Are we any closer to sustainable development? Listening to active stakeholder discourses of tourism development in the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve, South Africa

Abstract

'Biosphere reserve' is a United Nations (UN) designation stipulating that a region should attempt to follow the principles of sustainable development (SD). This paper adopts a stakeholder analysis framework to analyse the discourses of those tourism stakeholders who can actively affect SD in the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve (WBR), South Africa. Adopting an inductive qualitative methodology generated multiple research themes which were subsequently analysed using critical discourse analysis (CDA) techniques. These themes indicate that seeking SD in biosphere reserves is problematical when there are distinct ideological differences between active stakeholder groups and power relations are unequal. Adopting CDA allows us to make some sense of why this is the case as the technique appreciates not only *how* tourism development occurs, but also *why* it occurs in a particular way. This paper adds to the literature on stakeholder analysis in tourism specifically and also has wider implications for SD more generally.

1. Introduction

The background to, and need for, sustainable development (SD) is well documented (see for instance Barbier, 1987; Redclift, 1987; Lele, 1991; Reid, 1995; Moffatt, 1996; Clark et al. 1987; Mebratu, 1998; Robinson, 2004; Redclift, 2005), and putting the principles of SD into practice is essential if we are to move down a more sustainable pathway. What these principles are, and what this pathway might include, is illustrated through the work of both Palmer et al. (1997) and the subsequent literature synthesis by Sharpley (2000). They explain SD through four inter-related themes: *futurity* – a concern for future generations; *the environment* – a concern to protect the integrity of ecosystems; *public participation* – a concern to ensure that individuals participate in decisions which affect them; and *equity* – a concern for the poor and disadvantaged within society. There are various approaches and positions that can be taken by stakeholders in responding to the implications of these themes (Daly & Cobb, 1989; Haughton & Hunter, 1994). However, stakeholders are not homogenous

(Friedman & Miles, 2002) so differentiating between values and perceptions of different stakeholder types is important in understanding how tourism can contribute to SD.

The primary aim of this paper is to analyse active stakeholder discourses of tourism development in the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve, South Africa, in order to better understand how the principles of SD might be most effectively put into practice more generally. Active stakeholders are those who affect decisions or actions, while passive stakeholders are those who are affected (either positively or negatively) by those decisions (Grimble & Wellard, 1997). Our underlying premise is that if stakeholders can affect decisions or actions in relation to sustainability concerns, then gaining an understanding of how they view 'development' can provide further insights into the tourism development process.

The United Nations (UN), through its Man and Biosphere (MaB) programme, seeks to put the principles of SD into practice in specific locales (UNESCO, 2008). This paper utilises a specific UN biosphere reserve in South Africa (SA) as the focus of investigation. Biosphere reserves are "areas of terrestrial and coastal ecosystems promoting solutions to reconcile the conservation of biodiversity with its sustainable use" (http://www.unesco.org/mab/doc/faq/brs.pdf). The Waterberg Biosphere Reserve (WBR) was created in Limpopo Province, SA, in 2001. The main economic and land-use sector in the WBR is tourism, and therefore how this industry is developed has SD implications for the wider region, which are influenced by a variety of stakeholders (Waterberg District Municipality, 2010). This paper uses critical discourse analysis (CDA) (see for instance van Dijk, 2001 and Fairclough & Wodak, 1997) to better understand these stakeholders, and in so doing, uncovers interconnected notions of context, power and ideology. The notion of 'active' stakeholders and their views of tourism and sustainable development in the WBR are central to this discussion.

The paper is developed as follows. First, stakeholders and stakeholder analysis techniques are examined, linking these with concerns regarding power, as understanding notions of power are essential in the development process, determining how and why development occurs (Crush, 1995). This is followed by a review of the tourism stakeholder literature. Second, the case study is introduced and the methodological approach to its analysis, CDA, is reviewed in detail. Here we explain what CDA is and how we utilize it in this research. In essence, this critical, analytical approach attempts to uncover the ideological assumptions that are hidden

in discourse in order to resist and overcome various forms of 'power over' or to gain an appreciation of how power is exercised, which may not always be apparent (Fairclough, 1989). The paper then analyses the emergent discourses of the active stakeholders in tourism development in the WBR, focusing on sustainability issues in relation to the tourism industry in the region. The paper focuses not only on what is said (the discourses), but also *why* particular stakeholders may say the things they do. This is a key component of CDA (Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

2. Understanding Stakeholders

Attempting to understand what and who constitutes a 'stakeholder' is complicated. Different researchers apply different definitions to their research. Grimble & Wellard (1997, p.175-6) for instance define stakeholders as "any group of people, organized or unorganized, who share a common interest or stake in a particular issue or system; they can be at any level or position in society, from global, national and regional concerns down to the level of household or intra household, and be groups of any size or aggregation". There are multiple ways in which stakeholders can be classified. Albeit in a different spatial context, a useful summary can be found in Le Feuvre et al. (2016) who make reference to the power, legitimacy and urgency classification of Mitchell et al. (1997) and the primary and secondary, voluntary and involuntary distinctions of Clarkson (1995). Also covered are the four key stakeholder types of Savage et al. (1991) i.e. the supportive stakeholder; the marginal stakeholder; the non-supportive stakeholder; and the mixed blessing stakeholder, and the social typology of urban entrepreneurs proposed by Logan & Molotch (1987) i.e. serendipitous; active; and structural entrepreneurs. The three levels of interaction between stakeholders and organizations have been previously classified by Podnar & Jancic (2006) i.e. inevitable; necessary; and desirable, whilst Wheeler & Sillanpaa (1997) classify stakeholders by a two dimensional, primary-secondary and social-non-social classification system. Collectively it is evident that influence; power; and saliency are recurring themes within each of these studies analyzing stakeholders.

2.1 Influence

The idea of how different stakeholders either have influence or seek to gain influence over issues plays an important part in the stakeholder literature. For Woods (2003, p2-3) "influence refers to the capacity of one actor to modify the behaviour of another". Just as stakeholder groups can be mapped, so too can their influences. Stakeholder influence

mapping has been used as a tool in development studies to examine and visually display the relative influence that different stakeholders have over decision-making (International Institute for Environment and Development, 2005), to enable a better understanding and explicit discussion of who influences policy. The approach involves identifying various stakeholders in any chosen policy issue or policy arena according to how much influence they may hold over the policy, and also the relationships they have with each other (ibid). In order to have influence over an organisation or concern, stakeholders should have a deep commitment to the issues and actively pursue interests, actions, and values that relate to the concern (Dunham et al. 2006). However, whilst stakeholder influence mapping is useful for examining snapshots of stakeholders influence, it is best suited to examine the direction of changes in policies or issues over time (International Institute for Environment and Development, 2005).

2.2 Power

Theories relating to power predominantly fall into two categories – 'power to' and 'power over' (Wartenberg, 1990). 'Power to' refers to the ability of individuals to do something on their own and relates to an individual's traits. 'Power over' can be traced to Machiavellian notions of power, to Weber (1986) and Bourdieu (1983), and highlights issues of social conflict, control, and coercion. It relates to 'power as domination' (Foucault, 1980). The notion of 'power over' is of most relevance to this paper as it involves issues of inequality, which are central to the study of development: "…a theory of power has, as a first priority, the articulation of the meaning of the concept of power-over because social theory employs this concept as a primary means of conceptualizing the nature of the fundamental inequalities in society" (Wartenberg, 1990, p5).

Of relevance to this work are Foucault's notions of power and also space. Foucault (1980) regards power as a relational force that permeates the whole of society that connects all social groups in a web of mutual influence. Through power, this relational force constructs social organisation and hierarchy by producing discourses and truth. Order and discipline are therefore enforced, shaping human desires and subjectivities. For Foucault, power is both simultaneously productive and repressive, meaning any social body cannot function without it, even though power may result in oppression. Acknowledging the role of 'power as domination', his work is one of resistance to this form of power. As Foucault (1980, p. 102) states: "We should direct our researches on the nature of power" and we should "base our

analyses of power on the study of the techniques and tactics of domination". Only by understanding these underlying factors will a dismantling, or reduction in dominance, be possible. Foucault's work on space, particularly heterotopias, is also applicable. Heterotopias are places of Otherness, and their study can be used as a tool to examine *inter alia* space, politics, place and power (Foucault, 1997). This work examines contradictions and juxtapositions which may not be readily perceived at first, and has been applied to a number of examples (see Draper, 2000; Wright, 2005; Howell, 2013).

One method of analyzing the influence that stakeholders have over policies, organizations, developments or other concerns relates to the power and the interest that stakeholders have or accrue relating to such concerns. The work of Mendelow (1991) on power and dynamism was adapted by Johnson & Scholes (1993) and resulted in the power/interest matrix, which classifies stakeholders in relation to the power they hold and the extent to which they show interest in the development, proposal or issue (see Figure 1). The matrix is designed to produce a clearer understanding of how communication and relationships between stakeholders affect the issue being studied. It seeks to answer two questions: How interested is each stakeholder group to impress its expectations or objectives on the concern and do they have the power to do so? They also help in identifying and highlighting potential stakeholder coalitions which can either be encouraged or discouraged, what behaviour should be nurtured and whose buy-in should be sought or who should be co-opted (Bryson et al. 2002).

(Insert Figure 1 about here)

In stakeholder analysis, power is an important concern and can come from status, the ability to claim resources and also the symbols of power (Johnson et al. 2011). These authors also examine how stakeholder mapping can help to understand whether it is desirable to move particular stakeholders from one area to another. For example, powerful investors may be in quadrant C, but it may be beneficial to attempt to move them to quadrant D to gain support for initiatives. Community groups may be in quadrant B, but often they have connections to people in quadrant D, and therefore, may need to be carefully managed. The knowledge gained from the use of such a matrix can also be useful in identifying the powerless and potentially advancing their interests. This can sometimes be the case with stakeholder analyses relating to environmental management and development work, whereby commonly

known stakeholders are included in analyses at the expense of more marginalised or powerless groups (Grimble et al. 1995).

2.3 Saliency

As the power/interest matrix shows, power is not equally shared among stakeholders in either formal or informal structures, nor is it equal between different stakeholder groups. As power implies the coercion of others to follow certain courses of action, the extent to which this happens is dependent on the source of that power (Marwick, 2000). This links to how power is legitimized, and the work of Mitchell et al. (1997), who examine not only stakeholder power, but also the legitimacy of stakeholder relationships, and also the urgency of stakeholder claims. They define stakeholder salience as: "the degree to which managers give priority to competing stakeholder claims" (ibid, p854). Their work is predominantly concerned with organizational stakeholder theory, but can be related to the field of development studies, tourism development and Foucauldian notions of power discussed earlier. They also state that legitimacy, which refers to socially accepted and expected structures or behaviors, is often combined implicitly with power to create authority, which is seen by Weber (1947) as the legitimate use of power. Power and legitimacy can also be viewed as independent variables, but according to Mitchell et al. (1997) it does not capture the dynamics of the interactions between stakeholders. They propose that adding the stakeholder attribute of urgency helps move the model from static to dynamic. The attribute of urgency has synonyms including 'compelling,' 'driving' and 'imperative' (ibid).They also argue that:

> "… urgency is based on the following two attributes: (1) time sensitivity- the degree to which managerial delay in attending to the claim or relationship is unacceptable to the stakeholder, and (2) criticality - the importance of the claim or the relationship to the stakeholder. We define urgency as the degree to which stakeholder claims call for immediate attention." (ibid, p867)

When legitimacy is combined with urgency, it enhances access to decision-making channels, and when combined with power, it encourages one-sided stakeholder action. When legitimacy is combined with both, urgency causes shared acknowledgment and action between stakeholder groups.

All the techniques identified above: stakeholder identification and mapping; influence; power; and saliency are used in the WBR case study stakeholder analysis which follows. However, it is not our intention to undertake a full stakeholder analysis of all tourism stakeholders in the WBR, but rather to investigate those who are active within the WBR and to consider what they say about development, SD and tourism development and why they say the things they do.

3. Tourism Stakeholders

Multiple studies (see for instance Balaguer & Cantavella-Jorda, 2002; Vanegas & Croes, 2003; Durberry, 2004; Dritsakis, 2004; and Steiner, 2006) demonstrate that tourism can be an engine of economic growth. The main aspects of tourism as a strategy for development relate to its ability to generate income and employment, its linkages with other economic sectors and business development opportunities for small and medium-sized companies (SMEs), especially at the regional and local levels (Stabler et al. 2010). But development often impacts upon people and societies in very different ways, and analysing what this means to different stakeholder groups in particular is complex (Mitchell & Ashley, 2010).

Research into stakeholders and their interests regarding tourism development has had considerable coverage in the literature (see for example Lankford, 1994; Hardy, 2005; Andriotis, 2005; Getz & Timur, 2005; Byrd et al. 2009; Holden, 2010; Waligo et al. 2013; Hung Lee, 2013; and Farmaki et al. 2015). The rationale for examining stakeholders in tourism is put forward by Hall & Jenkins (1995, p31) who state that "to study inter-organizational relationships, students of tourism must, among other things, identify and access the relevant key actors and agencies, examine the values, perceptions, and interests of significant individuals and organizations, and isolate the relationships within and between stakeholders."

Examining the literature on stakeholders and tourism uncovers four main stakeholder groups (Byrd et al. 2009; Stylidis et al. 2014): tourists; residents; entrepreneurs and local government or management officials. Andriotis (2005) focuses on residents and entrepreneurs, Holden (2010) on tourists, entrepreneurs and officials, Lankford (1994) on residents, entrepreneurs and officials, Hung Lee (2013) on residents, while Hardy (2005), Byrd et al. (2009) and Waligo et al. (2013) examine all four. While the four stakeholder groups are a useful guide for categorizing research, the role of civil society/non-governmental organizations (NGOs) is

often omitted. As Reid (2003) notes, this latter group of stakeholders is becoming increasingly important in sustainable tourism development as more inclusive (Bryson, 2003) stakeholder perspectives are required.

The literature on tourism development has called for an emphasis on participatory approaches to be undertaken (Sharpley & Telfer, 2002; Spenceley, 2008; Tosun, 2005). This has meant a movement towards more inclusive stakeholder analyses to understand *all* stakeholder behaviours, interests, agendas, and influences on the decision-making processes. In particular, this has included the opinions of civil society and community groups (Brugha & Varvasovszky, 2000). As multiple authors observe (see for instance Murphy 1985; Sautter & Leissen, 1999; Getz & Timur, 2005; Buckley, 2012; and Hung Lee, 2013), as communities are key stakeholders within the tourism development process, how they view their own environment is important, as they are not only part of the tourism product, but they feel the effects of tourism development more than any other stakeholder. To examine this in more detail, this paper now moves to focusing upon the WBR case study. The context is provided, methodological considerations are detailed, and subsequently, the empirical findings presented. These findings examine the less understood discourses from the public, private and not-for-profit sectors and a number of individuals from civil society operational within the WBR.

4. Research Context: The Waterberg Biosphere Reserve, SA

The WBR was formed in 2001 and is located in the predominantly rural Waterberg District in Limpopo Province of South Africa. Table 1 summarizes 2011 census data for the Province. Around 100,000 people live in the WBR which covers an area of about 650,000 hectares, or around three quarters the size of the Kruger National Park. The Province has a number of important industries, of which mining is the largest, contributing around a quarter of the economic output. Tourism accounted for over 8% of economic output in 2008, although it is a growth industry (LEDET, 2009). The legacy of apartheid has left numerous challenges in South Africa. The challenges identified by Limpopo Provincial government in their 15 year post-apartheid review are summarized in Table 2. These challenges are in no way unique to this Province, but are typical of many rural areas in South Africa. They also mirror issues central to those at the heart of the SD agenda discussed earlier in the paper.

(Insert Table 1 about here)

8

(Insert Table 2 about here)

The WBR cuts across six local municipalities: Magalakwena, Modimolle, Lephalale, Bela-Bela, Mookgopong, and Thabazimbi. There is only one small town in the WBR, Vaalwater which has an adjoining township, Leseding. There are other small settlements and villages, but the area is predominantly rural with the main economic activities being tourism and agriculture (Taylor et al. 2003). The population within the Waterberg District is around 600,000, 90% of whom are African, 9% white and 1% other ethnic groups. There are nine languages spoken, with 58% speaking Sepidi, 9% Afrikaans and 1% English (Waterberg District Municipality, 2010). The area is malaria-free, has a mild climate, is around two and a half hours drive from the urban conurbations of Gauteng Province, and provides numerous opportunities for the development of outdoors, recreational-based tourism (Taylor et al. 2003; Limpopo Provincial Government, 2009). The type of tourism in the WBR revolves around the natural environment and is predominantly game viewing, hunting or outdoor recreation in the African 'bush'.

Within the Waterberg region there has been a shift in land-use away from agriculture to the tourism sector. This has resulted in increases in both consumptive (hunting) and non-consumptive (game viewing) forms of tourism. There is a growing conservation community that is involved in the sustainable utilization of wildlife, from both consumptive and non-consumptive perspectives (Waterberg District Municipality, 2010). Waterberg's tourism model is therefore built on the restoration of the natural environment from agricultural use, and also natural areas which have been left untouched. The natural environment is unique and it is this uniqueness which was fundamental to the creation of the biosphere reserve within the WBR: the vegetation is predominantly savanna containing a high level of biological diversity including a number of species of conservation concern including wild dog, brown hyena, honey badger, and servals to name but a few. There are over two thousand plant species, four hundred bird species, and a rich diversity of butterflies, insects and reptiles in the region. The low human density ensures large areas of unspoiled wilderness and open spaces are a main characteristic of the WBR. There has been human inhabitation for hundreds of thousand years and WBR is one of the most important San Rock Art areas in South Africa.

The region's topography can be described as an 'inverted saucer' stretching from Modimolle and Mokopane in the east to Lephalale and Thabazimbi in the west. The core of the region is

a plateau which is dissected by a number of rivers, the main rocks are ancient conglomerates and sandstones. The area is also characterised by low mountain ranges and escarpments with unique rock formations. There are some major landowners in the WBR, with two game reserves owning around 35,000 ha. The majority of game farms however are relatively small, with over 60% being under 5000 ha. There are numerous rare and endangered carnivore species. The 'big five', of elephant, lion, buffalo, rhinoceros and leopard can be found on a number of game reserves along with varieties of buck, zebra and giraffe. (Waterberg Biosphere Reserve, 2013).

4.1 WBR Stakeholder Mapping

There are numerous stakeholders that influence and are influenced by tourism development in the WBR. These stakeholders exist at various levels ranging from the international (through UNESCO's MaB programme), national (for example through the Department of Environment and Tourism (DEAT)), regional (exemplified by provincial government), to the local level, where public, private and civil society organizations exist along with local communities.

Within the WBR there are a number of small businesses which are either directly or indirectly related to the tourism industry. In Vaalwater for instance, there are a few cafes and retail outlets that cater to locals and tourists alike. There are no major retail chains in the WBR, with the exception of supermarkets. Instead, most businesses in the retail/hospitality area are locally owned/managed and are SMEs. As hunting plays a large part in the tourism offer in the WBR, there are a number of businesses which relate to this sector, such as taxidermy, game capture and auction. Stakeholders in the accommodation sector, who own land within the WBR and use it for tourism-related activities, can influence what happens on the land, thereby affecting environmental sustainability in the area.

Landowners have the ability to influence income and employment levels, thereby affecting economic sustainability. They can also affect some societal aspects relating to STD which include: quality of life concerns; empowerment; stakeholder equity; community participation; protection of cultural heritage and authenticity; support for and continuation of identity; culture, local values and interests of indigenous peoples. Those involved in civil society organisations such as the Waterberg Nature Conservancy (WNC) are all landowners and act as a lobby group to local government, particularly with regard to environmental concerns.

The chair of the WNC, inputs into WBR management plans and acts as a spokesperson for the organisation on planning concerns in the region. The director of Timothy House, a Visitor Centre operated by the Waterberg Welfare Society (WWS), has the ability to affect both economic and social aspects relating to quality of life and empowerment concerns within the Leseding Township.

Public sector employees have the ability to affect the three aspects of sustainable tourism development (STD), through the development and implementation of regional/local planning initiatives. They have all been involved in the environmental management framework (EMF) and the biosphere management plan (BMP) for the WBR. Specifically, they can ultimately affect planning decisions regarding what is developed, where, in what style, and at what pace, under the aegis of planning legislation guidelines. These guidelines incorporate: land use types; density of tourism beds; footprints for lodges (height, parking); impacts upon rivers and dams; vehicle densities; subdivisions; building lines and guidelines relating to heritage resources; pollution and environmental impact assessment (EIA) issues. These guidelines have been adopted by the local and district municipalities who deal with planning matters. All of these planning concerns affect STD in the WBR, hence those in the public sector can be said to be active in all areas that affect STD.

Land claimants have (albeit limited) ability to affect the various aspects of sustainability. They are passive participants in the development process in many ways. However, those claimants who have had their claim processed and who now have ownership of the land have the ability to affect what happens on that land, thereby affecting environmental aspects relating to STD. Other claimants whose claims are on-going, while working very closely with the current landowners, cannot actively influence how the land is used, thus limiting their abilities as active stakeholders.

5. Research Methods

The primary aim of this paper is to analyse stakeholder discourses of tourism development in the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve, South Africa, in order to better understand how the principles of sustainable development might be most effectively put into practice. As our earlier review of Grimble & Wellard (1997) informs us, stakeholders represent a diverse group of people, at both an individual, household and community level. For the purpose of

this paper we focus upon active stakeholders (i.e. stakeholders who affect decisions or actions), those in formal or informal leadership positions within their communities.

5.1 Research Design

May (2001) asserts that interviews yield rich insights into people's experiences, opinions, values, aspirations, attitudes and feelings. They can also generate a significant amount of discourse on a variety of topics. The study adopted semi-structured interviews akin to what Alvesson (2002) calls 'localist' in nature, whereby the interview produces a situated account, drawing upon cultural resources, in order to produce morally adequate descriptions. Interviewees all had information sheets given to them prior to the interview and they all signed a consent form stating that they understood the nature of the research and that all information was confidential. Interviews lasted between thirty and seventy five minutes and were all face-to-face, digitally recorded and later transcribed.

The broad question areas were determined through the thematic analysis of the STD literature along with information gathered during a scoping visit to the WBR. Table 3 details the main themes and sub-themes which were covered during the interviews. The interview questioning centred on tourism as a sustainable development tool in the WBR, focusing on the three main pillars of STD – economy, society and environment. Respondents were also asked about their knowledge of STD and also the biosphere reserve. The interviews started by asking for some background to the interviewee. The question "Can you tell me about yourself?" was used with appropriate follow-up questions to get background information on the respondents. This is an important aspect of CDA as who the stakeholders are affects what they say (their discourses). Stakeholder mapping and profiling were the first tasks in this process. Profiles and backgrounds of the stakeholders are important in CDA and this was carried out, examining their status, stakeholder group, socio-cultural and other relevant information. This information included family history and length of residency in the Waterberg, collected in order to build up a picture of who they are and where they are positioned within the region.

(Insert Table 3 about here)

5.2 Sample

The question of who to interview was complex, governed by the primary aim (i.e. to ascertain the opinions of active stakeholders). The criteria of deciding whether stakeholders were

active or passive were based on their ability to affect the three pillars of STD - namely economic, environmental and social objectives - through involvement with tourism. For example: economic criteria involve the ability to be active regarding job creation or income generation; social sustainability incorporates quality of life issues and empowerment; while environmental sustainability involves such issues as affecting land-use. From initial stakeholder mapping (see section 4.1), thirty-four stakeholders perceived to be potentially active at provincial and local level were identified for inclusion in the study (see Table 4). They were chosen to represent the tourism operational landscape: public sector officials (n=6, respondents PS1-PS5); accommodation providers (n=13, respondents AC1-AC13); other tourism business owners (n=5, respondents BS1-BS5); civil society individuals or representatives (n=8, respondents CS1-CS8); and land claimants (n=2, respondents LC1-LC2).

(Insert Table 4 about here)

5.3 Data Analysis

Whilst there are numerous ways to analyse text (see Titscher et al. 2002 for an overview), critical discourse analysis (CDA) was selected as the preferred method of textual analysis. CDA implies that science and scholarly discourse are not value free and are part of, and influenced by, social structure and produced in social interaction (van Dijk, 2001). CDA seeks to describe, interpret, analyse, and critique social life reflected in discourse. It is concerned with studying and analysing discourses to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality, and bias. Whilst there are numerous approaches to CDA (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; van Dijk, 1985; Bloor & Bloor, 2007; Wodak & Meyer, 2009), context is critical in each as it examines how these sources are initiated, maintained, reproduced, and transformed within various political social, economic and historical contexts (van Dijk, 1988).

CDA was selected as the preferred method of textual analysis as it is a linguistic method examining both the coherence of the text as well as the cohesion (the textual-syntactic connectedness) and involves ideologies associated with power (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Not only does CDA examine what people say, it also examines why they say these things. Non-linguistic methods such as grounded theory and content analysis only examine coherence and

it is through incorporating and analysing syntactic, semantic and pragmatic levels (cohesion) that a deeper understanding of the language used can be gained.

The discourses of the stakeholders were examined through a number of stages. First, the text was examined as a whole and discourse strands and sub-strands identified. Discourse strands are "flows of discourse that centre on a common topic… and are conceived of at the level of concrete utterances" (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p46). This was carried out using NVivo which can be used as a tool to link ideas, search for and explore patterns of data and ideas (Richards 1999). The discourses were grouped into a number of thematic areas. The data themes are an important element in organising data for subsequent analysis. Discourses on tourism were categorised under numerous themes and cross-referenced with SD themes. Second, the sub-strands under each strand were identified using the same technique. The entanglements of discourse strands were also identified. This is where one strand refers to a number of inter-related topics. For example when discussing Waterberg as a place, notions of development including politics, economics or the environment may also be referred to.

Still looking at the text as a whole, Huckin (1997) recommends, examining the perspective that is being presented. This involves angles, slants, or points of view, and is called 'framing.' For example, how one section of society sees other sections can be seen as a 'frame'. Third, discourse positions are also examined. These describe the ideological position from which subjects participate in and encompass their worldviews (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). This involves discourse positions on the environment, economics and development. For example, the neoliberal view of economics is a discourse position, as is a radical view of environmentalism. Having examined discourse strands, frames and discourse positions, the next stage is to examine the more minute levels of analysis: sentence, phrases, and words. There are numerous CDA techniques to facilitate this level of analysis and Gee (2011) likens these to tools in a toolkit. The analyst uses various tools to examine the discourse depending on what is being analysed. The tools used include: topicalisation; connotation; modality; intertextuality; lexical analysis; semantic contrast and identity and ideology construction through pronoun use.

Overall, this research generated in excess of 100,000 words of data. With, intentionally, no *a priori* template in place, the material presented in the next section (findings) is selected on the grounds that it is illustrative of the main themes emerging through the data. Inevitably not all

themes will therefore be covered. Quotations are selected in a similar vein, i.e. that they are illustrative of the key points emergent through the data.

6. Findings and Discussion

6.1 Tourism as an Economic Driver

STD is supposed to balance economic, societal and environmental concerns, but economic aspects often prevail. The WBR is no different. The economic aspects of tourism were mentioned by all the active stakeholders at some point during their interview, with the main discourse surrounding tourism as an economic driver for the area through income generation and job creation. However, the ability of the industry to alleviate many of the economic problems in the area is potentially limited:

> "I think tourism is probably the only industry within the biosphere that **could be** sustainable (…) it **needs to be** high-value tourism, so the numbers of people, while they **might be** small, **might be** high-paying visitors. It then generates economic wealth, and the people who work in the area, **need to be** remunerated accordingly and they **need to be** more highly skilled than in other places, because I believe that mass tourism, the sort you have down the coast of Spain and Portugal, would very quickly spoil the area."
> (AC2)

> "I as a Waterberger, think we're at a crossroads, where we **can** either through effective intervention if it **can be** possible move towards being a serious conservation area, which with a greater profile which **could** then assist the ecotourism potential and that **can** then absorb some of the jobs which were lost through agriculture before… (CS6)

The two discourses above highlight how tourism has the potential to be a key sustainable economic sector within the WBR. The modal verbs (in bold) also highlight some of the issues concerned with tourism. The discourse of AC2 states that it needs to be small-scale, high value tourism, while CS6 extols the virtues of ecotourism, and calls for 'effective intervention'. The development of these forms of tourism does not address the fundamental development concern of mass unemployment in the region. The primarily lodge-based tourism activity evident is indicative of a high value, low volume approach, but also has limited opportunity for linkages with other sectors of the economy, especially SME

development. Rural tourism generally has limited opportunity for economic development, particularly as many local people lack capital and knowledge to start businesses (Sharpley, 2002). The forms of tourism present in the WBR reflect this and also an inability to access tourism markets.

Duffy (2006) questions whether luxury resorts have a place in ecotourism, especially those owned by large corporations, as is the case in the WBR. The up-market tourism product in the WBR would appear to have implications for SME development in the area, as one public sector tourism official notes:

> "…there is **this wall that separates** the market for the rich and the market for the lower class. At the same time it also **discourages local tourism**, so people from around here **lose a sense of what tourism is** and what is the benefit of participating in tourism and the necessity of desiring to establish a business that is tourism related." (PS5)

This is quite a negative discourse (negative words in bold). One of the main benefits of tourism is that as an industry it offers numerous opportunities for SME development, either selling products directly to tourists or providing other products and services to the industry. This is recognised by Evans & Cleverdon (2000), who also assert that it can be problematical for SMEs to grow in developing countries as locals have limited resources, and power often lies with elites who control the industry. With regards to this case study, the discourses support this view, but also from a Foucauldian perspective, show that knowledge and power go hand in hand. It is this knowledge of the industry that perpetuates the dominance of certain sectors of society, in this case those who are economically dominant. PS5 also states that local tourism is not encouraged or understood, inferring that the dominant up-market, lodge-based tourism *is* the tourism industry, and access to other forms is limited.

While it is recognised that tourism is an important industry for employment generation, one discourse which emerges relates to the lack of skills of many of the local workers. Related to this is the issue concerning the employment of people from outside the area, particularly from Zimbabwe, who are seen by the private sector (i.e. respondents BS1; BS2; AC2; AC7; AC9; AC10) as having the requisite skills for working in tourism. If private sector businesses are to be economically sustainable, skilled staff are required in all areas of the business. Nearly all respondents in the private sector declared that they have problems in recruiting sufficiently

trained employees and they have to invest considerable resources into training and development.

One of the discourses which emerges from the public sector officials is that they understand the importance of the tourism industry as an economic driver in the region. They also recognise that the industry in the region is predominantly created and driven by the private sector, and the public sector only has a minor role to play in its development as it is not seen as a government priority. The tourism planning literature advocates that particularly at local level, governments need to take the lead in tourism development, although it is also recognised that stakeholder engagement, community-based, bottom-up approaches and tourism can be integrated into broader SD plans (Murphy 1985; Inskeep 1991; Gunn 1994; Jamal & Getz 1995; Twining-Ward & Butler, 2002; Telfer & Sharpley, 2008). Within the WBR, there is a sense of frustration at the district level of government from the public sector officials that these initiatives do not occur, thereby creating a barrier towards a more sustainable industry (modal verbs in bold):

> "The municipality is **supposed to** drive this thing, but they don't. Tourism is very, very low in the municipality's priority list and that's basically where the funding **should** come from. If our roads aren't maintained, you **won't** reach your end destination, you **won't** be able to continue with sustainable development in the destination, if there is no water, it **won't** continue. There are very big challenges in this country especially to do with tourism, because it's not a priority. (PS4)

The modal verbs from PS4 emphasise what the district municipality should be doing as regards tourism. There is little involvement in the industry lower down the government hierarchy. The public sector officials recognise not only the developmental concerns over infrastructure, but also those related to tourism structures, how tourism is delivered and the problems in doing this. Hall & Jenkins (1995) assert that for destinations to develop in a sustainable way, adequate structures from the public sector need to be in place and within this case-study region, this is patently not the case.

6.2 The Tourism Product in the WBR
The type and level of tourism determines the scale and direction of tourism impacts, and hence sustainability. The tourism product in the WBR is based around consumptive and non-consumptive wildlife tourism and other nature-related activities such as horse-riding,

mountain biking and walking. The tourist type is predominantly a nature-based, or ecotourist, who wishes to make use of the natural environment for sightseeing, relaxation, hunting, game-viewing or other outdoor activities. They tend to stay in up-market lodges, mid-market lodges, timeshares or second homes. The tourists are either international, mainly from Europe or North America or domestic South African. While it is acknowledged that hunting is a controversial subject with numerous intertwined ethical, conservation and economic issues, a full discussion falls outside the scope of this paper. The reader is directed to the work of Novelli et al. (2006) who examine the ethical issues surrounding hunting, and Nelson et al. (2016) who discuss the link between conservation, ethics and hunting, post the 'Cecil the Lion' incident.

The tourism product is continually evolving and as new entrants come into the market this affects the type of tourism in the area. A move towards more up-market or exclusive products which focus more on the affluent international tourist has become evident. This up-market movement, combined with how private sector tourism stakeholders regard the area, has implications for STD in the WBR. For example, one public sector tourism official was very critical of the exclusive tourism product and the power of these up-market operators as they fundamentally change the nature of what is being offered. Moving up-market requires significant funding and this often comes from large corporations or wealthy individuals, often from overseas (PS4; AC5). Reflecting the tourism development literature on who often has power and control of the tourism industry, this exemplifies that it is big business and wealthy elites and to some extent this reaffirms notions of dependency (Britton, 1982). PS4 states that this type of tourism takes away the sense of place of the 'bush' and a false, man-made product is being developed by the private sector that attracts the mainly international tourist and the domestic tourist is being priced out of the market:

> "*So you see it as quite an exclusive destination?*
>
> Yes, there are a few places where the *ordinary man* can still go, but they are not that well advertised. So the Waterberg is becoming **exclusive**, it's the playground of the **rich people** and that's bad.
>
> *And who is responsible for that?*
>
> I think like your big places such Game Reserves 4 and 5. They've got investment, so they bring people from overseas to invest and that they expand. And immediately they've got golf estates. If you have a **golf estate it is exclusive**, the *ordinary man* will never get into. If you don't have a

pass to say that you are booked in there, it's very **difficult even just to go into**, for a coffee or for a Coke or something of a lunch or whatever and get out, so **it's become exclusive**. There are smaller places yes, but they are three star and they are planning to become four-star. And as soon as they go up a level they **put up their prices.**

And do you see that as sustainable?

No. Now it's just getting these people from places like Los Angeles or wherever and it attracts a certain type of tourist and basically that will be people from outside the country (...) **it's become artificial**, everything is becoming artificial. Its **reproduction of luxury** into the Waterberg which is taking away the atmosphere of the bush, of what the Waterberg is really about and has to offer." (PS4)

When analysing discourses, speakers use semantic strategies to achieve their communicative goals (van Dijk, 1985). For example, in the discourse above there is a semantic contrast expressed between subsequent propositions; in this case up-market tourism (in bold) and mid-market or lower end tourism (in italics). The semantic contrast operates as a rhetorical antithesis so as to make more effective (and therefore more defensible) the negative opinion about the alternative (ibid). Luxury tourism is seen by PS4 as the opposite of what she sees as the real 'bush experience' that the 'ordinary man' has, while in the Waterberg the private sector has the power to change the type of tourism being offered as there is no control over how tourism activity and accommodation is graded or classified in the region. As PS5 states:

"First everyone has a freedom to develop themselves to whatever level, everyone has the latitude of attracting sponsors without any interference from the government and that to me has resulted in the existence of these big, expensive facilities that we have around here." (PS5)

The above discourse represents a very hands-off, market-oriented, neoliberal approach to the private sector from the public sector, allowing them a considerable amount of leeway and power to develop their establishments as they see fit. One accommodation owner whose market is mainly international tourists from Europe and North America, states that an increasing number of these tourists are booking packages through tour operators in their country of residence (AC1). Another states that he is constantly having to upgrade his facilities to compete for visitors (AC8), while others state that it is becoming a very hard place to make money from tourism (AC9; AC10; AC11; AC12). This movement to a more

upmarket destination has implications for the sustainability of the industry. It places increasing pressure on the accommodation sector to upgrade their products and thus consume more resources. Upmarket establishments generally consume more resources, than do lower graded ones, particularly water (Birkin, 2003) and in an area where water is scarce, this has implications for the sustainability of these establishments and the region. Competition in the private sector in tourism can be intense and it can be a fickle industry with demand influenced by a number of external factors meaning that only the fittest and most adaptable survive.

The development of the tourism product has primarily focused on the activities related to the natural environment. However, cultural tourism has been marginal to this process. The WBR did receive funding from the European Union to develop Telekishi, a black community-based initiative in a remote part of the region. There is a recognition from the black respondents that they have lost much of their culture and it has become Westernised (CS8; PS3; PS5; LC1). The legacy of apartheid is never far from the surface.

> "Yes you are right they have lost their own culture. When I started thinking of initiating this [Telekishi], then it was coming to me that's why can't we go back to our own culture because I can see the vendors used to wear their own traditional clothes, the Zulus wear their own traditional clothes, but ourselves, the Pedi we don't wear other culture's clothes. Yes, they have lost their own culture, it is not completely lost, but they have deviated from that.
>
> *How does that make you feel?*
>
> I'm a little bit scared, I'm not feeling all right about that because if you don't know where you are coming from you won't know where you are going. That's why I have initiated this. I could have just gone for some motels or other fancy things but we blacks sometimes we think of culture it is something barbaric, primitive, whereas culture it is your roots and if you don't have your roots, then how can you get some flowers."

There is a semantic contrast in this discourse between the Zulu and the local Pedi culture. The inference being that the Zulus are more open and proud of their cultural roots, whereas the Pedi's culture has been diluted and is seen as unworthy of display. The view that the black population have of their own culture of being 'barbaric' or 'primitive' is a discourse that has

its roots in colonialist discourse. As Levett et al. (1997) indicate, it is a representation of institutionalised power relations in both pre- and post-apartheid South Africa.

This idea is developed by PS3, a black, senior manager in LEDET, who states that there has been a negative connotation from the black population in that cultural tourism is about performing a dance for white tourists at an upmarket white-owned lodge for some food and a small payment. He does recognise that cultural tourism does have value if it can be developed, controlled and managed by people from the local, black culture and the benefits accrue to the local population. He sees that culture is a part of the tourism product and that the local black population need educating regarding this and performing for tourists is not demeaning, but it is about cultural appreciation.

> "Look I wouldn't say, of course there has been a feeling that they only wanted to dance and get a few shillings, that has developed a bit of a negative attitude, but I wouldn't say that people are not willing to show their culture, it is more about understanding and exposure and massive beneficiation out of this. (PS3)

The tourism industry is perceived predominantly as a white controlled industry. The discourses centre on a racial divide in the industry whereby tourists and businesses dealing with tourists are seen as white, while the black population are seen as the workforce, PS3 continues:

> "The farm managers are white, the land owners are white, the tourists are white, **we** don't have the money to come and spend, the only money **we** get is to spend on food for children, so that's not mainly **our** field, it's been there always." (PS3)

The connotation in the discourse is that whites have economic control over the industry, that they have surplus money to spend on luxuries such as tourism, while the blacks can only satisfy their basic needs. The respondent's use of the personal and possessive pronouns 'we' and 'our' (in bold) relates to the black population, even though his personal circumstances are different from the majority of the black population. The fact that he states 'it's been there always' correlates with the historical and political contexts in this case study and highlight how power has been and is still in the hands of the whites, whether they be the consumers or the producers of the tourism product. This concurs with the findings of Briedenhann & Wickens (2004, p177): "Whilst integration has occurred in many other areas of South African

business and society, tourism remains predominantly a 'white man's thing'." There is a view from another black public sector tourism official that 'township tourism', generally recognised as organised trips to areas of urban poverty known as townships in South Africa (Steinbrink, 2012), could be developed:

> "There is a lot of significant history and beautiful stories about the development of this township, about a lot of things around that we would love to expose our visitors to, but we don't have enough capacity to draw them in ourselves."(PS5)

There is an inference in this discourse that help is needed. PS5 continues, stating that in order for the industry to really benefit the black population, SME development assistance is required. The mention of the township, its stories, development and history reflects a potential knowledge of 'township tourism' which has become popular across the country.

6.3 Appropriate and Inappropriate Development

The type of tourism in the region affects sustainability concerns in the WBR. Discourses around what constitutes appropriate/inappropriate tourist types, levels, activities and developments emerge, invoking notions of power and knowledge. Views on such subjects require knowledge about the land, the economy and how the tourism industry functions. Certain types of tourism considered inappropriate by some respondents involve golf course developments, large-scale resorts and certain tourist attractions such as the small-scale zoos in the area (BS5; AC3; AC8; AC9; AC10). All these types of tourism are not seen as either economically or environmentally beneficial to the area. Specifically, second homes are criticised by a number of respondents, with the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve Management Committee chair and a former Waterberg Nature Conservancy (WNC) chair summarising these views:

> "…we've seen a change in land use and from a conservationist's point of view that's not always positive. From an economic point of view, it imposes great challenges because **hardly any employment** has been created in this area and we estimate that about **40% of the leisure properties are without any economic driver** at all. We're talking about retirement homes or second homes." (CS6)

> "… we have a very high percentage of absentee landowners that just use this for their personal recreation over the weekends. They **contribute**

22

nothing to the area, their **land is not accessible for tourism**, it **stands in the way** of creating bigger blocks of land, they are **not part of the community**, they are **not interested in any kind of branding** of the Waterberg or promotion of the Waterberg, they are a real drag, they, by and large they **don't contribute to the schools, the churches, the sports clubs, the local economy**, they **contribute nothing to the local economy**, **they employ very few people, there's no economic activity taking place on their properties** and they are a **drag on the whole area.**" (AC8)

The language in bold in the above discourses frames the retirement/second home phenomenon in a particularly negative light. These concerns reflect the literature on second home developments. For example, Hoogendoorn at al. (2005) find that the tourism second home developments in South Africa do not offer a sufficient range or permanency of employment opportunities for the local poor populations and that these developments can have serious environmental impact if not appropriately planned. They also assert that they tend to be a reflection of the wider race-class issue in South Africa, with most second homes being owned by whites. While no empirical data is available, the second homes in the Waterberg are, according to a real estate agent interviewed, predominantly owned by whites (BS3).

The economic linkages between the tourism sector and other economic sectors are also limited for this market. AC9, an ecotourism lodge owner and local land owner, states that most weekender tourists buy almost everything in Gauteng, bring it with them, consume what they have bought, and return, spending very little in the local area. This also has implications for STD in the region as weak economic linkages do little for income and employment opportunities generating low multiplier levels, which as authors such as Dearden (2010) have previously shown, are often a cause for concern in peripheral areas. The real estate agent and a number of others expressed severe reservations about overdevelopment of second homes from both economic and environmental perspectives, with water being a specific problem (BS4; BS5, CS2; AC2; AC3; AC8; AC9; AC10; AC12; AC13).

6.4 Government Control of Tourism Development
A particular concern in this study is that nearly all the active stakeholders interviewed mentioned the lack of control over development within the WBR. Multiple reasons are cited

for the lack of control, including political will, corruption, and a lack of capacity and resources in government. The common discourse is summed up by AC3:

> "I think the critical thing is the political will and that's something we've really struggled with, because what we need is planning control and when we need it is now." (AC3)

There was a sense that landowners can effectively build what they want on their land with relatively little interference and developers can get around EIA issues through either a lack of enforcement from government or them hiring expensive lawyers and going through the courts:

> "We've seen any number of those where glib, short-termist highly mercenary property developers come in, buy up some land from a distressed farmer, that's how it tends to work, and then they parcel the land into small pieces, using smart lawyers to get around the poorly enforced legislation that's available, so they can sneak their divisions through quasi-legally. Government doesn't have the capacity to enforce the very good legislation and environmental protection – it has state-of-the-art legislation, but no enforceability and the developers know that and their agents and attorneys know that." (AC2)

This highlights power positions in development. The WNC and the WBR as civil society organizations have tried to fight these developments, but as AC2 and a number of other respondents state (CS6; AC8, AC12), whilst environmental legislation is generally very good in South Africa, it is the implementation of legislation at local level that is problematic, a finding also upheld in the earlier work of Wilhelm-Reichmann & Cowling (2013).

Concerns over the capacity and resources of government, particularly at district level, to deliver the requisite services required to aid development are a common theme across all stakeholder groups. In terms of capacity, the primary discourse surrounds the ability of officials to fulfill their responsibilities. This is due to a lack of skills from public sector employees regarding what the position demands (PS1; BS3; CS1, CS5) and a lack of resources. Another accommodation owner is highly critical of both the type of development and the planning process:

> "We're having pepper pot development all over the Waterberg. Game Reserve 3 was a classic example as it's right in the core area of the biosphere, and what they are doing there in terms of water is completely

unsustainable. Water consumption, traffic, they have 150 units on an area which is much too small for 150 units and there is legislation to control that at the moment. AC6 is pulling his hair out as the politician at the last minute just hasn't done it and he suspects that there is money changing hands between the developers and the politicians." (AC3)

The aspect of corruption in South Africa was highlighted by a number of respondents (BS3; AC3; AC5; AC8; AC10). It is seen as endemic when dealing with the public sector at all levels and particularly with regard to politicians. Politicians are also particularly criticized by public sector officials as focusing on the short-term and on interfering in the planning process:

"The main challenges are *political challenges*, because **as a planner** we will receive the application. For example if someone wants to develop something in the biosphere, and **as a planner** I object to something in the application and we don't want to have that type of developments in the biosphere, but because of *political influences*, but the president of some organisation says you must build these things, but **as a planner** we are not allowed to do that. So because of the *political influences* we are forced to do something that we are not allowed to do in terms of the plans." (PS2)

The above discourse from a planner who is responsible for determining the outcome of planning applications emphasizes his role (in bold) and also what affects his role (in italics). These sentiments are also echoed by other public sector officials who see politicians' self-interest as over-riding planners' decisions. Politicians need to be seen as being pro-development as this enables re-election (PS3; PS4). PS2 also articulates how the public sector has been very poor at enforcing planning law and developers have realized this and have either been able to use the courts, bribe politicians or just flout the law and develop without consent, knowing that there will be few or no consequences. Church (2004) argues that power structures shape tourism development and the broader economic and political concerns need to be taken into consideration, with corruption and power abuses being a part of this. The sentiments regarding planning are also expressed by a number of landowners who have seen developments being erected on neighbouring farms that have no planning consent (AC1; AC8; AC9; AC13). The public sector officials themselves recognize governmental limitations in terms of enforcement, with one being very critical of their ineffectiveness:

"As a planner we are trying to develop a strategy to control those

developments in the Waterberg. But not now, now we don't really control things." (PS2)

Biospheres do not have any legal authority regarding planning law in South Africa. While biosphere reserves do use zoning techniques, these are not embedded in planning law and therefore are open to interpretation. An environmental legal review including key national and provincial environmental legislation was carried out as part of the WBR's expansion plans in 2011. This included the Protected Areas Act 57 of 2003 which covers special nature reserves, national parks and protected environments. This legislation along with a host of others (see Contour & Associates (2011) for a complete list) affects planning and management of natural areas. Planners should adhere to the zoning characteristics as laid out by UNESCO – core, buffer and transition, however this has not occurred in practice. Planning matters are further complicated by the responsibilities of the various levels of government. PS3, who is a senior manager for LEDET at the provincial level, highlights these issues, stating that there is a lack of clarity in terms of who must do what at which level, causing planning inertia and poor decision-making resulting in opportunities for exploitation by developers. As Raymond & Brown (2007) argue, land use planning at local levels affects resident quality of life and tourism planning decisions need to be integrated into local land use planning and political decision-making bodies. This is patently problematic in the WBR and has serious implications for the sustainable development of not just the tourism industry, but the WBR as a whole.

There is also a perception that the result of lack of development control is essentially a type of free-for-all for the private sector in terms of what they can do to land. This has implications for the carrying capacity of the area, which as Telfer & Sharpley (2008) remind us, is one of the principles of STD. While a number of respondents mentioned carrying capacities (PS3; PS4; BS4; BS5; CS2; AC10), the general feeling was that tourism levels could still increase, although certain types of tourism needed controlling. This inevitably has implications for the type and level of tourism development, which determines the impacts of tourism (Mason, 2008).

7. Conclusion

The aim of this study was to analyse active stakeholder discourses of tourism development in the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve, South Africa, in order to better understand how the

principles of sustainable development (SD) might be most effectively put into practice more generally. We suggest that the paper makes multiple contributions to existing literature on the subject. First, the biosphere reserve in the Waterberg is a relatively new phenomenon, and research into this geographical area is limited. This paper adds to the body of knowledge on the region, particularly relating to how tourism is perceived by local stakeholders active in STD.

Facilitated by CDA, this paper demonstrates that using techniques such as stakeholder analysis helps to uncover not only *how* tourism development occurs, but also *why* it occurs in a particular way. CDA is a somewhat neglected methodological approach in studies that examine tourism as a strategy for SD. Through examining themes of context, knowledge, ideology and power inherent in CDA (Hjortso et al. 2005), we contend that this paper makes a second, methodologically-oriented contribution, in analysing both *what* people say and *why* they say what they say.

Our analysis suggests that seeking SD in biosphere reserves is problematical when there are distinct ideological differences between active stakeholder groups, and power relations are unequal. There is a distinct conservation ethos and a desire to see better 'top-down' planning control within the WBR to maintain the 'sense of place', which centres on the natural environment and communities. However, the analysis of the active stakeholder discourses also highlights a number of community related matters that include power, conflict and post-colonial perspectives. The theory on STD calls for more 'bottom-up' and 'community-based' approaches to development (Getz & Timur, 2005; Telfer & Sharpley, 2008; Hung Lee, 2013), and the paper makes a further contribution through examining those stakeholders who can affect sustainability concerns in various ways, and therefore have some power in tourism development. In so doing, it adds to the work of Waligo et al. (2013) who reviewed sustainable tourism from a multi-stakeholder perspective; however, in this study the focus is specifically upon *active* stakeholders, and their considerable influence over development outcomes. Moreover, there are policy implications at a broader spatial scale. For example, as tourism is one of South Africa's growth industries, how it is developed will have implications for the economy, society and the environment - the three pillars of SD (Goodland & Daly, 1996). Thus, there are implications for how tourism moves along a more sustainable pathway not only within the WBR, and SA, but also within other biosphere reserves and protected areas more generally.

Whether tourism can be an appropriate option for SD here, or indeed more generally, is debatable and, as Wheeller (2004) would argue, depends on which perspective is taken. SD and STD are value laden concepts and this study has shown that the discourses that relate to concepts such as development, tourism, SD, STD are underpinned by ideologies and involve notions relating to knowledge and power. The dominant economic-based neoliberal paradigm that is emphasized in the literature on development is also evident in the active stakeholder discourses studied. Sustaining tourism, neoliberal views of the environment, tourism's inability to generate significant employment, a private sector-led tourism industry, weak government and unequal power distribution are all critical SD concerns. The biosphere, with its associated problems has been a mechanism to push discourses of a version of SD. It is, however, one that has quite a weak and mildly reformist approach. As has been shown, discourses lead to material realities. Stakeholders have an emotional attachment to the area, particularly the natural environment and its various communities. While the evidence points to tourism being unable to fulfill many of the principles and objectives relating to SD/STD, it is still early days in the WBR and tourism is still in its infancy in the region. The discourses from the active stakeholders point to the numerous, difficult problems within the area, however as SD/STD are journeys (Kates & Clark, 1999), material realities, in this case the formation of the WBR has meant that the journey has been started, initiated with discourses around these concepts.

7.1 Limitations and Future Research

This study has focused intentionally upon the feedback of active stakeholders. The distinction between active and passive stakeholders is not clear cut, however, as stakeholders can have multiple roles (Heikkila & Gerlak, 2005). It may not be absolute, as some groups (e.g. certain local people) may be involved in natural resource management in both active and passive ways. Seeking the views of those less able to influence, yet still affected by, SD activities will provide an equally important dimension to the topic area. Furthermore, when examining any concern involving stakeholders, it needs to be recognized that the area of study is not static. For example, influences may change, stakeholder groups may gain more knowledge about a subject, have changing levels of interest and power structures may evolve. This means that the stakeholder analysis should be updated during the entire period of the issue being analysed in order to gain knowledge about the potential influence various stakeholders have

at different stages (Olander & Landin, 2005). SD is an ongoing process, and considerable work remains to be done in this area.

LEVEL OF INTEREST

	LOW	HIGH
LOW **POWER**	**A** **Minimal Effort**	**B** **Keep Informed**
HIGH	**C** **Keep Satisfied**	**D** **Key Players**

Figure 1: Stakeholder mapping: the power/interest matrix (Johnson and Scholes, 1993)

Table 1: Limpopo Province Census Data, 2011

- Population - 5.4 million
- Black African population - 5.2 million
- White population - 140,000
- Percentage under 40 years old - 70%
- Number with no formal schooling - 500,000
- Percentage age 20+ with no schooling – 17%
- Unemployment rate – 49%
- Percentage with no toilet – 7%
- Percentage using wood for heating – 40%

Source: (Statistics South Africa, 2012)

Table 2: Challenges facing Limpopo Province

- Economic – high unemployment, poverty, lack of opportunity, lack of sectoral communication, HIV infection rate of 22%
- Land-use – access, tenure, restitution, administration
- Infrastructure – a) Water – scarcity and provision, sanitation, service maintenance, losses; b) Waste – unlicensed landfill sites, illegal dumping, recycling; c) Electricity – capacity, ageing infrastructure, illegal connections; d) Roads and Transport – road degradation, upgrading, poor public transport
- Education and Training – poorly skilled labor force, training opportunities, low skill base.
- Biodiversity – habitat destruction, pollution, urban development, habitat management, alien species invasion.
- Tourism – white controlled, lack of SME opportunities, lack of community involvement in value chain.
- Regional and Local Government – capacity, skills, poor systems, debt, high staff turnover, staff commitment, poor monitoring and auditing procedures, lack of finance and financial management.

Source: (Limpopo Provincial Government, 2009)

Table 3 Sample of questions asked to interviewees

Line of Questioning	Sample Questions
Introductory Questions	Can you tell me a little bit about yourself and what you do here in the Waterberg? What does the Waterberg mean to you? What adjectives would you use to describe the Waterberg
Development and Sustainable Development	What do you see as the main development concerns in the area? What are the roles of government in addressing development concerns? Can these issues be addressed? How? When you hear those words sustainable development or sustainability, does this mean anything to you? Do you feel as though you participate in making this area more sustainable? What do you think about the distribution of resources in the area? What is your view of environmental conservation in the area? Are you optimistic for the future of the Waterberg?
Tourism Development	Do you see the type and levels of tourism as appropriate? Would you like to see more tourism here? Are there any other forms of tourism that you would or would not like to see here? Do local communities play a role in tourism development? Can tourism address the development concerns you identified earlier? There is a lot of unemployment in the area. Do you see tourism as an industry that can help to solve some of these problems? How do you see the role of the local government in tourism development?
Micro Context - WBR	Does the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve mean anything to you? What about the role of the local government, do you see them as having a role in this? Have you had any involvement with the biosphere? Why/why not?
Questions Relating to Stakeholders (Accommodation Provider)	How many people does your business employ and are they all local people? Do you have to do your own training? Is it difficult to find people who are sufficiently skilled? Has the training that you've given people allowed them to progress with you? Do you work with any community groups, NGOs? What about suppliers, do you use local ones? Do you do anything green or environmental? Has running a business here changed over the years? Has the recession affected you, do things go in cycles? Have guests changed over the years? Are you optimistic for the future of your business and of the Waterberg?

Source: Primary Data

Table 4: Stakeholders in the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve

Level of Involvement	Stakeholder Group or Organization	Sector
1. International	UNESCO European Union Wilderness Trust of Southern Africa	Not-for-profit/civil society (cs) Public Not-for-profit/cs
2. National	South African Government, particularly: - Department of Environment & Tourism - Department of Higher Education & Training - Department of Agriculture - Department of Water Affairs Land Claims Committee SanParks, National Parks Board Agricultural Union Transvaal Agricultural Union South African Universities (Particularly Universities of Venda and Pretoria) DBSA (Development Bank of Southern Africa)	Public Public Not-for-profit/cs Not-for-profit/cs Private
3. Regional	Polokwane Provincial Government - Department of Economic Development, Environment and Tourism (LEDET). Department of Agriculture Department of Education Limpopo Parks & Tourism Board	Public Public Public Public
4. Local	Waterberg Biosphere Reserve Management Committee Waterberg District Municipality Other Municipalities which have jurisdiction in the WBR - Thabazimbi, Modimolle, Mogalakwena & Lephalale local municipalities.	Not-for-profit/cs Public Public

	Marakele National Park	Public
	Moepel Farms	Not-for-profit/cs
	Clive Walker Foundation	Not-for-profit/cs
	The Matabane community	Not-for-profit/cs
	Lapalala Wilderness School	Not-for-profit/cs
	Waterberg Nature Conservancy (WNC)	Not-for-profit/cs
	Farmer representative bodies,	Not-for-profit/cs
	Bakenberg Tribal Authority,	Not-for-profit/cs
	Land Claims Committees	Not-for-profit/cs
	Lephalale CTA	Not-for-profit/cs
	Telekishi Community Tourism Project (TCTP)	Not-for-profit/cs
	The Waterberg Academy & other educational institutions	Not-for-profit/cs
	Traditional leaders	Not-for-profit/cs
	South African Police Service (SAPS – local representation)	Public
	Khutso Foundation (Environmental Consultancy)	Not-for-profit/cs
	Rural community representatives	Not-for-profit/cs
	Waterberg Institute of Sociology and Ecology & (WISE)	Not-for-profit/cs Not-for-profit/cs
	Waterberg Welfare Society (WWS)	Not-for-profit/cs
	Other NGOs/Charities (e.g. Komotsogo Crafts)	Not-for-profit/cs
	Business Community	Private
	Private Game Farms incorporated in the Biosphere	Private
	Educational Establishments	Public/Private

Source: Primary Data

References

Alvesson, M. (2002). Beyond neopositivists, romantics and localists: a reflexive approach to interviews in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(1), 13-33.

Andriotis, K. (2005). Community groups' perceptions of and preferences for tourism development: evidence from Crete, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research, 29*(1), 67-90.

Balaguer, J., & Cantavella-Jorda, M. (2002). Tourism as a long-run economic growth factor - the Spanish case, *Applied Economics, 34*(7), 877-884.

Barbier, E. (1987). The concept of sustainable economic development, *Environmental Conservation, 14*(02), 101-110.

Birkin, F. (2003). Ecological accounting: New tools for a sustainable culture, *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology, 10*(1), 49-61.

Bloor, M., & Bloor, T. (2007). *The practice of critical discourse analysis*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Bourdieu, P. (1983). The field of cultural production, or: the economic world reversed, *Poetics, 12*, 311-356.

Briedenhann, J., & Wickens, E. (2004). Rural tourism - meeting the challenges of the new South Africa, *International Journal of Tourism Research, 6*(3), 189-203.

Britton, S. (1982). The political economy of tourism in the Third World, *Annals of Tourism Research, 9*(3), 331-358.

Brugha, R., & Varvasovszky, Z. (2000). Stakeholder analysis: a review, *Health and Policy Planning, 15*(3), 239-246.

Bryson, J., Cunningham, G., & Lokkesmoe, J. (2002). What to do when stakeholders matter: the case of problem formulation for the African American men project of Hennepin County, Minnesota, *Public Administration Review, 62*(5), 568-584.

Bryson, J. (2003). What to do when stakeholders matter: a guide to stakeholder identification and analysis techniques. London School of Economics and Political Science.

Buckley, R. (2012). Sustainable tourism: research and reality, *Annals of Tourism Research, 39*(2), 528-546.

Byrd, E., Bosley, H., & Dronberger, M. (2009). Comparisons of stakeholder perceptions of tourism impacts in rural eastern North Carolina, *Tourism Management, 30*(3), 693-703.

Church, A. (2004). Local and regional tourism policy and power. In Lew, A., Hall, M., & Williams, A. (Eds.), *A companion to tourism* (pp. 555-568). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Clark, W., Munn, R., & Conway, G. (1987). Sustainable development of the biosphere, *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development, 29*(9), 25-27.

Clarkson, M. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance, *Academy of Management Review, 20*(1), 92-117.

Contour & Associates (2011) *Waterberg Biosphere Reserve – Situational Analysis Report*. Rustenberg, South Africa

Crush, J. (1995). *The power of development*. London: Routledge.

Daly, H., & Cobb, D. (1989). *For the common good: redirecting the economy toward community, the environment and a sustainable future.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Dearden, P. (2010). Dependency and development in Northern Thailand, *Annals of Tourism Research, 37*(4), 947-968.

Draper, M. (2000). Culture and nature in the Valley of a Thousand Hills-a tough guide to other spaces. *Transformation-Critical Perspectives on South Africa*, 44, 36-52.

Dritsakis, N. (2004). Tourism as a long-run economic growth factor: an empirical investigation for Greece using causality analysis, *Annals of Tourism Research, 10*(3), 305-316.

Duffy, R. (2006). The politics of ecotourism and the developing world. *Journal of Ecotourism, 5*(1), 1-6.

Dunham, L., Freeman, R., & Liedtka, J. (2006). Enhanced stakeholder practice: a particularized exploration of community, *Business Ethics Quarterly, 16*(1), 23-42.

Durberry, R. (2004). Tourism and economic growth: the case of Mauritius, *Tourism Economics, 10*(4), 389-401.

Evans, G., & Cleverdon, R. (2000). Fair trade in tourism – community development or marketing tool? In Richards, G., & Hall, D. (Eds.), *Tourism and sustainable community development* (pp. 137-153). London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Harlow: Pearson.

Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In van Dijk, T. (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-285). London: Sage.

Farmaki, A., Altinay, L., Botterill, D., & Hilke, S. (2015). Politics and sustainable tourism: The case of Cyprus. *Tourism Management, 47*(April), 178-190.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. London: Harvester Press.

Foucault, M. (1997). Utopias and heterotopias. In Leach, N.(Ed.), *Rethinking architecture: a reader in cultural theory* (pp.330-336). London, Routledge.

Friedman, A., & Miles, S. (2002). Developing stakeholder theory, *Journal of Management Studies, 39*(1), 1-21.

Gee, P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: a toolkit*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Getz, D. & Timur, S. (2005). Stakeholder involvement in sustainable tourism: balancing the voices. In Theobald, W.F. (Ed.), *Global Tourism* (pp. 230-247). London: Routledge.

Goodland, R., & Daly, H. (1996). Environmental sustainability: universal and non-negotiable, *Ecological Applications, 6*(4), 1002-1017.

Grimble, R., Chan, M., Aglionby, J., & Quan, J. (1995). *Trees and trade-offs: a stakeholder approach to natural resource management*. London: International Institute for Environment and Development.

Grimble, R., & Wellard, K. (1997). Stakeholder methodologies in natural resource management: A review of principles, contexts, experiences and opportunities, *Agricultural Systems, 55*(2), 173-193.

Gunn, C. (1994). *Tourism planning* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Taylor Francis.

Hall, C., & Jenkins, J. (1995). *Tourism and public policy*. London: Routledge.

Hardy, A. (2005). Using grounded theory to explore stakeholder perceptions of tourism, *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change, 3*(2), 108-133.

Haughton, G., & Hunter, C. (1994). *Sustainable cities, regional policy and development.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Heikkila, T., & Gerlak, A. (2005). The formation of large-scale collaborative resource management institutions: clarifying the roles of stakeholders, science, and institutions, *Policy Studies Journal, 33*(4), 583-612.

Hjortsø, C., Christensen, S., & Tarp, P. (2005). Rapid stakeholder and conflict assessment for natural resource management using cognitive mapping: the case of Damdoi forest enterprise, Vietnam, *Agriculture and Human Values, 22*, 149-167.

Holden, A. (2010). Exploring stakeholder perceptions of sustainable tourism development in the Annapurna conservation area: issues and challenges, *Tourism Planning and Development, 7*(4), 337-351.

Hoogendoorn, G., Mellett, R., & Visser, G. (2005). Second homes tourism in Africa: reflections on the South African experience, *Urban Forum, 16*(2), 112-154.

Howell, F.C. (2013). Sense of Place, Heterotopia, and Community: Performing Land and Folding Time in the Badalisc Festival of Northern Italy, *Folklore*, *124*(1),45-63.

Huckin, T. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. Miller (Ed.), *Functional approaches to written text* (pp. 79-92). Washington DC: US Department of State.

Hung Lee, T. (2013). Influence analysis of community resident support for sustainable tourism development. *Tourism Management, 34*(Feb), 37-46.

Inskeep, E. (1991). *Tourism planning: an integrated and sustainable development approach*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

International Institute for Environment and Development. (2005). *Stakeholder influence mapping*. London: IIED.

Jamal, T., & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration theory and community tourism planning, *Annals of Tourism Research, 22*(1), 186-204.

Johnson, G., & Scholes, K. (1993). *Exploring corporate strategy*. London: Prentice-Hall.

Johnson, G., Scholes, K., & Whittington, R. (2011). *Exploring corporate strategy* (9th ed.). London: Pearson.

Kates, R.W., & Clark, W.C. (1999). *Our Common Journey*. Washington D.C: National Academy Press/

Lankford, S. (1994). Attitudes and perceptions toward tourism and rural regional development, *Journal of Travel Research, 32*(2), 35-43.

Le Feuvre, M., Medway, D., Warnaby, G., Ward, K. & Goatman, A. (2016). Understanding stakeholder interactions in urban partnerships, *Cities, 52*, 55-65

LEDET. (Limpopo Department of Economic Development, Environment and Tourism) (2009). *Annual report 2008/2009*. http://www.ledet.gov.za/docs/reports/Annual%20Report%2008-09.pdf: Polokwane, South Africa: Limpopo Department of Economic Development, Environment and Tourism.

Lélé, S. (1991). Sustainable development: a critical review. *World Development, 19*(6), 607-621.

Levett, A., Kittler, R., Barman, G., & Parker, I. (Eds.). (1997). *Culture, power and difference: discourse analysis in South Africa*. London: Zed Books.

Limpopo Provincial Government. (2009). *15 year review report 1994-2009*. http://www.Limpopo.gov.za/pubs_docs/docs/15%20Year%20Review%20Report.pdf: Polokwane, South Africa: Limpopo Government.

Logan, J., & Molotch, H. (1987). *Urban fortunes: The political economy of place*. University of California Press: Berkley.

Marwick, M. (2000). Golf tourism development, stakeholders, differing discourses and alternative agendas: the case of Malta, *Tourism Management, 21*, 515-524.

Mason, P. (2008). *Tourism impacts planning and management*. London: Butterworth-Heinemann.

May, T. (2001). *Social research: issues, methods and process* (3rd ed.). Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Mebratu, D. (1998). Sustainability and sustainable development: historical and conceptual review, *Environmental Impact Assessment Review, 18*(6), 493-520.

Mendelow, A. (1991). Proceedings of the second international conference on information systems, Cambridge. Cambridge, MA.

Mitchell, R., Agle, B. & Wood, D. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: defining the principle of who and what really counts, *The Academy of Management Review, 22*(4), 853-886.

Mitchell, J., & Ashley, A. (2010). *Tourism and poverty reduction: pathways to prosperity*. London: Earthscan.

Moffatt, I. (1996). *Sustainable development: principles, analysis and policies.* London: CABI.

Murphy, P. (1985). *Tourism: a community approach*. London: Routledge.

Nelson, M.P., Bruskotter, J.T., Vucetich, J.A. & Chapron, G. (2016). Emotions and the ethics of consequence in conservation decisions: Lessons from Cecil the Lion. *Conservation Letters*.

Novelli, M., Barnes, J.I. & Humavindu, M. (2006). The other side of the ecotourism coin: consumptive tourism in Southern Africa, *Journal of Ecotourism*, *5*(1-2), 62-79.

Olander, S., & Landin, A. (2005). Evaluation of stakeholder influence in the implementation of construction project, *International Journal of Project Management, 23*(4), 321-328.

Palmer, J., Cooper, I., & van der Vorst, R. (1997). Mapping out fuzzy buzzwords—who sits where on sustainability and sustainable development, *Sustainable Development, 5*(1), 87-93.

Podnar, K. & Jancic, Z. (2006). Towards a categorization of stakeholder groups: An empirical verification of a three-level model, *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 12(4), 297-308.

Raymond, C., & Brown, G. (2007). A spatial method for assessing resident and visitor attitudes towards tourism growth and development, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 15*(5), 520-540.

Redclift, M. (1987). *Sustainable development: exploring the contradictions* (1st ed.). London: Methuen.

Redclift, M. (2005). Sustainable development (1987-2005): an oxymoron comes of age, *Sustainable Development, 13*(4), 212-227.

Reid, D. (1995). *Sustainable development: an introductory guide.* London: CABI.

Reid, D. G. (2003). *Tourism, globalization and development*. London: Pluto Press.

Richards, L. (1999). *Using NVivo in qualitative research.* California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Robinson, J. (2004). *Squaring the circle*? *Some thoughts* on the idea of sustainable development, *Ecological Economics, 48*(4), 369-384.

Sautter, E., & Leissen, B. (1999) Managing stakeholders: a tourism planning model, *Annals of Tourism Research, 26*(2), 312-328.

Savage, G.T., Nix, T.W., Whitehead, C.J., & Blair, J.D.(1991). Strategies for assessing and managing organisational stakeholders. *Academy of Management Executive,* 5(2), 51-75.

Sharpley, R. (2000). Tourism and sustainable development: exploring the theoretical divide, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 8*(1), 1-19.

Sharpley, R. (2002). Rural tourism and the challenge of tourism diversification: the case of Cyprus, *Tourism Management, 23*(3), 233-244.

Sharpley, R., & Telfer, D. (Ed.). (2002). *Tourism and development concepts and issues*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Spenceley, A. (Ed.). (2008). *Responsible tourism: critical issues for conservation and development*. London: Earthscan.

Stabler, M., Papatheodorou, A., & Sinclair, M. (2010). *The economics of tourism* (2nd ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.

Statistics South Africa (2012). *Census 2011.* Retrieved 7/12, 2013, from http://www.statssa.gov.za/Publications/P03014/P030142011.pdf

Steinbrink, M. (2012). 'We did the slum!' - Urban poverty tourism in historical perspective, *Tourism Geographies, 14*(2), 213-234.

Steiner, C. (2006). Tourism poverty reduction and the political economy: Egyptian perspectives on tourism's economic benefits in a semi-rentier state, *Tourism Hospitality Planning and Development, 3*(3), 161-177.

Stylidis, D., Belhassen, Y. & Shani, A. (2014). Three tales of a city: Stakeholders' images of Eliat as a tourism destination, *Journal of Travel Research, 54*(6), 702-716.

Taylor, W., Holt-Biddle, D., & Walker, C. (2003). *The Waterberg: the natural splendours and the people*. Cape Town, South Africa: Struik.

Telfer, D., & Sharpley, R. (2008). *Tourism and development in the developing world*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E. (2002). *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London: Sage.

Tosun, C. (2005). Stages in the emergence of a participatory tourism development approach in the developing world. *Geoforum, 36*(3), 333-352.

Twining-Ward, L., & Butler, R. (2002). Implementing STD on a small island: development and use of sustainable tourism development indicators in Samoa, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 10*(5), 363-387.

UNESCO. *(*United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation) (2008). *Madrid action plan for biosphere reserves (2008-2013).* Madrid, Spain: UNESCO.

UNESCO. *(*United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation) (2009). *UNESCO man and biosphere*. Retrieved 1/11, 2011, from http://portal.unesco.org/science/en/ev.phpURL_ID=6393&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html:

van Dijk, T. (1985). *Handbook of discourse analysis,* London: Academic Press.

van Dijk, T. (1988). *News as discourse*. Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.

van Dijk, T. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In Tannen, D., Schiffrin, D., & Hamilton, D. (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Oxford: Blackwell.

Vanegas, M., & Croes, R. (2003). Growth development and tourism in a small economy: evidence from Aruba, *International Journal of Tourism Research, 5*, 315-330.

Waligo, V.M. Clarke, J. & Hawkins, R. (2013). Implementing sustainable tourism: A multi-stakeholder involvement management framework. *Tourism Management, 36*(June), 432-353.

Wartenberg, T. (1990). *The forms of power: from domination to transformation.* Philadelphia, PE: Temple University Press.

Waterberg District Municipality. (2010). *IDP annual report 2010/2011*. Retrieved 5/23, 2013, from http://www.Waterberg.gov.za/docs/reports/FINAL%202010-11%20IDP%20DOCUMENT%2026%20MAY%202010x.pdf:

Waterberg Biosphere Reserve. (2013). *Waterberg biosphere reserve.* Retrieved 5/23, 2013, from http://www.Waterbergbiosphere.org/

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. New York: Free Press.

Weber, M. (1986). Domination by economic power and by authority. In Lukes, S. (Ed.), *Power* (pp. 124-165). New York: New York University Press.

Wheeler, D., & Sillanpaa, M. (1997). *The stakeholder corporation: A blueprint for maximizing stakeholder value.* London: FT Press.

Wheeller, B. (2004). The truth? The hole truth. Everything but the truth. Tourism and knowledge: a septic sceptic's perspective, *Current Issues in Tourism, 7*(6), 467-477.

Wilhelm-Rechmann, A., & Cowling, R. (2013). Local land-use planning and the role of conservation: an example analysing opportunities, *South African Journal of Science, 109*(3), 1-6. .

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 1-33). London: SAGE.

Woods, N. (2003). *The United States and the international financial institutions* In Foot, R., MacFarlane, N., & Mastanduno, M. (Eds.), *US hegemony and international organizations* (pp. 92-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wright, E.A., (2005). Rhetorical spaces in memorial places: The cemetery as a rhetorical memory place/space, *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, *35*(4), 51-81.