World Heritage sites as units of analysis. It is crucial to obtain a wide variety of data from different sources in order to present a robust, rigorous case (Yin, 2014). For the collection, we used methods of web-based questionnaires and Skype interviews as well as additional data obtained from secondary sources for complementary purposes. In gathering the evidence, we use principles of triangulation, case study database and chain of evidence. Triangulation uses data from more sources to develop converging lines of inquiry and present a more accurate and convincing findings (Yin, 2014). Case study database is collection of gathered evidence (i.e. questionnaire responds, interview transcripts, emails) where a reader can find basis for conclusions. It increases reliability of the case study (ibid.) and in this paper is included in appendices. Chain of evidence describes the way how evidence was collected and order in which it was used and supports that the evidence used in the study is the evidence that was collected (Yin, 2014).

It needs to be pointed out that primary qualitative data – both interviews and questionnaires suffer from reliability issues; degree of which can be minimized by encouraging the respondents to write objective replies, in order to make the case study result useful for also for them. It is desirable to capture the experience, feelings and approaches of the World Heritage sites to the brand in form of stories. A questionnaire with open-ended questions enables the respondents to be not only restrained by limits of the questions, but also provide any additional
details and personal opinions they deem necessary. The questionnaire is a viable method due to large amount of respondents and short time to conduct the study. Also, respondents feel more comfortable with it and also allows for more precise answers than interviews, since the respondents have time to prepare the answer (Check & Schutt, 2012).

The main type of data used in the research are primary qualitative data collected directly from the sources via questionaries, interviews and emails, but also uses secondary qualitative data such as marketing plans, management plans and surveys done by other parties.

### 3.3 Operationalization

First initial interviews have provided enough qualitative data to be able to picture an overall situation concerning World Heritages in Sweden and Denmark and adress some of the issues, which we used in the questionnaire design.

Design of the questionnaire we have chosen is a standardized, semi-structured. It is standardized in a sense that researchers give the same questions regardless to the nature of the respondents, resulting in data which is easier to compare, more reliable and valid (Sauro, 2012). It is semi-structured not to restrict the respondents in sharing their own ideas and stories, which result in a robust case, exploring, describing and addressing a wider array of issues (Yin, 2014).

The questionnaire focused on the same areas as the interviews: Usage of the World Heritage brand in marketing; perceived strenght of the brand; networking (see appendix 1).

### 3.3.1 Choice of Sources of Evidence

By representing the common brand of World Heritage Site, sites on all levels (local, national, global) have become stakeholders to each other, as they have a direct impact on the brand’s equity. The impact answers to the ‘power‘ of each sites – more famous, more touristic sites have higher impact on the equity than small overlooked ones. And each particular site has its own specific primary stakeholders who affect and are affected by the brand – local society,
site management and municipalities. All sites answer to UNESCO World Heritage Centre, National Governments, who are the key stakeholders and National Heritage Boards, whose relation to World Heritage sites varies by countries.

In the beginning we contacted Swedish National Heritage Board and Danish Agency for Culture with three goals: to acquire an up-to-date contact list for managers/coordiators of World Heritage sites in Denmark and Sweden, to acquire secondary sources they may have had at their disposal and to conduct an interview to make an overview of the situation. Followingly, emails were sent out to the contacts provided before containing research objectives and requesting aid in filling down a survey as well as providing any statistical data they may have had. Due to time and distance constraints in data collection, the decision made was to send questionnaires to the unifying actors in the network – World Heritage Site coordinators in each of particular sites, since they are in the hubs connecting sites with their stakeholders, therefore present the most versatile sources, able to provide multitude of information. The information provided is however subject of their own narrations and only contains one sided-view, which is a limitation of this study.

World Heritage Sites contacted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sweden:</th>
<th>Denmark:</th>
<th>Germany:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal Domain of Drottningholm</td>
<td>Wadden Sea</td>
<td>Upper Middle Rhine Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birka and Hovgården</td>
<td>Jelling Mounds, Runic Stones and Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skogskyrkogården</td>
<td>Kronborg Castle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engelsberg Ironworks</td>
<td>Roskilde Cathedral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.3.2 Interviews

Two interviews were conducted, with Christina Staberg of the World Heritage in Falun, involved in the Swedish World Heritage group (network) and Bolette Lehn Petersen of Kulturstyrelsen/Danish Agency for Culture. The interviews were non-standardized and semi-structured. The interviewers were not only asking questions, but partaking in a dialogue between the interviewer and the interviewee, which lead to more open answers and creation of new questions in the process. A transcript and a summary were made for further analysis (see appendices).
3.3.3 Questionnaires

The mainly qualitative web-based questionnaire was sent via email to managers/coordinators of all 15 WHS in Sweden, 5 WHS in Denmark, excluding Ilulissat Icefjord on Greenland, which due to the geographical distance and very different profile would act as a very biasing response. We also sent the questionnaire to one WHS in Germany – Upper Middle Rhine Valley. The survey was standardized and semi-structured; semi-structured according to question if the asked World Heritage had been a part of a National World Heritage network, which lead to different following questions (see appendix 1).

The Survey was divided in two parts – first part aimed at how World Heritages perceive the World Heritage brand, its strength and how do they use it in their marketing strategy. Second section aimed at their participation in a national World Heritage network and what were the experiences and benefits; or if they were not in one, what would have been their expectations from one. Questions were carefully worded to be neutral with yes/no answers and often followed by further explanatory questions. 5-point Likert Scale (Likert, 1932) was also used to rate extent of usage of the World Heritage symbols, plaques and emblems; perceiving of the effectiveness of the World Heritage brand; satisfaction with inclusion in a World Heritage network. In the Likert scale, range was from 1 (not at all) to 5 (strongly). Usage of World Heritage symbols is expected to be positively correlated to the perceived strength of the brand.

(See appendix 2. for Operationalization table)

3.3.3 Data Analysis

Obtained data is categorized in two groups, following the two cases of World Heritage sites in Sweden and World Heritage sites in Denmark. Germany is presented as an additional case, only for the purpose of exploring possible differences from patterns observed in Sweden and Denmark. First the Denmark section will present an interview with a representative of the Danish agency for Culture showing the topics of branding, the use of the brand on individual
World Heritage sites and how stakeholders come together in networks. Afterwards answers in the questionnaires are presented in the categories of branding, local society and networking & strategy. The same structure is used for Sweden including an interview with a representative of the Swedish World Heritage Network (Group). The last short section is about Germany presenting data for future research showing that the methods used are applicable in other countries in the same way. We use the summary method as an efficient way to present data (Kohlbacher, 2005). Exact outcomes of the interviews and questionnaire can be requested by contacting the authors.

4. Data presentation

We received 11 responses from WHS in Sweden (73% response rate), 5 from WHS in Denmark (100% response rate). Two responses were received from Upper Middle Rhine Valley, in Germany, which is the only site we contacted, but the findings presented here do not attempt to represent the entire statistical population of World Heritage Sites in Germany, nor will try to describe the phenomena there. The findings will only be used to portray possible differences of Germany WHS to Swedish and their use of the brand. The chapter is divided in a non-response bias analysis followed by data presentation.

4.1 Non-response bias analysis

The non-response rate for Swedish World Heritage sites is 27%, 4 out of 15 sites have not replied to our survey and did not reply to repeated attempts to obtain the response. Replies were not received from Royal Domain of Drottningholm, Struve Geodetic Arc, Engelsberg Ironworks and Grimeton Radio Station. This results in a non-response bias. Royal Domain of Drottningholm is a major World Heritage sites with a large number of tourists each year and could have provided interesting insights. On the other hand Struve Geodetic Arc is located across multiple countries, with very few visitors and as such, the importance in the research is
very low. Triangulation, comparing evidence from other World Heritage sites corroborates the findings and make them more valid, which decreases the bias.

4.2 The situation of Denmark

The interview with a representative of the Danish agency for Culture in Denmark had the purpose to identify further questions for individual World Heritage sites. We started with a conversation of branding and have related it to the local society and the unification of stakeholders into networks and possible other ways of how stakeholders are connected to each other. According to the interview, the Danish agency for Culture and other World Heritage sites do not use the World Heritage in their branding strategy, but start doing it. The first step is to contact Visit Denmark as tourist organisation from a national focus point and a visitor centre is to be expected as of great importance in a few years.

The World Heritage logos or emblems are scarcely used due to legal restrictions. The sites tried to obtain signage on highways but this was not possible and thus signs are not largely used in attracting tourists. Also the expectations of the World Heritage brand are not high. We asked if there was an increase in the number of tourists on the sites and the answer was either ‘no’ or ‘difficult to say’. In most cases, there was a little increase after designation of the World Heritage sites followed up with a decrease in the amount of tourists. Additionally, there were not many expectations from becoming a World Heritage site for the reason that the sites were protected by the national government anyway in more than half of the cases.

The use of the World Heritage sites and the protected area is restricted to many rules and regulations. “UNESCO is a really bureaucratic organisation with many revised guidelines which makes it complicated. National support would be better”.

When talking about the local society and stakeholders, the representative told us that more than half of the sites were managed through top-down management. This has to be
changed for future success. At the moment they try to set up a network and a common strategy in order to improve collaboration among and between stakeholders.

We based the questionnaire questions of individual heritage sites on this interview to acquire an overview of the current situation on branding and stakeholders which are presented in section 4.2.1-4.2.3.

4.2.1 Branding in Denmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The World Heritage brand is used in tourism promotion to a large extent (see table 2). An example is the Wadden Sea World Heritage brand which are not using it but expect to implement it soon. In Stevens Klint is the same situation and they mention that even local tourism related businesses are ready to use the brand in the marketing. Jelling and Kronborg Slot does not use the brand for tourism promotion, except when it is to be considered as relevant for the targeted group. In contrast, symbols, logos, et cetera are not used widely through the country with an average of 2 on a 1-5 Likert Scale (table 3). Notable is the low interest in using emblems or logos as well. In short, most of the sites use a branding strategy, however this is not always related to the World Heritage brand.
A research mentioned by a respondent shows that 1/3 was aware of the World Heritage brand in the two last designated sites and came for that reason, 1/3 did not know and the others were in between. This is in line with the outcome shown in table 4. In addition, income from visitors is not seen as a vital part for the World Heritage sites, but more for the local society and businesses.

### 4.2.2 Local society versus World Heritage brand

This section explains the outcomes of how the World Heritage brand is perceived as beneficial for the local society and businesses. A surprising outcome is that most World Heritage sites are critical towards the World Heritage brand. Some expect they will benefit, however some answer on the question “Does the local society/businesses in the area surrounding your World Heritage site use the brand for their social and economical benefit?” that this is absolutely not the case or to a little extent. An example is Kronborg Castle which says the following: “Kronborgs brand as Hamlet's Castle and a nationally important place: Yes World heritage status: To a lesser degree”. An exception on the rule is Stevns Klinkt which says that businesses cannot wait to use the World Heritage brand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Perceived importance of the World Heritage designation on visitor decisions (Likert Scale 1-5)
4.2.3 Stakeholder collaboration through networks and experience thereof in Denmark

Table 5. Satisfaction with experiences in a National World Heritage Network (Likert Scale 1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Networks become more and more important in Denmark, however the average is lower compared to the other countries measured (see table 5). All the World Heritage sites said that they are organised what is in line with the interview where was said that the sites come together in informal meetings. Collaboration with other stakeholders seems to be experiences as successful when it comes to the exchange of knowledge and possibilities for bringing in new customers. An example is Stevns Klint who completed two job exchanges with other Site Managers which had a great outcome. A critical note has been placed when it comes to the Danish network because it has not come further than information sharing.

Notable is the focus of World Heritage sites on sharing information and stakeholder collaboration in the positive sense of the word. All answers are related to helping each other to become better. To conclude, most of the World Heritage sites have not experienced a strengthening of the World Heritage brand.

4.3 The situation of Sweden

The introduction of this chapter is based on an interview we had with a representative of the Swedish World Heritage Network and also manager of the World Heritage site ‘Falun’. She starts with pointing out that the UNESCO World Heritage list has not directly the purpose to attract tourism but preservation in the first case and that not all sites can be connected to tourism due to its design. The site of Falun had been a tourist destination before it became a World Heritage site and the manager does not think that the World Heritage increases the amount of tourists. The issue is that World Heritage sites should be made more visible for the
local society. When it comes to branding of the World Heritage site, touristic organisations often use the brand especially when promoting the cultural side of the city.

In Sweden, there is a World Heritage network where stakeholders collaborate with each other. The reason for creating a network is that the state party is not taking its responsibility as it should do. “We have to support each other”. The interview shows a clear frustration about the help of the state party especially for the reason that tourism is one of the larger income sources of Sweden.

When it comes to the use of the World Heritage site by the local society she mentions real estate agencies that use the World Heritage brand in their marketing. Also hotels and restaurants use the brand with for example “have a lunch in the World Heritage area. There is no negative influence of the brand I could think of”. In Falun, the brand is also use to teach children in order to make them aware of the World Heritage site.

Since our representative mostly reflects on the World Heritage site of Falun, there is reason to identify the outcomes of the questionnaire on a more individual level in the same structure as it has been done with the case of Denmark.

4.3.1 Branding in Sweden

According to the answers received, tourism promotion was not directly important for all World heritage sites (see table 2). The interest is on average. Most of the sites make effort in order to market the World Heritage site to tourists, however, this is often done by external companies. Activities, pamphlets and a visitor friendly area have been mentioned as strategies to attract visitors. In term of tourism strategies, most sites use a strategy or are developing one whether it is regional or local. However, most of time the tourism strategy is not planned by the World Heritage site but by third parties organising it. We are unable to say if the World Heritage brand is employed for site promotion in the strategies.
Referring to table 3, the signage is also not used often. When relating it to the brand usage for attracting tourists it explains the reason that World Heritage sites in Sweden do not expect so much of the World Heritage brand (table 4). This is in line with the expectations on tourism, but there are several exceptions on this. Most of the sites do not see tourism income as vital for preservation of the sites, because preservation is funded by the state to some extent but there are many wishes as an answer on this question: “An eternal problem! There is no system to canalise the income from tourism to the preservation of the site!”, “No, not directly. But connection with the brand World Heritage hopefully makes the county more attractive for the inhabitants and also for people who want to move here. This could be an inspiration for people to get new ideas to make a living, which in the long term is important for the preservation of the farms” or “Yes, if there is a shared responsibility for sustainable tourism development and a shared understanding for the OUV as well as the need for a local economic growth”. Branding the World Heritage as destination is not really common in Sweden but more and more sites are working on it for local economic development.

**4.3.2 Local society versus World Heritage brand**

When it comes to the benefits of the local society Swedish respondents are careful in their responses. The question was: “Does the local society/businesses in the area surrounding your World Heritage site use the brand for their social and economic benefit?.” Answers are mostly related to economic circumstances in terms of business where most say that some do benefit. They use the term “World heritage site” in their marketing. This “could be done more often”. The businesses that benefit the most are companies that provide services or products directly connected to the World Heritage site. In relation to the presented interview mostly real estate agencies, restaurants and hotels. There is one exception in Tanum where a shopping centre has an evident rock-carving profile.
4.3.3 Stakeholder collaboration through networks and experience in Sweden

The satisfaction of stakeholder collaboration through networks is relatively high with a 4.3 on a scale of 5 (see table 5). Sweden is developing when it comes to uniting stakeholders in order to become powerful. “We have a Swedish network that meet twice a year. We inform and learn from each other. We also have a Nordic/baltic network between WH sites.” Swedish World Heritage sites share the same problems when it comes to planning, wind power plants and roads, material for education, and so forth. Currently there is a discussion on how to strengthen the Nordic network. However, not every World Heritage site is positive. It has to be noted that the Swedish network had no formal position yet and is weak economically.

Most of the World Heritage sites see changing ideas and working together as the main benefits of having a network. “Support is always near”. When talking of networking in relation to brand strengthening, almost everybody does not believe in it. It is more about strengthening the network, online marketing and different events. “The brand is strengthened through activities of each site” so it is still the individual site or network that counts.

4.4 The case of Germany presented

World Heritage site of Upper Middle Rhine Valley is an example of a strong stakeholder management and the World Heritage brand usage. In Germany, there is an existing World Heritage network consisting of 39 sites, which is used mainly joint international marketing and economic affairs, which they claim to be enhancing the strength of the World Heritage brand in Germany. Prior to becoming a World Heritage site, economic benefits from tourism had been expected on the site and the listing was described as ‘benediction for Upper Middle Rhine Valley’ (see Appendix 2). Swedish sites also report high knowledge about and interest in
UNESCO World Heritages from side of German tourists, which could indicate cultural differences across countries and different effect of the brand on tourists from different countries.

5. Cross-case Analysis & Results

This section compares evidence collected through the two cases to show similarities or point out differences across the cases. These are discussed in relation to the theoretical framework with intention to describe the phenomena and test the proposition.

5.1 Branding

5.1.1. Brand usage

Both cases show medium use of the brand for tourism promotion as well as medium perceived importance of the designation on visitor decisions. These two phenomena are connected, naturally, if a brand is not believed to be attractive, it will not be used for promotion.

Usage of tangible signage (plaques, logos, emblems) The observations can be traced back to Poria et al. (2011), who found no significant difference between tourism in World Heritage designated and non-designated sites as well Hall & Piggin (2001, p. 103) “37% of sites do not use WHS in their promotion at all”. The result can be seen in decreasing usage of the World Heritage as a brand and rebranding of the sites to reflect their own identity, independent on the World Heritage along with usage of their own logos and signage.

5.1.2 Gap between brand identity and brand image

There exists a gap between UNESCO World Heritage brand identity – how UNESCO wants the brand to be perceived by the people - and the brand image – how it is actually perceived (Aaker, 1996). The gap results in misunderstanding of the brand and confusion, since the general brand is used on multitude of tangible and intangible heritages (‘products’), leading
to low impact on visitors decisions. Similarity to conclusions of Fyall & Rakic “the market is confused as to what it [the World Heritage brand] really represents“ (2006, p.171)

5.2 Are World Heritages beneficial for the local societies?

According to the Faro convention a World Heritage site should be beneficial to the local society (Council of Europe, 2015). In both, Denmark and Sweden the local societies do not benefit from the World Heritage designation what is in contrast with the Faro convention. Although individual World Heritage sites are working on World Heritage logos locally due to restrictions in usage (see section 4.2). The support of the local community is growing by local brands such as the Wadden Sea World Heritage brand or Tanum with a shopping centre near the heritage site. This is in line with Wijesuriya, et al., (2013) & Phillips (2002; 2003) who mentions the shift to managing a World Heritage site with the local society more in mind and other related changes mentioned in section 2.2.1. In this, rebranding is a part of forming new identity which involves the local community, which would otherwise be excluded from partaking in the brand’s benefits. Similar idea has already been argued for by Leask & Fyall (2006) that rebranding occurs where people and places are combined.

When WHS designation directly affects local societies and stakeholders, rebranding and creation of local World Heritage brands is necessary to be able to create a stakeholder network around the World Heritage, united by the new local brand, thus transferring the benefits of the designation onto them. It is not necessary in case of most World heritage sites which do not affect any communities.

5.3 The trend of uniting stakeholders into networks

Even though the World Heritages do not see high impact on tourism from the branding, they still identify themselves as World Heritage Sites and organize themselves in World
Heritage Site networks to share: 1. Best management practices, 2. Tourism, 3. Education. According to the survey (appendix A.2), sites are rarely relying on the World Heritage brand to attract tourists and thus are behaving the same way as non-designated sites in their management. However, they are still unified by their World Heritage status in their choice of members in the networks. According to the survey outcomes, most World Heritages Sites argue that it is important to meet even though they are using local brands for attracting tourists. The stakeholder approach shows its smartness in this way when it comes to the World Heritage brand as such. This has also been mentioned in theory by Strand (2015).

While the use of the World Heritage brand is restricted by UNESCO itself, it does not mean it is not usable. By uniting the brand in terms of local sites stakeholders come together organising themselves in a larger network strengthening their particular local brand by supporting and sharing learning experiences which influences the local societies when it comes to benefits. Also a common marketing will help for creating consistency in the World Heritage brand usage, what makes the message more clarified towards target markets which could lie in the field of preservation to the field of tourism. Working together can be used as a force against bureaucratic institutions or national governments since the voice of World Heritage sites united in a network is louder. Also supporting tourism or business organisations could be created by a shared budget for instance because a small input of budget creates a large budget when every World Heritage site is involved, stimulating entrepreneurship within the society what results in economic benefits. For some isolated sites (e.g. Birka and Hovgården located solely on a secluded island Björkö) income from tourism is the only income for the residents (tenants), who in return are crucial for running of the business activities in the area.
5.3.1 Local entrepreneurship

Another relation within our discussion is local entrepreneurship – local entrepreneurs are united by the brand around which the network is created. As stakeholders of the brand, they are directly able to affect its strength and partake in its promotion. A strong brand is a vital part of the entrepreneurial environment – it acts as a bonding agent, bringing different actors together and inciting them towards cooperation. Entrepreneurs in this way could be seen as tourist agencies working together with restaurants, local house owners or sport accommodations/stores creating a rolling business on the areas. Supporting organisations as spoken of before could stimulate such a development among different World Heritage sites. Also selling packages, where many World Heritage sites are included is a way of branding and selling the touristic areas. So on one hand it is supported on a more central level and on the other hand it is stimulated from the community. Using stakeholders approach as a uniting framework increases efficiency in branding the World Heritage site whether it is branded on a local or UNESCO level. We agree on Sarasvathy and Dew (2007) to call for further research connecting stakeholder theory and entrepreneurship through the effectuation process.

6. Conclusion

Field of the World Heritages is receiving minor attention from the researchers, most studies being conducted on the heritages outside Europe (eg. King & Halpenny, 2014, Poria et al., 2011) and only recently have acknowledged the weak brand equity of UNESCO World Heritage brand.

This research has through a cross-case study analysis described how the UNESCO World heritage brand is perceived and used by the World Heritages sites in Sweden and Denmark and how the sites organize themselves and their stakeholders in networks based around the brand and through the stakeholder unity creating stronger brands. In line with
contemporary research, awareness of the UNESCO World Heritage brand image has been found to be low, due to the strict principles of using the brand, its name and its logo on the sites, which excludes any use for commercial purposes and therefore minimizes the market penetration and in combination with vague guidelines of usage discourages the sites from populating their sites with the symbols. More importantly, the inability to transfer the usage of UNESCO World Heritage brand to the private sector - local business and communities living in and around the heritages, leads to creation of own World Heritage brands, which can be used by the private sector and for tourism promotion. Brand identities of these brands are thus co-created by the local communities and the site management, actively involving the stakeholders and if acting in a strong unity, then can create a strong brand identity, which is likely be in touch with the customers and their view of the local brand image, since it is formed in a bottom-up approach, instead of top-down. The local society and businesses will inherently become the representatives of the particular World Heritage brand and so being able to convey the positive connections to the brand to visitors. Such approach will lead to an enhanced customer experience.

There exists a gap between the brand identity created by UNESCO and the brand image perceived by the customers, which brings the sites out of touch with their customers in the field of tourism.

World Heritages in Denmark and Sweden are very independent on the national governments, which incites them look for alternatives in gaining funding (e.g. tourism).

For the above-mentioned reasons, the sites organize themselves into national and even international World Heritage networks, in which they share best practices, marketing strategies and join forces in promotion and united become stronger when interacting with external organisations and governments. Sites in both Sweden and Denmark report high satisfaction with the networks.
The study shows the phenomenon of retreating from usage of the UNESCO World Heritage brand in tourism promotion in Scandinavia and creation of own local brands, which in turn decreases the awareness of the former brand. While UNESCO World Heritage brand is not primarily designed for usage in tourism promotion, it has over time become a brand carrying a promise of economic benefits. This fact might have been overlooked by UNESCO in their brand usage guidelines, authorization and protection. UNESCO needs to make steps to strengthen the brand also from its position top-down:

1. The gap between the brand identity and the brand image must be narrowed down – the sites and the potential visitors need to know what the brand stands for.
2. Brand awareness needs to be increased – on-site surveys report alarmingly low awareness.

Findings and conclusions of this paper are useful for both practitioners and the academia. Its findings can to some extent fill in the blank space of research by Swedish National Heritage Board and Danish Agency for Culture and bring them closer to the World Heritages in their countries.

This research has portrayed the importance of mobilization of the local community towards building a strong destination brand, but has not touched how this actually works in reality.

It would be fruitful to pursue further research on a stakeholder management in World Heritage sites on more local level in order to analyse how local communities are mobilized by presence of destination brands, how does this presence create entrepreneurial environment and how can World Heritage site managers take up on roles of societal entrepreneurs.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Questionnaire questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire question (see explanation Methods chapter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview (starting points open interview)

| I.1 | How do you use World Heritage as a brand in your marketing? |
| I.2 | How do you use symbols and emblems of World Heritage on your site? |
| I.3 | Do you think, that World Heritage brand increases the number of tourists on your site? |
| I.4 | What are/were your expectations of benefits from being a World Heritage site, and how were these expectations fulfilled after being inscribed on the list? |
| I.5 | Are you satisfied with the support and guidelines provided from UNESCO? |
| I.6 | Have you devised and/or do you use strategies for usage of World Heritage branding? |
| I.7 | What is your opinion on being a world heritage and what are the benefits and disadvantages. |
| I.8 | How is the local community affected by presence of the World Heritage site? |
| I.9 | A few weeks ago, there was a meeting with all world heritage sites. How can the networking/relations be defined between all world heritage sites as well as national institutions? |
## Appendix 2: Operationalisation table: Theory connected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview questions</th>
<th>Connected Theory</th>
<th>Survey questions</th>
<th>Connected Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.2</td>
<td>(Aaker, 1995);</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Wijesuriya, et al., 2013); (Phillips, 1995).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(King &amp; Halpenny, 2014); (Fyall &amp; Rakic, 2006);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Poria, et al., 2011); (Shackley, 1998); (Cochrane &amp; Tapper, 2006); (Buckley, 2002)</td>
<td>S.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3</td>
<td>(UNESCO, 2015);</td>
<td></td>
<td>(King &amp; Halpenny, 1994); (Aaker, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Buckley, 2002);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cochrane &amp; Tapper, 2006); (Shackley, 1998);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Poria, et al., 2011); (Ryan &amp; Silvanto, 2014); (Huang, et al., 2012); (Su &amp; Lin, 2014)</td>
<td>S.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>convention)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.6</td>
<td>(Wijesuriya, et al., 2013); (Phillips, 2002; 2003)</td>
<td>S.6</td>
<td>(Leask &amp; Fyall, 2006); (Freeman &amp; McVea, 2001); (Gibson, 2000); (King &amp; Halpenny, 1994); (Council of Europe, 2015) (Berglund &amp; Johannisson, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.7</td>
<td>(Buckley, 2002); (Cochrane &amp; Tapper, 2006); (Shackley, 1998); (Fyall &amp; Rakic, 2006); (Wijesuriya, et al., 2013); (Phillips, 2002; 2003); (Ryan &amp; Silvanto, 2014); (Huang, et al., 2012); (Su &amp; Lin, 2014); (Poria, et al., 2011); (UNESCO, 2014); (JACQUOT, 2010); (Chih-Hai Yanga, 2010); (Van der Aa, 2005)</td>
<td>S.7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 (1)</td>
<td>(Freeman, 1984); (Freeman &amp; McVea, 2001); (Jawahar &amp; Mclaughlin, 2001); (Nicholas, et al., 2009); (Wijesuriya, et al., 2013); (Phillips, 2002; 2003); (Leask &amp; Fyall, 2006); (Baker &amp; Cameron, 2008); (Hankinson, 2009); (UNWTO, 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.8</td>
<td>(Freeman, 1984); (Freeman &amp; McVea, 2001); (Jawahar &amp; Mclaughlin, 2001); (Wijesuriya, et al., 2013); (Phillips, 2002; 2003); Leask &amp; Fyall (2006); (Davis &amp; Corsane, 2014); Davis &amp; Corsane (2014); (Baker &amp; Cameron, 2008); (Hankinson, 2009); (UNWTO, 2013).</td>
<td>S.13 (2)</td>
<td>(Stieb, 2009); (Schultz, et al., 2011); (Fagerholm, et al., 2012); (De Brucker, et al., 2013) + sources S7 (follow up).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.9</td>
<td>(Jawahar &amp; Mclaughlin, 2001); (Freeman &amp; McVea, 2001); (Freeman, 1984); (Nicholas, et al., 2009); (Wijesuriya, et al., 2013); (Phillips, 2002; 2003); (Leask &amp; Fyall, 2006)</td>
<td>S.14, 15</td>
<td>(King &amp; Halpenny, 2014); (Fyall &amp; Rakic, 2006); (Corporate Excellence, 2014); (Davis &amp; Corsane, 2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Questionnaire report supported by theory
Summary of data collected from the questionnaire and interviews: Similarities and differences linked to theories

From questionnaires:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SWEDEN</th>
<th>DENMARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Using WH brand as a marketing tool to increase tourism: 2.9</td>
<td>- Using WH brand as a marketing tool to increase tourism: 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage of the WH brand:</td>
<td>New association has been created getting more important to the World Heritage brand (ex: AB Höga Kusten in Höga Kusten/Kvarkens skärgård)</td>
<td>Usage of the WH brand: Brochure, advertisement (Roskilde Cathedra), logo (Stevns Klint), description of the website (Kronborg Slott) in order to use the brand as a strategic tool and thus increase tourists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory:</td>
<td>- Hall and Pigging (2001) about the usage of WH brand in the strategy by manager.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- gap between UNESCO World Heritage brand identity: how UNESCO wants the brand to be perceived by the people, and how the brand is actually perceived (Aaker, 1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A tourism strategy developed in a regional or local level (ex: regional tourism strategy in Tanum) or the tourism strategy is a project (ex: in Visby or in Lulea)</td>
<td>Tourism strategy developed with different degrees according to the World Heritage brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of the World Heritage designation on visitor decision = 2.7</td>
<td>Importance of the World Heritage designation on visitor decision = 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory:</td>
<td>Brand awareness very low (Marcotte &amp; Bourdeau, 2006; Hergesell, 2006; Yan &amp; Morrisson, 2007; Reinus &amp; Fredman, 2007; King &amp; Halpenny, 2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The majority of Local/business use the World Heritage brand ex: the World Heritage buffet in Falun or the shopping center in Rock Carvings in Tanum</td>
<td>Local/business use the World Heritage brand to some extent (Ex: Stevns Klint World Heritage logo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Theory:** Local society is now involved on the World Heritage field (Wijesuriya, et al., 2013) & (Phillips, 2002, 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World Heritage network for each sites in Sweden and in Denmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction WH network: 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-WH network as strength for the site: very satisfied and very useful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Share experiences is the common idea (through workshop) due to the same pb they can have in the field of the WH, learn a lot from each other, share their experience, get a global context (ex: Nordic Baltic Sea as an important tool to strength the brand)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Satisfaction WH network: 3.6                                  |
| -Share experience, exchange knowledge. Good impact especially for the young World Heritage site which can learn a lot from the site which have the label since many years. |
| -WH can be reflected as job exchange between world heritage site. (ex: exchange with job managers from Iceland and Norway in Stevns Klint) |

**Theory:** Tourism development as a collaboration between management and stakeholder (Nicolas, et al 2009) with the destination community ‘assets as a mean to share opportunities by tourists, local and private sector. Le perception of the WH management is view as a community assets within multi-skilled individuals (Wijesuriya, et al., 2013) & (Phillips, 2002; 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WH network doesn’t participate itself as a tool to promote the WH brand because other external factors influence the promotion. But the network can also participate to some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globally satisfied by the World Heritage representative meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network = crucial for WH success especially to attract foreign tourist, need to cooperate between sites to increase the brand awareness and be proud of the brand in a long term perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory: shift from in the management technique which is now based on long term perspective (Wijesuria, et al., 2013) &amp; (Phillips, 2002; 2003).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WH network is not enough active and don’t participate of promoting the brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite neutral in the satisfaction of WH representative meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Sites have to be more focus on WH emblem and in the networking (formalization).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Danish and Nordic network strength the brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Sites unknown: more benefits with WH by attracting more tourists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites known: no increase of tourists (ex: Kronborg Slott</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Theory: Su and Lin, 2014 concerning the correlation between unknown and known
“Because now, when we are talking about developing the city, especially when we are talking about developing central part of the city, investments are made very short term - they are often not thinking about long-term investments. It is needed to look back for long term investments, to see the identity.”

**Theory:** stakeholder approach which is now based on long term perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From the interview</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>does the brand of the World Heritage increase the number of tourists? And I don't think so</td>
<td>No and difficult to say (increase of tourism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And historically, when we became World Heritage site in 2001, in 2002, it was the first summer of World Heritage site, the number has increased very very much. But it was just that summer – it is normal, so to speak, due to increased media, presentation in the news and by the tourist organisations.</td>
<td>In the beginning there was a little increase for a short time and even a decrease at one of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory:</strong> Increase of tourism in short term (Huang, et al., 2002 &amp; (Su &amp; Lin, 2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am involved in a working group related to an old garden in Falun, how to raise the awareness among the local people who use the area as a recreational area and to make them know that they are taking part in an area that is included in the World Heritage list. We are thinking of ways how to increase awareness of the local people.</td>
<td>A visitor center would be from great importance in a few years as well to attract tourists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory:</strong> Increase the brand awareness by the stakeholder involvement through partnership (development of satisfaction and goals) (Baker &amp; Cameron, 2008); (Hankinson, 2009) &amp; (UNWTO, 2013).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is responsibility for the heritage site, which is at the state party, but we don't really see any engagement regarding the</td>
<td>National support would be better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Questionnaire results

World Heritage sites in Sweden, Denmark and Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HK: Höga Kusten/Kvarken skärgård</td>
<td>WS: Wadden Sea</td>
<td>Upper Middle Rhine Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu: Church Town of Gammelstad, Luleå</td>
<td>J: Jelling</td>
<td>- Manager of the regional tourism marketing office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SÖ: Agricultural Landscape of Southern Öland</td>
<td>S: Stevns Klint</td>
<td>- Project leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Rock Carvings in Tanum</td>
<td>KS: Kronborg Slot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Decorated Farmhouses of Hälsingland</td>
<td>R: Roskilde Cathedra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La: Laponia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K: Naval Port of Karlskrona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Mining area of the great copper mountain in Falun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V: Hanseatic town of Visby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Skogskyrkogården</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was increased tourism and implied social and economical benefits one of the expectations before the inscription of your site on the World Heritage List?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWEDEN:</th>
<th>DENMARK</th>
<th>GERMANY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HK:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>WS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU:</td>
<td>Unable to say</td>
<td>J:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SÖ:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>S:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La:</td>
<td>Unable to say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do you use World Heritage brand as a marketing tool in order to increase tourism on your site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWEDEN: 2.9</th>
<th>DENMARK: 3.6</th>
<th>GERMANY: 4.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HK: 3</td>
<td>WS: 4</td>
<td>Manager of the regional tourism marketing office: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU: 2</td>
<td>J: 2</td>
<td>Project leader: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SÖ: 2</td>
<td>S: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 5</td>
<td>KS: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: 4</td>
<td>R: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

**Sweden**
- **HK**: As world heritage coordinator at County Administrative board I don’t really work with marketing issues. That is not one the mission of the County administrative board. Therefore you should talk to our destination company AB Höga Kusten. Since 2014 four municipalities have formed this association in order to work for the destination. And for the touristic development in the area. Contact: Peter Holmqvist, VD, 070-696 64 32
- **LU**: Association has been formed to work for the destination
- **SÖ**: [http://www.lulea.se/omkyrkstaden/error/bestallbroschyr.4.75a7f685114adef836c80001224](http://www.lulea.se/omkyrkstaden/error/bestallbroschyr.4.75a7f685114adef836c80001224) 4.html
- **T**: Nothing
- **H**: Through the museum, the four great panels and a rich variety of activities, pamphlets...
- **La**: Nothing
- **K**: We are currently working on how to make use of the WH brand in a way that respects the values of UNESCO and is sustainable.
- **F:** The coppermine is (and has been for a long time) of great importance when it comes to the region of Dalarna. The gardens that are included in the World heritage site attract a new target group and get more attention thanks to the nomination, as well as some of the hiking trails.

- **V:** The Town Wall is used as a logotype for many in the private sector. The Medieval townscape is used in marketing etc.

- **S:** (No answers)

**Denmark**

- **WS:** We have just developed a Wadden Sea World Heritage Brand and expect to implement it soon in the entire Wadden Sea

- **J:** Nothing

- **S:** Local tourism related businesses are eager to use the brand in their marketing. We are currently developing a Stevns Klint World Heritage logo and certification for that purpose.

- **KS:** Description on website. Part of marketing when considered relevant (it depends on the targeted group).

- **R:** Through advertisement such as brochures, adverts etc.

**Germany**

- **Manager of the regional marketing tourism strategy:** We use the brand in many cases: as additional claim to our regular tourism message, we join tourism fairs with other German World Heritage sites just as "UNESCO World Heritage Sites of Germany". We offer tourism information in the corporate Identity of the site and many things more. The appreciation is very important for our region.

- **Project leader:** Our association isn't responsible for the tourism marketing, but we are working close together with the tourism marketing agency.

  - World Heritage Sites are a tourist destination.

  - most of the reasons why the Upper Middle Rhine Valley is a World
Heritage Site (wine growing area, castles, small historic towns, ...) are travel reasons for the tourists in our World Heritage Site.

- Of course the World Heritage is used for marketing.

*Have you devised and are using a tourism strategy on your site?*

**Sweden**

**HK:** No

**Lu:** Is planned to be worked into the management plan in progress.

**SÖ:** We have a tourism strategy for Öland

**T:** There is a regional tourism strategy and Tanum is one of the prior. sites. The museum of Vitlycke is working out a more elaborated strategy based on the UNESCO program/tool-kit. It should be ready in early 2016.

**H:** No, we intend to but have not started yet. It will be coordinated with the Gävleborg County Tourism strategy.

**La:** We are working with a tourism strategy

**K:** Our management plan does not include a tourism strategy.

**F:** The World heritage site itself does not have a strategy, but is always cooperating with the Tourist organisation Visit Södra Dalarna and they have a strategy.

**V:** No not in a developed way. A sustainable tourism plan is on the wish list. I don't work with tourism questions as a I am a government official.

**S:** (No answers)

**Denmark**

**WS:** Yes, we have a strategy for sustainable tourism for the entire Wadden Sea World Heritage

**J:** No

**S:** A brand new tourism strategy is completed by Stevns Municipality this month.
KS: We are part of a bigger agency that takes care of all state owned castles. There is a strategy for all castles.

R: Yes

Germany

Manager of the regional marketing tourism strategy: Yes, we have. The tourism valorisation of The World Heritage site is part of our strategy. The strategy is under forward projection.

Project leader: Please have a look at the tourism strategy of our tourism agency (just in german):


The strategy says: "We are a unique cultural landscape with two UNESCO World Heritage Sites." (Upper Middle Rhine Valley and Upper German-Raetian Limes)

How densely is your site populated by World Heritage emblems, logos and plaques, so that visitors are aware of their presence at a World Heritage site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>SWEDEN: 2.5</th>
<th>DENMARK: 2</th>
<th>GERMANY: 4.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WS: 1</td>
<td>UMRV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>J: 1</td>
<td>Manager of the regional marketing tourism strategy: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SÖ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S: 3</td>
<td>Project leader: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>KS: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How would you assess importance of the World Heritage designation on visitor decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>SWEDEN: 2.7</th>
<th>DENMARK: 2.8</th>
<th>GERMANY: 3.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>WS: 2</td>
<td>UMRV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>J: 4</td>
<td>Manager of the regional marketing tourism strategy: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SÖ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>KS: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider income from tourism to be a vital part towards preservation of your World Heritage site?

Sweden

HK: No
LU: No
SÖ: Yes

T: An eternal problem! There is no system to canalise the income from tourism to the preservation of the site!

H: No, not directly. But connection with the brand World Heritage hopefully makes the county more attractive for the inhabitants and also for people who want to move here. This could be an inspiration for people to get new ideas to make a living, which in the long term is important for the preservation of the farms.

La: No

K: Yes, if there is a shared responsibility for sustainable tourism development and a shared understanding for the OUV as well as the need for a local economic growth.

F: Income is important, but also to raise the awareness about the site itself and World heritage sites in general. To be able to do that, preservation is crucial.

V: No because the money from tourism goes to private sector and the preservation is payed by the state. The private house owners take mostly good care of their houses.

S: (No answers)
Denmark

WS: Yes

J: No danish legislation wil protect and keep the monumental area in a good shape.

S: The site will be sufficiently preserved no matter how many visitors are visiting. But off course an income from tourism would be –just as important- of big importance to the local businesses, the local society and the local support to the World Heritage Site.

*Regarding the former question: We know from visitor surveys 2014 (first year of designation) that the World Heritage designation had a importance for about 1/3 of the visitors, about 1/3 did not care, and the rest was in between.

KS: Yes

R: No

Germany

Manager of the regional marketing tourism strategy: The income from tourism is not used for preservation.

Project leader: Yes

Does the local society/businesses in the area surrounding your World Heritage site use the brand for their social and economical benefit?

Sweden

HK: There are a few businesses who use the term "World heritage site" in their marketing.

LU: In some cases. Could be done more often.

SÖ: Not Yet

T: Yes, during 2014 a new big shoppingcentre opened close to the E6 and was given a very evident rock-carving profile
H: Since the World Heritage Site is quite new (3 years) there are some but few that use the brand.
La: Sometimes
K: Some of them do, the ones that provides services or products that are directly connected to the World Heritage.
F: Some do. For example the real estate businesses who attract new customers by saying that the house is within the World heritage site. Also restaurants sometimes offers "World heritage buffet".
V: Yes I think so.
S: (No answers)

**Denmark**

WS: We expect they will.
J: No not as far as I can see.
S: Yes, see question 5.
KS: Kronborgs brand as Hamlet's Castle and a nationally important place: Yes World heritage status: To a lesser degree.
R: A little bit.

**Germany**

Manager of the regional marketing tourism strategy: Not really.
Project leader: All municipalities and our partners in the World Heritage Site use the brand.

*Is your site organized in a World Heritage network? Yes for each site!*
Rate your satisfaction with the experiences of being organized in the World Heritage network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWEDEN: 4.3</th>
<th>DENMARK: 3.6</th>
<th>GERMANY: 4.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HK: 5</td>
<td>WS: 5</td>
<td>UMRV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU: 5</td>
<td>J: 5</td>
<td>Manager of the regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SÖ: 4</td>
<td>S: 4</td>
<td>marketing tourism strategy: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 4</td>
<td>KS: 2</td>
<td>Project leader: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: 5</td>
<td>R: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please, describe successes and failures.*

**Sweden**

**HK:** We have a Swedish network that meet twice a year. We inform and learn from each other.

We also have a Nordic/baltic network between wh sites. Its is also very useful.

**LU:** *(No answer)*

**SÖ:** *(No answer)*

**T:** The Swedish network is very weak economically and has no formal position.

**H:** Very important - we share the same problems i.e. when it comes to planning, roads, windpowerplants etc.

Also for sharing experiences and material for schools, tourism etc.

**La:** Laponia is a mixed World heritage and the conditions for Laponia is different compared with other sites in Sweden

**K:** The Swedish national network is very active and is a good platform for discussions and capacity-building, and so is the Nordic (Nordic-Baltic) network. Currently there is a discussion of how to strengthen the Nordic network, and that will make it even better a forum for competence and capacity-building. Successful is the exchange of experiences and knowledge, a failure is the loss of support by the NWHF (or an organization alike).
F: We are part of the Swedish organization. Regular meetings when we discuss different topics that are of importance at the moment. We have got to know each other very well, can talk openly, share experiences and support each other. We organize workshops.

V: There are several networks to be a part of. Most of them do not deal with everyday questions and that is a need from the sites that is not yet fulfilled.

S: (No answers)

Denmark

WS: We are participating in more than one network and it is useful to exchange knowledge and learn from other.

J: We have learned more about taking care and seeing the possibilities in bringing in new costumers

S: It is of great importance to meet and visit other (Nordic) World Heritage Sites, to exchange experiences, learn from each other. I have even completed two job exchanges with other Site Managers from Iceland and Norway, with a great outcome.

KS: (No answer)

R: The Danish network has so far failed to produce anything other than shallow information sharing.

Germany

Manager of the regional marketing tourism strategy: We are member in the Association of The 39 Unesco World Heritage Sites. This makes an international marketing easier; we can use synergy in economic affairs.

Project leader: (No answers)
What are the main benefits of being organized in a World Heritage Network (Group) for your site?

Sweden

HK: Knowledge exchange and expert help, assistance on certain issues. Some of the other WH site managers have become my colleagues because I work alone with wh questions on the County Board.

LU: To be able to take part of other sites good practice. Education and training around Periodic Reporting and management. To get the global context regarding threats and issues concerning world heritage in general and the work in the world heritage committee.

SÖ: One good example is the Swedish World Heritage-portal, developed by the association World Heritage Sites in Sweden.

T: change of experiences,

H: Having people to discuss similar issues with

La: Networking, information about what is going on at an international level

K: Main benefits is the exchange of knowledge, experience and information. In the Swedish network there are thematic working groups that include a variety of professions and are a good source of input.

F: The feeling that what I do is of great importance. The global perspective that Falun is a part of something larger. Support is always near.

V: To meet other sites and share experiences. I organize a network of sites around the Baltic Sea with the aim to work in projects together.

S: (No answers)

Denmark

WS: Joint forces, collaboration and the possibility for joint projects
J: More knowledge

S: Especially for a new site it is great to have 'sister sites' (formal or informal) with similar OUVs, to learn from. We are currently corresponding with Jurassic Coast in UK, having a geological site very similar to ours, and many years of experience to share.

KS: Network and sharing knowledge.

R: A little bit of information sharing.

**Germany**

**Manager of the regional marketing tourism strategy:** As mentioned before.

**Project leader:** contact to other World Heritages and exchange of ideas and projects.

*Has the World Heritage Network helped to strengthen the brand of World Heritage? If yes, how?*

**Sweden**

HK: I don't think so. If we had economical resources we had definitely been able to make some change and strengthen the brand. Ding events and websites and so on.

LU: Yes.

SÖ: No

T: Not the network itself! The brand is strengthened through the activities of each site.

H: No

La: Don't know

K: The Swedish national network, yes. It has done so by participating at seminars and gatherings where the Swedish WH sites have been presented.

F: We collaborate in the social media marketing different events. Raising the awareness among each other and among the society.

V: No, not yet.
S: (No answers)

Denmark

WS: No

J: By annual meetings in Scandinavia and frequent meetings with good issues in Denmark as such

S: In some ways, for example when collaborating about signs along the highways, and developing common signing and apps for all Danish sites - but the networks could be used much more proactively.

KS: No

R: No

Germany

Manager of the regional marketing tourism strategy: Yes

Project leader: No

Are you satisfied with the frequency of the World Heritage representatives meetings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWEDEN</th>
<th>DENMARK</th>
<th>GERMANY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HK: Yes</td>
<td>WS: Neutral</td>
<td>UMRV: Manager of the regional marketing tourism strategy: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu: Yes</td>
<td>J: Yes</td>
<td>Project leader: Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SÖ: Yes</td>
<td>S: Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Yes</td>
<td>KS: Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Yes</td>
<td>R: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La: Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K: No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V: No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you cooperating with other World Heritage sites in your country? Question not shown due to specific route questionnaire.
**Is there an intent to create a national World Heritage network in your country?**  Question not shown due to specific route questionnaire.

**In which way could a World Heritage network help you?**  Question not shown due to specific route questionnaire.

**Please, write any additional comments on topic of World Heritage as a brand and Networking towards strengthening the brand.**

**Sweden**

**HK:** I Think in Sweden that the brand "World heritage" is not as strong as it is international. We need to strengthen the brand in order to use it as a positive factor in the touristic industry. In order to attract visitors. We need to cooperate and network between wh sites. Specially to enhance awareness and knowledge at the local people about wh sites. Also the feeling to be proud over theirs world heritage ! We also need to network to find a longterm and sustainable financing for the **work at the world heritage site.**

**Lu:** (No answer)

**SÖ:** (No answer)

**T:** (No answer)

**H:** (No answer)

**La:** (No answer)

**K:** (No answer)

**F:** Networking is crucial for success and it is our obligation as World heritage sites to do so. We do not compete. Marketing takes time and I believe that the Swedish network eventually will come up with a result on a national level that will attract the foreign Tourist.
V: There is a lot more to be done on this subject.

S: (No answers)

Denmark

WS: (No answer)

J: I still don't understand why the local municipality doesn't see the possibilities in being a better partner in the world heritage work

S: Sites can focus much more on the use of the World Heritage emblem on site and in the marketing. We need formalization of the Danish and Nordic network in order to strengthen the collaboration.

KS: In my experience from working with world heritage, there is a huge difference in the potential of the individual sites of using a World Heritage Status as a brand attracting tourists. It is obvious that smaller places that are not known outside the country will have an opportunity to use the status as a means of attracting new visitors.

Places that are known to the world in advance are unlikely to benefit from World Heritage Status in increased numbers of visitors, but it is an honour and signifies the uniqueness of the place. Kronborg still gets most of its guests because it is known for Hamlet and as a national monument to Danes. We don't see people coming in numbers because we are a World Heritage Site.

R: (No answer)

Germany

Manager of the regional marketing tourism strategy: It was a benediction for The upper middle Rhine Valley to become Unesco Site. (I am in hurry, so I don't have time, to write down
the great positive impact. I have some English information, that I can mail during The next days if it is still time. )

**Project leader:** (No answer)

Appendix 5: Interviews

**Summary interview representative Danish agency for culture; main points**

**Time of interview:** 1 hour

*How do you and others use World Heritage as a brand in terms of marketing?*

We don’t brand it yet, but start doing it. We try to get in Visit Denmark as tourist organisation from the national focus point what could be very useful. A visitor center would be from great importance in a few years as well to attract tourists.

*How do you use symbols and emblems of World Heritage on all sites?*

Only at the entrance. We tried to get it on the highway but was not allowed because people need to concentrate. Signs are not really used.

*Do you think, that World Heritage brand increases the number of tourists on the sites?*

No and difficult to say. In the beginning there was a little increase for a short time and even a decrease at one of them. *Authors note: same as literature says about tourism increase.*

*What are/were your expectations of benefits from being a World Heritage site, and how were these expectations fulfilled after being inscribed on the list?*
Nothing at all (for the first three) since they were protected anyway by the national government.

_Are you satisfied with the support and guidelines provided from UNESCO?_

Yes UNESCO really supports us but because of a cut-down in budget it gets more difficult. It is a really bureaucratic organisation with many revised guidelines what makes it complicated. National support would be better.

_What is your opinion on being a world heritage and what are the benefits and disadvantages._

_How is the local community affected by presence of World Heritage sites?_

It is beneficial to be and we are proud of it. Only problem is that the first three sites that were inscribed were top down management. Personal opinion: We are missing the official purpose of the convention, namely protecting areas that are really at risk like in poor countries. Other countries could protect the areas by themselves easily. A few weeks ago, there was a meeting with all world heritage sites.

_How can the networking/relations be defined between all world heritage sites as well as national institutions?_

We have a lot of informal meetings and try to set up a lobby. We had a common strategy before but it got lost. Also the government has cut their budget. Challenge here is to keep the people in the heritage so in need of tourism, businesses to let people stay (employment reasons is one of the things people leave). We try to set it up again in the coming years.
Transcript interview with a member of Swedish World Heritage network: main points

Me: I would like to ask you how do you value to logo and the brand of World Heritage in connection to the questions I sent you in the email. We believe that the guidelines provided by UNESCO are very vague. UNESCO on their website claim that the brand can increase tourism on a site if managed properly, but we do not know what does it mean to 'be managed properly'.

Christina: We have to remember that we are actually dealing with the heritage in means of preservation, not touristical point of view. Another thing quite important is to remember that touristical importance was not originally why the UNESCO WH list was created. It is now that we can identify that these sites do have connection to tourism because they are located where they are. That's one thing that I think is quite important. The other thing is that each one heritage has to identify and clarify to themselves what are their outstanding universal values. Do these values have any connection to tourism? Because that's not the case of all sites.

Matúš: Exactly, I understand this is not the case of all the sites, but it is the case of Southern Oland, because they are counting on this brand to increase tourism on their site. And also let me add, we had a discussion with Cornelius Holtorf, an expert on World Heritages from Kalmar and he pointed out that in Venice convention, it has been acknowledged that World Heritages also need to be beneficial for the society also in sense of economical benefits or increase in tourism and people on Southern Oland count on the brand to bring more tourists to the site.

Christina: If I would talk just about the situation in Falun, the World Heritage site is on a very very big geographical area; Falun mines is the most well know. And the mine it was a touristical site also before it was inscribed on the World Heritage list. The question is, of course, very interesting – does the brand of the World Heritage increase the number of tourists? And I don't
think so. There are many German tourists and they do have more knowledge about World Heritages. And I think it's a lot because in Germany, heritage matters. And it's quite similar here in Falun when it comes to heritage and industrial heritage. It is like we share …. I think, I don't have a proof that when you talk to a german visitor, they have much more knowledge about the kind of how can the heritages affect Sweden and how can they affect Europe. But the brand of World Heritage is about outstanding universal values, we have lot of churches, main square, houses where mine workes used to live, natural areas, water, the surrounding landscape – all of that which has formed the way Falun looks today and I think that value should be used much more when it comes to developing the city itself, to make it much more attractive to people who live there and make it much more attractive for people to move in. I think this identity, we should talk about it much more and make it much more visible - … the red paint etc. Because now, when we are talking about developing the city, especially when we are talking about developing central part of the city, investments are made very short term - they are often not thinking about long-term investments. It is needed to look back for long term investments, to see the identity.

There I think there is a big mismatch of understanding, but to me, it is very sad to see what is happening here.

*Matiš: so for you it's about preservation the city as it used to be, not about using the brand for tourism.*

Christina: It is of crucial importance, that the town planners respect the fact that the values, why we are a World Heritage site has something to do with the historical remains. This region, Dalarna, is a region which is very touristic. We have a high number of visitors every way. I will try to find the numbers. Approximately, there are 250 000 visitors of the mine every year and
that counts not only people that go down in the mine, but also the people that are taking part in activities that take place outside of the pit, using the area for recreation. And historically, when we became World Heritage site in 2001, in 2002, it was the first summer of World Heritage site, the number has increased very very much. But it was just that summer – it is normal, so to speak, due to increased media, presentation in the news and by the tourist organisations.

Me: Are you using the World Heritage brand to attract new tourists? Are you using it in your marketing extensively or do you use brand Falun as a standalone brand?

Christina: The tourist organizations do use the brand World Heritage site when it comes to marketing of the city of Falun to tourists. Falun has two identities – it's sport and culture. In the cultural part, it has always been communicated that Falun is a World Heritage site.

Matúš: I would also like to ask about the Swedish World Heritage Network (Group). What are the problems that you are dealing with at the moment?

Christina: The problem that I have identified in recent years is that there is a gap between the state party and the actual site. There is responsibility for the heritage site, which is at the state party, but we don't really see any engagement regarding the preservation or regarding the developing from the state party. These responsibilities are now on each heritage's site. This is why we have this network – we have to support each other. Many others, we see that we don't really have natural connection to the state party. Because being a heritage site, for example having a mine, is very expensive – this is an issue most heritage sites can identify with. There is a gap, I don't know why – if it's a lack of interest, or a lack of information, but we feel that the state party should be much more interested and involved in World heritage sites. In Sweden, tourism is one of our biggest incomes and if the state party took much more engagement in the
World Heritage sites, that could also be a reason for visiting Sweden. Because we have 15 of World's most interesting places and they are well kept and we can accept a high number of visitors to our sites.

Matúš: How are local people affected by the world heritage sites? Are there benefits or disadvantages to the local society/community?

Christina: That is a tricky question. What I can answer is that there is a large number of people living in the World Heritage site, we have three very well preserved areas where the mine workers used to live and the houses are well preserved. For people living in one of these areas, they are aware of the fact that they are living in a cultural heritage area and there is a pride in it. Involvement and awareness from local people is very high and the interest to learn more – for example how to restore your own house. People are aware that you have to take care about it and they are eager to do the right thing.

There is one business that always use World Heritage brand in their marketing and that is the real estate agencies. If there is a house located in the World Heritage area, that are eager to promote that feature. Also restaurants and hotels use the brand, for example 'have a lunch in the World Heritage area'. There is no negative influence of the brand that I could think of.

I wonder if people go to Falun because it is a World Heritage site or because it's pretty? I think people also often don't know about presence of World Heritage site. Now I am involved in a working group related to an old garden in Falun, how to raise the awareness among the local people who use the area as a recreational area and to make them know that they are taking part in an area that is included in the World Heritage list. We are thinking of ways how to increase awareness of the local people.
Another thing, in Falun, there is one target group that is very very aware that Falun is a World Heritage site and that is children. Because we have a lot of pedagogical programs in schools and all the children in Falun are taking part in different programs connected to the World Heritage, where they are doing fun things, sometimes they are also visiting the mines and get to work as a miner for one day. We have also Teknikverkstat, where you do lots of experience connected to mining. You learn a lot about minerals and techniques how to make copper from the mineral and all children take part in these different programmes. It has been finances by the municipality and is going very well. It is very positive because they will grow up and as young people and adults they will have this awareness that Falun is a world heritage and will have some pride in it too. It is very popular for children to take part in these programmes and also the teachers and parents are thankful for it. You can use the World Heritage when teaching different subject as maths, physics, chemistry. This is one thing that struck me now, that the programmes for pupils are very good and of high quality.