

Article Whose Sense of Place? Catering for Residents and Tourists from an Open-Access Protected Area in South Africa

Tessa Rouillard¹, Keagan Deponselle¹ and Joana Carlos Bezerra^{2,*}

- ¹ Department of Environmental Science, Rhodes University, 50 Somerset Street, Grahamstown 6139, South Africa
- ² Community Engagement Division, Rhodes University, Prince Alfred Street, Grahamstown 6139, South Africa
- * Correspondence: bezerra.joana@gmail.com

Abstract: In addition to providing benefits to people, protected areas are valued in ways that go beyond the tangible. A sense of place, and the collection of values, feelings, and meanings associated with a place, can illuminate people-place relationships. Understanding how people relate to a place is essential in acquiring support for protected areas. This research investigates tourists' and residents' sense of place in Knysna, an open-access section of the Garden Route National Park, South Africa. Data was collected through questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The sense of place was characterised using five variables: physical, cultural, social, dependent, and ideological. Although 'physical' was the dominant variable for both tourists and residents, the 'ideological' for residents and the 'cultural' for tourists came second, highlighting the importance of safe places and recreational activities, respectively. The physical environment influences sense of place, and the importance of protected areas to stakeholders offers an opportunity for management to engage with the public.

Keywords: sense of place; protected areas; cultural ecosystem services; residents; tourists

1. Introduction

How people relate to a place reflects their experiences and their feelings towards it [1,2]. Sense of place, understood as the collection of values, feelings, meanings and beliefs that an individual or group associate with a particular place, develops through personal interactions or perceptions one holds about a specific locality [2,3]. Sense of place has emerged as particularly important in helping understand people-place relationships, by revealing key places for people and the meanings they attach to them [4,5]. Understanding these relationships can play a role in landscape management; people's feelings and experiences towards a place can support conservation, as the growing body of research on sense of place in protected areas demonstrates [1,4,6,7].

Although there exist notable exceptions, the literature on sense of place in protected areas in South Africa is limited. Sense of place, a cultural ecosystem service, is derived from different sources and can be unpacked to determine the key characteristic or variables that shapes one's sense of place. Protected areas attract different stakeholders, namely residents that live nearby and tourists. In open-access protected areas, residents and tourists enjoy the space, sometimes not even realising they are in a protected space, making these areas interesting case studies. This, together with a growing interest in incorporating cultural ecosystem services into environmental management strategies, reveals the need for such a study in the country. The aim of this study is to characterise tourists' and residents' sense of place by unpacking the key variables that shape these groups' sense of place and to explore the management implications of sense of place for nature conservation. This research project was conducted in Knsyna, a town situated on the Garden Route in the Western Cape of South Africa, surrounded by open-access protected areas. The paper is divided as follows: the next subsections present a literature of sense of place, sense of place and protected areas, and sense of place research in South Africa. The subsequent section



Citation: Rouillard, T.; Deponselle, K.; Carlos Bezerra, J. Whose Sense of Place? Catering for Residents and Tourists from an Open-Access Protected Area in South Africa. *Sustainability* 2022, *14*, 15525. https://doi.org/10.3390/ su142315525

Academic Editors: Pablo Díaz, Alberto J. Rodríguez Darias and Cecilia Arnaiz Schmitz

Received: 6 September 2022 Accepted: 4 November 2022 Published: 22 November 2022

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/ 4.0/). discusses the study area and methods, followed by results, discussion and final remarks, and future research.

1.1. Unpacking Sense of Place

Despite its long establishment, the sense of place research field is filled with diverse definitions, which can lead to confusion [8–10]. In general, sense of place brings together 'place attachment' and 'place meaning' [11]. 'Place attachment' refers to the emotional bond an individual or a group has with their environment [12], and it can be conceptualised as having two dimensions: place identity and place dependence [13–15]. Place identity comprises 'those dimensions of self that define the individual's personal identity in relation to the physical environment' [16] (p.155). 'Place dependence' speaks to an individual's or group's 'perceived strength of association between him or herself and specific places' [9,17]. 'Place meaning' refers to the descriptive statement of what a place is like and what images it evokes [18,19]. The meaning of the place can be conveyed by adjectives that describe the place, but also by nouns that denote its symbolic meaning, such as 'roots', 'home', and 'peace'.

This article focuses on the formation of sense of place in an attempt to understand the different constructs that shape it. Sense of place has been argued to be a social construction, which emphasises its subjective nature [20], and the shared social behaviour and cultural processes in a particular setting [21]. Culture, and the social connections individuals or groups experience in a particular setting, play a central role in sense of place formation, as does the place itself [22,23], which speaks to the biophysical environment of a place [24]. Thus, sense of place is shaped both by personal experiences and social, cultural and physical elements [19,25]. Places gain special meaning, and depending on the experience, might become a space to be valued and protected [26]. Because these experiences change people's sense of place, this concept can contribute to people's future behaviour [27].

Sense of place is a complex and difficult to determine concept [26]. Methods usually used to assess sense of place, such as attachment scales, leave out cultural and biophysical features [28]. Sense of place is usually seen as an umbrella concept that includes other constructs [29]. To unpack the concept and determine its sources, we focused on the different characteristics or variables of sense of place. There are several characteristics or variables that are observed as sources of place formation, i.e., creating one's sense of place, that have been discussed in the literature [2,7,30,31]. Multiple variables occur simultaneously in the construct of sense of place [32], making it a complex, multi-dimensional concept; thus, in order to obtain a more complete picture of someone's sense of place, it is necessary to explore the different aspects that shape that sense of place.

Of all the characteristics of sense of place, the following five are the most commonly used: cultural sources, social elements, physical features, dependent sense of place, and ideological sense of place (see Table 1 for the variables and their references). Cultural sources of sense of place can include personal experiences of a particular location, past historical affiliations, or events at a certain place [30]. Social elements of sense of place are similar to those of cultural sources, but also involve personal values, and often, a shared meaning or value of a particular place [32], such as traditional family holiday destinations. Physical features include the physical attributes of a place; its landscape, setting, and natural features [32], and the biophysical attributes, such as its ecosystems, and rare or endemic species [2]. Dependent sense of place refers to the lack of choice or easiest option, for example, a person going to a specific locality because it is closer and more convenient than other localities further away [30]; thus, where the choice is established on a person's situation rather than on personal preference. Ideological sense of place is built on personal ideals and perceptions of a place; a place that exhibits the same kind of lifestyle as the observer's. Ideological sense of place tends to be influenced by personal ethics, beliefs and religion [30].

SOP Variable	Definition	Key Words
Cultural elements	Includes personal experiences or past affiliations/visits with the town	Population diversity Memories Aesthetics Art Recreational activities Wood products
Social elements	Similar to cultural variable; also includes personal values or shared meanings for a particular place (e.g., family holidays)	Family and friends Town vibe Community Events Fire support Inequality Challenges Changes
Physical features	Includes physical attributes, such as the landscape and town setting, and biophysical attributes (biodiversity, ecosystems)	Scenery Forests Lagoon Weather Biodiversity Environment Fire damage
Dependent	An individual's situation or lack of choice rather than their personal preference; visit a place due to its convenience.	Location on Garden Route Convenience Work Livelihoods Stop-over No other option
Ideological	Ideals and perceptions of a place fitting a preferred kind of 'lifestyle'	Lifestyle Personal Family Safety Shops/restaurants Holiday
Other	Other variables mentioned that do not clearly fit into a SOP variable category	Love everything about Knysna Town size N/A Not very important

Table 1. Sense of place and keywords.

1.2. Sense of Place and Protected Areas

Sense of place reveals more than people's feelings and experiences; it can influence and be influenced by people's values and beliefs [30], and recent studies have shown that sense of place and attitudes towards the environment are related [30,32–34]. Larson and colleagues [30] argue that people's beliefs, as well as their commitments and values, are shaped by their sense of place and should be incorporated into natural resource management in order to improve the chances of success. This view is supported by Lin and Lockwood [32], who argue that gaining an understanding of place-based relationships can lead to the identification of important cultural as well as landscape features that could promote conservation behaviour. Research indicates that the greater the sense of place, the more likely people are to care about the place and its conservation, and to act pro-environmentally [23,35,36].

Protected areas have played a crucial role in biodiversity conservation around the world [37]. These areas are clearly demarcated regions assigned and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature [38]. In most cases, protected areas come with fences, thus limiting access to the ecosystem services

provided [39–41], an aspect that receives much attention in the literature. Protected areas do not exist in a vacuum, so not only are the ecosystems inside their borders crucial for the effectiveness and existence of the spaces, but these spaces are also valued for their cultural importance and the influence they exert on people's ethics regarding nature conservation [42–44].

Protected areas can be understood as places that provide bundles of ecosystem services [39], defined as environmental goods and services that add to people's livelihoods [45]. Cultural ecosystem services are 'ecosystem's contributions to the non-material benefits that arise from human-ecosystem relationships' [46]. This relationship involves spiritual, aesthetic and recreational experiences one has with the ecosystem bundles that exist in a place. Sense of place can, therefore, be described as a cultural ecosystem service [1,46,47]. Cultural ecosystem services are intuitively appreciated as a result of direct experiences and have often played a role in raising public awareness and support for protecting ecosystem services [48].

As the link between sense of place and nature becomes clearer, the connection has increasingly gained space in conservation and protected areas management [30,32]. Recent studies in different areas of the world suggest that incorporating sense of place in conservation management does indeed contribute to achieving conservation [1,2,49,50]. The inclusion of stakeholders and communities' ideas and knowledge into management practices can lead to further communication, engagement, and participation in conservation [50]. In this process, people may gain awareness of biodiversity and a sense of responsibility for conserving it and become willing to support the implementation and sustainability of policies and practices that are enforced [49,51], and so support these protected areas [1,6]. However, the inclusion of CES into management strategies has been scarce, probably due to its intangible feature [52,53].

Protected areas tend to attract a wide array of stakeholders. Two such groups are tourists travelling to the place, and residents who live in or around these protected areas. When considering sense of place in protected areas, it is important to note the differences between tourists to the protected area and residents who live in and around the area. In their study, Kianicka et al. [54] found that, despite some similarities, tourists' and residents' sense of place about a Swiss Alpine village differed in various ways. Understanding this difference is important as it affects the way protected areas, and tourist towns, are run and managed. Focusing on only one stakeholder group could lead to the prioritisation of one experience and strategies devised to foster that experience only. Thus, although sense of place has a role to play in biodiversity conservation, the sense of place of all the stakeholders involved needs to feed into management strategies so that all cultural ecosystem services are respected and protected.

1.3. Sense of Place in South Africa

As a concept that has been researched globally and is receiving much attention at present, sense of place could be an integral part of management plans surrounding protected areas and conservation in South Africa. However, it has not been particularly well researched locally, particular with regards to protected areas and conservation.

This field of research is underexplored in South Africa. Puren and others [55] state that within the spatial planning of places in South Africa, protected areas included, there is no consideration for symbolic and personal meanings. One of the few studies linked to, but not focusing on, sense of place and protected areas in South Africa was carried out in the Kruger National Park by Gaylard and Ferreira [56]. The study assessed the park's strategic adaptive management plan, and the values of various stakeholders, which could be linked to sense of place, were taken into account in the management structures. Two other studies, by Nikodinoska et al. [57] and van Wilgen [58], examined tourists' perceptions of invasive alien plants in protected areas in South Africa. While this research is linked to sense of place, the studies looked at a specific characteristic (invasive alien plants) only. Similarly, Barendse et al. [4] focused on tourists to interrogate the role of

viewsheds as conservation features, and the impact of non-native species in viewsheds. Masterson et al. [59] discussed place meanings to unpack local interests in the Wild Coast of South Africa. In both international and South African literature, research on sense of place in the context of open-access protected areas is limited.

2. Study Area and Methods

2.1. Study Area

Knysna is a town situated approximately 490 km east of Cape Town and approximately 260 km west of Port Elizabeth [60]. The study area is part of the Garden Route National Park (GRNP), which was amalgamated in 2009 and comprises three broad areas: the Knysna, Tsitsikamma and Wilderness sections [60].

The Knysna section is made up of open-access protected areas, such as the Knysna National Lake Area, declared a protected area in 1985, and the Diepwalle Forest Estate, which was declared a protected area in 1939 [60]. The Knysna estuary is one of the main features of the protected area and is ranked first in South Africa in terms of overall conservation importance [61]. The sections of forest found in the Knysna protected areas are mainly natural: mixed evergreens in patches along the river valleys, and coastal platform with a lot of fire-prone fynbos [62]. Figure 1 illustrates the surrounding protected areas of Knysna. The landscape rises upwards steeply from the beach (0 m above sea level) to a plateau (220 m above sea level) and further upwards to the Tsitsikamma mountain range.



Figure 1. Knysna and surrounding protected areas.

With a diversity of protected areas and possible activities, Knysna is a popular destination. The 'no fee' and 'no fence' features of the Knysna protected areas make this section attractive and accessible to tourists and residents, and an interesting place for a 'sense of place' study. The Garden Route not only attracts tourists interested in nature but is also located between two tourist cities (Cape Town and Port Elizabeth) and is an en route stop-over, thus attracting even more tourists [63]. With its constant influx of tourists, and the open-access nature of the protected areas where the town and protected area merge, Knysna is an interesting site for a comparison of tourists' and residents' sense of place.

Knysna has a population size of approximately 70,000 people [64] with around 66.9% of the population falling within the working age (15–64 years of age) and an unem-

ployment rate of around 24.8% [65]. Half of the town's residents are Afrikaans speakers; English speakers constitute around 17%, while IsiXhosa speakers make up about 25% of the population [65]. In terms of schooling, only around 3% of the population has received a higher education, and approximately 15% have completed secondary schooling [65]. About 15% of the population earn an average of between R38,201 and R76,400 per month; 18% earn between R19,601 and R38,200 per month, while 16.4% have no income whatsoever [65].

On 7 June 2017, Knysna experienced a disastrous fire that affected many community members [66]. The fires started in the Elandskraal area, situated northeast of Sedgefield, and at Mountain to Ocean (MTO) Kruisfontein plantations, east of the Knysna urban area. The fires were fueled by plantations and fynbos vegetation, which had been partly invaded by alien species, such as black wattle. Between 700 and 1000 houses were lost in Knysna, and seven people died. Over 10,000 ha of plantation were burned [66]. The fires devastated the community of Knysna.

For this project, a mixed methods approach was adopted, collecting data via questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. Qualitative and quantitative methods were used for analysing the data [67]. The primary source of data was Knysna residents and tourists to the area, and all respondents were over the age of 18 years. Ethical clearance for this research project was granted by the Environmental Science Department at Rhodes University.

2.2. Data Collection

The questions in the questionnaire and the semi-structured interview were based on understanding sense of place and followed the design of similar sense of place questionnaires [51,54]. The questionnaires consisted of three main sections: (i) reason for visiting Knysna, with four Likert-scale questions, a ranking question, and one openended question; (ii) the participant's experience of Knysna, with four Likert-scale questions and three open-ended questions; and (iii) the experience of protected areas, with two close-ended, two open-ended questions and a map for respondents to mark the places that were most important to them. Basic demographic details, such as home language, age and gender, were established at the beginning of the questionnaire.

The semi-structured interviews [68] complemented the questionnaires by providing more in-depth information. The guiding questions were: What does Knysna mean to you? What is appealing about Knysna? Are there any physical or social characteristics about Knysna that are important to you? As the interview progressed, the researchers asked follow-up questions based on the answers of the respondents. In our case study, the semi-structured interviews were especially crucial in collecting more comprehensive and personal information about respondents' views on the fires. Questionnaires tend to be more rigid in their structure and semi-structured interviews provide space for respondents to share their opinion without restrictions. While the questionnaires provided quantitative data, the semi-structured interviews provided depth of experience.

Data was collected between 30 June and 10 July 2017. The questionnaires were handed out in various public areas in the town, such as the informal market area and the Waterfront, and in the following conservation or protected areas: the Knysna Heads, Elephant Sanctuary, Garden of Eden and some of the surrounding forest areas. The questionnaires and semi-structured interviews were completed and collected on site. Stratified random sampling [69] was used to select participating residents in order to guarantee fair representation of the Knysna subpopulations; the same sampling outcome was achieved by conducting the questionnaire and semi-structured interviews in different locations in town. Random sampling was used for tourists, as there was no specific target required within this group. Researchers approached individuals and first asked if they were tourists or residents, and then sought permission to conduct the questionnaires or interviews.

A total of 205 completed questionnaires were administered (n = 103 residents and n = 102 visitors). The sample sizes for this study were guided by similar previous studies [51,70].

For the semi-structured interviews, 53 resident and 52 tourist replies were obtained from participants who had completed the questionnaires and were happy to continue answering questions. The semi-structured interviews consisted of three open-ended questions and were intended to get a deeper understanding and context of people's sense of place, allowing the respondent to answer more freely. Giving respondents an opportunity to express how important a place is for them in their own words increases the chances of capturing people's sense of place [32].

2.3. Data Analysis

Before analysis began, the questionnaires were divided into the separate user groups (resident and tourist). Responses from questionnaires and interviews were manually coded, based on the predetermined sense of place variables, and formulated into an Excel spreadsheet. The reason for manually coding was three-fold: the dataset was relatively small, so it made sense to code manually, and researchers felt more in control of the data [71]; researchers were not familiar with any computer software for coding and had limited time for data collection; questionnaire and interview notes were initially on paper and had to be captured on the computer. While doing this, researchers started the coding.

Coding is an intellectual exercise, regardless of whether it is done manually or electronically [72]. Sub-categories were created by linking specific words and indirect quotes from the respondents within the variables. This helps us determine the formation of, rather than the measuring of, the sense of place. Although the key words might seem similar, they do convey different meanings and are related to different experiences. The cultural variable included elements such as 'memories', 'recreational activities', and 'aesthetics' of the area. The social variable comprised elements such as 'community', 'family and friends', and 'events'. Physical features included attributes such as 'scenery', 'forests' and 'lagoon', as well as Knysna's 'biodiversity'. The dependent variable included the 'convenience' of Knysna and its accessibility, and 'work' and 'livelihood'-related elements. Lastly, the ideological variable included elements such as 'lifestyle', 'safety', and 'personal'. Table 1 illustrates the keywords and definitions used in determining the sense of place variables for the semi-structured interviews and questionnaires.

Variables of sense of place linked with each question were tallied to determine the most valued sense of place variable or perception. Chi-squared tests were used on the responses about the protected areas and for the total tally of sense of place variables, to test for associations between user groups (tourists and residents) and the sense of place variables. Descriptive statistics and percentages were used to examine the different variables of sense of place for residents and tourists. Tests for normality, using the Shapiro-test, and tests for equal variance, using Fishers F-test, were performed on the data to check test assumptions. Finally, the sense of place variables for the residents and tourists of Knysna were interpreted through inductive reasoning.

3. Results

3.1. The Experience of Knysna

Both residents and tourists responded positively to the experience of Knysna (see Figure 2). Most respondents from both user groups chose "agree" or "strongly agree" for three of the four Likert-scale questions. They were: "If I could live/visit elsewhere I would", "For what I am interested in Knysna is the best place", I am attached to Knysna", and "I identify strongly with Knysna". Residents' attachment to Knysna received the highest positive response, with 80.6% of the answers being either 'agree' or 'strongly agree'. Just over half of the residents (50.5%) indicated that, given the choice, they would stay in Knysna, which corroborates the high level of attachment.



Figure 2. Responses of feelings of residents and tourists towards their experience of Knysna.

The quotes below reflect that attachment:

'Knysna is part of me and I am part of Knysna.'

'[Knysna] is nature, is my history.'

'I grew up here and all my memories are here'

Attachment among tourists was lower, with only 45% of them agreeing or strongly agreeing that they were attached to Knysna, despite the fact that 65% of them identified with the town. Knysna is one of the best places for meeting tourists' interests, and they generally had a positive reaction to the experience of Knysna (Figure 2).

The high percentage of neutral or negative responses for 'If I could visit again I would' (about 70%), raises questions about generalised and localised sense of place. The following quotes show this:

'I like visiting Knysna, but I also enjoy travelling to other places.'

'Gorgeous place; however, I have preferred other places along the way.'

'Knysna is too noisy and busy to offer a good escape.'

The fire that had recently devasted the town emerged as a relevant topic for the residents. The incident was discussed in 31 of the 53 interviews conducted with the residents, in which residents showed a strong sense of community. The reaction of the community in light of such a disaster, including opening their homes and sharing and offering resources, reflects their social cohesion. The following quotes illustrate this attitude:

'We all felt the pain of the fire; didn't matter which side of town we were from, we were in it together; Knysna is part of us.'

'The community responded amazingly, drew everyone together, made people make new friends.'

For the residents, social elements and the physical environment were the two most important variables in their experience of Knysna; for the tourists, the two dominant sense of place variables that reflected their experience of Knysna were cultural elements: recreational activities and physical features (the scenery).

3.2. Awareness of Protected Areas

In responses to their awareness of protected areas, just over 80% of both tourists and residents were aware of the protected areas surrounding Knysna. Of these participants, 30.2% of the residents and 34.8% of the tourists had not visited one of the protected areas. Nearly one-quarter of both participant groups were either unsure whether they had visited a protected area before or were unaware of protected areas in the region altogether.

Figure 3 shows the residents and tourists' understanding of protected areas in relation to the sense of place variables. The physical sense of place variable was most evident in responses from residents (n = 37, 29.6%) and especially from the tourists (n = 61, 59.8%). The ideological variable for residents (n = 28, 22.4%) and the social sense of place variable for tourists (n = 48, 47.1%) were the next most evident in their respective responses (Figure 3).





Figure 3. Meaning given by residents and tourists to protected areas, and the link to the sense of place variables.

3.3. Significant Association by User Groups

Two chi-squared statistical tests for association between the user groups and the variables for sense of place were conducted. The responses to protected areas have been separated from other data in order to gain a better understanding of the user groups' sense of place relating specifically to protected areas. There was a very highly significant association between user groups and sense of place variables in the combined questionnaire and semi-structured interview data, excluding the protected areas section (X-squared = 85.54; d.f. = 5; p < 0.001).

Results indicate that there was also a highly significant association between the user groups and the sense of place variables evident in the protected areas section of the questionnaire (X-squared = 17.57; d.f. = 5; p < 0.010). This finding means that the sense of place variables, linked to users' responses for protected areas, as well as the combined questionnaire and semi-structured interview data, were not accidental, and that people from both user groups are highly likely to respond in the same way.

4. Discussion

The experience of the Knysna fire disaster emerged from the data as an important theme for residents especially. The strong association between user groups and the sense of place variables leaves room for further discussion, as does the knowledge and meaning of protected areas. These are discussed below.

4.1. The Experience of Knysna

High levels of attachment to Knysna among resident respondents were explained through the ideological sense of place variable. According to Lin and Lockwood [7], functional attachment could be associated with lifestyle opportunities. This is further supported by Lin and Lockwood [32], who allude to the fact that affective attachments are involved in the formation of personal place-based identities. Personal history, and a

sense of community, were frequently mentioned by the residents; these variables are closely linked to identities and could explain the strong attachment of residents.

The high levels of attachment and the frequent mention of 'memories' and 'community' by community members resonate with the literature. Relph [73] suggests that during times of loss and difficulty, people's links and commitments become apparent, indicating that experiencing difficult times could strengthen a person's sense of attachment. This idea is further supported by Taylor and Townsend [74], who found that a substantial number of respondents in their study reported that their feelings towards the place they lived were a result of previous hardships faced. Residents' strong sense of attachment and their desire to continue living in Knysna accords with work by Bonaiuto et al. [75], who found that individuals with a strong attachment to a place do not consider relocating as a result of natural environmental risks and are likely to return to an area after facing a natural disaster.

Many of the residents felt that the community reacted positively and became closer than ever after the fire, and they also believed they would remain close-knit long after the fire had occurred. The strong sense of community that emerged from the interviews resonates with Silver and Grek-Martin's [76] findings, in which feelings of social cohesion and optimism were common in community members who had suffered a disaster event and persisted longer than just the short-term 'honeymoon phase' predicted by other literature [77,78]. This finding reveals the importance of the social sense of place variable in situations where residents experience disasters, as was the case in Knysna.

Tourists reported lower levels of attachment to Knysna than residents, which speaks to the localised versus generalised sense of place. Lin and Lockwood [32] suggest that strong attachment to a locality is often built through social experiences that form strong peopleplace relations, which is more likely to be the case for residents than first-time visitors. Despite tourists' weak attachment, they did identify strongly with Knysna. Although Jorgensen and Stedman [79] believe an individual's bond with a place forms over longterm interaction with the locality, other literature [80,81] shows that an emotional bond can be created between a person and a location they have not previously visited, based on perceptions and experiences with similar environments or landscapes. This speaks to the generalised sense of place construct: places sharing elements that humans find safe or enjoyable, and a shared affinity constructed through sociocultural process and ideologies [32]. This bond explains tourists' high levels of identification with Knysna and the importance of it as a good place to visit for one's interests.

The high level of importance of cultural elements and physical features for tourists is similar to the findings of research by Hernes and Metzger [82], who observed that perceptions of a biosphere reserve in Scotland reflected a high value for the physical and cultural sense of place elements, with specific mention made of the recreational activities and scenery of the place. This finding adds to the localised and generalised sense of place construct. The results of this research support physical features as important in creating a generalised sense of place, as suggested by Lin and Lockwood [32], who found that physical aspects of sense of place are instrumental in determining one's generalised sense of place. Furthermore, our results suggest that certain cultural elements of sense of place, such as general recreational activities, may also have a significant impact on one's generalised sense of place.

Assessing physical features in more depth shows that scenery and the environment are the dominant aspects for both user groups. The landscape features surrounding the town (forests, mountains, and lagoon) were important contributing factors to both user groups' sense of place. This speaks to the role of the physical environment and the different ecosystem services (provisioning, regulating and supporting) in shaping the cultural services. As cultural ecosystem services are derived from human-ecosystem interplay [46], the process of CES production is not linear [52] and is shaped not only by cultural practices but also environmental spaces [83]. The role of other elements ecosystem services and the experience itself—in shaping CES speaks about the importance of looking at conservation from an integral perspective and the relationship between ecosystem services, their impact on CES and the importance of CES in harnessing societal support for conservation efforts and areas. Understanding how both groups differ is also important to avoid conflicts about competing uses [54]. Unpacking sense of place formation can illuminate the key elements of this protected area for each group and potential areas of conflicts that must be looked at by the conservation agency.

The two groups differ in their responses to the variables shown in cultural elements and ideological sense of place. Although there are similarities in the sense of place of tourists and residents, there are also some clear and fundamental differences. This is echoed by the findings of Kaltenborn and Williams [84], which show differences in tourists' and residents' sense of place, but also note the groups had several important shared meanings or perceptions for a place. This similarity highlights and supports the results of a strong association, a common trend between user groups and their perceptions about a place. A study conducted by Klanicka et al. [54] in a Swiss alpine village also found that tourists and residents have a similar but different sense of place. Although both groups referred to their personal connection to the village, residents' sense of place was more influenced by everyday life and their history. Tourists' sense of place was shaped by the aesthetics of the place and the activities they took part in.

Many tourists were physically active and used the forests for hiking or for mountain biking, a response that was linked to their generalised sense of place construct in which Knysna itself is not of particular importance, but the characteristics of the town are. This resonates with the findings of Ament et al. [85]. In their article, they report that, out of 19 SANParks reserves across South Africa, the Garden Route scored particularly high as a destination to visit for its recreational activities and opportunities. This further supports our findings. Known for its scenic beauty [4], the Garden Route National Park is seen as a naturebased destination of national and international importance [86]. These characteristics and activities play an influential role in stakeholder experiences and reasons for visiting a place and so could be integrated into management strategies to encourage visits to Knysna and its surrounding areas. The residents' sense of place was more affected by their lifestyles and perceptions of Knysna, particularly on issues around safety, which explains the prevalence of an ideological sense of place link.

The difference in sense of place has implications for management in that the sense of place of both user groups needs to be incorporated. For example, the surrounding protected areas need to be spaces that attract tourists through recreational activities, but that also consider residents' views with regard to their ideological sense of place and desire for family space.

By focusing on sense of place formation, this article contributes to the sense of place literature, elucidating how different stakeholders hold different senses of place and what that means for conservation agencies. Moreover, by looking at an open-access protected area, this area offers a unique case study to the sense of place and conservation studies literature.

4.2. Protected Areas

The 'no fees' and 'no fence' aspect of the Knysna protected area explains the relatively high number of people who were unaware that there were protected areas, a situation that could be detrimental to conservation efforts. The activities of people who are not aware that they are entering a protected area can be detrimental to these spaces, and there is a missed opportunity for support [31], as well as the possibility of areas being abused and their importance not being fully understood and appreciated. This problem is raised in various studies [30,33,34] that indicate a link between sense of place and people's attitudes towards the environment, therefore offering the opportunity to promote pro-environmental behaviour through raising awareness of protected areas.

The high level of importance attributed to the physical environment, as well as the overall positive feeling associated with protected areas, is similar to the findings of Kaltenborn and Williams [84], who illustrate a common trend, with both user groups having a high rating for 'protection of the environment' in a Norwegian National Park. This observation is further supported in a study by Larson et al. [30], who found that attractive landscapes, speaking to the physical variable, tended to encourage stronger emotional responses. A common response by both user groups, when speaking about the purpose of protected areas, was their role in preventing human interference, which highlights the value given to the role of biodiversity conservation of protected areas.

The concern for future generations, linked to the ideological variable, received considerable attention by both groups and is of particular importance for the sustainability of protected areas. This concern highlights the people-placed meaning on protected areas, and it is evident that respondents support the conservation and continuation of these protected areas, understanding their importance for generations to come. Establishing a clear programme that focuses on future generations would be a good opportunity for protected areas management to gain support from the public. Daniel et al. [1] and others [6,31], have also explored the value of cultural ecosystem services and have found that they are valuable in gaining and securing the support of people and communities to protect such ecosystems.

One way to incorporate people's perceptions into management is to map out what people value or perceive as valuable for a place (the sense of place elements), recognising areas with bundles of valued ecosystem services [87]. Depending on the ecosystem bundles, location, environmental situation, and people's preferences [88], management can identify possible opportunities and trade-offs for these areas and the services they provide. Understanding and incorporating human perceptions of the environment into planning can also help build support for, and resilience of, environmental policies and plans [89]. Moreover, this incorporation can also impact protected areas financially. Tourism and recreation are key CES provided by protected areas [90,91], generating financial resources for conservation agencies. With the link between the physical features and people's sense of place, understanding the variables that shape the sense of place of tourists and residents, conservation agencies can promote further visitation and human-ecosystem interaction, which will have positive feedback on the production of CES and financial gain.

A similar study by Snider et al. [51] suggests that management strategies for protected areas and the perceptions of visitors need to align, both having a common objective in mind, to avoid conflicts around these protected areas and to ensure continued visits and support. Gould et al. [92] further highlight this, specifying that spatial planning needs to capture holistically the needs of people and what matters to them most. Taking into consideration the variable elements identified for protected areas, management can find ways to implement these into planning and promoting the beauty of these areas and their importance. Prioritisation and specific planning can be directed at sites or protected areas found to be the most important to tourists and residents, helping to promote and attract people to the areas.

5. Conclusions and Future Research

The dominant sense of place of residents and tourists was highlighted through the physical, social and ideological variables, and there is value in taking these into consideration in future planning. Residents showed a heightened sense of attachment, which could be associated with the fire disaster which occurred in Knysna. In comparison, the tourists' experience of Knysna was closely linked to the literature on localised and generalised sense of place. The meanings associated with protected areas, by both tourists and residents, were linked with the physical sense of place variable as well as the social and ideological variables, with an emphasis on keeping the environment intact for future generations and for sustainability.

There is a space for sense of place as a cultural ecosystem service to improve and influence management decisions for open-access parks such as the Garden Route National Park. Taking into account each stakeholder's ideals within protected areas could encourage continued visits, further support, and improved environmental stewardship from wider society rather than one specific group.

This project explored the differences between the sense of place of tourists and residents to an open-access protected area. Building on the findings of the research, a comparative study of a protected area that is not open-access would provide insights into how these two spaces are different. One of the limitations of this study was the small sample size, a limitation that could be addressed with a bigger sample pool to investigate the differences between tourists and residents, and to examine the link between sense of place and pro-environmental behaviour. A bigger sample size would also enable different statistical analyses. The link between sense of place and management could also be explored further using a larger sample and with a research project that includes park management as one of the stakeholders. The omission of park management as a stakeholder is another limitation of this study. A study with a concrete proposal of management strategies based on sense of place research would contribute to both management and the protected area's literature, which was beyond the scope of this project.

With regard to the residents, a study that concentrated more on the effects of the disastrous fire on the stakeholders could help elucidate its impact on sense of place. The area is prone to fire, as we have seen in more recent years, and such a study could contribute to the understanding of the impact of disasters on sense of place. Would the heightened sense of community and attachment persist through time, or would a similar study in the future indicate otherwise? Future studies could examine whether differences between various home language users, or the income classes of the population, impact the residents' sense of place.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, J.C.B., T.R. and K.D.; methodology, J.C.B., T.R. and K.D.; formal analysis, T.R. and K.D.; investigation, T.R. and K.D.; writing—original draft preparation, T.R. and K.D.; writing—review and editing, J.C.B.; visualization, T.R. and K.D.; supervision, J.C.B.; project administration, J.C.B.; funding acquisition, J.C.B. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by the Rhodes University Research Grant s1500060-2017 and by the National Research Foundation CEC200125500325]. The APC was funded by the Rhodes University Research Office.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Ethics Committee of the Rhodes University Department of Environmental Science (protocol code ES17/19 approved on 11 April 2017).

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are not publicly available in line with the conditions of the informed consent.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- 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.; et al. Contributions of cultural services to the ecosystem services agenda. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 2012, 109, 8812–8819. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Hausmann, A.; Slotow, R.; Burns, J.; Minin, E. The ecosystem service of sense of place: Benefits for human well-being and biodiversity conservation. *Environ. Conserv.* 2015, 43, 117–127. [CrossRef]
- Chapin, F.S.; Knapp, C.N. ScienceDirect Sense of place: A process for identifying and negotiating potentially contested visions of sustainability. *Environ. Sci. Policy* 2015, 53, 38–46. [CrossRef]
- 4. Barendse, J.; Roux, D.; Erfmann, W.; Baard, J.; Kraaij, T.; Nieuwoudt, C. Viewshed and sense of place as conservation features: A case study and research agenda for South Africa's national parks. *Koedoe–Afr. Prot. Area Conserv. Sci.* 2016, 58, 1–16. [CrossRef]
- Ramkissoon, H.; David, L.; Smith, G.; Weiler, B.; Ramkissoon, H.; David, L.; Smith, G.; Weiler, B. Relationships between place attachment, place satisfaction and pro-environmental behaviour in an Australian national park. J. Sustain. Tour. 2013, 21, 434–457. [CrossRef]
- 6. Mayer, M.; Müller, M.; Woltering, M.; Arnegger, J.; Job, H. The economic impact of tourism in six German national parks. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* **2010**, *97*, 73–82. [CrossRef]

- Lin, C.; Lockwood, M. Forms and sources of place attachment: Evidence from two protected areas. *Geoforum* 2014, 53, 74–81. [CrossRef]
- Hidalgo, M.C.; Hernandez, B. Place Attachment: Conceptual and Empirical Questions. J. Environ. Psychol. 2001, 21, 273–281. [CrossRef]
- Jorgensen, B.S.; Stedman, R.C. Sense of Place As an Attitude: Lakeshore Owners Attitudes Toward Their Properties. J. Environ. Psychol. 2001, 21, 233–248. [CrossRef]
- 10. Shamai, S. Sense of Place: An Empirical Measurement. Geoforum 1991, 22, 347–358. [CrossRef]
- 11. Tuan, Y.F. Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience; University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, MN, USA, 1977.
- 12. Altman, L.; Low, S. Place Attachment, 1st ed.; Plenum: New York, NY, USA, 1992.
- 13. Raymond, C.M.; Brown, G.; Weber, D. The measurement of place attachment: Personal, community, and environmental connections. *J. Environ. Psychol.* **2010**, *30*, 422–434. [CrossRef]
- 14. Williams, D.; Vaske, J. The Measurement of Place Attachment: Validity and Generalizability of a Psychometric Approach. *For. Sci.* **2003**, *49*, 830–840.
- 15. Williams, D.R.; Roggenbuck, J.W. Measuring place attachment: Some preliminary results. In *Abstracts of the 1989 Leisure Research Symposium*; McAvoy, L., Howard, D., Eds.; National Recreation and Park Association: Arlington, TA, USA, 1989; p. 32.
- 16. Proshansky, H.M. The City and the Self-Identity. Environ. Behav. 1978, 10, 147–169. [CrossRef]
- 17. Stokols, D.; Shumaker, S.A. The Psychological Context of Residential Mobility and Well-Being: EBSCOhost. J. Soc. Issues 1982, 38, 149–171. [CrossRef]
- 18. Manzo, L.C. For better or worse: Exploring multiple dimensions of place meaning. J. Environ. Psychol. 2005, 25, 67–86. [CrossRef]
- 19. Masterson, V.A.; Stedman, R.C.; Enqvist, J.; Giusti, M.; Wahl, D.; Svedin, U. The contribution of sense of place to social-ecological systems research: A review and research agenda. *Ecol. Soc.* **2017**, 22. [CrossRef]
- 20. Kyle, G.; Chick, G. The Social Construction of a Sense of Place. Leis. Sci. 2007, 29, 209–225. [CrossRef]
- 21. Greider, T.; Garkovich, L. Landscapes: The Social Construction of Nature and the Environment. *Rural Sociol.* **1994**, *59*, 1–24. [CrossRef]
- 22. Acedo, A.; Painho, M.; Casteleyn, S. Place and city: Operationalizing sense of place and social capital in the urban context. *Trans. GIS* **2017**, *21*, 503–520. [CrossRef]
- Scannell, L.; Gifford, R. Defining place attachment: A tripartite organizing framework. J. Environ. Psychol. 2010, 30, 1–10. [CrossRef]
- 24. Lewicka, M. Place attachment: How far have we come in the last 40 years? J. Environ. Psychol. 2011, 31, 207–230. [CrossRef]
- Pérez-Ramírez, I.; Gárcia-Llorente, M.; Benito, A.; Castro, A.J. Exploring sense of place across cultivated lands through public participatory mapping. *Landsc. Ecol.* 2019, 34, 1675–1692. [CrossRef]
- 26. Ried, A.; Monteagudo, M.J.; Benavides, P.; Le Bon, A.; Carmody, S.; Santos, R. Key aspects of leisure experiences in protected wilderness areas: Notions of nature, senses of place and perceived benefits. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 3211. [CrossRef]
- Hawthorne, T.L.; Toohy, K.R.; Yang, B.; Graham, L.; Lorenzo, E.M.; Torres, H.; McDonald, M.; Rivera, F.; Bouck, K.; Walters, L.J. Mapping Emotional Attachment as a Measure of Sense of Place to Identify Coastal Restoration Priority Areas. *Appl. Geogr.* 2022, 138, 102608. [CrossRef]
- 28. Gottwald, S.; Albert, C.; Fagerholm, N. Combining sense of place theory with the ecosystem services concept: Empirical insights and reflections from a participatory mapping study. *Landsc Ecol.* **2022**, *37*, 633–655. [CrossRef]
- 29. Domingues, R.; Gonçalves, G.; de Jesus, S.N. Measuring sense of place: A new place-people-time-self model. *J. Spat. Organ. Dyn.* **2021**, *9*, 239–258.
- Larson, S.; De Freitas, D.M.; Hicks, C.C. Sense of place as a determinant of people's attitudes towards the environment: Implications for natural resources management and planning in the Great Barrier Reef, Australia. J. Environ. Manag. 2013, 117, 226–234. [CrossRef]
- Wolf, I.D.; Stricker, H.K.; Hagenloh, G.; Wolf, I.D.; Stricker, H.K.; Outcome-, G.H. Outcome-focused national park experience management: Transforming participants, promoting social well-being, and fostering place attachment. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 2015, 23, 358–381. [CrossRef]
- 32. Lin, C.; Lockwood, M. Assessing sense of place in natural settings: A mixed-method approach. J. Environ. Plan. Manag. 2014, 57, 1441–1464. [CrossRef]
- 33. Brown, G.; Raymond, C. The relationship between place attachment and landscape values: Toward mapping place attachment. *Appl. Geogr.* **2007**, *27*, 89–111. [CrossRef]
- 34. Kaltenborn, B.P. Effects of sense of place on responses to environmental impacts. Appl. Geogr. 1998, 18, 169–189. [CrossRef]
- 35. Leviston, Z.; Walker, I.; Green, M.; Price, J. Linkages between ecosystem services and human wellbeing: A Nexus Webs approach. *Ecol. Indic.* **2018**, *93*, 658–668. [CrossRef]
- 36. Stedman, R.C. Is It Really Just a Social Construction?: The Contribution of the Physical Environment to Sense of Place. *Soc. Nat. Resour.* 2003, *16*, 671–685. [CrossRef]
- Watson, J.E.M.; Dudley, N.; Segan, D.B.; Hockings, M. The performance and potential of protected areas. *Nature* 2014, 515, 67–73. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

- Dudley, N.; Stolton, S. Defining Protected Areas: An International Conference in Almeria, Spain; IUCN: Gland, Switzerland, 2008. Available online: https://www.iucn.org/resources/publication/defining-protected-areas-international-conference-almeriaspain-may-2007 (accessed on 2 November 2022).
- 39. Cundill, G.; Bezerra, J.C.; De Vos, A.; Ntingana, N. Beyond benefit sharing: Place attachment and the importance of access to protected areas for surrounding communities. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 2017, 28, 140–148. [CrossRef]
- Justus, J.; Colyvan, M.; Regan, H.; Maguire, L. Buying into conservation: Intrinsic versus instrumental value. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 2009, 24, 187–191. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 41. Palomo, I.; Martin-Lopez, B.; Potschin, M.; Haines-young, R.; Montes, C. National Parks, buffer zones and surrounding lands: Mapping ecosystem service flows. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **2013**, *4*, 104–116. [CrossRef]
- 42. Infield, M. Cultural Values: A Forgotten Strategy for Building Community Support for Protected Areas in Africa. *Conserv. Biol.* **2001**, *15*, 800–802. [CrossRef]
- 43. Robinson, J.G. Ethical pluralism, pragmatism, and sustainability in conservation practice. *Biol. Conserv.* **2011**, *144*, 958–965. [CrossRef]
- 44. De Vos, A.; Bezerra, J.C.; Roux, D. Relational values about nature in protected area research. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **2018**, *35*, 89–99. [CrossRef]
- 45. Constanza, R.; D'Arge, R.; de Groot, R.; Grasso, M.; Hannon, B.; Limburg, K.; Naeem, S.; ONeil, R.V.; Paruelo, J.; Raskin, R.G.; et al. The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature* **1997**, *387*, 253–260. [CrossRef]
- Chan, K.M.A.; Satter, T.; Goldstein, J. Rethinking ecosystem services to better address and navigate cultural values. *Ecol. Econ.* 2012, 74, 8–18. [CrossRef]
- 47. Díaz, S.; Demissew, S.; Carabias, J.; Joly, C.; Lonsdale, M.; Ash, N.; Larigauderie, A.; Adhikari, J.R.; Arico, S.; Báldi, A.; et al. The IPBES Conceptual Framework-connecting nature and people. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **2015**, *14*, 1–16. [CrossRef]
- 48. Gobster, P.H.; Nassauer, J.I.; Daniel, T.C.; Fry, G. The shared landscape: What does aesthetics have to do with ecology? *Landsc. Ecol.* 2007, 22, 959–972. [CrossRef]
- Mehnen, N.; Mose, I.; Strijker, D. Governance and Sense of Place: Half a Century of a German Nature Park. *Environ. Policy Gov.* 2013, 23, 46–62. [CrossRef]
- 50. Walker, G.J.; Chapman, R. Special Issue: Sustainable Places Thinking Like a Park: The Effects of Sense of Place, Perspective-Taking, and Empathy on Pro-Environmental Intentions. *J. Park Recreat. Adm.* **2003**, *21*, 71–86.
- Snider, A.; Hill, J.; Luo, S.; Buerger, B.; Herstine, J. Implications for place attachment in coastal Reserve management. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* 2011, 54, 612–620. [CrossRef]
- 52. Roux, D.J.; Smith, M.K.S.; Smit, I.P.J.; Freitag, S.; Slabbert, L.; Mokhatla, M.M.; Hayes, J.; Mpapane, N.P. Cultural ecosystem services as complext outcomes of people-nature interactions in protected areas. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 2020, 43, 101111. [CrossRef]
- 53. Milcu, A.I.; Hanspach, J.; Abson, D.; Fischer, J. Cultural ecosystem services: A literature review and prospects for future research. *Ecol. Soc.* **2013**, *18*, 44. [CrossRef]
- 54. Kianicka, S.; Buchecker, M.; Hunziker, M. Locals' and Tourists' Sense of Place. Mt. Res. Dev. 2006, 26, 55–63. [CrossRef]
- 55. Puren, K.; Drewes, E.; Roos, V. An Exploration of Sense of Place as Informative for Spatial Planning Guidelines: A Case Study of the Vredefort Dome World Heritage Site, South Africa. *Int. J. Civ. Environ. Struct. Constr. Archit. Eng.* **2007**, *1*, 42–49.
- Gaylard, A.; Ferreira, S. Advances and challenges in the implementation of strategic adaptive management beyond the Kruger National Park—Making linkages between science and biodiversity management. *Koedoe—Afr. Prot. Area Conserv. Sci.* 2011, 53, 52–59. [CrossRef]
- Nikodinoska, N.; Foxcroft, L.C.; Rouget, M.; Paletto, A.; Notaro, S. Tourists' perceptions and willingness to pay for the control of Opuntia stricta invasion in protected areas: A case study from South Africa. *Koedoe-African Prot. Area Conserv. Sci.* 2014, 56, 1–8. [CrossRef]
- 58. Van Wilgen, B.W. Evidence, perceptions, and trade-offs associated with invasive alien plant control in the Table Mountain National Park. *S. Afr. Ecol. Soc.* **2012**, *17*. [CrossRef]
- 59. Masterson, V.A.; Spierenburg, M.; Tengö, M. The trade-offs of win-win conservation rhetoric: Exploring place meanings in community conservation on the Wild Coast, South Africa. *Sustain. Sci.* **2019**, *14*, 639–654. [CrossRef]
- 60. South African National Parks. Garden Route National Park: State of Knowledge; South African National Parks: Pretoria, South Africa, 2014.
- 61. Turpie, J.K.; Adams, J.B.; Joubert, A.; Harrison, T.D.; Colloty, B.M.; Maree, R.C.; Whitfield, A.K.; Wooldridge, T.H.; Lamberth, S.J.; Taljaard, S.; et al. Assessment of the conservation priority status of South African estuaries for use in management and water allocation. *Water SA* **2002**, *28*, 191–206. [CrossRef]
- 62. Geldenhuys, C.J. Bergwind fires and the location pattern of forest patches in the southern Cape landscape, South Africa. *J. Biogeogr.* **1994**, *21*, 49–62. [CrossRef]
- 63. Western Cape. Western Cape Figures for 2016 High Season. 2016. Available online: https://www.westerncape.gov.za/assets/ departments/economic-development-tourism/western_cape_figures_2016_high_season.pdf (accessed on 5 September 2022).
- 64. South African National Parks. *Garden Route National Park: Park Management Plan;* South African National Parks: Pretoria, South Africa, 2012. Available online: https://www.sanparks.org/docs/parks_grnp/planning_products/management_plan.pdf (accessed on 27 September 2022).
- 65. Statistics South Africa Census. 2011. Available online: http://www.statssa.gov.za/ (accessed on 25 September 2022).

- 66. Stehle, T. Knysna's Great Fire of 2017. Available online: http://saforestryonline.co.za/articles/knysnas-great-fire-of-2017/ (accessed on 14 October 2017).
- 67. Decrop, A. Triangulation in qualitative tourism research. Tour. Manag. 1999, 20, 157–161. [CrossRef]
- 68. Britten, N. Qualitative interviews in medical research. Qual. Res. 1995, 311, 251–253.
- Onwuegbuzie, A.J.; Leech, N.L. Sampling Designs in Qualitative Research: Making the Sampling Process More Public. *Qual. Rep.* 2007, 12, 238–254. [CrossRef]
- Groulx, M.; Lemieux, C.; Dawson, J.; Stewart, E.; Groulx, M.; Lemieux, C.; Dawson, J.; Stewart, E. Motivations to engage in last chance tourism in the Churchill Wildlife Management Area and Wapusk National Park: The role of place identity and nature relatedness. J. Sustain. Tour. 2016, 24, 1523–1540. [CrossRef]
- 71. Saldana, J. The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers, 1st ed.; SAGE Publications: London, UK, 2009.
- 72. Basit, T. Manual or electronic ? The role of coding in qualitative data analysis. Educ. Res. 2010, 45, 143–154. [CrossRef]
- 73. Relph, E. Place and Placelessness; Pion: London, UK, 1976.
- 74. Taylor, C.C.; Townsend, A.R. The Local 'Sense of Place' as Evidenced in North-East England. *Urban Stud.* **1976**, *13*, 133–146. [CrossRef]
- 75. Bonaiuto, M.; Alves, S.; de Dominicis, S.; Petruccelli, I. Place Attachment and Natural Environmental Risk: Research Review and Agenda. J. Environ. Psychol. 2016, 48, 33–53. [CrossRef]
- Silver, A.; Grek-Martin, J. "Now we understand what community really means": Reconceptualizing the role of sense of place in the disaster recovery process. J. Environ. Psychol. 2015, 42, 32–41. [CrossRef]
- Moore, S.; Daniel, M.; Linnan, L.; Campbell, M.; Benedict, S.; Meier, A. After Hurricane Floyd passed: Investigating the social determinants of disaster preparedness and recovery. *Fam. Community Health* 2004, 27, 204–217. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 78. Zeigler, D.J.; Brunn, S.D.; Johnson, J.H., Jr. Focusing on Hurricane Andrew through the eyes of the victims. Area 1996, 28, 124–129.
- 79. Jorgensen, B.S.; Stedman, R.C. A comparative analysis of predictors of sense of place dimensions: Attachment to, dependence on, and identification with lakeshore properties. *J. Environ. Manag.* **2006**, *79*, 316–327. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Cheng, C.K.; Kuo, H.Y. Bonding to a new place never visited: Exploring the relationship between landscape elements and place bonding. *Tour. Manag.* 2015, 46, 546–560. [CrossRef]
- Droseltis, O.; Vignoles, V.L. Towards an integrative model of place identification: Dimensionality and predictors of intrapersonallevel place preferences. J. Environ. Psychol. 2010, 30, 23–34. [CrossRef]
- 82. Hernes, M.I.; Metzger, M.J. Understanding local community's values, worldviews and perceptions in the Galloway and Southern Ayrshire Biosphere Reserve, Scotland. *J. Environ. Manag.* **2017**, *186*, 12–23. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 83. Fish, R.; Church, A.; Winter, M. Conceptualising cultural ecosystem services: A novel framework for research and critical engagement. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 2016, 21, 208–217. [CrossRef]
- Kaltenborn, B.P.; Williams, D.R. The meaning of place: Attachments to Femundsmarka National Park, Norway, among tourists and locals. Nor. J. Geogr. 2002, 56, 189–198. [CrossRef]
- 85. Ament, J.M.; Moore, C.A.; Herbst, M.; Cumming, G.S. Cultural Ecosystem Services in Protected Areas: Understanding Bundles, Trade-Offs, and Synergies. *Conserv. Lett.* **2017**, *10*, 439–449. [CrossRef]
- SANParks. Garden Route National Park. Draft Park Management Plan for the Period 2020–2029. South African National Parks Unpublished Document. 2020. Available online: https://www.sanparks.org/assets/docs/docs/conservation/park_man/grnpdraft-plan-for-public-comment-v2.pdf (accessed on 26 September 2022).
- Raudsepp-hearne, C.; Peterson, G.D.; Bennett, E.M. Ecosystem service bundles for analysing tradeoffs in diverse landscapes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 2010, 107, 5242–5247. [CrossRef]
- Klain, S.C.; Satterfield, T.A.; Chan, K.M.A. What matters and why? Ecosystem services and their bundled qualities. *Ecol. Econ.* 2014, 107, 310–320. [CrossRef]
- Martín-López, B.; Iniesta-Arandia, I.; García-Llorente, M.; Palomo, I.; Casado-Arzuaga, I.; Del Amo, D.G.; Gómez-Baggethun, E.; Oteros-Rozas, E.; Palacios-Agundez, I.; Willaarts, B.; et al. Uncovering ecosystem service bundles through social preferences. *PLoS ONE* 2012, 7, e38970. [CrossRef]
- Smith, K.; Kraaij, T. Research note: Trail runners as agents of alien plant introduction into protected areas. J. Outdoor Recreat. Tour. 2020, 31, 100315. [CrossRef]
- 91. MEA (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment). *Ecosystem and Human Well-Being: General Synthesis;* World Resource Institute: Washington, DC, USA, 2005.
- Gould, R.K.; Klain, S.C.; Ardoin, N.M.; Satterfield, T.; Woodside, U.; Hannahs, N.; Daily, G.C.; Chan, K.M. A protocol for eliciting nonmaterial values through a cultural ecosystem services frame. *Conserv. Biol.* 2015, 29, 575–586. [CrossRef]