Tourism, Wellbeing and Cultural Ecosystem Services:
A Case Study of Őrség National Park, Hungary

Melanie Kay Smith and Bernadett Csurgó

Introduction

This chapter will focus on the relationship between tourism, wellbeing and protected areas using a Cultural Ecosystem Services framework. Within the context of ecosystem services research, cultural ecosystem services (hereafter CES) have been relatively under-researched, partly because of the complexity of measuring intangible benefits and values (Chan et al., 2012; Milcu et al. 2013; Leyshon, 2014; Andersson et al., 2015). This is especially true of spirituality, aesthetics, inspiration and sense of place. Although it has been noted that more research has been undertaken on recreation and tourism in the context of CES (Plieninger et al., 2013; Hernández-Morcillo, Plieninger and Bieling, 2013), there are still relatively few studies. Romagosa et al. (2015) also note the gap in the literature about health and wellbeing benefits in the context of protected areas compared to urban and suburban parks. This chapter therefore aims to explore the relationship between tourism, wellbeing and CES in the context of protected areas, especially national parks. A case study will be provided of the Hungarian national park Őrség, a protected area which attracts domestic and increasingly international tourists. The main aim of the case study was to demonstrate how a CES framework can be applied to a protected landscape providing new insights into local and tourism planning priorities.

The Wellbeing Benefits of Landscapes and National Parks

The IUCN (2008) describes a protected area as **"**a clearly defined geographical space, recognised, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values". This can include national parks, wilderness areas, community conserved areas, nature reserves and so on. As stated by de Vos et al. (2016) protected areas are increasingly expected to justify their existence through the services that they provide to society, which includes cultural services and non-material benefits. Mellon and Bramwell (2016) suggest that although the original goal of protected areas was conservation, many managers may be broadening their policy and management goals. They note that one of these policy areas might include residents' socio-economic wellbeing, as well as sustainable tourism. Ideally, tourism could contribute to socio-economic wellbeing through rural regeneration or reducing dependency on farming, as will be seen later in our case study of Őrség. Ray (1998) also states that landscape systems and their associated flora and fauna are an important local resource which can be seen as key to improving the social and economic wellbeing of local rural areas.

Xu and Fox (2014) describe national parks as important places for experiencing nature, noting that their designation is usually connected to aesthetics, conservation, recreation or tourism. However, common tensions exist between the conservation and recreation or tourism

functions of national parks. Their research shows that those people who view nature in an 'anthropocentric' way will give greater priority to tourism development, whereas those who are more 'ecocentric' will give primacy to the natural environment. Some of these perceptions or approaches may be culturally embedded, for example, Tenberg et al. (2012) distinguish between Anglophone interpretations of landscape which are based more on visual features of landscape and Nordic concepts of landscape which include interactions between people and place.

In terms of the benefits of landscapes, national parks and other protected areas for tourists, several studies have focused on happiness, health and wellbeing. Frash et al. (2016) study the relationship between happiness and visiting parks and their research suggested that diversity of park activities was more important than the length of time spent there, but no one activity (e.g. fitness) made people happier than another. Just being in the park seemed to engender greater happiness. Interestingly, women reported higher happiness levels than men.

Romagosa et al. (2015) talk about 'ecosystem health' and the health benefits of environmental protection, such as the creation of parks and protected areas. Indeed, the authors suggest that the wellbeing benefits of protected areas can be greater because of the higher degree of biodiversity, good provision of infrastructure and services. Parks and protected areas not only contribute to the conservation of biodiversity, they also provide an attractive setting for creating wellbeing for human populations and promoting health. Direct health benefits include acting as locations for physical exercise and therapeutic activities which improve mental health. Maller et al. (2008) summarized the benefits of parks and protected areas for human health and wellbeing, which included the following:

- Physical: settings for recreation, sport and other leisure activities
- Mental: restoration from fatigue, peace and solitude, artistic inspiration and education
- Spiritual: reflection and contemplation, feeling a sense of place, connecting to something greater than oneself
- Social: including couples, families, networks and associations' recreational activities and events
- Environmental: preservations and conservation of ecosystems

Abraham et al. (2010) similarly summarise the wellbeing benefits of landscapes or outdoor environments in their scoping study as follows:

- Mental wellbeing: nature as restorative
- Physical wellbeing: walkable landscape
- Social wellbeing: landscape as bonding structure

In their research on national parks, Wolf et al. (2015) list many of the possible benefits which include physical fitness, re-engagement with nature, mental restoration, and numerous other

wellbeing benefits. They also question how national park managers can know which are the most beneficial activities for visitors and how best to provide them. Xu and Fox (2014) suggest that many park managers throughout the world are under increasing pressure to provide more facilities and different activities to satisfy visitor needs. Wolf et al. (2015) discuss how guided tours can be one way of helping visitors to gain access to pristine areas. Indrawan et al. (2014) also show how tours of national parks in Australia can be an effective tool for landscape management with political and financial advantages for park managers.

Little (2015) argues that providing manifold opportunities for people to engage with their natural surroundings is one effective strategy for fostering human wellbeing. One way of encouraging greater engagement with national parks is to increase place attachment in order to create a sense of community identity and to encourage environmental stewardship and repeat visitation. Wolf et al. (2015) describe how the conditions for place attachment are usually specific to the place and the community. The cultural traditions or heritage of the place may be an important part of this. Teuscher et al. (2015) suggest that sense of place contributes towards shaping peoples' beliefs, values and commitments, but Schmidt et al. (2016) argue that place attachment and place identity have significant effects on attitudes to conservation whereas the overall construct of sense of place does not. Ganglmair-Wooliscroft and Wooliscroft (2014) analyse place identity and emotional attachment to place, including its symbolic importance. They discuss how national parks can form part of the identity of certain nationalities, for example New Zealanders, as national parks cover almost one third of the country. Their research on domestic tourists showed that the most important aspect of national park visitation was firstly the contribution to physical health followed by learning new things. Indrawan et al. (2014) describe how visitors to Australian national parks who developed strong ties with community members experienced significant improvements in wellbeing, health and other positive impacts on their lives beyond the visit.

Another wellbeing element that emerged from Wolf et al.'s (2015) research in national parks was inspiration. Later in the paper, Cultural Ecosystem Services (CES) are discussed as something of an 'umbrella' concept to research the various benefits of landscapes and national parks, and sense of place (including place attachment), cultural heritage and inspiration are three of the main categories within this concept. Another main category is recreation and (eco)tourism. Lee et al. (2014) describe how national parks and natural areas are important recreational and tourism resources, especially because of their aesthetic recreational benefits. Aesthetics is a further main category within CES, and some authors have argued that aesthetics is the most valued ecosystem service (e.g. Tengberg et al., 2012; Plieninger et al., 2013; Sagie et al., 2013; Soy-Massoni et al., 2016; Zoderer et al., 2016). Lee et al.'s (2014) Customer Wellbeing Index employed in the context of national parks suggests that needs can be grouped accordingly:

- High-order needs include the need for self-actualization, esteem, knowledge, and beauty or aesthetics.

- Low-order needs include physiological, economic, and social.

Their research on natural wildlife parks also included the example of increasing knowledge or education (another main CES category). Spiritual experiences (another CES) were also rated relatively highly, perhaps surprisingly, higher than relaxation or socialising. They conclude that if higher order wellbeing needs are met, tourists are more likely to stay longer, visit more often and spend more.

It could be concluded from some of the previous research that has been undertaken on the benefits of visiting protected areas like landscapes and national parks that the main elements that emerge correspond closely to the CES categories that were defined by the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005). This potentially useful framework for capturing the multiple (wellbeing) benefits of being in a protected area is discussed in the following section.

Landscapes, Wellbeing and Cultural Ecosystem Services

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005) stated that cultural services and values were not recognised enough in landscape planning and management. They subsequently went on to develop the Cultural Ecosystem Services or CES framework. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA, 2005) describes CES as "The non-material benefits people obtain from ecosystems through spiritual enrichment, cognitive development, reflection and aesthetic experiences". Table 1 shows the main elements of CES according to MEA (2005).

Table 1: Main Elements of Cultural Ecosystem Services

- Spiritual and religious: many societies attach spiritual and religious values to ecosystems or their components
- Recreation and ecotourism: people often choose where to spend their leisure time based in part on the characteristics of the natural or cultivated landscape in a particular area
- Aesthetic: individuals find aesthetic value in various aspects of ecosystems, as reflected in support for parks, scenic drives, and selection of housing locations
- Inspirational: ecosystems provide a rich source of inspiration for art, folklore, national symbols, architecture and advertising
- Sense of place: ecosystems as a central pillar of "sense of place", a concept often used in relation to those characteristics that make a place special or unique as well as to those that foster a sense of authentic human attachment and belonging
- Cultural heritage: many societies place high value on the maintenance of either historically important landscapes ("cultural landscapes") or culturally significant

> species. The diversity of ecosystems is one factor contributing to the diversity of cultures
> - Educational: ecosystems and their components and processes provide the basis for both formal and informal education in many societies. In addition, ecosystems may influence the types of knowledge systems developed by different cultures.

The difficulties of researching CES have been noted by several authors (Chan et al., 2012; Milcu et al. 2013; Leyshon, 2014; Andersson et al., 2015), and one of the greatest challenges has been to explain or articulate clearly what CES means (Gould et al. 2014; Riechers et al., 2015). Several recent studies have focused on the relationship between CES and wellbeing (e.g. Aretano et al., 2013; Wu, 2013; Vallés-Planells et al., 2014; Riechers et al., 2016; Blicharska et al., 2017). Pleasant et al. (2014) undertook research on ecosystems and human wellbeing and concluded that CES were the only ecosystem service category which was linked to all four categories of human wellbeing as provided by the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA, 2005) framework. These were health, good social relations, security and basic material for a good life. Nevertheless, it has been stated by some authors that CES have been relatively under-researched in the context of landscapes (Norton et al., 2012; Riechers et al., 2016), despite the fact that Musacchio (2013) and Plieninger et al. (2015) argued that a better understanding of the dynamics of Cultural Ecosystem Services (CES) can inform landscape planning.

One exception to the lack of research is Vallés-Planells et al. (2014) whose research suggested that CES can contribute to wellbeing in the context of landscapes in terms of enjoyment through recreation and aesthetics, personal fulfilment through education, inspiration or spiritual benefits, social benefits through heritage or sense of place, and last but not least, health, especially through the sense of escapism and calm. In their study of protected marine ecosystems and CES, Bryce et al. (2015) identified the following cultural wellbeing benefits: engagement and interaction with nature, place identity, therapeutic value, social bonding, spiritual value, and memory/transformative value. In relation to conservation and communities, Ranger et al. (2016) describe some of the key emerging themes in the cultural ecosystem services literature as the importance of interpretation, relational values, identities and interventions related to peoples' connection to place. In terms of tourism research, Maciejewski et al. (2015) describe nature-based tourism as a cultural ecosystem service which can provide a key source of income to protected areas and helps to facilitate a sustainable solution to conservation. Willis (2015) suggests that in the context of tourism, understanding CES better can help to maximise opportunities for sustainable engagements with nature and lead to a better understanding of 'non-material benefits of nature' in relation to tourist motivations, expectations, behaviours and levels of satisfaction.

Daniel et al (2012) and Schirpke et al. (2016) noted the importance of human perceptions in the context of CES and landscapes. However, Van Zanten et al. (2015) state that very few comparative landscape preference studies have been undertaken. A few recent studies have emerged (e.g. Schirpke et al., 2016; Zoderer et al., 2016), but most of these examine only one

type of landscape and often only one or two categories of CES. One exception is the CES questionnaire discussed by Ram and Smith (2016) which was distributed in six different types of landscape in eight countries. Plieninger et al.'s (2013) meta-analysis of 42 CES papers showed that most papers focused on recreation and ecotourism services (54%) followed by aesthetic (14%) and educational (9%) dimensions. Hernández-Morcillo et al. (2013) reviewed 42 papers and also suggested that recreation and ecotourism is the most researched CES category, while inspiration was the least investigated. It is perhaps inevitable that researchers only focus on one or two categories of CES, because as suggested by Tratalos et el. (2015) CES are so rich and multifaceted that any set of indicators is likely to measure only some of the range of services provided. Nevertheless, more integrated research would be useful, as Gould et al.'s research (2014) showed that CES values as heavily intertwined.

The following case study considers all dimensions of CES and focuses on eliciting stakeholder perceptions in the context of a national park landscape. Musacchio (2013) and Plieninger et al. (2015) argued that a CES approach identifies social values that stakeholders attach to landscapes which may not be captured otherwise. The research follows Pleasant et al. (2014) and Raymond (2014) who advocate using stakeholder participation methods that focus on value elicitation and social representation. It seems that quantitative methods have been more commonly used in ecosystem services research, but that there is a growing realization that qualitative data collection methods may be more suitable for CES (Pleasant et al, 2014; Winthrop, 2014; Scholte, 2015). This approach follows the logic that is not always possible to measure quantitatively what really matters to people (Milcu et al., 2013).

Case Study of Őrség in Hungary

A strong connection between CES, tourism and protected areas emerged from a broader research study undertaken in Őrség national park between 2014 and 2016 which aimed to investigate interactions between rural cultural heritage, rural re-structuring and sustainable development. Őrség was selected as a case study because of its rich natural and cultural heritage, as well as its protected area status which provides a special framework for heritage-based tourism. Qualitative sociological and anthropological methods were used to collect data, with the main method being semi-structured interviews. There were altogether forty interviewees including National Park employees, local government employees, members of local civic organizations, local artisans and those involved in tourism. The focus of the interview questions was mainly on natural and cultural heritage, for example, the relationship between heritage and rural identities, the benefits for communities from natural and cultural heritage, and the motivations and drivers behind local involvement in heritage-based activities (e.g. tourism). The interviews were analysed using thematic content and discourse analysis using Atlas.ti software. A grounded theory approach was applied (Charmaz, 2014) which is commonly associated with and supported by the Atlas.ti programme (Muhr, 1991). After studying the interview texts, coding and comparing them, it was clear that a significant number of themes had emerged which mirrored many of the CES categories as defined by the MEA (2005). This reinforced the notion that a CES framework is an appropriate and useful one when analyzing rural landscapes. Thus, the CES framework was used for further analysis and

interpretation of the data, especially for establishing preferences and priorities, and for studying inter-relationships between categories. A grounded theory approach is limited in the sense that it does not give equal attention to all CES categories, only those that emerge strongly. Secondly, interviewees were not asked specifically about all categories of CES from the outset – mainly cultural heritage. However, previous CES research has noted the difficulties of articulating CES in research (Gould et al., 2014) with many respondents being unfamiliar with the term(s) (Riechers et al., 2016).

Őrség is one of ten national parks in Hungary, which cover around 10% of its territory. It is located in the territory of the historical Őrség region, which is situated in the western part of Hungary in the southwest part of Vas and Zala counties. The territory of Őrség National Park consists of 44 settlements and its area extends 44,000 square kilometres. Its western border location resulted in special status for the region with a higher degree of control and a lower degree of development during the socialist era. As a result of this disadvantaged status, the Őrség region has kept its traditional landscapes and settlement structure, including the shape of the houses and untouched nature. Thus, Őrség National Park is rich not only in natural beauty but also folklore and cultural history.

Babai et al. (2015) describe how landscapes in Central and Eastern Europe have changed significantly in the past few decades. After 1989, many regions became far less isolated and it became easier to find jobs in urban areas. As a result, rural areas were radically transformed, traditional land-use patterns and management methods changed, and in some cases, farming was abandoned altogether and social institutions disintegrated. The Landscape Protection Area in Őrség was established in 1978 and an Act and law on the protection of nature came into force in 1982. Őrség National Park was established in 2002 and Nature 2000 regulations were adopted in 2004. Following this, conservation measures became more frequent in the area and agri-environmental subsidies became available. However, such areas struggle to retain their young people. The future of farming in cultural landscapes will need to focus on activities that generate revenue, otherwise younger generations in peripheral regions like this one are less likely to carry on the cultural patterns (Babai et al. 2015).

In Hungary, ecotourism is strongly connected to National Parks (Magyar and Sulyok, 2014). In this context, ecotourism can be seen as one relationship between tourism and protected areas which may have an impact on rural development where the main focus is on providing local people with benefits from the protected area (Campbell. 1999). Several types of ecotourism services such as study trails, visitor centres and forest schools were developed in National Parks in the last few decades. The number of visitors in National Parks shows that protected areas are popular tourism destinations for domestic tourists and their most popular tourism services are events, visitor centres and study trails. Data from the Hungarian Agricultural Ministry from 2013 (analysed by Magyar and Sulyok, 2014) shows that there were 51,648 visitors in Őrség National Park in 2013. The most popular services were events and organised tours and their most popular sites are Pityerszer built heritage site which received 23,748 visitors in 2013 and

Harmatfű Nature protection Education Center with 8,831 visitors in 2013 (Magyar and Sulyok, 2014).

From the late 1980s onwards and most significantly after the change of the political system from 1990, Őrség became one of the main tourism destinations for the middle classes (mostly from Budapest) demanding a 'rural idyll' (Bunce, 2003; Short, 2006). Urban inhabitants bought second homes in the Őrség region and many of them stay there from spring to autumn or settled down permanently. They were the pioneers and initiators of new tourism activities. In the first period, their main service was accommodation in a rustic, rural milieu. The Őrség has been regarded as an idyllic rural landscape ever since that time. Since the Őrség National Park was established in 2002, in addition to nature protection, it has become one of the main actors for (especially sustainable and eco) tourism activities and local cultural heritage is particularly important.

As the manager of National Park said:

> I'm talking about a kind of ecological awareness which concerns local people regardless of their generation, and it also means tourism-related ecological awareness, which concerns visitors and tourists. We have to show and teach people how to behave in such a protected area. So this is why we are actively participating in tourism. We provide pocket programs for tourists which are focused on ecological issues as well as local communities' traditions.

The focus on local residents as well as visitors suggest that Őrség National Park is following the 'anthropocentric' conservation method (Xu and Fox, 2014), as the protected area is regarded as a space where humans and nature co-exist. The unique landscape was shaped by human cultivation and protection of built heritage and local rural traditions are a priority. The National Park's tourism policy aims to decrease tensions between socio-economic development and ecological conservation. Local tourism actors can benefit from the protected area at the same time as respecting environmental protection and sustainability. Most of the protected sites are open for visitors and the natural and cultural heritage is presented in the form of tourist trails and visitor centres. In terms of the natural attractions, one manager of the National Park Agency described how:

> *There are several bogs/marsh meadows here with highly protected sphagnum moss, which are ex lege [by law] protected natural areas, which means they could not be visited. However, in Szőce, we managed to develop one of them for visitors and create a tourist route via a footbridge over the bog/marsh meadow. So it can be visited all the time, even if it is wet, and information tables are placed alongside the route to provide information on the bog/marsh meadow and related protected natural attractions.*

Community development is also emphasized strongly by the National Park Agency, and they aim to provide benefits for locals from tourism in the protected area. For example, they created a so-called special guest coordination system, which means they guide the visitors in the area

through their programs and services and present the local and cultural heritage in an ecologically sustainable way. Their activities are regarded as a driver of local tourism development both by primary and secondary local tourism actors. One guest house owner said:

> … it's great that they organize events, it would be better if they could do even more. It is very important and good for us, because most of the visitors want events and special programs, and the National Park has the capacity to provide them….

As the main organizer of local tourism events and services, the National Park Agency involves local tourism entrepreneurs as well as local communities in their sustainable tourism activities and shares their principles through them. There are several regulations because of the protected area, but the National Park Agency does not control and regulate local entrepreneurs and inhabitants directly. Instead, they involve them in their activities and share the benefits from the protected area including tourism services. One NPA manager explained his approach:

> … in most national parks and other protected areas, park rangers guard the area and if somebody touches or takes a protected flower it is sanctioned immediately. I had a different idea, I think it was in 2006 or 2007 when the spring snowdrops were blooming - I suggested to my colleagues to try a different method which might be more effective than to employ more and more rangers in two shifts. A "Night shift is not needed" - I said - "I only need two good people during the daytime who invite locals for a walk and introduce the natural treasures to them"…. Since that time many people have been queueing up to join these walks, and they are not only locals. They walk with the rangers and learn how to protect the natural heritage. It is a very new and different approach but it is more effective.

The National Park Agency organizes tourist routes to present protected areas and also the cultural heritage of the region. These are so-called study trails which are walking tours including walking and hiking activities and information tables and stop-off points are placed alongside the routes. The Yellow Lily Study Train on the Tourinform webpage[1] describes how:

> The walking tour departs from Velemér and follows a 6.2 kilometre path to Magyarszombatfa. Along the way, there are ample opportunities to observe the natural and cultural assets of the Belső-Őrség, an area which is relatively unknown and not yet popular with tourists. The study trail and information provided at each stop-off point are designed to enable visitors to discover local nature, architecture, landscape and cultural history without disturbing sensitive areas.

These routes are situated in different parts of the protected area and most of them are 2-3 hour round tours. Natural beauty, protected fauna as well as cultural heritage are emphasized in the descriptions of the tours. Tours are also presented as family-friendly programs. Emphasis is placed more on recreation and experiences rather than physical activities such as walking,

---

[1] http://tourinform.hu/orsegi-national-park

hiking and fitness. It is important to state that the special and unique characteristics of the landscape with its protected area status are strongly emphasized in each brochure and information materials of the Őrség region. Landscape appreciation is also encouraged through the tours.

Education plays a central role in the NP's goals and activities, including both latent and manifest forms of education. Study trails and different forms of local involvement exist in the latent forms, while there are several manifest education programs too, such as Forest schools for local and non-local pupils and courses for local schools. Thematic courses and workshops are held by NPA employees in local schools. The knowledge transfer for local community is strongly emphasised by NPA. One NPA employee stated that:

> When my colleagues or I go to the local kindergarten or school to hold a workshop or course and we see the children's eyes light up, we think this is a really positive outcome. Of course, we organize forest schools for non-locals too, for urban pupils, but for locals we provide several services for free, because they are really important for us, so it should not be a question of money…

The National Park plays a central role in regional and local development and the National Park Agency (NPA) involves local governments, local civic associations and entrepreneurs in its projects. An NPA employee stated that "Project successes mean that the local community believes in the cooperation and the values of the region. It can strengthen the local identity too." Place attachment and place identity are emphasised strongly in NPA narratives. All of the interviewees from the NPA highlighted the importance of uniqueness of place in the success of their tourism development as well as other developments such as community development and identity building. The special character of the landscape, protected natural beauty and local cultural heritage are the main elements of the image of the place, and the NPA develops and promotes this image in its tourism activities. This image is also reinforced by the mainly middle or upper class newcomers to the area who arrived from urban areas (mostly Budapest) who yearned for a kind of 'rural idyll'. Many of them settled in the area, although sometimes only temporally from spring to autumn, and started different kinds of tourism businesses such as restaurants, guesthouses, program organization, etc.

Place attachment is also fostered by local product development, and NPA supports high quality and traditionally produced goods and services. A special National Park product label to reflect the Őrség National Park brand was created to support and protect local products. This label symbolizes quality, aesthetics and authenticity. Most of the labeled/branded products are food items, but guest houses and artisan activities such as pottery-making can also acquire this label. The label represents the involvement of local producers and protects their interests, but also provides a value-enhanced brand which can be used in tourism.

NPA also plays a central role in cultural heritage protection. Landscape protection including natural and cultural heritage are at the centre of its narratives. Community protection and

wellbeing are also strongly emphasized. Cultural heritage and local tradition are strongly connected to the place in both senses, including the entire Őrség region as well as specific places/villages. An NPA employee stated that:

> *… thus the tourism here is not merely a form of national park tourism which presents only protected plants and animals. People and community are also part of the landscape protection here. This landscape is created by the men who cultivated the land and use the region in a particular and unique way. Thanks to their activities we have this landscape with fields, with forest and with fruit tree gardens as well as the flora and fauna (...)This is why we want to focus on local community too.*

The National Park Agency does not only focus on the image of the region for tourists, but also tries to develop and strengthen the internal image and identity for local communities, local entrepreneurs and governmental bodies. Increasing the confidence of local people in their own values and capacity and valorizing local resources are at the center of the NPA's development strategies. The NPA supports the establishment of local historical collections and memory sites as a part of local heritage protection. Local and regional socio-economic wellbeing is based both on the cultural heritage and protected natural area.

Discussion and Conclusion

The use of a CES framework seems appropriate in the context of Őrség National Park which is clearly managed in an 'anthropocentric' way (Xu and Fox, 2014), and cultural heritage is valued just as much as the natural environment. Indeed, the two are inextricably connected in the strong sense of place and place attachment. The following table summarises the ways in which a CES framework can be applied in the context of Őrség National Park.

Table 2: A CES Framework Summary of Őrség National Park

CES Category	Related activities	Comments
Sense of place	• Place attachment and place identity are emphasised strongly in NPA narratives • Promotion of a unique landscape based on natural beauty and cultural heritage	Strong emphasis on local place attachment and identity including both external and internal image Newcomer residents' search for and reinforce a sense of place based on a 'rural idyll'
Educational	• Latent forms of education such as study trails and guided walks, as well as pocket programs focused on ecology and local cultural traditions • Manifest forms of education	Emphasis is placed on free local education

	such as Forest schools, courses and workshops for local school children and residents	
Recreation/tourism	• Focus on sustainable and ecotourism • Tourist routes and trails • Visitor centres • Information and education programs	More emphasis on education, appreciation and aesthetics than physical exercise or fitness
Cultural heritage	• Protection of built heritage and local rural traditions are a priority for the NPA • Development of a food and crafts label to guarantee quality aesthetics and authenticity	Strong connection between cultural heritage, tourism, place attachment and environmental protection
Aesthetic	• Natural beauty • Traditional shape of houses • Local crafts	Label and branding system for local products used to strengthen aesthetics and authenticity
Inspirational	• Connected to the 'rural idyll' • Aesthetics of the unique, cultivated landscape • Cultural heritage including arts and crafts	The landscape inspired residents to move from urban environments and establish tourism businesses
Spiritual/religious	• Not explicitly stated beyond the (spiritual) values associated with natural landscape and cultural heritage	Environmental stewardship has emerged from the strong emotional place attachment here, which may be partly spiritual as well as cultural

The case study confirms Mellon and Bramwell's (2016) findings on the broadening management goals of protected areas that include residents' socio-economic wellbeing and the contribution of tourism to rural regeneration. The local sense of wellbeing (including that of newcomer residents and visitors) is closely connected to social, mental and spiritual dimensions of wellbeing, perhaps even more than physical and environmental ones. This is reflected in the emphasis on aesthetics, appreciation and education rather than exercise or fitness on the part of the NPA. However, environmental and ecological protection are still paramount, which is clear from the educational and tourism policies. Aesthetics of landscape is also an important element in the desire to conserve it, and this includes the traditional settlement structure and houses. Cultural heritage is a central focus of the NPA, including the food items produced using traditional methods which are mostly organic and are labelled to ensure quality and maximise health benefits. Aesthetics and authenticity of crafts production are also enhanced by this labelling system.

The wellbeing dimensions listed by Maller et al. (2008) as benefits of protected areas are very similar to what the Őrség NPA summarized as characteristics and attractions of the Őrség landscape. This includes physical dimensions such as recreation and leisure activities in nature, mental dimensions including peace, tranquility and relaxation. Spiritual dimensions relate mainly to the sense of place, and the social dimension is inherent in the strong bond between local residents and their positive interaction with both newcomers and tourists. This is fostered by the careful cultivation of place attachment and identity (confirming the findings of Wolf et al., 2015 and Ganglmair-Wooliscroft and Wooliscroft, 2014) and internal and external image creation.

In terms of the practical implications of using a CES framework for understanding and managing protected areas better, it seems that such research can help to provide a clearer picture of local and tourist priorities and the inter-relationships between these priorities. The findings support the work of Gould et al. (2014) that CES are closely inter-connected and cannot easily be studied in isolation. For example, in the case of Őrség, the aesthetics and cultural heritage of the natural and cultural landscape exert a strong influence over inspiration and attachment to place, as well as the desire to create educational and tourism experiences that provide further wellbeing-enhancing recreational experiences. For local authorities, park managers or funding bodies, it can be useful to determine where the attention (including funding) should be directed. The emphasis may be on improving local community wellbeing through increased contact with nature or through education for children. It may be on supporting local heritage sites and crafts production, which creates jobs and generates economic benefits through tourism. Future studies should explore further the most important dimensions of CES, but also determine which elements of CES are closely connected and could support each other (e.g. does providing education about heritage and improving aesthetics of an area increase place-attachment resulting in enhanced wellbeing, the attraction of tourists and further economic benefits?). Although the interview data and grounded theory could not fully answer these questions, it provided confirmation of the usefulness of a CES framework and indicates directions for future research in this field.

Acknowledgements

References

Abraham, A., Sommerhalder, K. & Abel, T. (2010) Landscape and well-being: a scoping study on the health-promoting impact of outdoor environments, *Int J Public Health*, 55, pp. 59–69.

Andersson, E., Tengö, M., McPhearson, T. & Kremer, P. (2014) Cultural ecosystem services as a gateway for improving urban sustainability, *Ecosystem Services,* 12, pp. 165–168.

Aretano, R., Petrosillo, I., Zaccarelli, N., Semeraro, T. & Zurlini, G. (2013) People perception of landscape change effects on ecosystem services in small Mediterranean islands: A combination of subjective and objective assessments, *Landscape and Urban Planning,* 112, pp. 63– 73.

Babai, D., Tóth, A., Szentirmai, István, Sépligeti, M., Varga, A., Molnár, A., Kun, R. & Molnár, Z. (2015) Do conservation and agri-environmental regulations effectively support traditional small-scale farming in East-Central European cultural landscapes?, *Biodivers Conserv* 24, pp. 3305–3327. DOI 10.1007/s10531-015-0971-z

Blicharska, M., Smithers, R. J., Hedblomd, M., Hedenåsd, H., Mikusińskif, G., Pedersenh, E., Sandströmd, P. & Svensson, J. (2017) 'Shades of grey challenge practical application of the cultural ecosystem services concept', *Ecosystem Services* 23, pp. 55–70.

Bunce, M. (2003) Reproducing rural idylls, in Cloke, P. (Ed.) *Country visions*. Pearson, Harlow, pp. 14–30.

Bryce, R., Irvine, K. N., Church, A., Fish, R., Ranger, S. & Kenter, J. O. (2016) Subjective well-being indicators for large-scale assessment of cultural ecosystem services, *Ecosystem Services,* 21, pp. 258-269.

Brymer, E. G., Cuddihy, T. & Sharma-Brymer, V. (2010) The role of nature-based experiences in the development and maintenance of wellness, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education*, 1(2). pp. 21-27.

Campbell, L.M. (1999) Ecotourism in rural developing communities, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26 (3) pp. 534-553

Charmaz, K. (2014) *Constructing Grounded Theory*. Sage, London.

Chan, K. M. A., Satterfield, T. & Goldstein, J. (2012) Rethinking ecosystem services to better address and navigate cultural values, *Ecological Economics*, 74, 8–18.

Daniel, T.C., Muhar, A., Arnberger, A., Aznar, O., Boyd, J.W., Chan, K.M.A., Costanza, R., Elmqvist, T., Flint, C.G., Gobster, P.H., Gret-Regamey, A., Lave, R., Muhar, S., Penker, M., Ribe, R.G., Schauppenlehner, T., Sikor, T., Soloviy, I., Spierenburg, M., Taczanowska, K., Tam, J. & von der Dunk, A. (2012) Contributions of cultural services to the ecosystem services agenda. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci*. 109, 8812–8819.

De Vos, A*.,* G. S. Cumming*,* C. A. Moore*,* K. Maciejewski*,* & G. Duckworth (2016) The relevance of spatial variation in ecotourism attributes for the economic sustainability of protected areas*. Ecosphere* 7*(*2*),* e*01207.*10.1002/ecs2.1207

Frash, R. E., Blose, J. E., Norman, W. C. & Patience, M. (2016) Healthy Parks, Happy People: An Exploratory Study of a County Park System, *Park and Recreation Administration,* 34 (1), pp. 84–102.

Ganglmair-Wooliscroft, A. & Wooliscroft, B. (2014) "Part of Me": National Parks Integration Into the Extended Self of Domestic Tourists, *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 23(4), pp. 360-379, DOI: 10.1080/19368623.2013.768188

Gould, R.K., Klain, S. C., Ardoin, N.M., Satterfield, T., Woodside, U., Hannahs, N., Daily, G. C. & Chan, K. M. (2014) 'A Protocol for eliciting nonmaterial values through a cultural ecosystem services frame', *Conservation Biology,* 29(2), 575–586.

Hernández-Morcillo, M., Plieninger, T. & Bieling, C. (2013) An empirical review of cultural ecosystem service indicators, *Ecological Indicators* 29, pp. 434–444.

Indrawan, M., Yabe, M., Nomura, H. & Harrison, R. (2014) Deconstructing satoyama – The socioecological landscape in Japan, *Ecological Engineering*, 647784. doi:10.1016/j.ecoleng.2013.12.038)

IUCN (2008) What is a protected area? https://www.iucn.org/theme/protected-areas/about (accessed 6th June 2017)

Lee, D., Kruger, S., Whang, M. & Uysal, M. (2014) 'Validating a customer well-being index related to natural wildlife tourism', *Tourism Management,* 45, pp. 171-180.

Leyshon, C. (2014) Cultural Ecosystem Services and the Challenge for Cultural Geography, *Geography Compass* 8/10, pp. 710–725.

Little, J. (2015) Nature, wellbeing and the transformational self, *Geographical Journal,* 181(2), pp. 121-128.

Maciejewski, K., De Vos, A., Cumming, G. S., Moore, C. & Biggs, D. (2015) Cross-scale feedbacks and scale mismatches as influences on cultural services and the resilience of protected areas, *Ecological Applications,* 25 (1), pp. 11-23.

Magyar, Z. & Sulyok J. (2014) Az ökoturizmus helyzete Magyarországon, *Turizmus Bulletin*, 16 (2) pp. 14-23.

Maller, C., Townsend, M., St.Ledger, L., Henderson-Wilson, C., Pryor, A. & Prosser, L. (2008) Healthy parks healthy people: The health benefits of contact with nature in a park context: a review of current literature, *Social and Mental Health Priority Area*, Occasional Paper Series. Melbourne, Australia: Faculty of Health and Behavioural Sciences.

Mellon, V. & Bramwell, B. (2016) Protected area policies and sustainable tourism: influences, relationships and co-evolution, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(10),

pp. 1369-1386, DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2015.1125909

Milcu, A. I., Hanspach, J., Abson, D. & Fischer, J. (2013) Cultural Ecosystem Services: A Literature Review and Prospects for Future Research, *Ecology and Society*, 18(3), 44.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005) *Ecosystems and Human Wellbeing: Synthesis*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Muhr, T. (1991) ATLAS/ti — A prototype for the support of text interpretation, *Qualitative Sociology* 14(4), pp. 349–371.

Musacchio, L.R. (2013) Cultivating deep care: integrating landscape ecological research into the cultural dimension of ecosystem services, *Landscape Ecology,* July, 28(6), pp.1025-1038.

Norton, L. R., Inwood, H., Crowe, A. & Baker, A. (2012) Trialing a method to quantify the 'cultural services' of the English landscape using Countryside Survey data, *Land Use Policy* 29, pp. 449-455.

Pleasant, M. M., Gray, S. A., Lepczyk, C., Fernandes, A., Hunter, N., & Ford, D. (2014) Managing cultural ecosystem services, *Ecosystem Serv*ices, 8, pp. 141–147.

Plieninger, T., Dijks, S. Oteros-Rozas, E. & Bieling, C. (2013) Assessing, mapping, and quantifying cultural ecosystem services at community level, *Land Use Policy,* 33, pp. 118– 129.

Plieninger, T., Bieling, C., Fagerholm, N., Byg, Hartel, A. T., Hurley, P., López-Santiago, C. A., Nagabhatla, N., Oteros-Rozas, E., Raymond, C. M., van der Horst, D. & Huntsinger, L. (2015) The role of cultural ecosystem services in landscape management and planning, *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 14, pp. 28–33.

Ranger, S., Kenter, J. O., Bryce, R., Cumming, G., Dapling, T. Lawes, E. & Richardson, P. B. (2016) Forming shared values in conservation management: An interpretive-deliberative-democratic approach to including community voices, *Ecosystem Services*, 21, pp. 344-357.

Ray, C. (1998) Culture, Intellectual Property and Territorial Rural Development, *Sociologia Ruralis,* 38, (1) pp. 3-20.

Raymond, C. M., Kenter, J. O., Plieninger, T., Turner, N. J., & Alexander, K. A. (2014) Comparing instrumental and deliberative paradigms underpinning the assessment of social values for cultural ecosystem services. *Ecological Economics*, 107, 145–156.

Riechers, M., Barkmann, J. & Tscharntke, T. (2016) Perceptions of cultural ecosystem services from urban green, *Ecosystem Services* 17, pp. 33–39.

Romagosa, F., Eagles, P. F. J. and Lemieux, C. J. (2015) From the inside out to the outside in: Exploring the role of parks and protected areas as providers of human health and well-being, *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 10, pp. 70–77.

Sagie, H., Morris, A., Rofè, Y., Orenstein, D.E. & Groner, E. (2013) Cross-cultural perceptions of ecosystem services: A social inquiry on both sides of the Israeli–Jordanian border of the Southern Arava Valley Desert, *Journal of Arid Environments*, 97(0), 38–48, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2013.05.007

Schirpke, U., Timmermann, F., Tappeiner, U. & Tasser, E. (2016) Cultural ecosystem services of mountain regions: Modelling the aesthetic value, *Ecological Indicators*, 69, pp. 78–90.

Schmidt, K., Sachse, R. & Walz, A. (2016) Current role of social benefits in ecosystem service assessments, *Landscape and Urban Planning,* 149, pp. 49–64.

Scholte, S. S. K, van Teeffelen, A.J.A. & Verburg, P. H. (2015) Integrating socio-cultural perspectives into ecosystem service valuation: A review of concepts and methods, *Ecological Economics,* 114: 67–78.

Short, B. (2006) The idyllic rural, in Cloke, P., Marsden, T., Mooney, P. H. (Eds.) *Handbook of rural studies*, Sage, London, pp. 133-148.

Smith, M. K. & Ram, Y. (2016) Tourism, landscapes and cultural ecosystem services: a new research tool, *Tourism Recreation Research*, DOI: 10.1080/02508281.2016.1253206.

Soy-Massoni, E., Langemeyer, J., Varga, D., Sáez, M. & Pintó, J. (2016) The importance of ecosystem services in coastal agricultural landscapes: Case study from the Costa Brava, Catalonia, *Ecosystem Services*, 17, pp. 43–52.

Tengberg, A., Fredholm, S., Eliasson , I., Knez, I., Saltzman, K. & Wetterberg, O. (2012) Cultural ecosystem services provided by landscapes: Assessment of heritage values and identity, *Ecosystem Services* 2, pp. 14–26.

Teuscher, M., Vorlaufer, M., Wollni, M., Brose, U., Mulyani, Y. & Clough, Y. (2015) Tradeoffs between bird diversity and abundance, yields and revenue in smallholder oil palm plantations in Sumatra, Indonesia, *Biological Conservation*, 186306318. 10.1016/j.biocon.2015.03.022

Tratalos, J. A., Haines-Young, R., Potschin, M., Fish, R. & Church, R. (2015) Cultural ecosystem services in the UK: Lessons on designing indicators to inform management and policy, *Ecological Indicators*, 61(1), pp. 63–73.

Vallés-Planells, M., Galiana, F. & Van Eetvelde, V. (2014) A classification of landscape services to support local landscape planning, *Ecology and Society,* 19 (1), pp. 44.

Van Zanten, Verburg, P. H., Koetse, M. J. & van Beukering, P.J.H. (2015) A comparative approach to assess the contribution of landscape features to aesthetic and recreational values in agricultural landscapes, *Ecosystem Services,* 17, pp. 87-98.

Willis, C. (2015) The contribution of cultural ecosystem services to understanding the tourism–nature–wellbeing nexus, *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism,* 10, pp. 38–43.

Winthrop, R. H. (2014) The strange case of cultural services: Limits of the ecosystem services paradigm, *Ecological Economics,* 108, pp. 208–214.

Wolf, I.D., Stricker, H. K. & Hagenloh, G. (2015) Outcome focused national park experience management: transforming participants, promoting social wellbeing, and fostering place attachment, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(3), pp. 358-381, DOI:10.1080/09669582.2014.959968

Wu. J. (2013) Landscape sustainability science: ecosystem services and human well-being in changing landscapes, *Landscape Ecol*, 28, pp. 999–1023.

Xu, F. & Fox, D. (2014) Modelling attitudes to nature, tourism and sustainable development in national parks: A survey of visitors in China and the UK, *Tourism Management*, 45, pp. 142-158.

Zoderer, B. M., Tasser, E., Erb, K., Stanghellini, P. S. L. & Tappeiner, U. (2016) Identifying and mapping the tourists' perception of cultural ecosystem services: A case study from an Alpine region, *Land Use Policy* 56 pp .261-251