Mining Impacts on the Image of a Tourist Resort –
Case: Ylläs, Kolari

(Miia Mikkonen)
A mining boom is taking place in Northern and Eastern Finland. Mining may cause land-use conflicts with existing activities in the area. This paper studies the impacts mining has on the image of the Ylläs tourist resort in Kolari in Northern Lapland. The image of Ylläs relies strongly on nature. This study studies the image building process and things that have an impact on it. The main focus of the study is the perceptions of tourists about mining in the vicinity of a tourist resort. The theoretical framework uses the concepts of place, place promotion, landscape, identity and image. In Kolari there are plans to reopen the Hannukainen iron-gold-copper mine, which concerns the tourism industry due to its possible impact on the image of Ylläs. Empirical material was gathered with a questionnaire realized in cooperation with DILACOMI –project during spring 2012 at the Levi and Ylläs tourist resorts. Information on tourists’ attitudes towards mines, especially in cases where mines are located close to a tourist resort was collected. The interviewees’ thoughts in regards potential mining in the area were slightly negative. Mining might reduce tourists’ willingness to revisit the area. Both the threats and opportunities that mines bring were recognized. Mining and tourism can exist next to each other. Finding the balance between possible mining activities and tourism is the key to decreasing the negative impact on the image.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

A mining boom is taking place in Northern and Eastern Finland and the newspapers are writing about the topic daily. The first mines are already operating, but many of them are still in planning phase. Mines bring jobs to sparsely populated areas, not only through direct employment, but also through job creation in support services that the mines require. Local communities are beneficiaries from this increased employment. Finland is an attractive country for international mining companies, as it possesses fairly good infrastructure and a stable society (Heikkinen 2007: 9 – 10). Finland’s Mineral Strategy (2010: 12) outlines in its vision that by 2050 “Finland will be a global leader in the sustainable utilization of mineral resources and the minerals sector is one of the key foundations of the Finnish national economy”. This is brought into action by creating solutions for global mineral chain challenges, promoting domestic growth and prosperity and making sure the environmental impacts are mitigated.

Global challenges, like increasing population, accelerating urbanization and higher living standards which enhance the demand for metals, minerals and rock aggregates, are seen in our backyards. It has been estimated that 70 % of the world population will live in cities by 2030, and the middle class will grow and increase in wealth. Even though metals and minerals are effectively recycled this only partially meets the growing demand for minerals, and therefore new resources have to be exploited. (Finland’s Mineral Strategy 2010: 4).

From the regional political view the mining industry benefits Northern and Eastern Finland as it brings long-term industrial job opportunities to these areas and by that way it enhances the living conditions and possibilities there (Finland’s Mineral Strategy 2010: 9). On the local level there may be conflicts with other land uses such as nature protection or
tourism. The land area mines require is relatively small, but the impact on the image does not stop at the border of the mine. As the Strategy suggests, tourism and mining industry can search for mutual benefits through transport connections and improved services. (Finland’s Mineral Strategy 2010: 14.)

As mentioned above, mines do not bring only well-being to the local communities. Besides the environmental concerns related to mining, mines may cause land-use conflicts with existing activities in the area. One project that is researching land-use conflicts resulting from mining is DILACOMI, a joint research program with the University of Oulu, the University of Lapland and the Finnish Forest Research Institute (Metla) (DILACOMI 2012).

This paper studies the impacts mining has on the image of a tourist resort. In Kolari there is a vibrant tourism industry, but it is also a former mining municipality. After the closure of the mine in the end of 1980s it has strongly developed the tourism sector and Ylläs tourist resort. Recently the former mining area has become interesting again and there is a plan to reopen the mine. The image of Ylläs is based on nature and wilderness and therefore a mine in a 10 kilometer radius from it creates some discussion and concerns in terms of image and identity and how tourists react to it. These concerns are studied in this paper and opinions, perceptions and feelings about the coexistence of a mine and nature based tourism is asked with a questionnaire aimed at tourists visiting the area. The results provide one view on how tourists see the possible impacts of mining on the image of Ylläs and gives some ideas on how to avoid the weakening of the tourists’ willingness to revisit the area.

The Mining industry by its very nature impacts on the environmental and society. Before it is possible to start building a mine a lot of research has to be undertaken. The Act on Environmental Impact Assessment Procedure (1994 2§) says that projects having direct or indirect effects on human health and their living conditions, nature, community, landscape, cultural heritage and utilization of natural resources must go through an environmental impact assessment (EIA). According to the act those parties whose
circumstances or interests the project has an impact on must be heard. The assessment procedure also includes social impacts assessment. Northland Resources used the help of consulting companies to compile their environmental and social impact assessments. Ramboll Finland Oy was in charge of the environmental part and Pöyry Finland Oy took care of the social impact assessment (see Appendix 1 for a detailed procedure regarding Hannukainen EIA).

A lot of study and negotiations is done before a program of the environmental impact assessment can be handed to the Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment (CEDTE) of Lapland which is the public authority in charge of the procedure. After the program is given to the CEDTE a public hearing is done where stakeholders can give their opinions of it, the project and point out things to be completed. Northland handed the program in on 22nd December 2010. That was followed by public hearings in small stakeholder groups. The process and timetable is explained in detail in Appendix 1. In the hearing opinions given by stakeholders it was obvious that they were concerned about the mining impacts on the image of Ylläs as wilderness tourist resort and they wanted more study in this field. I had been thinking of this topic before I read the program, so it was more or less obvious that both my and the stakeholders' interests met on this issue and that made it clear I would write my Master’s Thesis on this topic.
1.2 Study questions

The aim of this study is to go through the image building process and things that have an impact on it. Perceptions of tourists about mining and the vicinity of a wilderness tourist resort are the focal issues in this study and those are gone through with the following study questions:

- How do tourists perceive the present mining activity in the area?
- How do tourists perceive the impacts of mining industry in the neighborhood of a tourist resort to the image and identity of it?

  ○ Is there a way these two industries could coexist with mutual benefit?

Empirical material of this study is data gathered with a questionnaire aimed for tourists travelling to Ylläs area during winter season 2012. In this study qualitative and quantitative methods are used and data triangulation is used in order to get the bigger picture of study problems.

The mining history of Kolari and present, strongly grown tourism industry provide an interesting area for this study. There are both domestic and foreign tourists arriving in the area and for some of them Ylläs is a place to revisit year after year for long time. At the time this study was carried out the Hannukainen iron ore mine was only a project and no decision of opening it had been done. This study gave a chance to see how many of the tourists have heard about the project and how they feel about it. The results of this study can be used in the image building process of Ylläs.

This study is carried out together with DILACOMI –project which is a joint project with the University of Oulu, the University of Lapland and the Finnish Forest Research Institute (Metla). Departments of environmental law and sociology are part of the project from the University of Lapland; Thule-Institute and departments of architecture and culture-anthropology from the University of Oulu.
DILACOMI – project concentrates on mines, land-use and local communities and it studies the legislative framework which within mines operate, impacts on society and community and the mitigation of mining and other nature based livelihoods. The aim of it is to find out good practices for socially acceptable mining. The project is funded from the European Regional Development Fund via Tekes. The research institutions undertake the work independently and are not tied to the mining companies, though Northland Resources and Agnico-Eagle are partners and part-funders in the project. Other partners are the Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation (Tekes), municipalities of Kolari, Kittilä and Muonio, Levi Tourist Office, Ylläksen Matkailuyhdistys ry, Borenius Attorneys at Law, Kaivannaisteleollisuus ry, Tunturi-Lapin Kehitys ry, Ruralpolis, Reindeer Herder’s Association, Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment Lapland, Regional Council of Lapland, Geological Survey of Finland and Luleå University of Technology. (DILACOMI 2012) Project participants represent a wide range of interests in the area and give a rather good possibility to plan mine operations in a way that satisfies each of the counterparts.

1.3 Related studies

Vähäkangas (2008) surveyed the relationship between mining industry and tourism in Kittilä. The impacts mining industry has on the image of Kittilä municipality and Levi tourist resort was studied with a questionnaire aimed for tourists visiting the area, and the answers were compared with the discussion in media. Attitudes towards mining were mainly positive and both resources were in line about this, though it was noticeable that foreign tourists were a bit more reserved towards mines from domestic.

An Australian research team has made a pioneering study on how mining, indigenous people and tourism can work together. They had three cases in Northern Australia in which all of them a mining company, national park and indigenous people
were in each other’s vicinity. They wanted to see if there are possibilities to develop local tourism activities, which at the moment is a growing market, with the help of mine and the infrastructure it has, both hard and soft. The hard infrastructure covers transport corridors, vehicles and so on, while the soft one is the trained workforce. A new kind of approach is needed that comes possible with partnership between the mining company and indigenous groups. It also requires long-term planning and commitment and identifying opportunities. Participation of the government is also necessary (Brereton et al. 2006).

One of the Brereton group case studies go through how mines can work as a facilitator for tourism (Buultjens et al. 2006). Remote areas in Australia benefit out of the infrastructures built by mines and mines allow indigenous people to use this infrastructure for their purposes, like tourism. They also let them do the guided tours at the mine. By this way the mining company supports local business and fits tourism and mining together. Buultjens et al. (2007) have published an article regarding the same issue which also questions the activity parallel to the benefits described above. The effort done by the company is not seen that effective as it may take relatively long time to before the benefits are seen in the community. On the other hand political connections have been discussed. The moral side has also been raised up as the company is seen to invest in indigenous tourism in order to maximize the economic development in the region.

Edwards and I Coit (1996) have studied the potential of mines and quarries as industrial heritage attractions in Wales and Spain. Former industrial sites represent the history and heritage of the region and therefore those are part of the scenery and mirroring the society. Those sites can never be taken out of the context they are based in and the evidence of human-nature interaction is the key of these attractions. Industrial heritage tourism is a niche market, but in certain places these attractions have become the most visited ones, like the Llechwedd Slate Caverns in Wales. It is a visitor center opened in the old slate quarry and mine in 1972, which has a Victorian village, café and mine tours. Other activities related to the center have been established which makes the area a slate-industry complex with Land Rover safari and so on.
Lichrou and O’malley (2006) have studied the conflict on how mining and tourism are marketing the Milos Island in Greece as a tourism destination. At the Milos Island there is a long history of mining which nowadays provide the most income. On parallel family-owned businesses run small and medium-sized tourism who would like to develop the Island mainly as a tourism destination. As these two businesses, mining and tourism, do not agree on the way how the island should be marketed and developed, they are in juxtaposition to each other. Furthermore, this causes trouble in the discussion between these two industries and lack on the needed infrastructure development that should be done and which would benefit especially the tourism sector.

1.4 Structure of the study

The second part of this study introduces Kolari and Ylläs tourist resort as study area and the picture of the area is drawn with statistics and history of it. The third chapter is about tourism and introduces how tourism, leisure time and recreation are linked to each other and how tourism experience is formed. This is studied further by looking at the sub-section of tourism called ”nature-based tourism” which helps to understand the tourism facilities in Ylläs. Mining characteristics and the industry are described in the next chapter. The Hannukainen iron-gold-copper mine project is also introduced.

The fifth chapter goes through the conceptual framework of this study. Place is discussed in the context of visual view and landscape, which is attracting tourists to the Ylläs area. Place is also a destination, which is visited. Identity and image are culturally and socially constructed and discuss with each other in sensitive manner as both are rather imaginary. On the other hand image is the key in the competition between tourist resorts, which want to meet the needs of their customers. Landscape is linked to nature and that gives an idea of the wilderness image Ylläs has. Perceptions of the tourists are the underlying idea of the conceptual framework.
Methods and the empirical data are gone through in the sixth chapter and results in the seventh. Finally, the study expediency of the data used and the study itself is discussed together with the reliability and generalizability of it. Conclusions are made based on study questions.
2. KOLARI AS STUDY AREA

Kolari is located in Lapland, Northern Finland, and it covers an area of 2559 km² (see Map 1.) At the end of 2011 it had 3836 inhabitants. The in- and outflow of people is presently quite stable as the number of inhabitants changed only -0.1 % during the past year, although the change has been large over the long term as in 1985 there were over 5000 inhabitants in the municipality (Table 1). The demography is skewed towards the elderly, as 21.6 % are over 65 years old, 12.5 % are 0-14 and the remaining 65.8 % are between 15-64 years old. The vast majority are Finnish speaking Finns. Compared to the amount of inhabitants the number of summer cottages is significant, as there were 2217 of them (Tilastokeskus 2012).

Table 1. Inhabitants in Kolari municipality during years 1980-2010. (Tilastokeskus 2012)
Map 1. Location of Kolari municipality in Finland.

According to the Ministry of Employment and the Economy (2007, 2011) the unemployment rate was 15.1% at the end of 2010, which is 4.5% units less from the situation in 2005. Meanwhile open positions increased from 29 to 60. Tilastokeskus (2012) lists that most of the people work in the service sector which covers 79.3% out of all jobs. The industrial sector employed 11.3% and 5.9% work in primary production. The occupation of the remaining 3.5% is unknown.
From the end of 1970s to the beginning of the 1990s Rautaruukki was operating in Kolari and it employed 250 people at its peak. It was not only the jobs the company brought, but also some change in the structure of the area: the center town of Kolari was moved to its current place 26 kilometres north from its original location in Sieppijärvi at the end of 1970s. This new location was closer to Rautuvaara and 106 new apartments for the staff of Rautaruukki were built in Kolari. The mining company built facilities for wellbeing such as installing lights to the skiing track in the town. “Rautariihi” offered facilities for many hobbies, like wood and handicrafts and gym. News regarding closing the mine in the end of 1980s did cause great concern in Kolari and lots of effort was done to save the jobs as long as possible. The lowered world market price for iron ore, the recession and outdated technology in the end proved too strong and Rautaruukki closed the mine in 1988. (Alajärvi et al. 1990: 18–20) The effect of closing the mine can be seen in the Table 1 above, which shows the start of the outmigration in the end of 1980s.

2.1 Ylläs Tourist Resort

Ylläs is located in the municipality of Kolari in western Lapland, about 150 kilometers north from the Arctic Circle. Ylläs fell rises 718 meters above sea level which makes the slopes of the resort the longest and highest in Finland. The website of Ylläs describes the place to be well known of its winter sport possibilities and hiking routes during summer and autumn. The Ylläs region is based on seven fells and two traditional local villages which are located on both sides of the fell. Äkäslompolo is located on the northern side and Ylläsjärvi on the southern side. Both of the villages provide facilities for accommodation, eating, night life, shopping and program services. The national park of Pallas-Yllästunturi located next to Ylläs has pristine nature and a variable landscape. (Ylläs 2012)
Ylläs area, belonging to the Ounasselkä landscape area, is characterized by the Muoniojoki and Torniojoki river valleys. Highland ridges and the fell chain, in which the highest tops reach over 700 meters above sea level, make the landscape and geological formations versatile. The lowlands are characterized by mires, lakes and coniferous forests. The climate has Eurasian continental climate features with long, cold winters and short, cool summers. There can be found rather diversified flora and fauna with arctic characters, and the high fells and valleys provide a large variety of habitats for northern and southern species to meet. Proximity to nature and these circumstances provide many nature-based attractions in the area where tourist centers of Levi, Ylläs, Pallas and Olos are located. Infrastructure in the area is good, ensuring good reachability with train, plane and cars. Tourism has mostly been based on winter tourism, but summer time tourism has been rising within the last ten years. (Uusitalo et al. 2006: 163 – 164)

The villages of Äkäslompolo and Ylläsjärvi are connected to each other by a scenic route over the fjell built in 2005. Before this, the only connection was road that went around the fjell. The cultural environment in Ylläsjärvi is more coherent than the one in Äkäslompolo. Building new holiday apartments and facilities serving tourism purposes has been an issue of concern in terms of impacts on landscape and protected areas of both local residents and tourists. National park, nearby fells, village structure and scenic route are highly appreciated and there is a desire to maintain village type structure. (Uusitalo et al. 2006: 164 – 165)

Pallas-Yllästunturi national park was established in 2005 as a result of emerging Pallas-Ounastunturi national park and Ylläs-Aakenustunturi area. The park, with an area of 102 000 hectares, is located in the areas of municipalities of Enontekiö, Kittilä, Kolari and Muonio. In terms of area it is the third biggest national park in Finland and the most popular by its visitors; in year 2010 there were 436 000 visitors in the park altogether. Most of them, 290 000, visited the park during winter time from November to May. Nature is versatile in the large park and has many protected species, nature types and habitats. Most of the visitors interviewed for the visitor survey done in 2010 were 55 – 64 years old and
80% of them had visited the national park before, many of them several times. Altogether 94% of the visitors were Finnish and majority of them came from southern Finland. Totally 77% of visitors were on a day trip and the rest stayed overnight. The most popular things to do while visiting the park are cross-country skiing, walking, watching the nature, hiking and photography. Landscape and experiencing the nature along relaxing were the main reasons of the visit (Rantatalo & Ylläsjärvi 2011).

The high season for Ylläs tourist resort is winter and the busiest time is rather short, from February to late April (see more in the Chapter 2.2 Ylläs in statistics in page 18). December attracts especially British tourists to visit Santa Claus and November with its early skiing possibility has also become more vibrant. Activities are strongly related to winter circumstances, as downhill and cross-country skiing, snow mobile riding, huskies and reindeer safaris are the main activities tourists do while visiting. Wilderness plays an important role in Lappish image and marketing, which is what tourists expect to see and experience in Ylläs. They want to see natural landscapes and to be in the middle of it with access to it (Tuulentie & Mettiäinen 2007: 210 – 211).

Niskakoski and Taskinen (2012) have recorded the colorful history of Äkäslompolo from the Ice Age until nowadays. The village has grown into a tourist resort over time and tourism is one way of earning living: the other ways of making a living include forestry, agriculture, fishing and reindeer herding. Notable in this book is that it does not mention mining as a source of livelihood as it has been a part of the means of making earning in the area, though for a relatively short period of time when compared to other ways of earning living.

The Ice Age left Äkäslompolo 11 000 years ago and there have been found traces of people living in the area during the Stone Age. It is not known who these people were, but it is evident that Sami hunters and fishers were there before Finnish inhabitants. Many names today have their roots in Forest Sami words, like hangas and äkäs, which mean a fence used to trap wild reindeer. Some integration between the Finnish settlers and some of the Forest Sami took place which also leads to mixing the lifestyles of these two groups.
Those who stayed in the area started small-scale animal husbandry once some of the Forest Sami migrated up north around the mid 1700’s. The first permanent residents settled in 1748. During 1800’s Reindeer Sami arrived to the village and many of their offspring still live in the area (Kurkkio 2012: 9 – 10).

The development of Äkäslompolo as a village was slow in the beginning. In year 1870 there were four permanent houses. During 1940’s the amount of people was 200 and it took 50 years before another hundred people came in. After that it has sped up and in 2010 there were already 500 inhabitants (Kurkkio 2012: 10 – 11).

The first tourists of Ylläs were skiers who found the place already during the 1930s. They were accommodated by locals in their homes. Before 1970s tourism developed slowly and by local small-scale entrepreneurs, but during 1980s it started to grow when the planning of the area started without hearing locals. After the recession in 1990s development has been fast and nowadays more local people are involved with tourism industry (Tuulentie & Mettiäinen 2007: 215 – 216).

Kurkkio (2012: 10 – 11) explains the development of Äkäslompolo as a tourist destination with more details. The first tourist group arrived in year 1934. Kariniva was the first lodge built for touristic purposes and it was completed in 1939, the same year that the telephone arrived. The first shop was opened in the village in 1950. Three years after that the winter road was opened. In 1957 the first ski-lift was built and an electrical one in year 1968, a year after electricity reached the village. More and more buildings were constructed during 1960s and 1970s and the first hotel, Äkäshotelli, was built in 1974. Connections got better in 1983, when the first plane landed in Kittilä and trains started to transport tourists in 1986. The tourism association Äkäslompolon Matkailu was established in 1984, the same year as the ski-track network.

Tourism grew slowly to be supplementary income for the Äkäslompolo villagers. Before the Second World War there were five houses providing lodging and still at the end of the 1960s the village had its original Lapp appearance. Other sources of daily bread were coming from farming, forestry and reindeer herding. During 1970s the opening of
Riemuliiteri and Äkäs-Hotelli turned the village to a tourist center (Niskakoski & Taskinen 2012: 131). Äkäslompolo villagers presented a petition for natural environment and the preservation of an area already in the 1970s. It took 30 years before the Pallas-Yllästunturi National Park was established because local district officials saw it as a threat for tourism development during those days. As we see today, it has turned to another direction (Tuulentie & Mettäinen 2007: 216).

Two brochures of Ylläs have a bit different approach on how to market the tourist resort. The newer one for winter season 2012 – 2013 is aimed for domestic tourists and the older one, whose year of publishing is not known, for foreign tourists. In Ylläs winter brochure (2012) landscape, nature and culture are the main messages which are delivered with the idea of orthodoxy and home-like coziness, but with high professionalism. Orthodoxy is underlined with a page which collects together the family companies in Äkäslompolo with long history. Recognizable target groups are cross-country and downhill skiers, families, hikers, snowmobile riders and culture tourists. Pure, white snow, beautiful landscapes and views with smiling people deliver the message throughout the brochure. An older Ylläs brochure delivers quite the same message, but highlights reindeer, mysticism of nature and culture. On the front page there is a big picture of reindeer running in white snow under northern lights with some hills on the background. Snow and cross-country skiing play the major role and there are more pictures of animals. Sami culture was absent in the domestic brochure, but in the foreign one it is present. On the other hand orthodoxy is not that strongly picked out. Though the picture is more exotic, the target groups are quite the same by their age and interests, regardless of the difference in nationality. As Bernstein (1986: 20) wrote marketing material is important in delivering the visual image to their customers and the way how they separate it from other destinations. This is how the powerful image is build.
2.2 Ylläs in statistics

The Regional Council of Lapland makes a statistical review of tourism in Lapland and publishes an overview of the economic trends in Lapland twice a year. This is mainly based on the data collected by Statistics Finland and tax administration, but information provided by business overview (Toimiala Online) and Civil Aviation Agency Finland is also used. In Ylläs region there are many privately owned cabins unregistered in the statistics as these establishments have fewer than ten rooms. This gap is covered with the estimation based on water consumption (LMV 2011: 5 – 6).

Strong seasonality characterizes tourism in Lapland. The busiest months are March, April, July and December, while in May there is hardly any tourists, neither domestic nor foreign, visiting the area. October and November are also rather silent months. The difference in terms of registered overnights between the busiest (March 312 305 visitors) and silent months (May 49 056 visitors) was 263 249 in year 2010. In Tunturi-Lappi region, in which Ylläs belongs together with Levi and Pallas, the seasonality follows the same pattern (LMV 2011: 20, 47).

The most of the tourists arriving to Ylläs in year 2010 were domestic, their share around 73 % of the total visitors. Almost all of them are leisure time travelers. Only few per cent come there for a business trip. The largest group of foreign tourists come from the United Kingdom, approximately 40 000 visitors per year. Swiss were the second biggest group with around 11 000 visitors, Dutch 6 000, Russians 5 000, and Germans, French and Japanese with couple of thousand visitors. Foreign tourists arriving to Lapland have noticeable seasonality in their arrival. Tourists from the United Kingdom arrive mainly in December and Russians populate the area in December-January. Germans are attracted by Finnish summer from June to August in addition to the early springtime from February to March, which is also the most popular time for the rest of the mentioned nationalities (LMV 2011: 20, 54, 60).
Tourism has had a positive impact on the regional economy in Tunturi-Lappi region. The turnover in accommodation and restaurant business has increased annually during 2006 – 2009. Also more and more people are working in the business. In Kolari the turnover in accommodation and restaurant business was 26 million Euros in 2009 and 228 personnel years were recorded. This development is positive, especially when overnights slightly decreased during 2009-2010 (LMV 2011: 50 – 52).

2.3 Perceptions of Tourism Landscapes in Ylläs

Referring to Meinig (1979: 7 – 8) one of the central tasks of a geographer is studying the characteristics of places as those are combinations of different aspects. Maps are the key tools in this work as compositions of symbols which are interpreted with ideology and understanding the history behind them in order to get the meaning behind the symbols. Maps consisting symbols draw a representation of a real world which is revealed to a geographer not only via clusters, nodes, scatterings, gradations and mixtures, but also with the processes, functions and behavior behind them which connect them to the wider geographical context. Sketches and photographs are the way to study tourists’ impressions and physiognomy of a place and the sketch-map method used by Uusitalo’s (2010) paper is based on this idea.

Tuulentie and Mettiäinen (2007: 211) have been studying tourist destinations in Northern Finland in terms of how local people can have an impact on the evolution of the destination. They made a comparison between Levi and Ylläs destinations as both of these destinations have elements of rural villages and wilderness nature. Wilderness and easy access or living in between wilderness is important for tourists visiting these places. In Ylläs the surrounding wilderness is more visible especially because of the Pallas-Ylläs National Park underlining the nature values of the area.

Sarala and Uusitalo (2007: 35 – 36) have gone through Ylläs scenery, which is characterized by many fells. Valleys are in minor role, though most of the buildings are
located there. Historically people were located next to water because rivers and lakes were used for transport. The tourist center has mostly grown next to the old villages, but as it has needed more space while growing, more and more leisure time buildings are located in the hills. Downhill-skiing resorts have also fostered growth in the higher portions of the fjell. In the lower parts are recreational functions, as hiking paths.

Uusitalo (2010: 311) has done a case study in Ylläs about how tourists and local residents see the landscape of the resort. In her case landscape is understood as a visual representation of a space, following the same idea as both Relph (1976) and Tuan (1977) suggest.

Tourists coming from Finland and abroad and locals drew freehand maps of Ylläs for first time visitors. They were asked to draw down and name places, attractions, landmarks and other special places which they considered important for tourists to know. These maps show how people see the landscape and how their spatial cognition is formed (Uusitalo 2010: 317, 319). The main aim of the study was to identify those landscape elements and places important to Nordic nature-tourism destinations which were recognized in Ylläs (Uusitalo 2010: 312).

Landmarks dominated the maps the tourists drew and the structure of them emphasized that Ylläs is seen as a large-scale nature-tourism destination with village centers and skiing slopes which are surrounded by large wilderness. Cultural elements were visible most frequently and Ounasselkä fell chain came out most often of the landscape elements. Locals were able to draw and name special places on the maps which indicate their place attachment and non-spatial knowledge. The first-time tourists’ perceptions were limited and concentrated more on villages and some cultural key elements. Some independent and more experienced travelers were able to go over the scale of the village and add natural elements on their sketches. Things that were not visible were absent in the maps and these missing places can provide valuable information of the image of the destination. International tourists see Ylläs more wilderness like Finnish first-time tourists (Uusitalo 2010: 326 – 328).
3. **MINING**

According to the Ministry of Employment and the Economy (Kaivosteollisuus 2011: 8) mining industry is based on utilizing metals and minerals found in bedrock. Certain features, like the composition, scale, geographical location, production costs and the world market price impact on the profitability of the resource. Cost-efficiency is a critical factor for the mining industry. Ores are separated into two groups: metals and industrial minerals. Metals are used in the manufacturing of machines, apartments, cars, electronics and many other commodities. Industrial minerals exclude metals, mineral fuels and gems, but include a wide range of minerals and rocks used in commodities we use in our daily life: building materials, fertilizers, ceramics, paper, electronics, cosmetics, medicines, water treatment and food production. Industrial rocks are crushed and used for making concrete or rock wool for example.

The EU is rather dependent on exported metals as the member states consume 25 – 30 % of metals produced globally, but produce only 3 % by themselves. Regardless of intensified recycling of metals new materials are needed. The European Commission has taken action with the Raw Material Initiative in 2008 to improve the long-term availability of raw-materials. It aims to move production and consumption towards sustainable utilization and recycling of raw-materials within EU and enhance expertise and development of new technology. Initiative also wants to secure the operating environment and integrate legislation, permit procedures and land-use planning. Eventually a uniform minerals policy for the EU member countries will be created (Finland’s Mineral Policy 2010: 6).

Finland’s Mineral Strategy (2010) has been written in line with the Raw Material Initiative in order to secure our national level supply of our future mineral resources which are efficiently managed and sustainably utilized. New international business activities are an attractive opportunity, which the Strategy aims to create facilities for. It also supports regional development by enhancing the living possibilities in sparsely populated areas with
new jobs. The existing situation has been recognized and an active approach to new innovations, legislative regime and business environment are paid attention to in order to create a sustained and sustainable growth path for the sector (Finland’s Mineral Strategy 2010: 12).

This chapter takes a deeper look at the characteristics of the mining industry and the history of the Finnish mining industry. This helps to understand where the Finnish mining industry is today. At the end of the chapter, the case of the Hannukainen iron-copper-gold — project is introduced.

3.1 Characteristics of mining industry

The mining industry has certain, industry-specific characteristics, which make it different from other fields of industries. First of all, it is based on a nonrenewable resource. This means all mining projects end at some point and usually the lifetime of a mine is defined. The investments should be recovered during this period of time. Secondly, mining is location bound. The mineral resources have to be explored and exploited at the place where they are found. Therefore investors cannot take advantage of cheap land or employees or get easy access to the location, but instead the infrastructure has to be built by the company on site. The last key characteristic for the mining industry is that it requires a lot of capital already at the exploration phase. It also takes years to explore and define the resource. There is a large likelihood that the number under the bottom line after this process is negative. World market prices also set the scene in which the mining industry must operate. Declining metal prices are a driving factor in the drive to continually decrease production costs. (Jourdan 1990: 29 – 30). Lindborg (1996: 53) adds that the First World has a transport cost advantage due to the proximity of the end-user markets. Mines themselves are location-bound, but processing has more options depending not only on the ore price,
availability and location, but also infrastructure, interests, loaning, employers and other factors regarding processing.

In Finland mining projects have usually taken 10 – 15 years to be developed. Most of the ore resources known today have been found already decades ago, but as ore is an economic term, the value in the world market has to be high enough and technology good enough before exploiting it becomes profitable. Costs and profits are dependent on the phase of the mine. The exploration and development phases are unprofitable. In this phase new capital is raised in order to get the project into production. During the early production years, loans are paid back, and in full production the mine makes profit. In the closing phase profitability decreases and losses can be recorded (Korhonen 2012: 34). Kaivosteollisuus (2011: 9) explains more of the mine life cycle. Exploration and project development usually take 7 – 10 years. Before establishing the mine impact assessments and permitting need 2 – 3 years of time. Building the mine site takes 1 – 2 years. In the ramp-up phase the production starts and depending on the process it uses it takes from a few months to a couple of years before full production.

3.1.1 Past and present in Finnish mining industry

Historically the most well-known resources in Finland have been water and wood. Some small-scale mining existed already in the 17th and 18th centuries, but because of the lack of technology and knowledge, underdeveloped infrastructure and hard conditions only small mines close to the coast were possible. Apart from minor projects during the 17th century the beginning of Finnish iron industry was in 1616 when the first blast furnace was established in Mustio, Karjaa. Later on during the same decade 20 more blast furnaces were started and because the iron ore reserves in Finland were poorly known, ore was imported from Sweden. The first copper mine was opened in Orijärvi, Kisko in 1758. During the 18th
century knowledge, professionals and capital arrived from Sweden, but regardless from that the industry stayed small (Virrankoski 1980: 240, 245 – 248).

Growth of the mining and metal industry around the 20th century was smaller than industries in general. The industry became more mechanized. The known ore reserves ran dry and by 1872 there was only one iron mine in Kulonsuomäki, Uusimaa. Finding the Outokumpu copper ore deposit in 1909 gave a start to a new era in the field of mining related industries (Heikkinen & Hoffman 1982: 71 – 72). Even though the Outokumpu deposit was rich, it took more than 20 years and the state of Finland as operator before it became successful and made Finland one of the most significant copper producers in Europe. (Ahvenainen & Kuusterä 1982: 246)

Finding the Outokumpu ore deposit initiated an increase in national exploration and boosted domestic mining machinery development, production and export during the Second World War. Education in mining was also increased and this also served regional politics by placing academies around Finland. During 1950s mining was revived and by the 70s a technologically successful mining cluster was born (Leiponen 1994: 21 – 22).

The Finnish metal industry used mainly national resources. During 1948 – 77 employment in the base metal industry increased from 7000 persons to 20 000 and the growth was fastest during 1960s when Rautaruukki Oy was founded and Outokumpu Oy expanded its metal refinement. The commodity metal industry almost doubled the amount of its employees during the same period and in the end of the 70s 35 000 persons were working with tools, building materials and so on. Opening of new mines increased employment from 6 400 to 8 300 persons in the mining industry, which was not that much, but as mentioned before, these resources brought multiple jobs in the refinement industry. Characteristic for mining industry during this period were small mines which were mined out rather fast (Hjerpe 1982: 421 – 423).

Diversified and revived steel, copper and non-ferrous metals created a new field of know-how, which boosted the demand of mining technology. The flow born in 1960s decreased during 1970s as the industry matured. Investments in new exploration projects
were reduced (Lindborg 1996: 37 according to Mannerkoski 1988: 9 – 11). The mining industry started to look abroad during 1980s and attention and investments were done to internationalization, strategic way of thinking, funding, management and logistics. As a result of this policy Finnish mining machinery is utilized in mines on every continent today, even though many of these companies are not Finnish anymore. During 1990s more attention on international actions and new production models became more important (Leiponen 1994: 149).

In the 1980 – 1990s mines in Finland were not profitable and Finnish companies Outokumpu, Rautaruukki and Kemira sold their mines. Domestic production came down and ore was exported abroad. As Lindborg (1996: 151) says, a big structural change in state-owned mining companies started when the mining law was changed in 1994. It allowed foreign companies to start exploring and mining in Finland.

The new millennium brought new activity to the mining industry as metal prices climbed to a new level due to the increased demand in China and other developing economies. This made Finland interesting for investment by foreign mining companies. There are about 40 exploration and developing projects in Finland today and some new mines are already opened or under construction. See map of active mines and current projects in Appendix 2 (Hernesniemi & Berg-Andersson & Rantala & Suni 2011: 37).

Today the mining sector is one of the industries in Finland that attracts remarkable amounts of international investments (Finland’s Mineral Strategy 2010: 8). In 2012 there were twelve operating metal mines in Finland, which includes three mines in ramp-up phase: Laivakangas in Raahe, Kylylahti in Polvijärvi and Kevitsa in Sodankylä (Uuisuo 2012: 6). Mines, operating companies in Finland and their products are seen in the Table 2 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mine</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Operating company in Finland</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suurikuusikko</td>
<td>Kittilä</td>
<td>Agnico-Eagle Finland Oy</td>
<td>gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitura</td>
<td>Nivala</td>
<td>Belvedere Mining Oy</td>
<td>nickel, copper, cobalt, platinum, palladium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pahtavaara</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Lappland Goldminers Oy</td>
<td>gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijärvi</td>
<td>Keminmaa</td>
<td>Outokumpu Chrome Oy</td>
<td>chrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jokisivu</td>
<td>Huittinen</td>
<td>Dragon Mining Oy</td>
<td>gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orivesi</td>
<td>Orivesi</td>
<td>Dragon Mining Oy</td>
<td>gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyhäsalmi</td>
<td>Pyhäjärvi</td>
<td>Pyhäsalmi Mine Oy</td>
<td>copper, zinc, sulphur, silver, gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talvivaara</td>
<td>Sotkamo</td>
<td>Talvivaara Sotkamo Oy</td>
<td>nickel, zinc, uranium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pampalo</td>
<td>Ilomantsi</td>
<td>Endomines Oy</td>
<td>gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevitsa</td>
<td>Sodankylä</td>
<td>Kevitsa Mining Oy</td>
<td>copper, nickel, PGM, gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylylahti</td>
<td>Polvijärvi</td>
<td>Kylylahti Copper Oy</td>
<td>copper, cobalt, nickel, zinc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laivakangas</td>
<td>Raahe</td>
<td>Nordic Mines Oy</td>
<td>gold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Operating metal mines in Finland in August 2012. (Uusisu 2012: 6)

Altogether 31 mines or quarries were operating in 2011 producing industrial minerals or rocks. These mines may have overlapping years in their production as is the case with Nordkalk’s chalk quarry in Kolari. (Uusisu 2012: 6) See Tables 3 below for the operating ones.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mine (location)</th>
<th>Operating company in Finland</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reetinniemi (Paltamo), Matara (Juuka) Ahola (Kesälahti), Ilhalainen (Lappeenranta), Limberg-Skräbböle (Parainen), Matkusjoki and Putkinotko (Huittinen), Ruokojärvi (Kerimäki), Ryytimaa and Vesterbacka (Vimpeli), Sipoo, Tytyri (Lohja), Mustio (Raasepori)</td>
<td>Juuan Dolomiittikalkki Oy</td>
<td>dolomite, limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkkima, Rantamaa and Ristima (Tornio), Ankele (Pieksämäki)</td>
<td>Nordkalk Oy Ab</td>
<td>limestone, dolomite, wollastonite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyypiämäki (Salo)</td>
<td>SMA Mineral Oy</td>
<td>dolomite, quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sälpö/Kyrkoberget (Kemiönsaari), Kinahmi (Nilsiä/Siilinjärvi)</td>
<td>Salon Mineraali Oy</td>
<td>limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siilinjärvi</td>
<td>Sibelco Nordic Oy Ab</td>
<td>quartz, feldspar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsmanaho and Pehmytkivi (Polvijärvi), Punasuo and Uutela (Sotkamo)</td>
<td>Yara Suomi Oy</td>
<td>apatite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joutsenlampi (Lapinlahti), Lehlampi (Mäntyharju), Sallittu (Salo), Ybbenäs (Parainen), Vanhasuo (Savitaipale)</td>
<td>Mondo Minerals B.V.</td>
<td>talc, nickel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paroc Oy Ab</td>
<td>industrial rocks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Companies and operating mines exploiting industrial minerals in 2011. (Uusisuho 2012: 7)

In 2012 there were 4100 people working at mines in Finland. This amount is expected to grow with 5600 persons by 2022. This number is strongly depending on the current mine projects and their timetables not only in Finland, but also in Northern Sweden. New projects and the retirement of old mining experts create a demand for new professionals and
this puts pressure on education in order to get enough educated personnel for all mines (Karhula & Loukola-Ruskeenniemi 2012: 30).

### 3.2 Hannukainen iron-gold-copper mine project

Hannukainen is a brownfield project, which means there has been an active mining before. Kuervaara and Laurinoja open pits, as well as an underground mine in Rautuvaara have been exploited during the 1980s by Rautaruukki. Iron and copper were the main products, but also some gold was found. Already during that time it was known that there is lots of iron ore in Hannukainen, but not all was exploited (Titaani 1983: 33).

![Map 2. Location of Hannukainen mine claim area (map by Miia Mikkonen).](image_url)
The iron ore resources in the area were known already in the 17th century, when some ore from Juvakaisenmaa was used in Kõnkânen iron works. There were some plans to start ore refinement during 1760s close to the Rautuvaara area, but because of difficulties in transport and other reasons nothing could be done in two hundred years. In 1956 exploration started in Rautuvaara area and Rautaruukki Oy decided to open a mine in 1970. It took five years to build it up and open the mine (Titaani 1985: 25). Already in the beginning of 1980s the mine faced problems due to sinking world market prices. Opening the Kuervaara and Laurinoja pits ten kilometres north from Rautuvaara helped the situation, but as it was estimated the mine would close by 1987 – 88 regardless of these new pits (Titaani 1983: 32 – 33). Metal prices kept on sinking and due that the mine had to close in 1992. In 2005 Northland got interested in the Hannukainen area (see Map 2). The company acquired the deposit and started doing exploration and plans to reopen the mine. The definitive feasibility study is on its way together with the environmental and social impact assessment. The life of mine is expected to be 14 years and it would produce mainly iron, but also copper and gold (Northland 2011: 25).
4. TOURISM

Saarinen (2001, 2004) has been studying tourism in the field of geography. His focus is on transformation of tourist resorts and representation of nature in tourism. The topic of tourism and tourists are approached and defined by many researchers and institutions (UN 2008; Hall & Williams & Lew 2004; Urry & Larsen 2011; Prentince 2004; Hemmi 2005), but defining tourism destination has not gained that much interest. Kotler, Bowen and Makens (1996) have made an effort in doing that. Boorstin (1962) sees tourism as representation of real world.

The United Nations World Travel Organisation (UN 2008: 9 – 12) has made detailed recommendations on how tourism should be classified statistically in order to have comparable data between countries. According to this guideline travel is activity done by travelers, in which a traveler is someone moving from a geographical location to another for any reason and purpose. Domestic travel takes place within a country and is done by residents of that country. Travelers arriving from abroad make inbound travel and travelling outside from the country by residents is outbound travel. A trip is the travel done back and forth from the location a person lives his/her daily life and which is therefore considered as his/her usual environment. A visitor is a traveler, who leaves his/her usual residence with intention to return in no longer than a year for business, leisure or other personal purpose. Visitors staying overnight during their trip, or making a visit during the same day in some other way, can be categorized as tourists. Furthermore, trips done by travelers can be understood as tourism trips, which is a subsection of traveling. In this study visitors are considered as tourists, as they are expected to have left their usual environment in order to travel to Ylläs and the surrounding area of it to stay overnight or making a day-trip. Tourists are either domestic or inbound.

In order to define a place as a destination some borders need to be drawn, both actual and perceived. Physical boundaries, like those of islands, are easy to recognize, but political ones are a bit more negotiable. Those might exist between countries or
municipalities, but for marketing purposes they can be moved to the side. Country is a macro destination which beholds multiple micro destinations, but on the other hand a micro destination might become the way how tourists see the whole country (Kotler et al. 1996: 636). Thus destination is an economic definition and therefore it is more relevant to open a destination brochure instead of a map of the area in order to see where the borders are drawn.

Hall, Williams and Lew (2004: 4 – 5) approach tourism from the relationship perspective with tourism, leisure and recreation, which are seen as overlapping concepts (see Picture 1). They want to take tourism a bit further from the industry thinking and understand it in social, environmental and political way, though economic cannot be taken out of this context. All of these activities take place in the frame of work, as Urry and Larsen (2011: 4 – 5) also suggest in their definition for tourism. They place it in historical, sociological and geographical context. Tourism is leisure-time activity which is enabled by paid work and free time. Travelling is seen as modern activity where people become tourists when they step out of their daily work and residence surrounding in order to stay in a destination with an intention to come back home. Places tourists visit provide contrast to their work and daily life. Expectations for such places can be high and constructed of information received through TV, DVD, Internet, brochures, literature and so on. Tourists gaze on features in land- and townscape which do not remind them of their everyday life. Certain characteristics and signs are expected and those fulfill the experience of the place. In Lapland for instance seeing a reindeer draws a picture of real and wild Lapland and fulfills the expectations given by the information received via media and brochures.
Picture 1. Leisure, tourism and recreation related to each other. (Hall et. al. 2004: 4).

As Picture 1 draws, tourism is only a part of a larger picture of people mobility. All of these ways of determining free-time activity — let it be leisure, tourism, recreation or business travel — is not unambiguous and therefore they do not only overlap but their borders are also blurred. It indicates the change tourism is experiencing: more and more people own second-homes; go on work-related trips and spend some leisure time while there; go out for finishing their studies and do not necessarily stay overnight during their trips. Tourism as itself is only one of the ways on how temporary mobility is established. (Hall et. al. 2004: 5). Prentice (2004: 268) continues by noting that the more mobile our lifestyle becomes with laptops, internet and mobile phones, the more leisure time and work overlap. Nowadays the office can be in a café and on the other hand banks and former warehouses are turned into bars or galleries.
Travelling is a sign of status and in modern life the importance to get away and for a holiday has become of great worth. It almost seems like people’s physical and mental health is depending on these get-aways (Urry & Larsen 2011: 6). There is no single way to explain, how tourists pick their destination. Prentice (2004: 276) studied through different typologies of tourists and he noticed that motivations and behavior of a tourist change over time and experience. Therefore one cannot be classified into one square only and expect him to stay there, but people change. They also take opportunities, which makes the decision-making more difficult to predict.

People able to travel are mostly from industrial countries and as Hemmi (2005: 319 – 320) writes, most of the tourists come from urban environment and they are looking for counter environments to their daily ones. Travelling to nature is seen positive and giving both energy and experiences. Being in natural environment gives traveler sense of belonging for the period of time visited; though this most often fades away once returned home.

Urry and Larsen (2011: 15 – 16) continue with the aspects of a place to be interesting in terms of tourism. Tourists search for pleasurable experiences out of their daily life and which are out of the ordinary. Elements encountered interesting need to be considered extraordinary. Gazed objects can be in a way or another unique, known by large audience like the Eiffel Tower in Paris. Seeing unfamiliar aspects of life is also interesting. What used to be daily life of ordinary people become interesting when it is museumized. Furthermore, seeing daily life of ordinary people in other cultures is interesting. This can be considered as theater and a play for tourists, who also expect to see these plays when they come to a tourist resort. Saarinen (2001: 35 – 36) writes that tourist attractions can be called destinations, which are pending on the history and meanings of specific time and space. The local context and social practices come along together with the larger cultural discourse. This reproduces the destination in which tourist attractions are parts and which is in constant change and trans- and reformation. It is the dynamics of socio-spatial structure behind which causes this.
Boorstin (1962: 103) considers tourism industry filled with pseudo-events. Tourists are experiencing reality in tourist resorts which is not presenting the real world, but serves an exaggerated picture of rites, festivals and cultural aspects. A real event lies underneath, but the industry and expectations of travelers look for something extraordinary. As the audience changes continuously and the demand changes strongly according to seasons, these events must be repeatable and happen when the audience is present, not when these events take place in reality. Therefore they are called pseudo-events. Saarinen (2001: 39) agrees with this idea. In tourism representation, textualisations of space have a basis in real world. Because the view is subjective, the historical and cultural portrayals are always made by someone, who wants to represent something to somebody.

Saarinen (2004: 439) discusses nature and how tourists and tourism construct it. The origin of nature-based tourism lies in the nature which is limitedly built and developed. Tourism industry tends to reproduce this “underdeveloped” image and uses pictures with natural landscapes, wilderness and wild animals.

### 4.1 Nature-based tourism


Meyer-Arendt (2004: 425) finds the roots of nature-based tourism in the Romanticism and tradition of springs and seaside. Nature and exploration play a significant role and lead not only to hunting and fishing, but also on the curiosity on animals. Parks facilitate recreation movement and it is also evident that search for perfect climate fosters nature-based tourism. Saarinen (2001: 35) points out that tourism is able to turn negative issues, like hard climate conditions, into positive. These conditions are marketed out as
manageable and controlled things and some glory and mystification can be added on top of
that. At northern latitudes, like in Ylläs, the climate can be considered extreme instead of
perfect and therefore it is an attraction as itself. The change of seasons draws the
destination anew regularly and it also provides many ways of movement and exploring.

As mentioned previously, tourists are seeking for places different from their daily
environment and in many ways Ylläs area fulfills that and succeeds being exotic. In
people’s minds meanings and representations are attached to far-away places which has an
impact on choosing the destination and becoming a tourist (Saarinen 2004: 442).

Hemmi (2005: 333 – 335) defines nature-based tourism as travelling, which takes
place in natural environment and that supports sustainable development and does not
impact on biodiversity. In a way it is opposite to mass tourism. There is no uniform
definition for nature-based tourism, though in the widest sense it can be everything that is
based on nature. Anyway, the connecting threads among the numerous definitions can be
found. Nature-based tourism is, as the name suggests, tourism. Furthermore, it takes place
in nature which plays significant role as operational environment. It is based on the
attractiveness of nature and it provides experiences, which the tourist is also expected to
have. Last, nature-based tourism includes all activities which take place in nature, also the
ones with motorized equipment, like snowmobiles.

Biodiversity is mentioned often in the nature-based tourism discussion. Versatile
nature is seen attractive and it offers superior experience from a monotonous one. This
biological approach is one of the possible ways to think the relationship between tourist and
nature, but environmental philosophy and ethics also explain a lot of how tourists relate
themselves with nature. Furthermore, social sciences, environmental economics and
graphy have interest on the issue among nature-based tourism, religion, literature and
photography. Therefore it cannot be said any science has the one and only way to determine
nature-based tourism, but a holistic approach is needed. (Hemmi 2005: 322)

Willamo (2004: 33 – 35) goes deeper with the discussion about the difficulty of
defining nature and separating it from cultural non-nature and finds it rather challenging.
Biodiversity can be one way of defining what nature is, without a human impact on it. Apparently this is a rather narrow view as nature modified by man, like parks and forests, are also perceived as nature by some people. Birds and plants are present in the most urban environments, like railway stations, which fades the border between nature and cultural, human-intensive environment. According to this discussion nature is more than plants and birds in the unreached wilds; it beholds some traces of human actions. In the context of tourist resorts it can be assumed that nature is understood in that way, though it is spoken as wilderness. Hemmi (2005: 320) supports this idea by saying nature and urbanism are not vis-à-vis to each other, but go alongside each other. Contemporary tourist resorts offer the conveniences of urban environments with access to the wilds.

The relationship between humans and nature is the basis for nature-based tourism. This relationship grows with us from childhood and as mentioned previously in the context of landscape, also in this regards a person’s home, experiences, socialization, culture and environment they live in form the way of thinking and seeing nature. As more and more children grow up in urban environment the more distant nature becomes. However, this does not mean directly they do not want to go to nature; it has been discussed that at some point people want or they have a need to get into nature. Nature-based tourism fills this need, though cultural and experience services based on nature are not directly opposite to urban life. Furthermore, tourists having the nature experience as their main reason to travel also may like to visit cultural sites and get to know the local culture. (Hemmi 2005: 320, 322)

Hemmi (2005: 328 – 329) has listed four ways on how the relationship between man and nature can be approached in terms of nature-based tourism and activities based on nature: nature as itself; experiencing and observing the nature; nature-based activities; and nature facilitating recreation and regeneration. In the first case nature possesses the symbolic value of the nature. Nature gives vitality and strength and it represents both development and stability at the same time. Nature provides facilities for experiencing and observing it with our senses. Those, who are interested in nature-based activities, consider
emotional and aesthetical experiences significant and they set positive value for these dimensions. Thirdly nature provides an opportunity to escape our daily surrounding and civilization. Picking berries, hunting and fishing among nature-based program services are the activities, which can be located in the nature surrounding. For some people these activities are trips in themselves when others might like to exceed their limits in extreme activities. In the last approach nature is a place which gives both physical and mental refreshment and it allows us to let our concentration on things wander in nature environment. This can also be done in built urban nature, like parks in the cities.

The relationship between man and nature is also a matter of generation, as Vuolle (1992: 16 – 17) suggests. He loosely divides generations to old, middle and young. The eldest generation has a strong and close relationship with nature and they are used to go out in nature to pick berries, hunt or do sports. For them nature is a base for activities. The middle generation still has a strong relationship with nature, but they are also used to urban environments and nature modified by man. For this generation nature seems to get more diverse roles from the older one. Nature is not only place for activities, but it is also a place to escape everyday life. As it is distant to the daily surrounding, nature gives experiences and refreshes. The youngest generation has grown up in an urban environment and for them the relationship with nature is the most distant in this group of three. Nature serves the purposes of nature-based activities and escape from the urban environment. Visiting the nature provides experience to their senses. This definition can anyway be only a rough generalization and inside these groups there is lots of versatility depending on the personality, place of living and previous experiences.
5. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The study questions seek an answer to the complex nature of the concept of *image*. How is it constructed, perceived and managed? In order to see the underlying factors impacting on the image that has been created it is necessary to look at the terms that frame it, which are *place, place promotion, landscape,* and *identity*. In this study tourists’ decision on choosing the tourist destination for their holiday is a result of a chain of decisions based on attitudes, background information, socio-economical status, preferences and so on. Tourists have preferences and attitudes which they want to meet with the image of the destination they choose. The image of the destination becomes focal in this context as that is the picture communicated outside to the customers (see Picture 2).

**Picture 2.** Theoretical framework.
Place promotion is the channel through which the image is shared and the challenge is to base the image with the identity of the place. Image and identity do overlap each other as concepts, yet they are different. Going through this difference is necessary in order to understand the process of building the image. Place is one of the key concepts in geography and in this case it is not to be understood only as the physical surrounding of Kolari and Ylläs as a tourist destination, but the environment where people travel to and have experiences. As much as a place is bound to geography, geography is also bound to place and therefore it is a self-evident concept forming the context in this study. Last, but not the least, is landscape. Wild nature, village, fells and other visible attributes bring the place alive and the identity is rather strongly built on that basis. The discussion in regards the visibility of mines in the landscape makes this concept important in this study.

Landscape is the dimension where the place becomes visible and is pure as Granö’s (1930) geomorphologic study proposes. Meinig (1979: 7 – 8) calls geographers the ones who can see the wide geographical context putting landscape and place together. According to Terkenli (2001: 202), landscape study can be placed in the field of cultural geography. The landscape identity is based on the dynamic relationship between land and life. As the concept is multifunctional and variable over time and holds economic and politic systems within the society, it can be studied from the angle of political and regional geography. Place identity possesses the history, geography, imaginary and vocabulary of the area in it and that is the construction of the image of the area. The sense of community builds on that base and it depends on the storyteller how the place is communicated outside. The perception of the tourist visiting the place – Ylläs – and seeing the landscape there is the key in order to understand how the image communicated relates to the identity of the place.

Ylläs relies strongly on its image of wilderness and nature which both are part of the local landscape and identity. Culture grows from that ground and is spiced with history. Marketing material and other channels of communication reproduce this image (Bernstein 1986: 20); therefore it is relevant to take the term place promotion into this research. As the base of an image can be found in landscape and the identity is strongly related to it as well,
place promotion works as an interpreter of the image and identity and other terms these are based on to the public.

5.1 Place

Place as a term gets many definitions depending on the context of discussion – it can be understood as a physical location with certain attractions, but in wider sense it is a destination that can be felt, seen and experienced by someone in many ways. This destination-based thinking lays the framework for this study in order to understand the relationships between theoretical concepts and the environment in which the tourist destination of Ylläs is located in. Furthermore the destination, visited by people, is always experienced and in change, both from inside and outside. In order to understand the flow of changes and how image is built the term place need to be handled more carefully.

Relph (1976) and Tuan (1977) have been studying place in terms of visual view and landscape, which draw the viewer’s attention towards them. Their approach is cultural and places get significance in people’s perception. Barke and Harrop (1994) bring the identity and image of place in the discussion and think further with creating an image for a place which is important regarding place promotion. Karjalainen (1987) thinks about the existentialistic nature of place.

Place has a location, which can be understood in a universal way according to coordinates. In this regard the place is the same for everyone, but when it is experienced by someone it is never the same. People experience the places and this awakes location. Places become human and therefore are dependent on the spatial and temporal attributes once experienced (Karjalainen 1987: 17). This can be seen in case of Ylläs as well. It has multiple faces as it is a place for permanent inhabitance and a tourist attraction which is visited only once or regularly by tourists. For those who live there the area is a place for everyday life and those who visit it is seen unknown. Regular visits familiarize tourists with
the place and they start seeing significant spots there, use them by their own ways and widen their knowledge about it. As it was discussed earlier, Uusitalo’s (2010) study showcases how the details come more accurate from first-time tourists’ perception to inhabitants (see page 19).

For the multiple ways of describing place Tuan (1977: 161) declares it as a stable object which catches our attention. In a panoramic scene we pause our sight at points of interest which fill our picture of the place drawn in our minds. We do not see the scene as a whole but point by point which draw our attention on their side. It can be a monument, high mountain peak or a mining site that makes our eyes to stop and register it into our minds.

The relationship between place and landscape according to Relph (1976: 30 – 31) is that landscape is a visual form of place, where it becomes physical. Like Tuan mentioned, the viewer pauses his sight at the attributes in the landscape, as hilltops or some other features noticeable in the view. These attributes can be well-known and used in marketing of the place. The relation between place and landscape can be understood directly as concentration of human activities where visible features are an evidence of human presence. It can also be understood in more complex way where these features are reflecting human values and intentions. The way a place looks is significant.

Tourists are constantly looking for new places to visit. Places aimed for tourism are usually filled with sights, sounds and smells which give an intimate experience of a place for individuals. Intimacy of an experience is difficult to make public as it is personal and deeply felt, depending on person’s cultural background and his previous experiences. Furthermore, the experience is depending on current circumstances, especially those under an open sky. Individuals can share experiences in a group and find overlapping feelings (Tuan 1977: 146 – 147). Relph (1976: 29) is following this idea. Places cannot be taken out from their context, but they are depending on the location and appearance of them. Place is a mixture of landscape, ritual, routine, other people, personal experience, care and concern in terms of home and they are related to other places.
As discussed before, for some people holiday resorts become distinctive places as they visit these places year after year even though they do not create a visible boundary on that place. Visit to the resort is planned and expected and as the place becomes more and more familiar it gains significance in an individual’s mind (Tuan 1977: 182 – 183). As Tuan (1977: 187 – 189) continues, this applies especially on older people: for them objects are anchors of time and they are likely to come back to familiar places as they feel comfortable there. Some people are very keen to recapture the past and the world is to be maintained or restored. Compared to this background and will to keep things the same over time it is understandable that great changes at the resort can be uncomfortable and bring down the attachment to the place. Change is not a desirable direction of development as people would rather keep things as they are. But isn’t there a great danger of museumizing the place?

Place can have an identity and image. Identity of a place can be seen as an objective thing which defines what the place is like. Image sees place externally and can be influenced by the objective identity. The perception by others cannot be controlled even though image makers try to do that. Apart from the apparent facts of objective real world image can exits independently (Barke & Harrop 1994: 95). Relph (1976: 29) talks about the essence of place which is revealed in our experience and sense of place. He approaches place as a multifaceted phenomenon of experience and studies it in light of location, landscape and personal involvement. These properties can let us see how the essence and meanings of place are born.

Barke and Harrop (1994: 95) think further with the sense of place and admit that there is complexity in any conceptualization of place. The perception of identity or image varies depending on whether it is experienced as an individual, group, community or mass. In any of these cases we need to know the level we are seeing the place in order to analyze the current perception. They ask if places can be sold because of their identity or does place have to represent something else in order to be sold. That leads to a more complex question of image requiring attention and how it relates to the identity of place. As tourists resorts
are sold with images, does it mean that the image given becomes the identity of the place? Or the representation of it. Tourist is the one judging if this process has been successful.

5.1.1 Place promotion

As Karjalainen (1987) mentioned above, places become significant once they are experienced. In case of a tourist resort people need to travel to the destination before being able to have the experience and prior to that they need to choose the destination between the options available. A place has to be promoted in order to bring it to the customers’ knowledge so that they have the option to choose it. Furthermore it is the link between the place and audience, as it communicates the place image to customers.

Gold (1974, 1995) and Burgess (1990) discuss further about place promotion while Morgan (2004) looks at the problematisation of it. Gold and Burgess associate places and communication together which links place to marketing of place. In Burgess’s (1990: 139 – 140) definition place promotion is a part of culturally defined system of communication. In this approach the audience decodes the message sent by specialist group of producers. Gold (1974: 10 – 13) underlines three different identifications on promotional messages. The first one sees the message as a part of the production system where the image communication fills the needs of communicator. The second way to see place promotion is as a message of the media which searches selected, encoded and communicated meanings in the material. Audience and their media message consumption is the third dimension.

A representation of place is a source of environmental information which influences decision making based on behavior. People make assumptions about places by the information they have and the less first-hand knowledge they have the easier they make stereotypes of the places according to the characteristics they see. Once a stereotype is formed it is difficult to change and a negative stereotype can be harmful for place as in
some cases stereotypes can damage the reputation of the place (Gold 1995: 22 – 23). Morgan (2004: 176) notes demonstrations of space, place and landscapes are not fixed, but dynamic and in continual transition. Landscapes always possess a meaning which arises from society around it and it’s symbols and norms.

Furthermore, as Morgan (2004: 178) writes, time should not be forgotten in this context. The representation of places and cultural artifacts depend upon time and is bound on the historical and cultural context. Therefore promotion of places is always depending on the actions made by locals and rises from the values and motivation of them. This social construction of tourism places is still understudied and probably not understood well enough. It is anyway rather clear that each place promotion act is the product of its time.

5.2 Landscape

According to Saarinen (2001, 2004) tourism industry uses natural landscapes in image building and nature is the attraction for nature-based destinations, like Ylläs. As Hemmi (2005) points out the relationship between human and nature is the basis for nature-based tourism as the need to go to nature exists and needs to be filled. Experiencing and observing nature is one dimension of this relationship and landscape is an essential concept in this regard. Landscape links place into identity and image as in landscape place becomes visible and once this view is taken under human sight it turns cultural.

Landscape can be defined in a very technical way, as Granö (1930) does. Sauer (1963) sees the meaning of human in turning natural landscape into cultural one. Jones (1991) goes a way further in his approach as he says there is no landscape without human impact on it. The way how landscape is experienced depends on the viewer and his background. Grotenfeld (1988) recognizes the landscapes ability to create national or local identity. Raivo (1996, 1997, 2002) admits that landscape is always somehow subjective and
connected to the context in which it is used. Meinig (1979), Paasi (1983) and Karjalainen (1987) discuss about aesthetical dimension of landscape and the experience it serves to the perceiver.

Granö (1930: 49 – 50) calls landscape as a visible environment which is distant; it can also be the field of vision. In his approach certain distance and circumstances, i.e. light, is the base of seeing the landscape. He goes beyond only seeing the landscape as it also can be felt, heard and smelled. Finnish landscapes have been divided into regions which are based on Granö’s (1929: 136) landscape geography. His systematical study goes through a landscape with levels of ground, water, vegetation, artificial elements and the subdimensions of these. For example Suomen Kartasto still uses a three-level division of Finnish landscape regions based on Granö’s ideas. The country has five great regions which are divided into smaller landscape regions. Inside of these are the most specific regions which all have a name of their own. Ylläs region is located to Ounasselkä fell area which is characterized by Muoniojoki and Torniojoki Rivers running between fell chain, highland ridges and mire, lake and coniferous forests at low lands (Uusitalo et al. 2006: 163).

Sauer (1963: 333), with the school of Berkeley, sees landscape as a process in which natural landscape turns into cultural landscape by human sight. The idea is based on the morphology of landscape where the landscape is not only a region but also a chronological space determined by the powers of nature and cultural impacts. Landscape survey aims to follow the development of how untouched nature landscape turned to one which is utilized and inhabited by a human. Raivo (2002: 89) agrees with this idea as he considers landscape is viewed and analyzed from the culturally determined way, among the thoughts of landscape as visual scene and a geographical region. These ways do not exist alone, but overlap and landscape gets multiple faces. Raivo (1996: 7) has also said that landscape is natural or cultural regional category and chronological space and on the other hand it is a way how to see and experience cultural environments.
Jones (1991: 241) writes about the elusive nature of landscape research. He takes three approaches to the subject. The first one sees landscape from Granö’s point of view as a set of physical forms. It is objective and can be scientifically investigated by observing. This approach does not have any subjective values. In the second approach some specific selected elements are pointed out from the landscape and these elements make it valuable. This perspective has a subjective tone, especially in case of potential threat of destruction or change. Wilderness can be seen as a valuable element and the threat of change in the condition of it raises concern among people. In Jones (1991: 232) definition emphasis is placed on the landscape which is under threat of change or facing disappearance. Jones (1991: 242) continues with the third dimension which sees landscape socially. Landscape is way of seeing and the way it is seen depends on the observer and the set of values behind him. Landscape consists of symbols which stand and express individual values and makes it in a way mental, a human picture of reality. These three approaches are in an interaction in varying social contexts as work, travelling and nature values.

The concept of landscape gets several layers of meanings which apparently cause some conflicts between subjective and objective approaches. Landscape and nature are linked to each other. The more technical and hectic everyday life gets the more interesting nature-based attractions come. This creates more interest towards wilderness and nature-based places to visit such as Pallas-Yllä Nature Park. Nature, landscape and cultural landscape have historically specific social and cultural context within (Jones 1991: 234). Jones (1991: 231) says there is no landscape which is not influenced by humans, therefore looking at the landscape always means looking at the human traces in it. Meinig (1979: 4, 6) goes a bit further by saying the illnesses of contemporary society are visible in the landscape. The will of exploiting nature and its wealth bring up conflicts in land-use as every group has their own interest and view on it. Those interests create juxtaposition in the perception of the landscape as it reflects the changes.

Different groups of people see and interpret landscape in different ways depending on their cultural and socioeconomic background. Objective becomes subjective and the
elements in the landscape turn significant (Jones 1991: 232). This applies also to the travelers’ at Ylläs area, who each perceive the area in a different way based on their background.

Grotenfelt (1988: 29 – 30) mentions that landscape is described as national, traditional or Finnish in terms of landscapes with regions and views. Lakes, forests, heartland and ridges are part of Finnish national landscape which is also visible in the national anthem. Furthermore landscape has ability to create national or local identity. This has a long historical background as Finns wanted to distinguish themselves from Sweden after the separation in the beginning of 19th century. The “North” was idealized and romanticized already during those days and this tradition is still alive. Nowadays many songs and films are placed in the scenery of the north and it can be seen as a place to start life anew. As Raivo (2002: 96 – 97) writes, landscapes are closely linked with mental images rising from the history, tradition and past times of the area. Elements and traces of the past, like place names, stories and memories, help us to recognize the history and thus the sense of place and spirit are created. What comes to national landscapes in Finland it can be said all the national landscapes are reflecting the past and serve national identity. No matter how much the past is discussed it is the present that brings landscapes and the history of it alive.

Paasi (1983: 104) writes about the German tradition in geography and comes over the systematical and physical definition of landscape and talks about aesthetical tradition which opens the landscape not only in optical scenery but also as an experience which only the viewer him-/herself can have. One of the ways Meinig (1979: 1 – 2) has on landscape and views is that every physical landscape includes a view which makes it the visual experience that a landscape is. View is a very personal experience which changes every time the perceiver moves. He/she can never be inside of the view, but it still exists in one’s experience via his/her senses. Karjalainen (1987: 9) has a humanistic idea of a landscape. He suggests it does not even exist without one seeing and sensing it. The consciousness of a human wakes up the landscape and carries within the moment one recently experiences.
Therefore experience is a subject to change, but varies according to the perceiver and his/her development over time. Followed by this idea it can also be said landscape is personal and no one else can access it the same. From this point of view every opinion and perception are equally valuable and acceptable.

Raivo (1997: 207 – 209) concludes that a landscape can have multiple faces which can be seen as regions, views or in ways how to see and define cultural environments. Most of the time landscape is a combination of all of these. According to him the content and meanings of landscape are always cultural and it is not identical to natural way to understand it. As landscape is seen by a person it is never neutral nor objective. In the end Raivo (1997: 193 – 194) points out that even though landscape has been discussed widely over the past few years it still lacks scientific definition. Therefore more attention should be paid to the fact whose landscape is under discussion when speaking of it.

5.3 Identity

Identity lies somewhere in between the place and image. Human sight over the place and landscape make the physical view cultural as discussed above and in this process it is perceived in certain way, depending on the background of the perceiver. Identity is dynamic and never the same which makes it challenging to define and communicate outside. Anyway it is important to understand the concept of identity in order to understand the process of turning place to an image and see the dependency between these concepts.

Relph (1976) and Barke and Harrop (1995) studied the identity of place and the difference between image and identity. If the image and identity do not match, it is difficult to represent and it does not meet reality.

Relph (1976: 59 – 60) writes about an identity of place and how it develops along the way as a tourist observes and experiences the place around him. A stable identity is
reached after a complex process of adaptation, accommodation and socializing knowledge. This process is quite unselfconscious and might start already in childhood. When it takes place as a self-conscious process where one reveals oneself to the place they become an insider and bring in their cultural and personal values. Opposite to the insider is outsider, who experiences the place without receiving it inside themselves. They have preconceptions and attitudes which come over the direct experiences. Regardless their own experiences they rely on the mass identity provided by mass media and explain away observations crossing that identity.

Barke and Harrop (1995: 95) speak about the identities places have. Identity of a place can be perceived as an objective thing which defines what the place is actually. It is different from image which is the external perception of a place. Tourist resorts need to ask themselves if they are selling the identity or image – the place as it is or the representation of it. Selling the identity needs some attention to the relation between it and the image. In some cases the image has to be changed because of the history of the place. According to Barke and Harrop (1995: 110) this might cause a conflict in marketing as the history may reflect a shadow over the image as the identity is different from the image presented. For local people the identity of the place might be laden strongly with the history, but this does not necessarily fit in with the identity of a tourist resort.

Relph (1976: 60) continues with the plausibility of identity in terms of ceasing. Changing environmental conditions may turn it insufficient and disable social interaction and individual behavior. There can also be changes in attitudes and fashion which turn the image from desired into undesired.
5.4 Image

Finally, after going through the previous concepts, it is possible to understand how image is formed and built. It is a strongly commercial concept, but it should be based on reality, otherwise it does not meet the identity lying underneath. Image should meet the needs of tourists and support their decision-making process. Once this is successful, so is the promotion of the destination. For those communicating the image understanding the flow of image-formation all the way from place is important in order to build a strong, reliable and acceptable image matching reality and bringing the culture, society and environment alive.

Image is a complex concept and has many definitions in dictionaries. One of them suggests it as a physical likeness or representation of a person, animal or thing which has been made visible by photographing, painting or sculpting. Image can also be understood in a mental way, being an idea or conception. Furthermore it can be represented afterwards even when the original stimulus is not present any more. Closest to this study approach comes the one defining image as general or public perception of a company or some public figure – or place - which has been created and achieved with careful and purposeful work (Dictionary.com 2012).

On an international level image has been studied in the late 50’s and early 60 ’s by American researchers Boulding (1956) and Boorstin (1962) who are classics and often referred today. Bernstein (1986) approaches the relationship between image and identity and the challenges of these two to match. In Finland Karvonen (1996) has studied image widely in the context of Finnish society. Rope and Mether (1987) have more practical view on the topic and they study how image of a company is formed. Some later studies have been made, but in the end studies mentioned above form the backbone of image as a concept.

Karvonen (1996: 11) sees image as a very sensitive subject which awakes lots of interest in contemporary Finnish society. It stretches all the way from both public and private sectors to associations and politics. All sectors are concerned about the image they
have and if it is good or bad, it’s too little or it does not exist at all. Regions, municipalities, companies, parties and even sport clubs are thinking of their image, not to mention the state itself.

In the USA there is a long history of studying the term image. Kenneth Boulding (1956) and Daniel J. Boorstin (1962) have become classics in the field of image. Boulding (1956: 82 – 84) has a cognitive and neutral approach on image, which is widely used among marketing communication. He sees image as a positive thing serving the purposes of the organization in its business among people who work with public relations, marketing, and communication or consulting. Karvonen (1996:12) defines this approach as *marketing discourse of image*. Boorstin (1962: 182 – 183) is more critical - even pessimistic - and his idea of image is that it is false and serves a fabricated picture of the reality. He sees that late capitalism is relying more and more on a polished picture of the real world and is developed as companies want customers to see it. The world becomes a pseudo-event created by man and these events become the reality man lives in. Karvonen (1996: 12) calls his approach as *deceit discourse of image*. Bouldings approach is the way how tourism business works; they want to deliver a positive and uncritical image of their services and attract customers. Customers – tourists – are seeing tourist resorts more from Boorstins point of view as a screen or a representation of the reality with some cornerstones from the real world. From this point of view it seems challenging to meet the sent and perceived image in between tourist resorts and their customers.

Bernstein (1986: 37 – 38) explains the relationship between image and identity in human communication. This helps to understand also the formation of image and identity in the case of tourist resort. Image is someone’s subjective perception of something which is formed according to the aftermath of knowledge, experiences, attitudes and emotions one has towards that something. Furthermore, identity means all those means a company uses in order to make itself known. People form their attitudes towards the company according to this information received and the image is born as understanding of identity. Image is therefore always a subjective perception of the company. Bernstein (1986: 308) continues
on the difficulties regarding image reflected to the audience. It is truthful only in those cases when it matches the identity. Changing the personality is difficult and it demands lots of work.

Rope and Mether (1987: 78 – 79) have studied the psychological formation of image which consists of the mixture of values, emotions, prejudices, attitudes, perceptions, beliefs, information and experiences. All of these have an impact on how an image builds up in one’s mind. The set of values is born and raised at home and the culture background is the window one looks through other things. Emotions play a central role and they usually are stronger from sanity. Decisions are based on emotional reasons and this decision is rationalized and explained to others with sense. Prejudices against something related to the present issue judge it as well even though the link may be weak. Attitudes are formed according to the values, emotions and prejudices one has towards the issue. Attitudes work as a filter defining which messages one allows in and understands. The beliefs a person has impact on that how they deal with the perceptions they get. One is likely to handle the perceptions so that it fits in with their own background and values. The information a company or a tourist resort sends is compared with the image the receiver has. If these two match, the information is interpreted as credible. Finally, all the experiences one has are filtered through subjective understanding.

Rope and Mether (1987: 112 – 113) continue dividing image formation into three levels, which are information, attitude and behavior. On the first level image is pure and based on the information sent by the company. On this level one is getting to know the product available and the image is neutral. On the second level a stable image is formed and one starts to have negative, neutral or positive attitude towards the company. At this stage it is important for the company that it does not create negative associations and positive ones can be strengthened. The third level, behavior, is the one when one finds the company better compared to the others and acquires the product. If this experience meets the expectations of the customer, he comes back and accepts the company image as his inner truth. Image is now completely accepted and it is difficult to change.
5.4.1 Building an image – how to get it right for the audience?

As discussed previously image is not taken as given but can be impacted and built. It is not simply a matter of delivering the desired image to the audience, but it demands a lot of work. Bernstein (1986) speaks about the power of an image and the ways image can be delivered. Vuokko (2003) has the same approach. Anholt (2007) looks beyond the marketing purposes of a tourist resort and sees the bigger picture. National image is built on the parts a country holds within. Karvonen (1996) recognizes the competition between tourist resorts and sees the importance of the image in distinguishing one from another. Lampikoski, Suvanto and Vahvaselkä (1990) confirm Karvonen’s perception and stress the importance of a good and positive image in selling the product to customers.

Image is usually connected to private companies, but it can be understood in a wider scale as well. As mentioned previously, municipalities, associations and even hospitals have an image and on a general level the image building process is the same with them as it is with private companies. Identity is one part of the image. It is the selection of tools which the company uses to reflect its personality to the audience in both conscious and unconscious ways. Name, location, colors, logo, products, marketing material and even staff are important parts of identity building. The picture or the image of the company summarizes all the effort done in the audience’s mind. Therefore image is a subjective conception of a target and it does not belong to the company itself but the audience (Vuokko 2003: 103). For an area or a tourist resort image building is a long process and needs lots of consideration in order to create a uniform picture which reflects the spirit and identity of the place.

Bernstein (1986: 20) thinks of image as a visible subject; they are messages sent as brochures, catalogues, and press releases or by uniforms, letters and trademarks. Personnel of a company are also one dimension of an image as they carry the message with them in their daily life. The image has power. It visualizes how people see the company and makes them buy the product it produces. Tourist resorts pay attention to their marketing material
and the visual image they serve. This is the way how they reach their potential customers and when the message is uniform it distinguishes them from other resorts.

Anholt (2007: 88 – 89) looks at the identity of a tourist resort from a national marketing point of view. Single tourist attractions form a big picture which becomes the colorful identity of the country and attracts travelers from global markets. Furthermore, this identity serves the purposes of country branding and attracts investments.

Karvonen (1996: 20 – 21) notices the same issues and says the competition between tourist resorts is the reason why images, and how the audience perceives the message, become so important. In the market where a wide range of products exists the one “we” offer must be recognized and desirable. Each tourist resort has their own colors, images and symbols which makes them different from the others. After learning these symbols and recognizing the messages they deliver the customer is able to choose the one filling his needs and expectations the best.

As a subjective conception image does not match one-to-one with the message sent by the company. People form the image in their mind layer by layer and minor things might have a great impact on the image they finally build. Forming an image does not always need a personal involvement, but it can be based on a thing quickly heard or seen somewhere. Nevertheless images formed quickly can still be durable and are not easy to change, as discussed previously. If the image of a company is negative it is a great challenge to change it (Vuokko 2003: 105).

What are the things people use to form their impression of a company? The range of these things is wide and a bit uncontrollable. Attitudes and prejudices, rumors and beliefs are things a company does not have power over. Values can be influenced, but not changed overnight. Each company has a direct effect on information, experiences and perceptions and it should actively manage these. Action and communication are required both inside and outside the company (Vuokko 2003: 110 – 111).

The customer is the center in marketing and the company attempts to fill their needs and expectations as well as possible. It is not only a physical product one buys but also an
image. Selling an image combines the things a company does, says and what it looks like. The product is sold with a suitable image that satisfies the customer. Companies, who have a positive and strong image, can reach a wide market share and the messages they send are seen as believable (Lampikoski et al. 1990: 188).
6. METHODS AND DATA USED

6.1 Questionnaire for the tourists

The empirical material of this study consists of a questionnaire aimed at tourists in the Olos, Ylläs and Levi areas during the spring season 2012 (Appendixes 3a, 3b, 3c and 3d). The questionnaire was realized together with the DILACOMI project, as they were interested in the same issues, though on a larger scale. Quite many surveys had been carried out in the area related to the Hannukainen mine project, so it made sense to decrease the amount of new initiatives by cooperating. The survey carried out together also helped to increase the amount of interviews for this study.

The aim of the questionnaire was to collect information on tourists’ attitudes towards mines and especially in cases where mines are located close to a tourist resort. Tourists were asked if they knew about existing mines or development projects in Kittilä and Kolari and if they had previous experience of mines. They were asked to consider which kinds of areas are suitable for mining and which are not and what are the focal threats and opportunities related to mines in their opinion. The tourists were also asked how they see mining impacting on Levi and Ylläs areas in terms of i.e. image, environment, tourism and economy. The questionnaire was conducted both in Finnish and English.

The target group of the questionnaire were tourists visiting Kolari, Kittilä and Muonio municipalities and the tourist resorts Ylläs (Kolari), Levi (Kittilä) and Olos (Muonio). The age range was estimated to be 18 – 75 years. People under 18 years were left outside of the group as they most probably travel together with their parents. Those over 75 years were not that common, but if encountered they were included in the sample. Random sampling was used by the interviewers to choose the interviewees and in some places a pile of questionnaires with a return-box was placed, so people could leave their filled in questionnaires independently.
The size of the sample group was planned to be 600 people of which 100 foreign tourists. Six persons including myself undertook the interviews; the other five worked for Metla (Finnish Forest Research Institute). Four men were experienced in doing interviews and a woman, who joined the group in the middle of March, was a trainee at Metla. I participated on about one third of the survey days. For Metla it was important that I was not present every day because of the terms of funding they have for the project. The total amount of tourists interviewed was 1138 and 605 out of them said their main destination during their trip was Ylläs. Respondents 18 years or older were included to this study which resulted in the exclusion of 10 interviews. Therefore the sample used in this study is 595 interviews. This subset can be compared to the complete amount in the results of the DILACOMI project which will be published in autumn 2013.

The survey was conducted as self-administered which is an efficient and inexpensive way of conducting a survey. In semisupervised cases respondents are handed a paper with the questions and a pencil and they complete the questionnaire by themselves. In the questionnaire carried out for this survey the interviewer went away while the questionnaire was filled. Respondents were told they can ask for help if they find some of the questions unclear. Semisupervised interviews give some possibility to monitor the situation and completion of the questionnaire, but samples might become unrepresentative. In unsupervised return-box cases the option to answer possibly arising questions at the moment of answering was not available. In this case people interested in the issue can actively answer on the questionnaire and by this way samples become more representative, meaning that those concerned with the topic of the questionnaire are expected to answer it more actively. However there is no control on who answers the survey (Bourque & Fielder 1995: 2, 9).

The questionnaire was conducted during the spring season from the end of February to the beginning of April in 2012. Places were chosen according to the ease of accessibility, possibility to sit down and their ability to cover different traveler profiles. In Ylläs such places were identified to be Kellokas Visitor Centre in Äkäslompolo and Café-Restaurant
Taiga and a lunch corner downstairs of Hesburger in Ylläsjärvi. In Levi the areas chosen were hotel HulluPoro, ski café Zero Point and café Luvattumaa. Kittilä Airport was a good place to reach tourists coming from abroad.

In Hotel HulluPoro the interviews were done in the lobby. During the morning hour’s people came down and aimed straight outside. Some people stayed there to read newspapers or to wait for other members of their group. People represented all age ranges, but elderly people seemed to have more time to sit down.

Zero-Point has a ski rental shop, sport clothing shop and café Tanja in it. The survey was done in café Tanja where people were taking a break from downhill or cross-country skiing. There were many families with teenagers, but also some adult couples or friend groups. The café was quite busy and people changed rather fast, so this was a good place to get people to answer while they had a cup of coffee and a snack.

Café Luvattumaa is located about 8 kms outside of the Levi centre and it can be reached with cross-country skiing, snowmobiles and by car. The first two groups seemed to be the majority. The age range of visitors here ranged from babies to retired people, so it was a good place to reach a good range of people. Café is a cozy place which makes it easy to contact people while they have a warm drink and something to eat. People did not seem to be in a hurry.

A permission is needed in order to have access through the security check to the waiting lobby of Kittilä airport. After people have completed the security check they wait for their flight departure and getting answers was relatively easy. The majority of the travelers were Finnish, but even on the regular flights to Helsinki there were a lot of foreigners. About one third of the interviewed people were foreigners. All age groups were present.

Kellokas Visitor Centre is located on the Äkäslompolo side of Ylläs, half-way between the downhill ski center Y-1 and the Äkäslompolo village. It is a visitor centre of Metsähallitus with exhibitions, tourist information, a souvenir shop and a café. Ski tracks pass by the centre, which brings people doing cross-country skiing in for a break. There is a
library which was a good place for people to have a peaceful sit and fill in the survey questionnaire.

Café-Restaurant Taiga is located in Ylläsjärvi, next to the place where the gondola-ski lifts depart. The restaurant has three sections with an à la carte restaurant, pizza restaurant and a café which is in the middle. People were not interviewed while they were eating, only when they had a drink and were sitting down on couches. The majority of the customers were downhill skiers and quite young.

Statistical methods were used to analyze the sample. Frequencies were taken to describe the data and in open questions both quantitative and qualitative methods were used. Frequencies were categorized to groups according to themes in certain cases. In order to find dependencies Chi-Square test ($\chi^2$-test) was used. This is an independence test which assumes (zero hypothesis) that there are no dependencies between variables. The test basis on the size of the difference between observed frequencies and expected frequencies. If this difference is big enough it is probable that the observed differences are not just a coincidence, but can also be found in the population. This test was used in order to find dependencies between variables in the sample (Ristiintaulukointi 2006).

The significance level, also known as risk level, indicates the possibility for rejecting the zero hypotheses in case it is actually valid. Therefore statistical inferences are always done within certain risk level and this level indicates the possibility researcher has rejected the correct hypothesis. The most common risk level, which is also used in this analysis, is 0,05 (5 %). This means 95 % validity among the sample group. In every statistical test p-value is included and according to this value the incorrect inference of the test can be assumed. The significance levels are usually as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\rho < 0,05 & = \text{statistically almost significant (*)} \\
\rho < 0,01 & = \text{statistically significant (**)} \\
\rho < 0,001 & = \text{statistically highly significant (***)}
\end{align*}
\]
(Ristiintaulukointi 2006).
6.2 Background information of the interviewed

Most of the interviews were done in Kellokas where 42.5 % of the total amount of interviews were done (Table 4). Altogether 69.6 % of the interviews were done in Äkäslompolo (Elämänuukku, Kellokas, Navettagalleria, Velhonkota) and 3.2 % in Ylläsjärvi at Taiga restaurant. The rest were interviewed at the railway station in Kolari, airport in Kittilä and in Zero Point in Levi, where tourists mentioned Ylläs as their main destination during their trip. The “N” is the frequency of accepted values in each case.

![Graph of Places of interview](image-url)

**Table 4.** Places of interview (N=595).

Male and female were equally represented as the share between them was 50 % / 50%. The youngest interviewed were 18 years old while the oldest was 90 years old. There were ten questionnaires filled by people younger than 18 years old and they were excluded in this sample as it is probable they travel with their parents. This precondition was defined in the starting assumption. While doing the interviews ages were not asked and sometimes parents let their children fill in the survey; therefore a few under-agers got into the sample. The
mean age was 52.89 years and as seen in Table 5, the age structure of the respondents has two peaks. People around 30 years old are overrepresented with the ones between 60-70 years while those in their 40s are underrepresented.

Altogether 89.7% were domestic travelers and the remaining 10.3% were foreign. According to the LVM (2011: 54) 72% of the travelers are domestic and 28% foreign, so in this survey foreign tourists are underrepresented. This can be due to the short period of time when conducting the questionnaire.

![Age structure of the respondents in groups (pieces/group, N=593).](chart)

**Table 5.** Age structure of the respondents in groups (pieces/group, N=593).

The vast majority, almost 68%, had completed higher education in a university or college and polytechnic level. 22, 5% had a degree from high school or vocational training and the rest, slightly less than 10%, had a background with primary or middle school (Table 6)
Table 6. Education of the group (N=594).

The majority of the interviewed lived in an urban environment, as 83, 3 % of them were living in a city centre, suburb of a larger city or in small town or village. Only 16, 7 % lived in a rural area (Table 7). This follows the findings of Hemmi (2005: 319 – 320) that people travelling are looking for counter-environments to their daily ones. Those living in the urban environment search for natural ones and as Urry and Larsen (2011: 15-16) mention, try to find something extraordinary out from their daily lives.
On average tourists stayed 8.23 days in Lapland during their trip. The shortest stay was one day while the longest was 100. The most common duration of the stay was 7 days (44.9%). The vast majority, 93.5%, were on a holiday either on a private trip or they participated on an organized package holiday and 3.7% of the interviewed were on a work-related trip. The rest 1.7% had their own cottage or second home in the area, they were local people or were working and living in the area (Table 8).
Table 8. Type of trip (N=588).

Almost three out of four were travelling with adults and one fifth with children. Those traveling alone were 5,7 % out of the group (Table 9)

Table 9. Traveling company (N=588).
Some tourists become regular visitors of a resort and familiarize themselves with it during their trips. As Tuan (1977: 182-183; 187-189) writes, for some people holiday resorts become distinctive places and there might be a will to keep the place unchanged. He does not say how many visits are needed to reach certain level of attachment, but it can be assumed the more frequent visits are the more attached people are to that place. There seems to be lots of frequent travelers to the Ylläš and Levi area as almost half, 46.7% mentioned they have been there previously more than ten times. Visitors who had been to the area 1-5 times made up almost one fourth of the group and visitors who had been to the area 6-10 times made up 17.5% of the group. About 11% had not been in the area before. In this section it is not possible to tell if the interviewed have been only in Ylläš area or in Levi area. This number only gives an idea that they like the area, but it is definitely evidence that for the majority this area is worth visiting regularly and over a long period of time as the next Table x indicates (Table 10).

Table 10. Previous trips to Ylläš before this trip (N=592).
The first trips to Levi and Ylläs area were done as early as in 1933 and the latest in the very year of interviews done in 2012. Before the year 1970 there have been rather few first time visitors, but since that the number starts to increase a bit more rapidly (Table 11). The last decade includes only two complete years and few months in the beginning of 2012. These numbers give an idea that Ylläs and Levi areas grew during 1980s and 1990s and attracted lots of first time visitors and it also follows the growth history of Ylläs as a tourist destination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First trip to Ylläs (by decade)</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 11. First trip to Ylläs (trips before 1970 excluded, N=524).*

The last question regarding the current trip asked what season visitors mainly come to the area. Totally 82 % of the visitors come during winter time, 7,4 % visit the in the fall “ruska” season and 5,7 % come during summer (Table 12). As seen in the LMV 2011 statistics earlier, winter time is the busiest season while summer is very silent. These numbers might also indicate that the visitors interviewed are more interested in winter sports and for that reason this season is overrepresented in these answers. If the same survey was carried out during summer and autumn the numbers would probably be different.
Table 12. Main traveling time to Ylläs by season (N=566).
7. RESULTS

7.1 Why to Lapland?

The first section of the questionnaire looked at the reasons why tourists come to Lapland. They were asked to indicate the most important reasons in choosing the destination and rate them on a Likert-scale from 1 to 5 (1=Not important at all – 5=Very important). The higher the average is, the more important the reason is (Table 13).
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**Table 13.** Importance of certain elements when choosing the destination, average (1=Not important at all, 5=Very important, N=577 – 593).

In the case of Ylläs it seems people enjoy doing sports in the beautiful natural landscape and pristine wilderness. The destination is perceived safe and it is easy to reach with good transport connections. Although the nature is the pulling force, it is preferred to be enjoyed
after a good night sleep and good dinner in one of the restaurants in the area, not partying all night long. Other reasons mentioned were the Northern Lights, friends and people, an own cabin in the area, light and cleanliness.

**Picture 3.** The meaning of Lapland described with three open words (N=1307).

People were asked to describe with three words of their choice what Lapland in general means to them. Answers were grouped into five subcategories according to their themes and it was clear that for most of them Lapland means nature, landscape and beauty (44,1 % of the total words given, see Picture 3). There are two kinds of ways how Lapland is perceived: active and relaxing. It is a place for many kinds of activities and recreational ways of spending time, like cross-country skiing, for 17,8 %, while 27,6 % have an idea of peaceful, silent and relaxed place. 8,8 % connect Lapland with culture, people and see it as a unique destination. For some people (1,7%) it is work, food and having fun. This brings alive rather well the importance of landscape and the visuality of it in the context of tourist
resorts. As Sauer (1963: 333) suggested, a natural landscape turns into a cultural landscape under human sight. That landscape is utilized and inhabited by humans and has visual cultural features. Landscape and nature are linked to each other and in the contemporary hectic way of life nature-based attractions become more and more interesting (Jones 1991: 234). The perceptions of those interviewed support these ideas rather strongly and so do the nature-based activities tourists do while staying in Lapland.

![Bar chart showing the most important activities during the trip.](image)

**Table 14.** The most important activities during the trip (three most important, averages, N=5 — 488).

The last question in this section asked what is the most important outdoor activities tourists do while in Lapland. They marked down three of the most important from a list of activities and were able to add an activity if it was not mentioned on the list. The smaller the average number is, the more important a certain activity is (see Table 14). Cross-country skiing is the most important activity done during the trip, as 488 people mentioned it and it got an
average of 1,33. Downhill skiing and snowboarding were also favorite activities, while Nordic walking and safaris with horse, reindeer or snowmobiles were also mentioned by many visitors. Nature and landscape are probably perceived as background for these activities and those are not literally recognized as activities. Other activities mentioned were walking out with children, dog or hiking on the fells. Partying and dancing, seeing people and geocaching were also mentioned and some people just relaxed and enjoyed their holiday in a cabin.

7.2 Mind the mines – attitudes towards mining industry

In the last section the attitudes towards the mining industry were assessed. At first it was asked if people knew about the current plans for opening an iron mine in Kolari and what kind of experience people have of mines in general. Against this base it is possible to reflect if knowledge makes a difference to the attitude or not. Suitable areas for mining were also considered together with mining impacts on the Ylläs and Levi areas. Open questions were asked to find out what people feel are the main threats and opportunities related to mining. The last section mapped the feelings about mines and how they impact on the Levi and Ylläs areas.

It is good to notice that in the Ylläs area the mine does not exist at the moment and therefore the scale and impacts can only be imagined. In Levi there is an operating mine which has not caused any problem. Ylläs and Levi are both mentioned in this context as this question stretches its scale from local to national and global level in terms of international mining industry and as said above, these issues are rather abstract and unimaginable for people. Therefore it is not assumed that people think specifically of the mining impacts in the very place they are during their trip, but on a wider scale. However the subset in analysis is the one from Ylläs and the attitudes are considered to affiliate with Ylläs area.
During the time of conducting the interviews there was a lot of discussion in the Finnish media regarding negative impacts of the Talvivaara nickel-mine in Sotkamo which on a whole created a negative atmosphere towards the whole mining industry. Furthermore, it can be assumed no one – regardless of one’s own attitude towards mines - wants to have a mine next to their holiday resort, whether it was big or small, produced gold or iron or had impacts on its environment or not.
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**Table 15.** Did You know prior to Your trip that there is a plan to set up an iron mine in Kolari? (N=592)

At first it was asked if people knew about the Hannukainen mining project in Kolari. The Hannukainen mining project was totally unheard of by 43,9 %. Slightly more, 45,5 % had heard about it and 10,1 % had familiarized themselves with the project (Table 15). In Table 16 is the indication of experience regarding mines. Most of the interviewees have never visited a mining site (46,6 %), almost one out of three have visited a closed mine (31,6 %) and the rest of them have visited an operating mine (21,0 %). Both operating and closed mine visits spread all over the world, so people have a very versatile picture of mines.
Table 16. Visit to a mine (N=590).

In the next question it was asked which areas are considered to be suitable for mining and some options were given. People were also able to name some other areas. The suitability of an area was estimated with Likert-scale in which 1 means not at all and 5 very well. In the Table 17 answers are counted by averages which means the bigger the number is the more suitable the area in question is considered for mining. Not surprisingly industry areas are seen the most suitable (average 3,99). Maybe because of the idea of NIMBY (Not In My BackYard) sparsely populated or rural areas are seen suitable as there are not that many backyards probably. A bit surprisingly wilderness areas (2,71) were also seen rather suitable, compared to nature protection areas which was seen as the least suitable area (1,47). Also fell areas are seen as not being suitable for mines (1,98). No one is willing have a mine in their backyard, neither in their everyday life (1,82) or leisure time (1,97). The areas in which mines were considered to be suitable were old industry areas, ugly areas or places far away. Places like Helsinki and Russia were named. Some people admitted there is no chance to fight nature; suitable places for mines are those where the ore is. There were also some people who said there are no areas where mines suit.
Table 17. Suitable areas for mining (N=560 – 572, 1= Not at all – 5=Very well, averages)

Main threats related to mining were asked with an open question where people were able to name three key threats in their opinion (Picture 4). These answers were grouped to six theme categories in order to cover the direct impacts and disturbance caused by mines (noise, dust, vibration); traffic and impacts on social environment, including safety; nature and the pollution of it including water, soil, air and environment in general; landscape and the beauty of it with closure and landscaping of the mining area; comments mentioning other mines in Finland and international mining companies or mining policy; and last other issues not included on the above ones.
Spoiling and polluting the environment is the major fear as 55% of the concerns were related to this. Spreading of dust, loss of silence in the area and vibration were mentioned in 14.6% of the answers, while traffic and social impacts in 13.4%. The visual landscape and the mine spoiling it is also one of the focal concerns as 11.4% mentioned it. Money going abroad with international mining companies has been discussed widely in media and that is seen in the answers. Furthermore trouble with others mines, mainly in Talvivaara, were mentioned and many people wished the same mistakes will not be made in these mines. Altogether 2.8% of the answers related to these issues. In the last group (3.0%) some people said they see no threat related to mining, or they consider mines go beyond their ability to estimate threats. Some preconditions were also given: there are no threats if everything is taken care well. It was also mentioned that industrialized countries need mines and the products from there, but this causes exploitation in these developing
countries. Exploiting unrenewable resources, gravel ridges and touching bedrock was also seen as unpleasant.

Main opportunities were asked in the same way and the answers showed a smaller variation as there were 755 different answers given here compared to 1010 in threats (Picture 5). Opportunities were categorized as economy, work and job opportunities, living conditions, nothing and other. Economy covers scales from local to national and in some cases also beyond national, together with import and export. Work and job opportunities were separated from the economy and also the socio-economical dimension followed by these as a theme of living conditions and traffic. The category of "nothing" consists of answers in which the interviewed felt that mining does not provide any benefits. The last group is other.

Picture 5. Main opportunities related to mines (N=755).
Work opportunities are seen the greatest benefits related to mining as 55.9% mentioned them and usually it was the first one to be mentioned – in some cases also the only one. There was some skepticism about the amount of jobs that will be created, the temporality of them and the price environment might have to pay because of them. On the other hand it was seen as a beginning for the good development path for the region and locals, as work increases wealth and provides better opportunities to stay in the northern areas, especially when locals get employed. 3.8% mentioned living conditions and better traffic connections as its own thing. Jobs created by mines support local services, infrastructure and enhance not only local or regional development, but also on national level.

Almost one out of three mentioned (27.4%) economies of scale together with export and import of goods as a main opportunity. Mines mean money for the nation, region and municipality and it is also good for the competitiveness of Finland. Some expectations were laden for maximizing the Finnish benefit through national mining companies, as the outflow of money from Finland concerned people. Regardless of the obvious benefits from improvement to local incomes and livelihoods, responses indicated that these benefits could not be accepted at any cost. The need to take care of the environment was mentioned as one condition.

No benefits were also seen by some (2.9%). Mining was said to be out of fashion or it should benefit the whole nation before being acceptable. A regular visitor or local person does not get benefit out of it.

In the last group (9.9%) it was once more discussed if all the profits go abroad with international mining companies. Nationalist ideas arose also with the idea that it should be only Finland that gets the benefits out of its resources. It was also noticed that contemporary civilization is dependent on mines and resources need to be exploited somewhere anyway. Mines mean industry development and also provide resources for it. Production in Finland was also seen cleaner from that of in developing countries. Some also saw mines as a tourist attraction.
Mining impacts on the Ylläs area were asked using the Likert-scale. (Table 18). The interviewed circulated the most suitable option for him/her in each paragraph on a scale -2=Very negative – 2=Very positive. These options are coded from one to five where -2 stands for number one. Averages counted from each option indicate a certain impact. The bigger the average is the more positive the option is seen. Those averages close to zero indicate no impact or are neutral.

Mining effects on the local business and local economics nearby Ylläs (3,82) together with national economics (3,87) were seen as the most positive impacts. Mining effect on the tourism business itself (2,34) is hardly seen as negative, while the image of the Ylläs area seems to be a more sensitive issue (2,15). Mining is seen to weaken the ability to use nature by locals (2,16 ) and even more the nature experience in Ylläs (2,01). The impact is even stronger on the wilderness nearby Ylläs (1,88) and the environment (1,78).

Table 18. Mining impacts on Ylläs area (N=568 – 575, averages).
The last set of questions looked at the feelings about current mining activities in the area and towards the possible expansion of them, and also peoples interest in visiting one of the mines. The same scale and coding were used as in the last question (Table 19).

The feeling about the present mining activities in Levi and Ylläs areas were seen fairly positive (2,62), while the possible expansion of it was considered only slightly less attractive as an idea (2,46). Again, when asking the impact on image of the tourist resorts in the area, the feeling gets more negative (1,97). Not that many would be interested in visiting a mine in the area (1,67).

| How do you feel about the present mining activities taking place near Levi and Ylläs? |
| Would You be interested in visiting one of the mines nearby Levi and Ylläs areas during Your trip? |
| How would the possible expansion of mining affects the image of Levi and Ylläs as nature tourism destinations? |
| How would the possible expansion of mining affect Your willingness to revisit Levi and Ylläs area? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0,00</th>
<th>0,50</th>
<th>1,00</th>
<th>1,50</th>
<th>2,00</th>
<th>2,50</th>
<th>3,00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 19.** Feelings about mining activities and expansion of them in the area, interest in visiting a mine (N=551 – 581, averages).

There is a highly significant statistical difference (p=0,000, Table 20) between men and women in regards how they feel about the present mining activities taking place in the area.
Women are notably more negative towards mines as almost half of them feel it is unpleasant and only about 9 % see it as positive. The vast majority of both men and women react neutrally. This group of neutral is the “wild card” whose opinions can be changed in case something goes wrong.
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**Table 20.** Feelings men and women have about present mining activities taking place near Levi and Ylläs (N=273 – 274, p=0,000).

The possible expansion of mining affects the willingness of both men and women to revisit the area, although the difference between them is not statistically significant (p=0,087, Table 21). The possible expansion does not make a difference, but it is notable that it would reduce both groups willingness to revisit little or significantly. Only very few think expansion increases the attractivity of the area.
Table 21. Impact on willingness for men and women to revisit Ylläs and Levi area in case expansion of mining (N=285 – 290, p=0.087).

The impact on the image of Levi and Ylläs as a nature tourism destination in case of expansion of mining is a sensitive issue and there is a statistical difference between men and women in their attitudes (p=0.012, Table 22). Women are stricter and consider that the expansion weakens the image significantly, as men do not see that much impact. As Bernstein (1986: 37 – 38) explained image is always someone’s subjective perception of something and there are many things impacting on it, like knowledge, experiences, attitudes and even emotions. This set of decision-making tools is always different and as it is seen there is a difference between men’s and women’s perceptions of the impacts and image.
Table 22. The affect of possible mining expansion to the image of Levi and Ylläs as tourist destinations (N=284 – 290, p=0,012).

Not suprisingly men are more interested in visiting a mine during their trip, while over half of women are not interested in this kind of attractions (Table 23). The difference between men and women is statistically significant (p=0,05)
Table 23. Interest in visiting one of the mines nearby Levi and Ylläs areas during visit (N=288 – 289, p=0,005)

Does knowledge make a difference in attitudes? As it was discussed in the context of the image Rope and Mether (1987: 78-79) suggested image consists of the mixture of values, emotions, prejudices, attitudes, perceptions, beliefs, information and experiences. In here the relationship between experiences, emotions and knowledge overcome each other and the tourist sees this as an image. The received information is compared with the perception and underlying set of values one has and after that the attitude is formed. It can be assumed that the more you know the better you can justify your opinion and assumptions based on real experience and information, not on emotions which are formed quickly and do not necessarily have a lot of knowledge behind them.

It was explored whether knowledge about the Hannukainen iron mine project has an impact on the attitude towards present mining activity taking place in the area (Table 24). It
was asked if people had heard about the Hannukainen project, familiarized themselves with it or if they had not heard about it at all. Most of the groups are rather neutral regarding the present mining activity. It is quite interesting that those, who are familiar with the Hannukainen project, have very strong attitudes either in a very negative or a very positive direction. The reasons can only be guessed, so it would be interesting to study further why opinions are that strongly divided when having knowledge about the project. This statistical difference is highly significant (p=0.000).
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**Table 24.** Feeling about the present mining activity near Levi and Ylläs, attitudes if familiar with Hannukainen mining project, heard of it or not heard at all (N=2 = 118, p=0.000).

Does knowledge about the Hannukainen iron mine project have an impact on the perception of the Levi and Ylläs area image as nature tourism destinations in case of possible expansion of mining activities (Table 25)? It seems that those, who were familiar
with the project consider its impact on the image more positive from those who have only heard about it or who do not know it. Those who have not heard about the project are the most negative and believe that the image as a nature destination weakens. The statistical difference is highly significant (p=0.000) so it can be said knowledge makes a difference in attitudes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Heard</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve significantly</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>6,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve a little</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
<td>3,0%</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No affection</td>
<td>17,2%</td>
<td>18,9%</td>
<td>31,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaken a little</td>
<td>38,3%</td>
<td>48,6%</td>
<td>50,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaken significantly</td>
<td>29,6%</td>
<td>31,3%</td>
<td>18,3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 25.** Possible expansion of mining affecting on the image of Levi and Ylläs as nature tourism destination, attitudes if familiar with Hannukainen mining project, heard of it or not heard at all (N=0 – 121, p=0.000).

In the last test it was studied how people feel about present mining activity if they have visited an operating or closed mine or if they have never visited a mine. It can be assumed that a visit to a mine increases knowledge and thus has an impact on the attitude towards present activity (Table 26). The difference between these groups is statistically significant (p=0.009) as those, who have visited an operating mine are more positive from the others.
Notably those, who have visited a closed mine are the most negative. Maybe the closed mine has not been landscaped and therefore with this picture it is assumed the same thing happens with present mines once they stop operating. Visit to an operating mine seem to turn the attitude more positive as almost one out of four feels positive about the present mining activity.
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**Table 26.** Feeling about the present mining activity near Levi and Ylläs, attitude if visited an operating or closed mine or no visits to a mine (N=5 – 118, p=0.009).
8. CONCLUSIONS

8.1 Evaluating the study process

The survey was carried out only during a short period of time during the winter season, and therefore it does not represent the whole demography, share of foreign and domestic tourists and their attitudes and reasons to travel to the area. It also reflects the public discussion and atmosphere in regards mining at the time, which was tainted by negative impacts from another mining operation in Finland.

Image and identity are complex issues which are not easy to study as they are abstract and can be formed fast and be based on very few issues, but are persistent once formed. The mixture of values a person has, such as emotions, prejudices, attitudes and so on, have a great impact on how the image about something is formed in the person’s mind. A questionnaire cannot go into great depths in finding the ways of how people perceive the image of Ylläs or mining, but can only give an estimation based on statistical information.

Entrepreneurs in the Ylläs and Levi areas were cooperative with letting us undertake the survey in their premises and using their customers. The cooperation with the Finnish Forest Research Institute was a great help and made people more willing to answer this survey than if it would have been carried out only as a student’s survey.

People were willing to answer the survey especially at the Kittilä airport where they had nothing but time while waiting their flight. In other places they were in holiday mode, but declining to answer was rather rare. Some people thought they did not know enough about mines in order to answer and declined for that reason.

The survey form was compiled and modified by the Finnish Forest Research Institute, although we discussed together that it will serve both of our purposes and study questions. In the end it was well done and filling it was fast. For people it seemed to be convenient and they had the motivation to answer it all the way to the last question. Even after many check-up rounds and testing a minor mistake managed to get into the survey as
on the map on the cover letter Russia was named as Sweden — and the map in the English questionnaire cover letter was in Finnish. This mistake was noticed only after many days of work when one of the interviewed mentioned it. The cover letter remained the same throughout the survey and this geopolitical mistake did not cause any further trouble.

8.2 Conclusions

The survey draws a picture of the tourist arriving to Ylläs being highly educated, in his/her mid-age with some years remaining in working life and living in an urban environment. Socio-economical information was not asked, but it can be assumed these people are in their working life or recently retired and can afford to travel to Lapland. Nature, wilderness, opportunities to do sport and safety of the destination indicate they want to have an escape from their daily lives and relax for approximately a week. As Hemmi (2005: 319 – 320) said, travelling to nature is seen energizing and positive, offering a chance to feel the connection and sense of belonging while visiting. Furthermore, Vuolle (1992: 16 – 17) suggested the relationship between man and nature is dependent upon generation; old and middle aged have a closer relationship with nature than the younger generation. Nature is a base for activities and offers a place to escape the hectic everyday life. The results support this idea as the generations most represented are older and middle aged and the activities they prefer are based on nature.

The aim of this study was to find answers to the study questions with empirical data gathered with survey in the framework of place, place promotion, landscape, identity and image. Tourists’ perceptions about mining close to Ylläs tourist resort as a case was searched through during this study. With these questions the image building process and things having impact on it wanted to be found out. The first study question is:
● **How do tourists perceive the present mining activity in the area?**

Feelings regarding recent mining activity in the area are slightly negative; women are more suspicious about it in general. The majority does not see expansion of mining impacting their willingness to revisit, but there is a big group of tourists who think it would reduce their willingness to travel and see it as weakening the image of Ylläs. This is a sensitive case that needs a lot of care in order to manage the potential negative impact on the image. Increasing knowledge seems to make a difference as the study found out: if tourists had familiarized themselves or had heard about present mining activity in Hannukainen; or if they had visited an operating or closed mine they felt more positive towards it than those who had not heard about it – but also some, who had familiarized themselves with the project were very negative. Visits to closed mines apparently raise negative attitudes towards mines. It is notable that over half of the visitors have heard or familiarized themselves with the Hannukainen project and yet they revisit the area.

● **How do tourists perceive the impacts of mining industry in the neighborhood of a tourist resort to the image and identity of it?**

The landscape around Ylläs provides the background in which services and activities are provided. This package is what attracts tourists to the area. A mine is considered to have some change on the landscape and there are concerns of the impacts on nature in terms of pollution and other environmental issues. Minimizing and managing the threats related to mines need to be focused on. Dust, noise and vibration indicate industrial activity and are not welcome either, nor is seeing a mine in the landscape during or after the mining activity. On the other hand the opportunities are recognized, especially with bringing wealth, jobs and increasing living conditions. Benefits quite often rise over the local level
to regional or national, but the threats are seen to be suffered at the local level. This is the
gap that causes concerns and needs to be paid attention to.

There are rather many frequent travelers in the Ylläš area, who have been coming
back to the area year after year since their first trip, which can have taken place decades
ago. For them Ylläš as a place has become significant and meaningful. As Uusitalo’s
(2010) study found out the more familiar tourists are with the area the more familiar
tourists are with the area, the more they can identify details characterizing the place.
Therefore things absent in the maps they sketched are fewer from the first time and from
those made by the not so regular visitors. It can be assumed these people are more attached
to the place and are also more resistant to change. They can also be more involved with the
locals and understand the sources of livelihood, identity and culture more widely. They also
probably know about previous mining activity and present plans and based on that
information are able to form their attitude from a deeper understanding. And as Rope and
Mether (1987: 78 – 79) mentioned, attitudes are the filter which define the message one lets
in and how it is understood. For these people the changes a mine would bring to Ylläš as a
place has a great meaning. They see the pros and cons of the mine, but also filter their
attitude through their personal experience and perceptions. How do they see the change of
place impacting on the identity and how locals and the resort bring the change of identity
into image is important in this regard.

Gold (1995: 22-23) discusses about stereotypes which are formed quickly according
to information people have on places. The less information and first-hand knowledge there
is available the less this stereotype matches reality. These stereotypes may be very durable
and difficult to change. If the assumption is negative it can be harmful for the place and
damage the reputation of it. Furthermore it must be noted, as Morgan (2004: 178) points
out, that every act of place promotion is a product of its time. In this spatio-temporal
context deliberate information regarding mines in the vicinity of a nature-based tourist
resort could help to avoid negative assumptions and guide tourists’ perceptions of it
towards acceptance. As it could be seen in the results of the questionnaire, there is the
connection between having knowledge about mines or visits to them and having less negative attitude towards existing mines, projects or plans to expand them.

- *Is there a way these two industries could coexist with mutual benefit?*

Some tourists see the mines as attractions and would like to visit them. As the study done by Edwards and I Coit (1996) about mines and quarries as industrial heritage attractions in Wales and Spain indicate, these attractions can become very popular. However it is a niche market and in the case of Ylläs it would only be one of the attractions in the area. This would help the mine to be part of the tourism industry and ease the gap between these two industries. A mine as a tourist attraction brings it in the identity of the area and by that way the image would be built on that base. But as seen in this study mining is a challenging neighbor for a tourist resort and a lot of work needs to be done in order to strengthen the positive image and the risks related to mining need to be managed well.

For marketing the tourist resort it is essential the message is positive in order for tourists to choose to come there. Landscape is the physical form of bringing mental images from history alive and that includes place names, stories and other things creating the sense of place (Raivo 2002: 96 – 97). These elements are part of the identity – the physical and mental landscape – and should be brought alive as an image of the area. Strengthening the positive elements is crucial and finding the balance between possible mining activity and tourism is a challenge as the image of mining industry at the moment is not very attractive. But as it comes out in this study, knowledge makes a difference. However this is not the direct answer and there are many having the knowledge who do not accept mines close to a tourist resort.

As it was mentioned in chapter three regarding mining in Finland there are over thirty operating mines and quarries and only one of them has become daily news in media. It should be kept in mind no two mines are alike nor is the surrounding they operate in. Some further discussion and study could be done regarding the difference between mines
and how they impact on the image of their surrounding area. Is a gold mine more acceptable from iron mine and if so, why? And is there a type of mine that is not acceptable in any case? The Talvivaara –factor in perception and attitude forming towards mining industry could provide an interesting field of study. How strong is the impact of a mine in choosing of holiday destination (if there is a mine in the vicinity of it)?

In this study, as the mine close to Ylläs does not exist at the moment of writing this paper, lots of imagination takes place and answers are based on perceptions. No one actually knows how the mine will look like and what the impacts will be, as everything is just a plan right now. This study is only giving an idea of how tourists might react to a mine close to Ylläs, but it provides a good starting point for further studies. It would be interesting to study the construction and operations phases, if and when it takes place, those would reveal more concrete results. An image management plan would benefit the Ylläs tourist resort and would ensure that the right things get paid attention to in regards the mining plan and/or activities. It would also be relatively interesting to undertake a follow-up study in Kittilä and Suurikuusikko mine or in Sotkamo about the impacts of Talvivaara mine on the image of Vuokatti. As perceptions are subject to change, and as circumstances change and active place promotion takes place, there will be a continuous need to monitor the questions investigated in this study.
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NORTHLAND MINES LTD

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROGRAMME
22.12.2010

Supplementary statements, impact assessment and comparison of alternatives in the programme according to the statement given by contact authority

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
March 2013

APPLYING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PERMISSION 6 MONTHS
Possible additional necessary statements, preparing permit application

APPLICATION TO THE NORTH FINLAND REGIONAL STATE ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY
late summer 2013

CEDTE Lapland (contact authority)

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE PROGRAMME since 25.2.2011

Statements and opinions on the programme

STATEMENT OF THE CONTACT AUTHORITY 26.5.2011

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT 2 MONTHS FROM PUBLISHING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Statements and opinions on the EIA report

STATEMENT ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT IN 2 MONTHS

ENVIRONMENTAL PERMIT
Q2 2014

Steering group

Stakeholder- and steering groups

Stakeholder- and steering groups

Permitting process, app. 12 - 18 months
Jalometallit  Precious Metals
1. Iso-Kuotko gold - Agnico-Eagle Ltd
2. Hanhimaa gold - Dragon Mining Ltd
3. Kittilä gold - Agnico-Eagle Ltd
4. Kettkuusikko gold - Taranis Resources Inc.
5. Naakenaavaara gold - Taranis Resources Inc.
6. Pahtavaara gold - Lapland Goldminers Ab
7. Kiekerämaa gold - Tertiary Minerals Plc
8. Rompas gold, uranium - Mawson Resources Ltd
9. Suhanko-Konttiävä PGE - Gold Fields Arctic Platinum Oy
10. Kuusamo gold - Dragon Mining Ltd
11. Laiva gold - Nordic Mines Ab
12. Hirskangas gold - Belvedere Resources Finland Oy
13. Ängesneva gold – Belvedere Resources Finland Oy
14. Kopsa gold - Belvedere Mining Oy
15. Taivaljärvi silver - Sotkamo Silver AB
16. Pampalo gold - Endomines AB
17. Seinäjoki gold, antimony - Nortec Minerals Corp.
18. Osikonmäki gold - Belvedere Resources Finland Oy
19. Haveri gold - Lapland Goldminers Ab
20. Orivesi gold - Dragon Mining Ltd
21. Jokisivu gold - Dragon Mining Ltd
22. Kaapelinkulma gold - Dragon Mining Ltd

Perusmetallit  Base Metals
1. Riikonkoski copper, gold - Taranis Resources Inc.
2. Kevitsa nickel, copper, PGE - First Quantum Minerals Ltd
3. Sakatti nickel, copper, PGE - Anglo American Exploration B.V.
4. Läntinen Koillismaa (LK) nickel, PGE – Finore Mining Inc.
5. Kuhmo nickel - Altona Mining Ltd
6. Kuhmo nickel - Anglo American Exploration B.V.
7. Talvivaara nickel, zinc, copper - Talvivaara Mining Co.
8. Hitura nickel - Belvedere Mining Oy
9. Pyhäalmä zinc, copper, pyrite - Inmet Mining Corp.
10. Rautavaara nickel, zinc, copper - Western Areas NL & Magnus Minerals Oy JV
11. Kylylähti copper, gold, zinc, nickel, cobalt - Altona Mining Ltd
12. Valkisen rantta, Särkiniemi nickel, copper - Altona Mining Ltd

Timantti  Diamond
1. Kuusamo - Sunrise Resources Plc
2. Kuhmo - Karelian Diamond Resources Plc
3. Kaavi-Kuopio - Sunrise Resources Plc
4. Kaavi - Mantle Diamonds Ltd & Firestone Diamonds Developments JV

Muut  Other Commodities
1. Sokli phosphorus, niobium - Yara International ASA
2. Sivakkalehto iron - Tertiary Minerals Plc
3. Kolari iron, gold, copper - Northland Resources Ab
4. Kemi chromium - Outokumpu Chrome Oy
5. Ramua uranium - Mawson Resources Ltd
6. Mustavaara vanadium - Mustavaaran Kaivos Oy
7. Punasuo tale, nickel - Mondo Minerals Oy
8. Alannen tale - Luzenac Suomi Oy
9. Länttä lithium - Keliher Resources Ltd
10. Koivusaarenneva ilmenite - Kalviniit Oy
11. Siilinjärvi phosphorus - Yara International ASA
12. Eno uranium - Mawson Resources Ltd
13. Tammela lithium, tin, tantalum - Nortec Minerals Corp.

GEOLOGIKAN TUTKIMUSKESKUS
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF FINLAND
www.gtk.fi
TOURISTS’ ATTITUDES TOWARDS MINING PROJECTS

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Gender
   1 Female
   2 Male

2. Year of birth ____________

3. Country of residence __________________________

4. Education?
   1 Primary and Middle school
   2 High school or vocational training
   3 College or polytechnic
   4 University

5. In which kind of environment do You live in?
   1 City centre
   2 Suburb of a larger city
   3 Small town or village
   4 Rural area

INFORMATION REGARDING YOUR CURRENT TRIP

6. Are You on
   1 a private trip?
   2 an organized packaged holiday?
   3 work or incentive trip?
   4 something else, what?__________________________

7. For how long do You stay in Lapland during this trip? _______ days

8. What is the most important destination during this trip?
   1 Levi  2 Ylläs  3 Olos  4 Something else, what__________________________?

9. I travel...
   1 alone
   2 with child(ren). Age(s) of the child(ren): _________________
   3 with adult(s). Number including Yourself ________
TOURISTS’ ATTITUDES TOWARDS MINING PROJECTS

10. a) For how many times have You travelled to Levi or Ylläs before this time?
   1. None
   2. 1-5 times
   3. 6-10 times
   4. more than 10 times

   b) In which year did You travel for the first time to Levi or Ylläs?
   Year _____________

   c) Mainly during which time of the year have You travelled in Levi or Ylläs?
   1. Summer
   2. Autumn / Seasons colours
   3. Winter (snowy season)

WHY TO LAPLAND?

11. How important do You see the following elements in choosing your destination?

   Circle the most appropriate option for each element.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
<th>Fairly important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local history and culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pristine wilderness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful natural landscape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to do sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good food and wide range of restaurants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-grade accommodation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide range of program services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pampering and wellness services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of the destination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant nightlife</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for romance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good transport connections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something else, what?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. What does Lapland mean to You? *(Describe with three words)*

THE MOST IMPORTANT OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES

13. Please indicate three (1, 2, 3) most important outdoor activities for You during this trip?

- Nordic walking, jogging, snowshoeing
- Cross-country skiing
- Hiking (with cross-country skies and walking)
- Downhill skiing and snowboarding
- Ice fishing
- Horseback riding
- Dog sledge riding
- Reindeer safari
- Snow mobile safari
- Landscape viewing
- Observation of nature
- Something else, what? ____________________________

ATTITUDE TOWARDS MINING INDUSTRY

14. Did You know prior to Your trip that there is a gold mine in Kittilä?

1  No  2  I have heard about it  3  I have familiarized myself with it

15. Did You know prior to Your trip that there is a plan to set up an iron mine in Kolari?

1  No  2  I have heard about it  3  I have familiarized myself with it
TOURISTS’ ATTITUDES TOWARDS MINING PROJECTS

16. What kind of experience do You have of mines?
0 I have never visited a mining site.
1 I have visited a closed mine.
Where?______________________________
2 I have visited an operating mine.
Where?______________________________

17. What are the areas You think are suitable for mining?
Circle the most suitable option for You in each paragraph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Fairly well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>I don`t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicinity of settlements (up to 10 km distance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicinity of tourist centres (10-30 km distance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparsely populated / rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fell areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature protection areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other area, what?______________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 a) What do You think are the main threats related to mining?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

18 b) What do You think are the main opportunities related to mining?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
### TOURISTS’ ATTITUDES TOWARDS MINING PROJECTS

19. What do you think are the mining impacts in Levi and Ylläs area?

*Ring the most suitable option for You in each paragraph.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Description</th>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>Fairly negative</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Fairly positive</th>
<th>Very positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mining effects on the image of Levi and Ylläs tourist centres</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining effects on the nature experience at Your destination</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining effects on the wilderness nearby Levi and Ylläs</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining effects on the business and local economics nearby Levi and Ylläs</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining effects on the nature use of locals</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining effects on the environment</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining effects on tourism business</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining effects on national economics</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. How do you feel about the present mining activities taking place near Levi and Ylläs?

-2  Very negative
-1  Fairly negative
0   Neutral
1   Fairly positive
2   Very positive
21. How would the possible expansion of mining affect Your willingness to revisit Levi and Ylläs area?

-2  Reduces significantly
-1  Reduces a little
0   No affection
1   Increases a little
2   Increases significantly

22. How would the possible expansion of mining affects the image of Levi and Ylläs as nature tourism destinations?

-2  Weaken significantly
-1  Weaken a little
0   No affection
1   Improve a little
2   Improve significantly

23. Would You be interested in visiting one of the mines nearby Levi and Ylläs areas during Your trip?

0   Not at all
1   Fairly interested
2   Very interested

Thank You for your answering!
MATKAILIJOIDEN SUHTAUTUMINEN KAIVOSHANKKEISIIN

TAUSTATIEDOT
1. Sukupuoli 1 Nainen
   2 Mies
2. Syntymävuosi __________
3. Asuinalue ________________

4. Koulutus? 1 Kansakoulu tai peruskoulu
2 Lukio tai ammatillinen koulutus
3 Opisto- tai ammattikorkeakoulutus
4 Korkeakoulu tai yliopisto

5. Millainen on asuinalueen
   asuinystävällisyyteen? 1 Kaupunkikeskusta
   2 Kaupunkilähiö
   3 Pieni kaupunki tai kuntakeskus
   4 Harvaan asuttu maaseutu

MATKAA KOSKEVAT TIEDOT
6. Oletteko... 1 yksityiselän lomamatkalla? 3 työ- tai kannustinmatkalla?
   2 organisoidulla
   pakettimatkalla? 4 muulla, millä?______________________________

7. Kuinka kauan viivyttää Lapissa tällä matkalla? ______ päivää

8. Mikä on tärkein matkakohteenne tällä matkalla?
   1 Levi 2 Ylläs 3 Olos 4 Joku muu, mikä________________________?

9. Olen matkalla... 1 yksin

   Ympyröi tarvittaessa useampi
   vaihtoehto 2 lasten kanssa. Lasten iät: _______________________
   3 aikuisten kanssa. Lukumäärä teidät mukaan lukien _______
**MATKAILIJOIDEN SUHTAUTUMINEN KAIVOSHANKKEISIIN**

10. a) Kuinka monta kertaa olette matkaillut Levillä tai Yläksellä tätä ennen?  
   1. En kertaakaan  
   2. 1-5 kertaa  
   3. 6-10 kertaa  
   4. yli 10 kertaa

b) Minä vuonna matkustitte ensi kerran Leville tai Yläkselle?
   Vuonna ____________

c) Mihin vuodenaikaa olette pääasiassa matkaillut Levillä tai Yläksellä?
   1. Kesäisin  
   2. Syksyisin /Ruska  
   3. Talvisin (lumen aika)

**MIKSI LAPPIN?**

11. Miten tärkeitä syitä seuraavat tekijät olivat matkakohteenne valinnassa?

*Ympyröikää jokaisesta kohdasta mielestinne sopivin vastausvaihtoehto.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paikallishistoria ja kulttuuri</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koskematon erämaa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauniit luonnnonmaisemat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liikuntamahdollisuudet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyvä ruoka ja monipuolinen ravintolapalvelu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korkeatasoinen majoitus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monipuoliset ohjelmapalvelut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemmottelu- ja hyvinvointipalvelut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohteen turvallisuus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilkas yöelämä</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahdollisuus romanttiseen kanssakäymiseen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyvät liikenneyhteydet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muu asia, mikä? ______________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Mitä Lappi teille merkitsee? (kuvailkaa kolmella sanalla)

13. Mainitkaa numerojärjestyksessä (1, 2, 3) kolme tärkeintä ulkoiluharrastettanne tämän matkan aikana?

_____ Sauvakävely, lenkkeily, lumikenkäily
_____ Hiihtäminen
_____ Vaellushiihto ja retkeily
_____ Laskettelu ja lumilautailu
_____ Pilkiminen
_____ Ratsastus
_____ Koiravaljakolla ajo
_____ Porosafari
_____ Moottorikelkkasafari
_____ Maisemien katselu
_____ Luonnon tarkkailu
_____ Muu, mikä?

Huom!
Älä rastita.

14. Tiesittekö ennen matkalle lähtöänne että Kittilässä toimii kultakaivos?

1 En  2 Olen kuullut asiasta  3 Olen perhehtynyt asiaan

15. Tiesittekö ennen matkalle lähtöä että Kolariin on suunnitteilla rautakaivos?

1 En  2 Olen kuullut asiasta  3 Olen perhehtynyt asiaan
16. Millaisia omia kokemuksia teillä on kaivoksista?
0  En ole koskaan käynyt kaivosalueella
1  Olen käynyt lakkaustetulla kaivosalueella
Missä?________________________________________________________
2  Olen käynyt toimivalla kaivosalueella
Missä?________________________________________________________

17. Millaiset alueet soveltuvat mielestänne kaivosteollisuuden käyttöön?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alue</th>
<th>Ei lainkaan</th>
<th>Melko hyvin</th>
<th>Erittäin hyvin</th>
<th>En osaa sanoa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asutuskeskusten lähialueet (alle 10 km etäisyys)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matkailukeskusten lähialueet (10-30 km etäisyys)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haja-asutusalueet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erämaa-alueet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunturialueet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luonnonsuojelualueet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teollisuusalueet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muu alue, mikä?______________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 a) Mitä keskeisiä uhkia mielestänne liittyy kaivoksiin?
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

18 b) Mitä keskeisiä mahdollisuuksia/etuja mielestänne liittyy kaivoksiin?
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
19. Miten arvioitte kaivostoiminnan vaikutuksia Levin ja Ylläksen alueella?

*Ympyröikää jokaisesta kohdasta mielestänsä sopivin vastausvaihtoehdo.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>syöttö</th>
<th>erittäin kielteinen</th>
<th>melko kielteinen</th>
<th>ei vaikutusta</th>
<th>melko myönteinen</th>
<th>erittäin myönteinen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaivostoiminnan vaikutus Levin ja Ylläksen matkailukeskusten imagoon</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaivostoiminnan vaikutus matkakohteenne luontokokemukseen</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaivosten vaikutus Levin ja Ylläksen lähialueiden erämaisuuteen</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaivosten vaikutus Levin ja Ylläksen alueiden elinkeinoelämään</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaivosten vaikutus paikallisten luonnonkäyttöön</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaivostoiminnan vaikutus ympäristöön</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaivostoiminnan vaikutus matkailuelinkeinoon</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaivostoiminnan vaikutus kansantalouteen</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Miten suhtaudutte nykyiseen kaivostoimintaan Levin ja Ylläksen lähialueilla?

-2 Erittäin kielteisesti
-1 Melko kielteisesti
0 Neutraalisti
1 Melko myönteisesti
2 Erittäin myönteisesti
MATKAILIJOIDEN SUHTAUTUMINEN KAIVOSHANKKEISIIN

21. Miten kaivostoiminnan mahdollinen laajeneminen vaikuttaisi halukkuuteenne vierailla uudelleen Levin ja Ylläksen alueella?
   -2 Vähentäisi tuntuvasti
   -1 Vähentäisi jonkin verran
   0 Ei vaikuttaisi millään lailla
   1 Lisäisi jonkin verran
   2 Lisäisi tuntuvasti

22. Miten arvioitte kaivostoiminnan mahdollisen laajentumisen vaikuttavan Levin ja Ylläksen alueen imagoon luontomatkailukohteena?
   -2 Heikentäisi tuntuvasti
   -1 Heikentäisi jonkin verran
   0 Ei vaikuttaisi millään lailla
   1 Parantaisi jonkin verran
   2 Parantaisi tuntuvasti

23. Olisitteko kiinnostunut käymään lomamatkanne aikana jossakin Levin tai Ylläksen lähialueiden kaivoksista?
   0 En lainkaan kiinnostunut
   1 Jonkin verran kiinnostunut
   2 Erittäin kiinnostunut

Kiitos vastauksestanne!
DEAR TRAVELLER!

In the last few years, mining projects have been developed or are in the planning stages in Northern Finland. For example, a gold mine operates in Kittilä and an iron mine project is under development in Hannukainen, Kolari.

DILACOMI – Mines, land-use and local communities is a joint project between University of Lapland, University of Oulu and the Finnish Forest Research Institute. The project studies the legislative framework within which mines operate, impacts on society and community and the consolidation of mining and other nature based livelihoods. The research institutions undertake this work independently and are not tied to the mining companies.

The survey is aimed at travelers to the Ylläs and Levi areas, and it looks into how the combination of tourism and mining is perceived in the tourist centers. With this survey we hope to receive important information regarding the factors which travelers see as important in the Levi and Ylläs areas and how the possible development of mining activity would impact on these.

The survey will be undertaken during the spring of 2012 at the Levi and Ylläs areas and at the Kittilä airport.

Please participate in our survey! It takes only about 5 minutes to complete.

More information: Mikko Jokinen, tel. +358 50 391 3525, mikko.jokinen@metla.fi

ulapland.fi/dilacomi

METLA  Tekes  European Union
HYVÄ MATKAILUA!

Pohjois-Suomessa on viimevuosina käynnistynyt lukuisia kaivoshankkeita. Esimerkiksi Kittilässä toimii kultakaivos ja Kolarin Hannukaiseen on suunnitelltaa rautakaivoksen avaaminen.

DILACOMI- Kaivokset, maankäyttö ja paikallisyhteisöt on Lapin yliopiston, Oulun yliopiston sekä Metlan yhteinen tutkimushanke, jossa tutkitaan kaivosten lainsäädännöllisiä toimintaedellytyksiä, sosiaalisia ja yhteiskunnallisia vaikutuksia sekä kaivosten ja muiden luontoperustaisten elinkeinojen yhteenvetattamista. Tutkimuslaitokset toimivat tutkimuksessaan itsenäisesti ja kaivosyhtiöistä riippumattomina.

Alueen matkailijoille suunnattu yhteys kyselyllä on tarkoitus tutkia, miten matkailun ja kaivostoinnin yhdistäminen koetaan alueen matkailukeskuksissa. Kyselyllä uskomme saavamme arvokasta tietoa siitä, mitä teki joota matkailijat pitävät tärkeinä Levin ja Yläkosken alueella ja miten kaivostoinnin mahdollisen laajentumisen arvellaan näihin vaikuttavan.

Kysely toteutetaan kevään 2012 aikana Levin ja Yläkosken alueella sekä Kittilän lentokentällä.

Toivomme, että osallistut kyselyyn! Vastaamiseen kuluu aikaa noin 5 minuuttia.

lisätietoja tutkimuksesta: Mikko Jokinen, puh: 050 391 3525, mikko.jokinen@metla.fi

ulapland.fi/dilacomi