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Introduction

Tourism has been widely recognized as a potential agent of economic, social and ecological change worldwide. In particular, nature-based tourism, where some aspect of nature itself is the tourist attraction (Cheer & Lew, 2018b; Balmford et al., 2015), has the potential to provide many economic benefits to remote communities. But it brings many challenges, including concerns about ecological impacts to sensitive ecosystems. Arctic tourism (nature-based or otherwise) occurs in high-latitude areas where visitors are willing to travel large distances to see extreme environments and landscapes, exotic wildlife, and to experience indigenous communities and culture. More recently, “last chance tourism”, where tourists flock to sites where landscapes, seascapes or the species that inhabit these places are at risk of disappearance due to global forces like climate change, has become a phenomenon that attracts visitors to the Arctic. (Groulx et al. 2016; Lemelin et al., 2010). Paradoxically, the carbon emissions from travel and waste created by arctic tourism also contribute to the global climate change problem (Dawson, Stewart, Lemelin, & Scott, 2010). Further, the paradox results in communities investing in and potentially becoming dependent on tourism, even though (and also often because) the source of attraction is fleeting.

Arctic tourism is also increasingly seen as an avenue for development in many small, often remote communities that have few other economic opportunities. Although the social and economic make-up of Arctic communities can vary substantially depending on their location, many have typically relied on the surrounding environment for hunting and gathering, local and regional governments, and extractive industries associated with the resource base (e.g. gold and mineral prospecting/mining, petroleum-based industries and commercial fishing/whaling, etc.)
Increasingly, global economic and social trends have enabled more people to travel to the Arctic. Climatic factors, such as breaking up of sea ice have facilitated access to many remote arctic communities, such as Utqiaġvik, Alaska, (formerly Barrow), an historically native Iñupiat community situated on the coastal tundra where subsistence activities including hunting, fishing, and whaling have been integral to local way of life (Hillmer-Pegram, 2016). As communities become easier to access, they are experiencing an influx in nature and culture-based tourism activity (Hillmer-Pegram, 2016; Kaján, 2014a). Further, nature conservation efforts (e.g. the development of parks and protected areas) in rural or remote areas such as the Arctic regions, are increasingly expected to contribute to the economies of these areas by generating revenue from nature-based tourism and related activities and expenditures (Pashkevich, Stjernström, & Lundmark, 2016).

While integrating tourism (including nature-based tourism) as part of a diversified economy can provide communities with an often much-needed source of revenue, over dependency on tourism may adversely affect communities if the economy is solely centered on tourism, as economic dependence on tourism can result in reduced resilience and increased vulnerability of a community. Moreover, there are some Arctic communities where nature-based tourism has experienced rapid growth (“boomed”) and resulted in significant challenges of managing the natural resource base on which tourism depends. For example, the community of Churchill, Manitoba (Canada), for decades known as ‘the polar bear capital of the world’, relies heavily on income generated from polar bear viewing (Lemelin, 2008), and residents of the Nunavut Territory in Canada rely on polar bear populations for subsistence as well as income from sport hunting operations (Dowsley, 2010). The community of Churchill in particular has a long history
(as well as established infrastructure) of nature-based tourism, first becoming popular as a destination for birding and viewing beluga whale captures as early as the 1960s (Lemelin, 2008). Kaktovik, a community along the Arctic coast in Alaska, has also seen an influx of polar bears due to declining sea ice and a subsequent increase in tourism (Department of Planning & Community Services, 2015; Wolfe, 2013). Originally a coal mining community, Longyearbyen at Svalbard, Norway, is also known for its polar bear viewing opportunities, but has more diverse tourism opportunities than Churchill. Svalbard has been a destination for tourists since the late 19th century, but the number of overnight stays have tripled in the last 20 years reflecting strong bonds between the tourism industry, research, and governing institutions (Viken, 2010). Svalbard also draws tourists from cruise ships who view historical and cultural remains from the whaling and mining industries as well as trekkers seeking solitude in the Norwegian wilderness (Aars et al., 2005; Guðmundsdóttir & Sæþórsdóttir, 2009; Hagen et al., 2010; Lemelin & Dyck, 2008). In these communities as well as others that host polar bear tourism, increased incidents of human-polar bear interactions as well as disruption of coastal denning habitat pose threats to polar bear populations (Lemelin & Dyck, 2008).

Nature-based tourism is the main economic driver in several small Scandinavian Arctic communities. In Finnish Lapland, including the communities of Saariselkä and Kilpisjärvi, rapid development of tourism has resulted in tensions with Sami reindeer herders and with residents concerned about the sustainable use of nature, including the impact of motorized recreation on traditional activities such as skiing (Kaján, 2014b). In Norway’s Lofoten region, spectacular natural scenery including dramatic fjords combined with mild summer temperatures draw thousands of tourists each year. This area has also recently become the backdrop for several
Hollywood films, and is heavily promoted as a travel destination, resulting in a surge of tourism that has become unmanageable for local infrastructure (Henley, 2016; Kristoffersen & Midtgard, 2016). In Alaska between 2010 and 2014 most of the annually generated $54.3 million dollars from tourism occur below the Arctic Circle (Loeffler & Colt, 2015), however both Utqiaġvik and Kaktovic on the North Slope are exceptions. In these communities, residents struggle with how to expand tourism in a sustainable and culturally appropriate manner (Wolfe, 2013; Wanasuk & Thornton, 2015; Hillmer-Pegram 2016).

In some cases, a booming tourism industry could result in conflict and adverse long-term impacts in Arctic communities. Increased tourism could have ripple effects by changing infrastructure, technology, communication, and community demographics as well as altering the nature of social interactions, cultural identity, and community cohesion in Arctic communities (Amundsen, 2012; Puhakka, Sarkki, Cottrell, & Siikamäki, 2009). Arctic tourism is subject to change in response to global markets (as traveling to the Arctic is costly), or changes in natural conditions that alter the quality of the tourist/recreation experience (Kaján, 2014a). If the resource attracting tourism (e.g., polar bears or glaciers) is subject to degradation or displacement as the result of climate change, sole dependence on nature-based tourism may result in an economic “bust” similar to communities dependent on extraction of a single natural resource (Krannich & Petzselka, 2003). As such, this may contribute to decreased resiliency, or increased vulnerability of these communities.
In this paper we examine the potential for economic dependence and subsequent resilience or vulnerability of Arctic communities that host nature-based tourism. First, we review the tourism literature to examine the phenomenon of Arctic tourism, specifically nature-based tourism, upon which some Arctic communities now depend, in part or in full, as an economic driver. Next, we discuss the concept of “tourism dependence” and examine the implications of tourism dependence in Arctic communities. Finally, we propose a conceptual and analytical framework of potential measurable indicators for the future analysis of dependence of Arctic communities on natural resources as the basis for nature-based tourism. In the discussion of our analytical framework, we identify important data needs (key indicators) for analyzing and comparing the relative dependence of Arctic communities on nature-based tourism, discuss availability of data/operatoralization of measuring proposed indicators, and suggest potential methods of data collection to facilitate development of indicators and a consistent baseline of data on tourism dependence that can be used comparatively between communities.

Tourism in the Arctic region

Definitions of what constitutes the Arctic region vary. For the purposes of this paper, following de la Barre et al. (2016), we use the geographic definition of the Arctic including Alaska, northern Canada, Greenland, the Faroe Islands, Iceland, northern Fennoscandia, and northern Russia (de la Barre et al, 2016). This region contains a landmass of over 14 million km$^2$ across eight countries of which over 2.5 million km$^2$ are under some form of legal protection for natural values (Pagnan, 2002). These protected areas embody many of the values that impel tourists to visit the region. The Arctic region houses a range of cultures, including many indigenous communities, and is socio-economically heterogeneous from region to region (de la Barre et al.,
Tourism in the Arctic includes urban tourism, travel between different regions, and nature-based tourism. Arctic tourism is characterized by typically difficult to access locations set within fragile environments (de la Barre et al., 2016) and is highly seasonal in nature, which provides some challenges for tourism planning and development. (de la Barre et al., 2016; Yu, Schwartz, & Walsh, 2009).

The recent growth in tourism to Arctic regions (Balmford et al. 2009; Newsome et al. 2013) is partly a function of overall increases in global tourism, and globalizing economies (Müller, Lundmark, & Lemelin, 2013, Maher et al., 2014). Nature-based tourism has become increasingly popular as an alternative development pathway for rural and remote communities worldwide, which are facing demographic and economic changes (Amundsen 2012; Burns, 2018; Hall and Saarinen 2010). In the Arctic, general tourism and nature-based tourism have been closely linked for many decades (i.e., Fredman and Tyrväinen 2010; Hall & Boyd, 2005), as the draw of the unique and pristine scenery, and symbolic qualities of the natural attractions often go hand-in-hand with activities such as hiking, camping, and wildlife viewing. Global changes including changes in climate are influencing tourism in Arctic regions (Müller et al., 2013). However, the rise in tourism in Arctic regions can also be attributed to global climate change itself, as threats to Arctic ecosystems are recognized (e.g., melting glaciers, loss of species habitat) by tourists who are driven to experience polar environments and their associated megafauna and indigenous cultures before they are gone (Dawson et al., 2010; Lemelin et al., 2010; Müller et al., 2013). Termed “last-chance” or “doom” tourism, this relatively new trend has been promoted in tourism marketing, particularly in the Arctic (Lemelin et al., 2010). An example of last chance tourism is the influx of tourists interested in viewing polar bears in their
natural habitat before it disappears, such as in Churchill, Manitoba; Kaktovik, Alaska; and
Svalbard, Norway. A warming Arctic climate threatens polar bear populations as sea ice duration
and extent decreases, reducing the amount of time they are able to spend on sea-ice feeding on
seals (Derocher, Lunn, & Stirling, 2004; Lemelin et al., 2010). Diminishing sea ice also increases
the time polar bears spend on shore, increasing the likelihood of encountering tourists and local
residents, leading to increased bear mortality (Clark, Van Beest, & Brook, 2012; Rode et al.,
2015; Wilder et al., 2017). While there is evidence that tourism activities negatively impact polar
bear populations, research also exists that suggests these same activities are relatively benign
(Atwood et al., 2016; Dyck & Baydack, 2004).

Tourism dependence and community resilience

The concept of tourism dependence suggests that the economy of communities affected by
nature-based tourism attractions, such as gateway communities to parks and protected areas and
cruise-ship ports, can become overly dependent on income from tourism activities (nature-based
or otherwise) (English, Marcouiller, & Cordell, 2000). The definition of this idea varies within
the literature, but it is generally characterized by lack of economic diversification within the
community (Krannich et al., 2014; Krannich & Petzelka, 2003; Stedman, 2013), and an
associated potential decrease in community resilience (i.e., potential increase in vulnerability).
Resilience is defined as an organized network of adaptive capabilities linked to the ability of
people to function and adapt following a disturbance (Norris et al, 2008), including social and
ecological changes. The variability of indicators of resource dependency, which often include
measures of unemployment or income or other measures of community well-being, have
prompted some researchers to caution against overgeneralizations when examining resource
dependency, particularly in the context of rural community development (see Stedman, 2013).

For the purpose this paper, the definition of community resilience is derived from that given by
Bec, McLennan & Moyle (2016) as “the ability of a community to harness its resources in order
to adapt to change” (p. 432).

A now large body of work related to tourism and community resilience began to emerge in the
late 1990s and early 2000s, including early conceptual work by Farrell & Twining-Ward (2004,
2005) and later work by Cochrane (2010) and Strickland-Munro, Allison, & Moore. (2010), that
specifically discussed the impact of protected area tourism on the resilience of communities.
More recently, studies have examined the relationships between tourism, resilience, and
sustainability, and communities’ ability to adapt to environmental changes, particularly climate
change (e.g. Cheer & Lew, 2018a; Hall, Prayag, & Amore, 2018; Lew & Cheer, 2018a; & Lew,
et al., 2016). Authors note the difficulty in understanding and assessing both resilience and
sustainability of communities is due to confusion, particularly to weakly conceptualized
definitions of and lack of differentiation between the two terms, (Lew et al., 2016). Additionally,
the concept of resilience is often applied using ecological resilience theory, which assumes that
systems cycle adaptively through states of collapse and reorganization. This approach has been
highly criticized for its failure to account for social causes and implications of these cycles (Hall
et al., 2018). Instead, resilience of communities that are affected by tourism, especially nature-
based tourism occurring in the Arctic, must be considered as social-ecological systems, as
humans simultaneously derive ecosystem services from the natural environment while also
impacting that natural environment (Hall et al., 2018; Hillmer-Pegram, 2018). Further,
researchers Lew and Cheer (2018b) suggest that there are in essence three tourism systems that
researchers can examine through the lens of resilience: the “attraction system” (i.e. the resource base that drives the tourism), the “economic system”, and the “community system” (Lew & Cheer, 2018b). Here, we consider resilience within the context of a community’s economic response to potential declines in tourism due to changes in climate, the natural resource base, markets or other geopolitical forces.

Literature also exists that examines the relationship between the tourism industry and dependence in the context of dependency theory (Britton, 1996; Kahn, 1997). The focus of this work lies primarily in understanding how mass tourism in developing countries can result in these areas losing local control and becoming dependent on foreign economies that supply both the infrastructure and tourists for these tourism activities (Wanasuk & Thornton, 2015). When income from mass tourism in these areas does not remain in the host country, tourism activities can result in a structural dependency of host countries on foreign economies (Britton, 1996). This process can also occur at smaller scales within a single country or state, where economic revenue earned from tourism largely leaves the community of origin, resulting in minimal benefit to the community where tourism occurs. Also, decisions made regarding tourism often arise from outside the community. However, tourism is sometimes promoted for diversifying rural economies. Development of smaller scale ecotourism opportunities as well as sustainably-developed indigenous tourism are less likely to result in this type of dependency, as ecotourism operations often involve local participation in and ownership of tourism operations (Kahn, 1997; Wanasuk & Thornton, 2015). In addition, sustainably-developed indigenous tourism results in development of an economy that also supports cultural values (Hillmer-Pegram, 2016).
Rather than focus at the country level scale, we seek to better understand how rural or remote communities in the Arctic can become dependent on income from tourism activities, particularly nature-based tourism activities. In this context, the concept of tourism dependence has evolved from sociological research examining resource dependence of rural communities, primarily as a contributing factor to rural poverty (Freudenburg & Gramling, 1994; Krannich & Luloff, 1991; Nord, 1994; Peluso, Humphrey, & Fortmann, 1994). The specific resource that rural communities become dependent on varies, but is linked to the natural resource base of the surrounding area. Thus, economic dependence can be built on a number of natural resources, including timber, ores, minerals, oil, natural gas—any natural resource that can be used for profit. Freudenburg & Gramling (1994) argue that dependency and resultant poverty in these communities develops because the extracted resources, and their profits, do not fully remain in the communities from which they are extracted. Instead, the resources end up providing greater benefits to areas where the resources are used as inputs for industrial development elsewhere.

In developed countries, “staples theory” has been used to describe resource dependency and resilience to declines in rural areas. Nature-based tourism usually depends on resources in rural and remote areas, and such “peripheral” economies have historically relied upon export of “staples” commodities (derived from the natural resource base, such as fish, timber, oil or minerals, animal products such as wool, or livestock) to distant markets and capital input from outside for resource extraction (Schmallegger & Carson, 2010). When resource export declines another “addictive economy”, namely tourism, is suggested as the salvation to escape “the staples trap” and to develop declining resource-dependent communities (Carson & Carson, 2011). But self-reliant sustaining tourism has been difficult to develop in peripheral staples
economies, and communities usually rely on large companies and government for capital input, infrastructure, marketing and regulation of tourism industries. This external reliance limits the ability of communities to link economic development to tourism that is occurring locally, thus perpetuating the trap (Carson & Carson, 2011). As such, some researchers have suggested that rather than tourism functioning as an escape from the staples trap, tourism in rural communities often functions similarly to a traditional staples industry, and therefore, the staples thesis provides a valuable conceptual framework for understanding and promoting sustainable development of tourism in remote or rural areas (Schmallegger & Carson, 2010). Arctic communities often share characteristics of peripheral staples economies. Further, distributional inequalities between Arctic peripheries and more centralized areas within wealthy nations such as Norway, the USA, and Russia may functionally be just as much of a problem as foreign countries extracting resources or developing tourism industries, serving as an intra-national staples trap of sorts.

Tourism booms and busts

Rural areas dependent on natural resources experience cycles of rapid growth and instability or decline (boom and bust), due to the limited economic diversity of the areas (Krannich & Luloff, 1991). These cycles limit the adaptability of rural communities that become accustomed to periods of prosperity followed by economic decline. Rather than seek opportunities for developing their economies in more viable, sustainable ways, residents become conditioned to do nothing in response to changing conditions, because their past experience suggests that current conditions, whether for better or for worse, lack permanence (Krannich & Luloff, 1991). Ultimately, the natural resources available and the characteristics of the community are
intricately interwoven. Degradation of natural resources in these resource-dependent communities often leads to degradation of the social and economic structure of the community (Peluso et al, 1994). Further, resource dependence often displays a “nestedness”, whereby different communities may be dependent on the same resource in different ways and at different spatial scales (Beckley, 1998). For example, two communities adjacent to a managed forest may both be dependent on the forest—one for extraction of timber, and the other as a gateway for recreational access to the forest. Whereas logging activity and infrastructure may provide economic benefits to the adjacent logging community, recreation activities and associated support services (restaurants, outfitters, lodging) may more broadly benefit the economy of a county or entire region from which the recreation area is accessible. The opposite may also occur, particularly in Alaska, where the state or Native corporations pursue oil and gas development adjacent to rural communities. This resource extraction benefits the region and state (Haley & Fisher, 2012), whereas local communities may depend on the land for subsistence and recreation-related business (e.g. tour guides and outfitters) with a more localized effect. Another example of this type of resource dependence nestedness within the Arctic region can be drawn from the western Hudson Bay polar bear population. This “resource” is the target of polar bear viewing tourism in Churchill, Manitoba, but also hunted by Inuit peoples in Nunavut.

Related sociological research has examined tourism as a non-extractive use of the natural resource base that may also result in dependency in rural gateway communities adjacent to parks and protected areas that serve as tourist attractions. As early as 1980, researchers examined the growth and decline of the popularity of natural resource-based tourist areas, suggesting that proper management of an area is necessary to avoid cycles of rapid growth and decline (Butler,
Further research has gone on to quantify levels of tourism dependence of various communities using ratios of per capita lodging and/or per capita expenditures on eating and drinking to per capita income (English et al., 2000; Gooch, 1990; Smith & Krannich, 1998). For example, case studies of communities in the American west, including the gateway communities of Jackson, WY and Teton Valley, ID (gateway communities to Grand Teton National Park) and Moab, UT (gateway to Arches and Canyonlands National Parks) indicate that resident attitudes about tourism vary according the intensity (amount or level) of tourism an area experiences in a given season (Smith & Krannich, 1998). These case studies also describe community “typologies” related to level of dependence. These typologies, which range from “tourism-hungry” to “tourism-saturated” suggest a spectrum of dependence, related to both the natural resource base and community characteristics. An economy reliant on a recreation and natural-resource based tourism industry can result in dependency that makes these so-called tourism-dependent communities equally vulnerable to cycles of growth and instability as those dependent on extractive industry (Krannich & Petrzelka, 2003).

Further, tourism tends to create service sector employment, with positions that are seasonal and have lower levels of compensation. However, increases in tourism can result in soaring housing costs, making it impossible for those employed in the tourism industry to live in the community where they work (Krannich & Petrzelka, 2003). Research also suggests that the impacts of protected-area tourism on Arctic and aboriginal gateway communities has been mixed (Bennett, Lemelin, Koster, & Budke, 2012; Lemelin & Dawson, 2014). While establishment of protected areas can result in an increase in employment, infrastructure, and environmental protection, resulting increases in tourism can also lead to degradation of the natural resource base and local
culture (Bennett et al., 2012). In Churchill, Manitoba, for example, in addition to permanent residents, a transient seasonal workforce (defined as having resided in Churchill for two years or less) exists to accommodate the tourism demands, and is becoming a larger and larger proportion of the Churchill population. This workforce has displaced locals and created both actual and perceived vulnerabilities within the community, particularly concerning risk-taking behaviors (Schmidt & Clark, 2018).

While the concept of tourism dependence has been applied in Arctic communities in Finnish Lapland (Kaján, 2014a), a quantifiable way to measure tourism dependence has yet to be applied to nature-based tourism broadly in Arctic communities, as availability and scale of data related to tourism vary across the Arctic, making quantitative comparisons challenging (Hillmer-Pegram, 2018). The final sections of this paper examine the role of community control relative to tourism dependence, posit tourism-dependent communities as social-ecological systems (SESs), and present a framework for measuring and understanding the extent of nature-based tourism dependency in Arctic communities, whose natural resource base is particularly fragile and subject to degradation (de la Barre et al., 2016). The ability to determine a community’s relative dependence on nature-based tourism will help determine the extent to which the resilience of a community may be threatened by, or vulnerable to, dependence on tourism.

Community control

The reliance of peripheral communities on external governments or large companies for capital inputs to sustain or develop tourism has been linked to the aforementioned “staples trap” in rural
(and Arctic) communities (Carson & Carson, 2016; Carson & Carson, 2011). Thus, the level of local community control of tourism is an important potential indicator of the relative dependence of a community on nature-based tourism and susceptibility to boom-bust cycles. But what constitutes “community control”? Moreover, in the Arctic, how is a “community” defined?

Carson, Brouder, and de la Barre (2017) argue that a common definition of “community” is often elusive and can vary by country and jurisdiction within sparsely-populated areas of the north, including the Arctic. In addition to permanent residents, these researchers suggest including “mobile”, seasonal or semi-permanent residents whose association with the community may fluctuate over time. Historically, these temporary residents are perceived as problematic for communities, and are associated with conflict and negative impacts on both the permanent resident population and the local economy. Further, this transient population tends to be absent from community statistics (Müller, 2011; Storey, 2010). However, research suggests that these mobile or temporary residents may aid in stimulating development that could break traditional cycles of resource path dependence, and thus may have a positive influence on communities (Carson et al., 2017).

Community control involves collaborative participation of residents, both permanent and temporary, in tourism development through involvement in decision-making processes related to tourism in the community, as well as employment in local business designed to economically benefit the community (as opposed to a large, distant corporation running a tourism related business within a community (Rasoolimanesh & Jaafar, 2016)). In work at World Heritage Sites, Rasoolimanesh & Jaafar (2016) found that community participation in tourism development gave residents the opportunity to actively engage in decision-making and activities that allowed
them to establish local control of tourism in their community, rather than be passive subjects to
tourism. Researchers also noted that in these rural areas, the existing political structure often
functioned as a barrier to local residents wishing to be involved in decision-making processes,
and as such economic involvement, through employment in tourism-related work, became the
preferred means for community participation and engagement in tourism (Rasoolimanesh &
capabilities” including ability/willingness of residents to invest in tourism, as well as a lack of
collaboration within the local tourism industry as factors that may inhibit local community
control of tourism.

While the above research has established the need and benefits of community control over
tourism, as well as identified barriers to community control, several researchers have also
developed indicators for measuring and managing community control of tourism. Indicators have
a history of use within tourism and leisure studies, particularly within the field of natural
resource management, as tools to aid in management decisions (Phillips & Budruk, 2011).
Specifically, community indicators have been used to measure concepts like quality of life, and
often represent larger scale social goals. Instead of simply providing an economic measure (such
as GDP), community indicators consider social and environmental impacts to a community as
well as accounting for the services provided (i.e. the value) by natural and cultural resources.
(Choi & Turk; Phillips & Budruk, 2011). Choi and Turk (2011) suggest a range of indicators for
the six dimensions (economic, social, cultural, ecological, political, and technological) that could
be used to assess sustainability of tourism in a community. Examples of indicators for each
dimension include: employment growth in tourism (economic), resident involvement in the
tourism industry (social), type and amount of training given to tourism employees (cultural), amount of erosion present on the natural site (ecological), presence of a development control policy (political), and use of low impact technology (technological). These indicators, and others, will be discussed further in the following section, specifically relative to the development of a framework of indicators for measuring tourism dependence in Arctic communities.

Arctic communities, nature-based tourism, and SES

Tourism dependent communities as SES

Within the ecotourism literature, recent research has examined ecotourism as a SES (Gallaher, 2010). More broadly within the tourism and resilience literature, researchers have also called for an understanding of tourism systems as SES, particularly when examining or assessing the resilience of these systems (Hall et al., 2018; Hillmer-Pegram, 2018). In the United States and more so in developing countries across the world, people living in rural areas and gateway communities rely on tourism to parks and protected areas for their livelihood, either through revenue resulting from ecotourism, or through direct use of resources (Pimbert & Pretty, 1995). As such, developing and maintaining a sustainable ecotourism or nature-based tourism industry is contingent on sustainable management of the natural resources that draw tourists to the area.

For example, many Arctic communities where nature-based tourism occurs, such as Churchill, Manitoba, depend on a stable, cold climate to maintain the natural resource base (polar bears, beluga whales, and their associated habitat) that attracts tourism to the region. As global climate changes, these communities are facing increased threats to community resilience (Dawson, et al.
While research suggests that some Arctic communities are aware of climate change, they are skeptical of the potential impact of climate change on tourism (Saarinen & Tervo, 2006) and thus could be reluctant to adopt adaptation strategies. Further, for many communities, climate change is not considered the most immediate or highest-priority challenge they face. In some Alaskan communities already impacted by climate change, the primary focus is often on achieving some stability by maintaining existing infrastructure and other services to improve quality of life (Loring, Gerlach, & Penn, 2016).

Tourism is not only impacting the natural resource base upon which it depends in Arctic regions, but also the culture, cohesiveness, and identity of communities that serve as “gateways” to tourist areas (Bennett et al., 2012). Many gateway communities rely, at least in part, on subsistence economies derived from the same natural resource base drawing tourism (Puhakka et al., 2009). Therefore, community members may view tourism as a threat to their way of life. Tourism can also result in increases in “outsiders” to the community as people move to the area to work, often in seasonal positions, and reap the economic benefits of tourism. These outsiders can also be seen as a threat to the cohesion, culture, and identity of a community, resulting in an overall adverse or negative opinion of tourism for local residents (Leeming, 2016; Smith & Krannich, 1998). The interconnected nature of social and ecological factors at play suggest that communities that receive income from nature-based tourism are SESs. As SESs, these communities must both protect natural resources and provide a quality visitor experience that is both resilient (adaptable to changes in environmental and social conditions, as well as changes to policy) and sustainable (will endure for future generations).
Potential indicators of tourism dependence

Indicators are measurable variables that provide a way to quantitatively define, compare, and analyze issues relative to environmental management, including tourism and recreation within and beyond the Arctic (Manning, 2011). Existing literature suggests several socioeconomic indicators which may be useful in determining the relative level of dependence of a given community to nature-based tourism activities. The level of dependence could then be used to assess the resilience or vulnerability of communities to social and ecological change. Several researchers have developed a tourism dependency ratio (Gooch, 1990; Harvey, Hunt, & Harris, 1995; Royer, McCool, & Hunt, 1974; Smith & Krannich, 1998). While the inputs differ slightly, the general formula involves comparing either (or both) per capita lodging sales or gross taxable revenue from eating and drinking establishments to per capita personal income (Gooch, 1990; Smith & Krannich, 1998). These ratios have provided a basic way to roughly judge how economically dependent a given community is on tourism. Data involved is mostly straightforward and directly comparable across communities, but while it is more easily acquired for larger communities such data is difficult to obtain for smaller, remote areas.

Other potential indicators include cost of housing (English et al., 2000; Krannich & Petrzelka, 2003), or cost of living (or presence/absence of cost of living subsidies in areas like northern Canada where most housing is publicly owned), percent of houses occupied, and total employment (presumably in number of jobs) in tourism-related facilities or jobs including service-sector and seasonal jobs (Beckley, 1998; English et al., 2000; Krannich & Petrzelka, 2003). Total tourism-related income (perhaps more easily measured as tourism-related expenditures that occur within the community) minus spending for business or family travel
could also be a useful indicator (Beckley, 1998; English et al., 2000). These expenditures should include lodging, food and drink purchased at restaurants, recreation and amusement services and other tourism-related retail purchases. While arguably important, total expenditures may be potentially difficult to calculate.

Rates of population growth could help determine the potential importance of tourism on community economy (Krannich & Petrzelka, 2003), whereas understanding levels of community identity and connectedness can help determine the level of community “buy-in” to and desirability of tourism as an economic driver (Schweinsberg, Wearing, & Darcy, 2012). Measuring spatial distribution of income can help determine the amount staying in the local community (Nord, 1994). Factors like economic growth in tourism, resident involvement in the local tourism industry, the type and training given to tourism employees, the condition of natural resources in the area (e.g. the amount of erosion occurring), the presence of a tourism development policy in the community, and whether or not low-impact technology is being utilized could serve as indicators of the sustainability of tourism in a community (Choi & Turk, 2016). Participation rates in tourism and recreation activities of both visitors to and residents of the community have also been posited as potential indicators of tourism dependence (Beckley, 1998).

One consideration when determining potential indicators is the scale of analysis and available data. As Beckley (1998) points out when examining the “nestedness” of forest dependence, more readily available county level or regional data (such as that compiled in many socio-economic
datasets) may not reveal differences in vulnerability on the scale of individual communities. The scale of available data can be particularly problematic when examining or applying indicators across different countries. In their analysis of potential social indicators for examining the effects of climate change on Arctic tourism, Fay & Karlsdóttir (2011) found that none of the jurisdictions they examined within Alaska, Canada, Greenland, Iceland, Finnish Lapland, and Norway collected data consistently, or in such a way that it is comparable across locations. Similarly, Maher (2017) notes the difficulty in comparing tourism growth due to lack of consistency in how, where, and when data are collected. Further, the data collected are often not at a fine enough resolution (i.e. the community level) to examine the indicators in less-populated, rural, remote, areas where Arctic tourism often occurs. The authors called for development of a program to monitor indicators, consistently, at the community-level so as to better assess the impacts of climate change on Arctic tourism in the future (Fay & Karlsdóttir, 2011).

**Frameworks for analysis: Measuring resilience or vulnerability to resource dependence among Arctic communities**

Despite the challenges described above, a framework to guide inquiries into the relative resilience or vulnerability to resource dependency of Arctic communities is necessary. To date, no such framework exists. However, a general conceptual framework does exist which suggests concepts to include when examining resilience and the impacts of protected area tourism on communities (Strickland-Munro, Allison, & Moore, 2010). In this framework, authors suggest that the Resilience Assessment Process (as adapted from the Resilience Alliance (2007)) be used to investigate resilience of communities impacted by protected area tourism (Figure 1).
Further, Kaján (2013) presents a methodological framework for tourism development and community adaptation specifically related to climate change. The framework is designed to aid data collection and assessment of community vulnerability to “climatic risks” (p. 289), combining elements of climate-change adaptation and disaster risk reduction (Kaján, 2013). While this framework aids in measuring and understanding vulnerability of tourism dependent (or driven) Arctic communities, it is lacking in that it does not identify specific quantifiable, measurable indicators of vulnerability or resilience that could be applied comparatively, across communities, to better understand how differences in community structure may influence the resilience of a tourism-dependent community in the face of global change. We further these ideas by advancing a conceptual framework that more specifically delineates tourism dependence factors (Figure 2) and a suite of practical indicators (Table 1) that provide a way to comparatively measure the degree of dependency.

This framework places dependence or resilience of a community in the center to illustrate potential pathways of local development, where resilience is defined as adaptability of the community and surrounding environment to change. This includes the ability of the natural
resource base to withstand changes in policy and economics, as well as ability of policy and the local economy to withstand changes in the natural resource base. In order to understand the relative resilience or vulnerability of tourism-dependent communities, a suite of measurable indicators of tourism dependence, derived from tourism dependency literature, is presented (Table 1) that could be compared across Arctic communities that rely to some degree on nature-based tourism as an economic driver. These indicators are broken into “tourism related factors” (income from tourism, participation rates in tourism, tourist perceptions of the natural resource base, and tourist motivations for visiting an area) and “community related factors” (per-capita income/purchasing power, quality of the natural resource base, community control over tourism, and community perceptions of tourism).

<Table 1 about here>

While some of the data necessary to assess the indicators provided in Table 1 is readily available from public or government sources, other data, including tourism participation rates, condition of the resource base, visitor perceptions of the natural resource base, and community perceptions of tourism, though measurable, are not currently being collected or publicly available. These indicators would require development and implementation of protocols for collection within most Arctic communities. Though per capita income or purchasing power data is often readily available, this data can be difficult to acquire at the community level for many Arctic countries, such as Finland, which collects and reports this data at the country level (Statistics Finland, 2018). As noted by Fay & Karlsdóttir (2011), publicly available data varies widely from country
to country, and data at the scale of the municipality is often lacking. As such, this data would also need to be collected in the field until a program is developed to consistently monitor these indicators across Arctic communities.
**Conclusions**

As global tourism continues to increase, and “last-chance tourism” brings tourists from around the world to Arctic communities to see polar environments and their inhabitants before they are gone forever, Arctic communities may be becoming increasingly dependent on tourism for their development, making these communities more vulnerable to boom-bust cycles and potentially altering community structure and cohesion. This dependence may be the result of communities actively pursuing tourism business opportunities, simply allowing these opportunities to occur, or the result of decisions that are not made locally. In some cases, nature-based tourism may be the only economically viable option to sustain a community. No matter the cause, the concepts of tourism dependency, community resilience, and tourism as SES are relatively under-examined in the context of Arctic communities. However, research in other locations suggests that communities exhibiting these dependencies may be less resilient to change. In a time when global changes (increasing tourism, globalization, and changes to global climate) are influencing Arctic communities, understanding the relative dependence of these communities is important to help determine steps that can be taken to maintain or increase resilience and decrease vulnerability of these communities.

SES approaches suggest that key factors to examine when determining the relative level of dependence of a community on nature-based tourism include policy and governance, the global economy, and the natural resource base. These factors, when examined within the context of a number of indicators of tourism dependence, can provide an understanding of the resilience, or
lack thereof, of the community. The framework we have presented will enable an examination of potential tourism dependence in Arctic communities where nature-based tourism is the major focus. Understanding tourism dependence within the context of Arctic communities as SES can identify the extent to which the resilience of a community may be threatened by dependence on tourism, and disconnected from traditional and local ecological knowledge when managing the natural resource base upon which the tourism in these areas depends.
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**Tables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurable indicators of tourism dependent community resilience, operationalization, and potential data sources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism-related indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism-related income</strong> (lodging, expenditures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism participation rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist perceptions of the quality of the resource base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist motivations for visiting an area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-related indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita income/purchasing power*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of the natural resource base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community control over tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community perceptions of tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Measures of purchasing power are often more adapted to the peripheral areas in the Arctic. This measure uses fuel prices to control for cost levels (Schmidt et al., 2015)

** This could be conducted by quantitative analysis of decisions/policy indicators similar to Engen et al. (2018), Hausner et al. (2017).
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Figure 1. Conceptual framework for assessing impacts of nature-based tourism on community resilience. Adapted from Strickland-Munro et al., 2010.

Figure 2. A conceptual framework for understanding the factors influencing resilience of Arctic communities dependent on nature-based tourism. Increased nature-based tourism in the Arctic depends on global markets and could influence community resilience through lack of diversification of community revenue sources. According to the staples thesis, tourism dependency could result in boom and bust cycles that could negatively impact local communities (illustrated with black arrows; see Lemelin et al., 2010 and Schmallegger & Carson, 2010). We amend this model and propose that the impacts to the natural resource base can also influence the perceived quality of the destination by tourists and the local attitude towards tourism influencing socio-ecological dynamics. Such a negative spiral could also be influenced by the lack of local infrastructure to support tourism, as well as through adverse sociocultural impacts in the community (culture, cohesiveness, and identity). Finally, we argue that community resilience depends on the potential to regulate tourism locally, for example by being able to regulate traffic through licenses or by having the financial and institutional capacity to build appropriate tourism infrastructure, or even make investments that are not tourism related.
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Figure 2. A conceptual framework for understanding the factors influencing resilience of Arctic communities dependent on nature-based tourism. Increased nature-based tourism in the Arctic depends on global markets and could influence community resilience through lack of diversification of community revenue sources. According to the staples thesis, tourism dependency could result in boom and bust cycles that could negatively impact local communities (illustrated with black arrows; see Lemelin et al., 2010 and Schmallegger & Carson, 2010). We amend this model and propose that the impacts to the natural resource base can also influence the perceived quality of the destination by tourists and the local attitude towards tourism influencing socio-ecological dynamics. Such a negative spiral could also be influenced by the lack of local infrastructure to support tourism, as well as through adverse sociocultural impacts in the community (culture, cohesiveness, and identity). Finally, we argue that community resilience depends on the potential to regulate tourism locally, for example by being able to regulate traffic through licenses or by having the financial and institutional capacity to build appropriate tourism infrastructure, or even make investments that are not tourism related.
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