



Cooperation in Landscape Management in the Eastern Part of the Bernese Oberland

**A case study of cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee
and conservation organisations in the development process
of a Regional Landscape Development Concept**

**Submitted to Professor Richard J. Watts
as a Licentiate Paper in English Linguistics**

Abstract

This Licentiate paper is a contribution to the KILA project (Cooperation in Landscape Management) which is part of the National Research Project 48 (NRP 48), “Landscape and Habitats of the Alps”, of the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF). The KILA project promotes the exchange of experience and knowledge among scientists and practitioners involved in regional landscape development of the eastern part of the Bernese Oberland. Since the tourism-based *Berner Oberland-Ost* region depends on an attractive landscape, touristic, private-sector, agricultural, ecological as well as aesthetic aspects are crucial. They increasingly require collective patterns of action and institutional cooperation. By drawing up a concept for regional landscape development (R-LEK), the Regional Planning Committee *Berner Oberland-Ost* have tried to accomplish the manifold tasks in the area of landscape management in an innovative and cooperative way.

The study investigates the (lack of) cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations of the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region in the development process of R-LEK. It is based on qualitative research methods and involves five interdependent methodological steps: formulating research questions and hypotheses, sampling process, collection of data, data processing, interpretation and evaluation and the presentation of the research findings. A number of research questions concerning the conservation organisations’ involvement in the R-LEK process are answered; moreover, the study aims at verifying the following hypotheses:

- The institutions’ different views about landscape management affect the (lack of) cooperation in landscape management.

- During the development process of R-LEK power played an inherent role in the cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations.

The sampling process brought forth five institutions which are the actors in this study, i.e. the Regional Planning Committee and four conservation organisations active in the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region. Data collection for this study consisted of the analysis of documents, semi-structured interviews and of one instance of participating observation. After transcription the data were thematically coded by means of a digital coding programme.

Theoretical frameworks dealing with different views, *thought collectives* and *styles* concerning landscape management support the first hypothesis that the institutions' different views about landscape management affected the (lack of) cooperation during the R-LEK development process. The theoretical frameworks of power and *political discourse* support the second hypothesis that power played an inherent role in the cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations. The present study confirms that there was a lack of cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations in the development process of R-LEK.

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my special thanks to Prof. Dr. Richard J. Watts for his generosity in supporting this research study which was developed in an interdisciplinary framework. Moreover, I would like to express my deep gratitude to Denise Steiner for her invaluable support and much appreciated feedback throughout all the stages of my research process. I would also like to thank PD Dr. Thomas Hammer, who as project leader enabled me to participate in the KILA project. Thanks also to Prof. Dr. Ruth Kaufmann-Hayoz for providing me with a desk at and the use of the Interfaculty Office for the Coordination of General Ecology (IKAÖ)'s infrastructure. Furthermore, I would like to express my thanks to all interviewees who consented to being part of this study and were willing to be recorded and analysed, to Margret Powell-Joss for copy-editing, Ed Dean for his assistance in designing the cover page, to Zoë Ghielmetti for her generosity in allowing me to use the International Relation's infrastructure and to my parents for their financial support throughout my studies. Finally, I would like to thank Attila for our stimulating discussions, for his encouragement of self-discipline and perseverance in my research work and for all the leisure activities which I greatly enjoyed and which gave me the power to complete this thesis in a most intensive and effective way.

Table of contents

Abstract	I
Acknowledgements.....	III
Table of abbreviations.....	IX
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Starting point.....	1
1.2 Research objectives.....	2
1.3 Research questions and hypotheses	3
1.3.1 Research questions	3
1.3.2 Research hypotheses	3
1.4 Thesis structure	4
2. Methodology	7
2.1 Research approach	7
2.2 Research process.....	8
2.2.1 Research questions and hypotheses.....	9
2.2.2 Sampling process	10
2.2.3 Data collection.....	11
2.2.4 Data processing	14
2.3 Objectivity or the limitations of qualitative research.....	18
3. Theories.....	19
3.1 Some theoretical approaches to different views about landscape	20
3.1.1 Different views about landscape.....	20
3.1.2 Different <i>thought styles</i> and <i>thought collectives</i>	22

3.2 The role of power in landscape management.....	24
3.2.1 Theoretical approaches to the notion of power.....	24
3.2.2 Political discourse.....	26
4. Bases.....	29
4.1 Research area: The <i>Berner Oberland-Ost</i> region.....	29
4.2 The Regional Landscape Development Concept (R-LEK).....	30
4.3 Actor groups.....	33
4.3.1 The Regional Planning Committee <i>Berner Oberland-Ost</i>	33
4.3.2 Conservation organisations in the <i>Berner Oberland-Ost</i>	34
5. Results	37
5.1 Actors' divergent views about landscape management	38
5.1.1 The Regional Planning Committee's view about landscape management	38
5.1.2 Conservation organisations' view about landscape management.....	41
5.2 Conservation organisations in the R-LEK process	47
5.2.1 The public participation process and the involvement of conservation organisations in R-LEK.....	48
5.2.2 Institutions' views of each others' functions	53
5.2.3 Conservation organisations' assessment of R-LEK.....	58
5.2.4 Points of contact between conservation organisations and R-LEK.....	59
5.2.5 Suggestions for future cooperation.....	62
6. Synthesis	65
6.1 Theoretical concepts related to a lack of cooperation	65
6.1.1 Lack of cooperation due to divergent views about landscape management ...	65
6.1.2 A lack of cooperation in landscape management due to different <i>thought styles</i> and <i>thought collectives</i>	69
6.2 Power and different discourse types in the R-LEK process	70
6.2.1 A lack of cooperation in landscape management due to different forms of discourse	70
6.2.2 Instances of power in the R-LEK process	74

7. Summary and Conclusion	81
7.1 Methodology in retrospect	81
7.2 Summary of research process and findings.....	84
7.3 Recommendations.....	88
 References	 91

Table of abbreviations

BLN:	Bundesinventar der Landschaften und Naturdenkmäler von nationaler Bedeutung (Federal Inventory of Landscapes and Natural Monuments of National Importance)
BUWAL:	Bundesamt für Umwelt, Wald und Landschaft (Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape, SAEFL)
IKAÖ:	Interfakultäre Koordinationsstelle für Allgemeine Ökologie (Interfaculty Office for the Coordination of General Ecology)
KILA:	Kooperation im Landschaftsmanagement (Cooperation in Landscape Management)
KWO:	Kraftwerke Oberhasli (conglomerate of hydroelectric power companies in the Oberhasli/Grimsel area)
NRP:	National Research Programme
ÖQV:	Öko-Qualitätsverordnung (regulation on eco quality)
R-LEK:	Regionales Landschaftsentwicklungskonzept (Regional Landscape Development Concept)
RPC:	Regional Planning Committee
SNSF:	Swiss National Science Foundation
UTB:	Uferschutzverband Thuner- und Brienersee (Association for the protection of the shores of the lakes of Thun and Brienz)

1. Introduction

1.1 Starting point

The framework of my thesis is a research project which deals with Cooperation in Landscape Management: institutional strategies on a local and regional level (KILA project). The project has been pursued by the Interfaculty Coordination Office for General Ecology (IKAOe) of the University of Bern, and is part of National Research Project 48 (NRP 48), “Landscape and Habitats of the Alps”, of the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF). It promotes the exchange of experience and knowledge among scientists and practitioners involved in regional landscape development of the eastern part of the Bernese Oberland, henceforth termed *Berner Oberland-Ost*.

Alpine communities are increasingly faced with private-sector and ecological processes, such as increasing pressure on landscape development owing to urbanization, migration and decreasing primary production. Landscape management therefore must be oriented towards the conservation of landscape, which is part of our habitat, as an attractive public good. The tourism-based region of the *Berner Oberland-Ost* depends on an attractive landscape. Its relevance is not only touristic but also private-sector, agricultural, ecological as well as aesthetic. It has productive as well as reproductive functions, which increasingly require collective patterns of action on a supra-communal level. Landscape conservation is therefore a collective task, with institutional cooperation affecting landscape management. By drawing up a concept for regional landscape development (R-LEK), the Regional Planning Committee *Berner Oberland-Ost* have tried to accomplish the multitude of tasks in the area of landscape management in an innovative and cooperative way.

My part in the KILA project was to study cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee *Berner Oberland-Ost* and regional conservation organisations,

with particular focus on cooperation between these institutions in the context of the development process of R-LEK. This study is an attempt to analyse how the conservation organisations were involved in the development process of R-LEK, and how they are represented in the completed R-LEK document. In the next three sections I will introduce my particular research objectives, questions and hypotheses as well as the structure of this thesis.

1.2 Research objectives

My research objectives are in line with the overall aim of the KILA project, which is to obtain findings about influences on the regional process of planning and implementation of landscape development. This is also the major objective of NRP 48, Landscape and Habitats of the Alps:

NRP 48 aims to acquire the knowledge on goals and actions needed for a socially desired, economically acceptable and politically feasible landscape development. Endogenous and exogenous causalities of landscape development should be recognised, requirements and standards for a sustainable landscape development should be analysed and possible approaches in the relevant political fields and scopes of actions should be elaborated. (NRP 48)

In this sense, my thesis focuses on the cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations of *Berner Oberland-Ost* during the development process of R-LEK. I have examined the actors' aims and expectations with regard to landscape management; the participation of conservation organisations in the development of R-LEK; the way in which these organisations are affected by R-LEK; as well as their inclusion in and assessment of R-LEK. In order to achieve my research aims I have drawn up the research questions and hypotheses presented in the following section.

1.3 Research questions and hypotheses

The following research questions are designed to obtain answers to achieve the research objectives formulated above. Moreover, during the research process two hypotheses evolved from the research objectives, also given below, which I am hoping will be supported by my study.

1.3.1 Research questions

- What are the conservation organisations' aims and with regard to landscape management?
- What are the Regional Planning Committee's aims with regard to landscape management?
- In what way do the conservation organisations participate in the process of developing R-LEK?
- In what way are the conservation organisations involved in R-LEK?
- In what way are the conservation organisations affected by R-LEK?
- How do the conservation organisations assess the strengths and weaknesses of R-LEK?
- Do the two groups of actors (i.e. conservation organisations and the Regional Planning Committee) have any suggestions for improved cooperation?

1.3.2 Research hypotheses

- The institutions' different views about landscape management affected their cooperation in landscape management.
- During the development process of R-LEK power played an inherent role in the cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations.

Chapter 5, which presents the results of my study, is divided into two parts. The first part (5.1) refers to the first hypothesis that different views about landscape

management influence cooperation in landscape management. This part will also provide findings with regard to the first two research questions concerning the actors' aims in landscape management.

The second part (5.2) of the results part refers to the second hypothesis, i.e. that during the development of R-LEK power played an inherent role in the cooperation between institutions selected for this study. This part also serves to give answers to the further five research questions. It will show in what way conservation organisations participated in the process of developing R-LEK, how they are involved in and affected by R-LEK, and how conservation organisations assess the strengths and weaknesses of R-LEK. The last section of the results part will refer to the last research question related to suggestions for improved cooperation.

1.4 Thesis structure

Chapter 1, the introduction to this thesis, presents the starting point, the framework as well as the research questions and hypotheses of my study. Chapter 2 gives an overview of the qualitative methodological approach and research steps applied, such as sampling, collection and evaluation of data, as well as a discussion of objectivity in qualitative research methods. Chapter 3 presents theoretical approaches to different views on landscape management and power used in the analysis of the results of my research work. Chapter 4 describes my research area, the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region, the Regional Landscape Development (R-LEK) and the actor groups involved, i.e. the Regional Planning Committee and several conservation organisations. Chapter 5, the empirical part, presents the results of the data collection with regard to (lack of) cooperation between the institutions examined in my study. The first part (5.1) discusses my first hypothesis regarding

different views in landscape management, while the second part (5.2) refers to my second hypothesis concerning power and *political discourse* in the development process of the Regional Landscape Development Concept (R-LEK). Chapter 6 links my theoretical approaches to the results of my research work and will give reasons for supporting my hypotheses. In Chapter 7 I will draw conclusions with regard to methodology, research process and findings. Furthermore, these findings are summarised and suggestions are made for the improvement of future cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations.

2. Methodology

2.1 Research approach

The present study is based on qualitative research methods. In qualitative research there is a great variety of specific methods, each of which assumes different premises and pursues different aims. Every method is based on a specific understanding of its study subject. Correspondingly, qualitative methods cannot be regarded independently of the research process and the issue under study. They are embedded in the research process and are best considered from a process-oriented perspective. I therefore had to gain insights into the field, to consider possible research subjects – in this case institutions and organisations – as well as possible ways of formulating my research questions before I was able to select appropriate research methods. In this sense, my research methods always relate to the current stage of the research process. Before presenting this, I will briefly introduce some aspects of qualitative research which allowed me to choose the most appropriate methodological strategies.

Flick (2002: 4) defines four essential features of qualitative research: appropriate choice of methods and theories; identification and analysis of different perspectives; the researchers' reflections on their research as part of the process of knowledge production; and a variety of approaches and methods. He maintains (2002: 5) that an appropriate research method has to be open-ended so that it may do justice to the complexity of the object under study. It is not the method that determines the study object, but the other way around.

Qualitative research presents a variety of perspectives, i.e. the point of view of the researchers, the participants, and of professionals in the field. These different perspectives are always related to the subjective and social meanings of the subject under study. Qualitative research also involves the study of participants' knowledge

and practices. Flick (2002: 6) emphasizes the fact that interrelations between knowledge and participants' practices have to be described in the concrete context of the case, and explained in relation to it. Moreover, he adds that qualitative research takes into account the fact that – owing to subjective perspectives and social backgrounds – viewpoints and practices in the field are different. It was therefore essential for me to gain knowledge of the organisations' backgrounds and practices. These findings will be presented in sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 of this thesis.

Moreover, Flick (2002: 6) states that qualitative methods consider the researcher's communication with the participants an explicit part of knowledge production. Therefore, the subjectivity of both the researcher and the objects of study are part of the research process. The researcher's reflections on the participants' actions, impressions, irritations and feelings inevitably influence the interpretation of the data. Finally, Flick (2002: 7) also states that qualitative research is not based on a unified theoretical or methodological concept. Various theoretical approaches and their associated methods characterize the research practices. In my thesis I have largely adopted Flick's (2002) approach to qualitative research methods.

2.2 Research process

Essentially, qualitative research involves the following steps: formulating research questions or hypotheses and theories; sampling process; collection of data; data interpretation and evaluation; presentation of research findings, with interdependence between the individual parts. Flick (2002: 42) emphasizes that the data and field under study have precedence over theoretical hypotheses.

The research process for my study involved the following steps:

- research questions and hypotheses;
- sampling process;
- collection of data;
- coding of data;
- interpretation and evaluation of data;
- presentation of research findings.

While research for my study was a step-by-step process, the individual steps are interrelated and merge into each other. In the course of my study I often had to question my procedure as well as my findings.

2.2.1 Research questions and hypotheses

A very important step in the research process is how to formulate the research questions. Unclearly formulated questions may result in an unwieldy amount of data. It is crucial for researchers to develop a clear idea of their research question while remaining open to new results. According to Flick (2002: 46), clearly formulated research questions also help when it comes to testing the appropriateness of methodological decisions. The formulation of research questions depends on the general thrust of the study. In the KILA project this corresponds to the aims of NRP 48. As a member of the KILA group, I formulated research questions and hypotheses regarding cooperation between institutions in the context of a concept for landscape development. They correspond to the general thrust of the KILA project, which involves cooperation in landscape management. As Flick (2002: 50) suggests, I carefully examined the origin of my research questions, and attempted to ensure that there was they was a point of reference against which to test the soundness of the research design and appropriateness of methods used for collecting and interpreting the data.

2.2.2 Sampling process

2.2.2.1 Sampling strategies

In qualitative research there are various sampling strategies. I only refer to those which are relevant to my study. One possible sampling strategy for my work is *critical case sampling* (Flick 2002: 68), involving the selection of critical cases in which the relations to be studied become especially clear. In my study critical cases might be statements by experts or representatives of organisations which are relevant to my research questions. Another sampling method I decided to use is the *convenience sampling strategy* (Flick 2002: 68), whereby cases are selected which are the easiest to access under given conditions. I occasionally used this method as the only way to do the evaluation with limited resources of time and personnel.

2.2.2.2 Selected actors

The selection of adequate actor groups for my study was based on the following criteria described by Morse (1998). Morse (1998: 73) emphasizes that the selected interviewees should have the necessary knowledge and experience concerning the study issue. Moreover, they should be given time to reflect and ask questions, and should be explicitly prepared to participate in the study (Morse 1998: 73). If these conditions are met, the actors are likely to be integrated into the study.

The starting point of my study was not a theory but a set of research questions and hypotheses influencing both my sampling methods and procedure and the selection of my interview partners. The fact that my thesis deals with R-LEK implies that its initiators, the Regional Planning Committee *Berner Oberland-Ost*, are one of my selected actor groups. The aim of the paper is to show the cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations during the R-LEK process. Thus, as a next step in the sampling procedure I tried to find all the conservation organisations which are in some way active in my research area, the

Berner Oberland-Ost. I found numerous associations, unions, societies, etc., which are concerned with the protection of the landscape in the ***Berner Oberland-Ost*** (see section 4.3). From these institutions I selected a sample of four organizations which meet the requirements of a conservation organisation in a way that is adequate for my research, which is limited to R-LEK-related cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations. In a process of public participation the Regional Planning Committee invited the following four conservation organisations active in the Berner Oberland-Ost – among numerous other institutions and communities – to comment on the draft version of R-LEK:

- Pro Natura Berner Oberland
- Grimselverein
- Bernese Heritage Society (Regional group Interlaken-Oberhasli)
- Uferschutzverband Thuner- und Brienzersee (UTB)

The reason why I chose these four conservation organisations is that they were invited to submit a Public statement on R-LEK I therefore assumed that they were in some way related to the Regional Planning Committee; hence some form of cooperation could be expected. A portrait of the actor groups is presented in Chapter 4 (Bases).

2.2.3 Data collection

In order to obtain knowledge about cooperation between conservation organisations and the Regional Planning Committee with regard to the development of R-LEK, I applied a triangulation technique using three different qualitative data-collection methods. Initially, I gathered data by analysing relevant documents, followed by semi-structured interviews and, thirdly, I applied the method of participant observation.

2.2.3.1 Analysis of documents

Reading documents and literature is one of three methods I used to collect and interpret the data for my study. As a source of information written data both confirm insights and contradict previous findings while helping to reach new insights. In particular, I examined the following documents:

- the conservation organisations' statutes;
- the conservation organisations' annual reports;
- newspaper articles;
- the homepages of the institutions involved;
- the draft version of R-LEK;
- official statements by conservation organisations;
- the public participation report by the Regional Planning Committee;
- the final version of R-LEK.

The analysis of these documents helped me to describe the genesis and development of R-LEK as well as the relevant cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and the conservation organisations involved.

2.2.3.2 Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews are guided interviews with more or less open questions. These questions are expected to be answered freely by the interviewees. Flick (2002: 74-91) presents a variety of semi-structured interview types (i.e. semi-standardized, problem-centred or ethnographic interviews). Even though Flick (2002) and others suggest various kinds of semi-structured interviews I found it difficult to restrict myself to a specific interview type. However, the type which seemed to be most appropriate for my study is the expert interview.

Flick (2002: 89) refers to Meuser and Nagel (1991), who say that in the expert interview the interviewees are of interest due to their expertise in a certain field or activity. They are integrated into the study not as individuals but as representatives of a group. My interviewees are individuals in leading positions in the organisations under study. However, Meuser and Nagel (1991: 449-50) mention several weaknesses of the expert interview. For example, the expert interview fails if the expert proves not to be an expert on the topic, or if the expert tries to involve the interviewer in conflicts in the field and talks about internal matters and intrigues in his or her work field instead of talking about the interview topic. In my study the interviewees proved to be experts in their fields although their levels of knowledge of R-LEK varied quite considerably.

2.2.3.3 Participant observation

According to Denzin (1989b: 157-8) participant observation is defined as a field strategy that “simultaneously combines document analysis, interviewing of respondents and informants, direct participation and observation, and introspection”. The researcher goes into the field and observes from a participant’s perspective; however, any observations are also influenced by his or her participation.

When the final version of R-LEK was completed, the Regional Planning Committee together with the KILA group arranged a discussion workshop intended to help gather ideas concerning the regional implementation of R-LEK. Invitations to this workshop were sent to some forty representatives of various institutions and communities of *Berner Oberland-Ost* region. Participants discussed R-LEK and possible ideas for its implementation in the region in three groups.

As a member of the KILA group I attended parts of the discussions of all three groups. According to the definition quoted above, my participation in the workshop was a form of participant observation. I directly participated in and observed the

field, I had the same perspective as the other participants, and I directly influenced what I observed. My participation in this workshop gave me an insight into practice and helped me to see the potentials and limitations of the implementation of R-LEK. Moreover, I became aware of how difficult it is to establish cooperation between people and institutions of entirely different backgrounds and fields of interest (e.g. ecological vs. private-sector vs. agricultural, or scientific vs. application-oriented).

2.2.4 Data processing

Based on the research questions and hypotheses of my study I analysed the collected data by applying qualitative methods of documentation and interpretation. Prior to interpretation data have to be edited and coded. This section is a discussion of the data processing methods applied in my study, i.e. the steps of recording, transcribing, thematic coding, written presentation of the data, rounded off by some thoughts on data interpretation.

2.2.4.1 Data recording

While recording data the researcher may be confronted with some problematic aspects. In order to obtain useful material, the interview situation must be as natural as possible. Prior to recording the interviewer must obtain the interviewee's explicit permission to record their statements, and inform them about the further use of the recordings. Flick (2002: 167) maintains that having informed the participants about the purpose of the recording, the researcher hopes that they will forget about the recording device and that the conversation will be "natural". However, there is no proof that people act naturally if they know that they are being observed. This phenomenon is called the observer's paradox. Overcoming this paradox by leaving interviewees unaware of the device would result in an unethical recording. Unobtrusive recording equipment helps reduce the feeling of artificiality.

I was in the fortunate situation to use modern digital recording equipment provided by IKAÖ. It was small and unobtrusive and did not unduly affect the participants' behaviour. However, I still encountered aspects of the observer's paradox in that, when I turned off the recording device after some interview sessions, participants addressed issues – often of a delicate nature – which they had not mentioned before.

2.2.4.2 Data transcription

In order to interpret recorded data it has to be transcribed, for which it is important to find an adequate transcription system. Since my study is of an interdisciplinary rather than purely linguistic nature, the aim is not to attain standards of exactitude with regard to linguistic features (e.g. sound pitch, pauses, etc.), but to transcribe as many features as required to answer my research questions.

As the whole process of transcribing is affected by various individual perceptions, the interpretation of different measurable and non-measurable issues, and selectiveness with regard to the whole procedure, a transcription is always the result of a subjective process. To avoid too much subjectivity and to observe ethical standards, researchers must inform their interviewees of their intentions, not only describing their objectives, but also how the interviews will be transcribed and what omissions will be made.

Since I was able to work with excellent digital equipment and conduct most of the interviews in a quiet environment, the sound quality was good and I did not have to deal with technical problems, nor with much background noise. My knowledge of the context of the interview situation and having plenty of background information about my interviewees also helped me understand the recordings. However, I conducted a single interview in a restaurant and spent an inordinate amount of time transcribing the statements nearly drowned out by background noise.

2.2.4.3 Thematic coding

The coding process is one of the most important methods in qualitative research. It serves as a first step to develop or find a suitable theory. At the same time it is a basis for the decision on what additional data need to be collected. Not every coding method is appropriate. The choice depends on the subject of the study, the research questions and objectives, and on the collected data. It should be reviewed against the material to be interpreted. Flick (2002: 176-195) presents several coding methods. I will focus on *thematic coding* as developed by Strauss (1999), because I find it to be the most appropriate in the pursuit of my research goals. In general, *thematic coding* is suitable for studies in which group comparisons are to be conducted in relation to a specific issue. The underlying assumption is that different social groups will manifest different views (Flick 2002: 185). Flick (2002: 185) also maintains that in order to assess this assumption and to develop a theory of such group-specific perspectives, it is necessary to modify some details of Strauss's procedure. This will also increase the comparability of the empirical material. Sampling should be oriented towards those groups whose perspectives on the issue seem to be most instructive for the analysis. They should, therefore, be defined in advance. Hence, as the interviewer collects his or her data applying a method which seeks to guarantee comparability by defining topics, they remain open to the views related to them. Flick (2002: 185) states that to achieve this, the researcher may use semi-structured interviews. As mentioned above, this is the approach I chose. Moreover, the process of coding the collected data served to develop and find theoretical approaches which help to answer the research questions and support the hypotheses of this study.

In *thematic coding* I proceeded as follows: I made a short description of each research objective, question and hypothesis. This enabled me to find thematic categories corresponding to the research objectives, questions and hypotheses of my study. These categories were the basis for the different sections in the result part of this study (e.g. "Aims and expectations concerning landscape management," "the actors' different views about landscape management" or "the actors' assessment of

R-LEK”) and were then continuously tested and, if required, modified as the issue underwent further interpretation. The final step is the presentation to the reader in narrative form.

2.2.4.4 Data interpretation

The interpretation of data is the core of qualitative research. It serves to develop or find a suitable theory. It is also the basis for any decisions regarding the need to collect additional data. As with collecting data, not every method of interpretation is appropriate. Any methodological choice should be grounded in one’s own study, its research questions and aims and in the collected data. It should also be reviewed against the material to be interpreted.

Flick (2002: 238) refers to Becker (1986b: 18), who states that during the writing process it is important to consider the readership of the research paper and what they need to know so that they will not misread or find unintelligible what has been said. I therefore had to consider the fact that I have written for scientists with the Swiss National Science Foundation, for members of the KILA group and of the Regional Planning Committee, for conservation organisations in the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region, for inhabitants of the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region, and for readers of linguistic studies. As this list demonstrates, the range of readership could hardly be more varied, and it will be quite a challenge for this study to satisfy scientists as well as inhabitants of the region. Consequently, my study encompasses not only the interaction between myself and my object of study, but also the interaction between my potential readers and myself.

I began to interpret my data as I was coding the material. This is when I became aware of distinctive and striking features and similarities, differences and parallels in the coded data. These findings provided answers to my research questions. In order to interpret the coded data I applied theories appropriate to my

research focus which helped me to understand and handle the data. The theories applied to carry out this study are presented in Chapter 3 (Theories).

2.3 Objectivity or the limitations of qualitative research

In the preceding sections I have presented the qualitative research methods used in my study. Qualitative research allows a continuous approach to the complexity of the object of study, and a continuous optimisation of research strategies. However, the findings of my study are interpretative and subjective rather than quantitative and objective. In this regard, Beck and Bonß (1989: 31) argue that science no longer produces “absolute truths, which can uncritically be adopted. It provides limited offers for interpretation, which reach further than everyday theories but can be used in practice comparatively flexibly”. Despite all the methodological checks and balances, it is inevitable for my study to be influenced by the interests and social and cultural backgrounds of the researchers and actors involved. These aspects influence the formulation of research questions and hypotheses as well as the interpretation of data.

Qualitative science cannot be objective. It is impossible to eliminate subjectivity, since all research processes are based on different individual perceptions, on the interpretation of different measurable and non-measurable issues, and on selectiveness. In order to try to reduce subjectivity to a minimum I have defined my intentions and research objectives clearly, and described the different stages of my research project with the greatest possible precision.

3. Theories

The aim of my paper is to examine the cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations in the framework of R-LEK. Several reasons for cooperation between the institutions interviewed emerged while I was collecting my data:

- the institutions are all concerned with the landscape;
- they are all interested in an attractive landscape;
- landscape management is an important part of their mission.

These seem to be good conditions for successful cooperation and for the implementation of R-LEK. However, during the research process I realized that despite the fact that all institutions are interested in an attractive landscape and in landscape management, they did not cooperate very strongly. Apart from three kinds of contact during the public participation process, namely an invitation by the Regional Planning Committee extended to conservation organisations to submit a public statement; subsequent public statements by three of the four selected conservation organisations; and contributions by the Pro Natura representative to the landscape committee of R-LEK, there was barely any form of cooperation (for a detailed discussion of this issue, see Chapter 5 on results).

I therefore tried to find reasons for this lack of cooperation. As I was collecting and editing the data I found two theoretical approaches which helped me to understand my observations. They also were appropriate to obtain answers to my research questions and to support the hypotheses of this study. The aim is not necessarily to unify the collected data and the theories, but to contribute my own new ideas.

I will first present the theoretical approaches which refer to the hypothesis that the different backgrounds of the institutions are related to their respective views

about landscape. The second part of this chapter refers to the hypothesis related to the phenomenon of power inherent in the process of developing R-LEK, and the relevant research questions. The theories helped me to understand that the different institutions had divergent views about landscape, resulting in divergent landscape management strategies – not very good conditions for successful cooperation.

3.1 Some theoretical approaches to different views about landscape

By the expression “views about landscape management” I refer to the ways of understanding or interpreting landscape management. The notion of view involves the institutions’ different backgrounds and contexts and is also influenced by the institutions aims. I will therefore also consider the their different tasks, aims and backgrounds.

3.1.1 Different views about landscape

Landscape can be perceived from different backgrounds in several ways. Zwatz (1994: 188) states that any landscape can be considered under the aspects of economy, ecology and natural beauty. The ecologist focuses on ecosystems, the tourist wants to enjoy a beautiful view, and farmers need crops. These different approaches to landscape create tensions which may cause regional or communal conflicts. Hebertshuber (Hebertshuber 2000: 90-92) distinguishes six perspectives on landscape:

- The scientific perspective is focused on a pristine environment with great biodiversity which has to be maintained and protected from human encroachment. Bio-indicators provide measurable benchmarks to assess landscape quality. However, this perspective entails the very real risk of losing a more comprehensive overview of the genesis and productive function of a cultural landscape.
- Spatial planning aims at plannability and control. Landscapes are subdivided into functional areas. The more reproductive tasks, such as regeneration, waste disposal, nature conservation, etc., are displaced to peripheral areas.
- The perspective of the tourist economy reproduces idealised images of landscapes intended to attract potential tourists and likely to distract from the actually existing landscape.
- The private-sector perspective turns cultural landscapes, which are considered places of production, into marketable commodities.
- Landscape managers and nature conservationists try to conserve or re-establish the balance between the natural environment, agriculture and people, attempting to develop sustainable landscape management models for settlements and industry.
- Incentive programmes (agricultural policies, cultural landscape programmes) strive to rescue mountain farmers by rewarding their landscape management and conservation efforts. Subsidies provide an incentive to landscape conservation, turning a well-managed landscape into a product whose “producers” are required to respond to shifts in demand.

Views about landscape may be influenced by private-sector and tourist developments. Destructive technological and private-sector processes may activate the need for ecological harmony (Hebertshuber 2000: 88). This may create a conflict in the regions between the environmentalists’ and the population’s needs for participation in economic progress. Also the tourist perspective confronts local people with new views about landscape.

This theoretical background has helped me to describe the perspectives of the institutions interviewed for this study. In section 5.1 of this thesis (results) I will present the different views of my actors. In the synthesis part (6.1) I will relate the data to Hebertshuber’s list of perspectives and show in what ways different perspectives on and views about landscape management may have affected the (lack of) cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations in the development process of R-LEK. In the next section I will present Fleck’s theory of different thought styles and thought collectives, which will help to

support the hypothesis that different views about landscape management may result in a lack of cooperation.

3.1.2 Different *thought styles* and *thought collectives*

The theory of thought styles and thought collectives by Fleck (2002, originally 1935)¹ offers a good explanation for the institutions' different backgrounds and views about landscape. In a 1929 article Fleck for the first time analyses the relationship between objects, perceptual ability and social context in science. He emphasizes that there cannot be an *absolute truth* (Fleck 1983: 46-58). Each social group has its specific societal truth, whereas a given field of study determines the specific view of a certain object (Schäfer and Schnelle in Fleck 2002: XXII). In this sense Schäfer and Schnelle (foreword in Fleck 2002: XXV) state:

Von eigenen [...] Studien her kann Fleck nachweisen, dass es so etwas wie ein voraussetzungsloses Betrachten und Beobachten überhaupt gar nicht gibt. Immer sind Entscheidungen und vor allen Dingen denkstilgebundene Gewohnheiten mit im Spiel [...].

Moreover, Fleck introduces the notions of *thought collective* and *thought style* as instruments which serve to acquire a collective character. Fleck describes the *thought collective* as the carrier of the *thought style*. Therefore, he defines *thought style* as the “directed perception, with corresponding mental and objective assimilation of what has been so perceived” (Fleck 2002: 130; English translation taken from Fleck 1979: 99). However, the *thought collective* is not related to a certain group or social class. For the purpose of this study I focused on Fleck's (2002: 135) definition of *stable thought collectives*. He says that a *thought collective* emerges if a group exists long enough so that the *thought style* becomes fixed and formal in structure (Fleck 2002: 135). The *thought style* is then characterized by common features in the fields of interest to a *thought collective*, by the judgment which the *thought collective* considers evident, and

¹ When quoting Fleck in English, I use the only translation of his work *Genesis and development of a scientific fact* which was published in 1979.

by the methods which it applies as a means of cognition (Fleck 2002: 130). Fleck (2002: 185) states that we look through the eyes of the *thought collective*. We can therefore be limited by our own *thought styles*, so that any alien *thought style* appears like a free flight of fancy (Fleck 2002: 185/186). Our own *thought style*, in contrast, appears imperative to us because our own active perception functions unconsciously.

In my study the institutions represent different *thought collectives* strongly influenced by their own *thought styles*. As Fleck explains, since the institutions are somehow caught in their own *thought collective*, which is determined by the members' *thought styles* (e.g. common backgrounds and features of the fields of interests), each institution has its specific approach to the landscape. This may result in a lack of cooperation between institutions. In section 5.1 (results) I will present the institutions' different *thought styles* and describe the features of their *thought collectives*. In the first part of the Synthesis Chapter (6.1) I will link the results presented to Fleck's theory, which should help to support the hypothesis that different views – or in Fleck's words – different *thought styles* may be a possible reason for the lack of cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations in the development process of R-LEK. During the data collection I realized that a theoretical approach to the institutions' different views does not provide sufficient reasons for a lack of cooperation. I realized that power crucially affects cooperation between the institutions. In the following section I will therefore present some theories of power.

3.2 The role of power in landscape management

During the development process of R-LEK the Regional Planning Committee invited several institutions to join the public participation procedure by submitting a public statement giving their opinions on the draft of R-LEK. When I compared the public statements of the conservation organisations with the public participation report of the Regional Planning Committee and with the published R-LEK document, I realized that R-LEK considered the interests of the conservation organisations only to a very slight degree. This may be due to an imbalance of power throughout the development process of R-LEK, which moreover was very much like a political “game”. Thus, I reached the hypothesis that during the development of R-LEK power played an inherent part in the cooperation, or lack thereof, between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations. Concepts of power are of interest to almost every field of social science. Therefore, it is an ideal theoretical framework for this interdisciplinary study.

3.2.1 Theoretical approaches to the notion of power

Power is a social phenomenon and can occur in any social context. The concept of power has been of interest to numerous researchers, but the aim of this paper is not to give a comprehensive overview of the entire literature on power. Rather, I will focus on some of the key terms and concepts which are relevant to my study. I will present some aspects of Watts’ (1991), Ng and Bradac’s (1993) and Fairclough’s (2001) theoretical approaches to power.

According to Watts (1991: 56) power is the opportunity of imposing one’s will upon another actor. An essential point of this definition is that exercise of power is intentional and against the will of the other actor. Watts emphasizes that the aspect of intentionality involved in the exercise of power is problematic (Watts 1991: 57). He

states that for example “in institutionalised settings an individual or body of individuals may be invested with the ability to cause others to act against their will, but this does not necessarily imply intentionality” (Watts 1991: 56). Since in my research study I am dealing with institutions, this reflects the position of the interviewees as members of the institutions, which is why their personal opinions and attitudes are not under consideration.

Apart from physical force language is the most obvious means through which power is exercised. Ng and Bradac (1993: 190 -191) define four aspects of the relation between language and power. They say that language *reveals*, *creates*, *reflects* and *obscures* power. The first three aspects show who is in a powerful position but can also help to change or confirm imbalances of power. The fourth aspect describes how language is used to obscure the exercise of power.

Fairclough (2001: 36) introduces the notions of power *in* and power *behind* discourse. Power *in* discourse refers to the actual exercise of power; power *behind* discourse, on the other hand, is related to the way in which relations of power shape and constitute the social orders of social institutions or societies. Since the focus of my study is on power relations, my focus is on power *behind* language related to the influence of power in social institutions.

Another interesting aspect of Fairclough’s power theory is the field of *political discourse*. In the context of my study *political discourse* is of interest with regard to the development of R-LEK, which involved regional political issues (e.g. the payment of an incentive bonus in the context of eco-quality regulations (*Öko-Qualitätsverordnung, ÖQV*). It is therefore a suitable theoretical framework to support the hypothesis that power plays an inherent part in the cooperation process between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations in the development of R-LEK.

I will now briefly comment on Fairclough’s notion of *political discourse*

3.2.2 Political discourse

Among numerous different forms of discourse, Fairclough (2001) also considers *political discourse*. According to Fairclough (2001: 71), “there is a constant endeavour on the part of those who have power to try to impose an ideological common sense which holds for everyone.” But there will always remain some degree of ideological diversity, so that ideological uniformity is never completely achieved, perhaps resulting in conflict or struggle. Fairclough (2001: 71) takes the diversity of political ideologies as a starting point. He writes that, “among the various forms which social struggle may take, it is *ideological struggle* that is of particular concern in the present context because ideological struggle pre-eminently takes place in language” (Fairclough 2001: 73). Furthermore, Fairclough (2001: 75) maintains that the struggle over language can manifest itself between ideologically diverse *discourse types* which refer to conventions, norms and codes underlying the actual discourse.

Struggles between discourse types often occur because in a social domain there is always one discourse type which tries to establish or maintain the dominant role, and therefore to establish or maintain certain ideological assumptions as commonsensical (Fairclough 2001: 75). In politics, each political force tries to win general acceptance for its own discourse type as the preferred and ultimately the “natural” one. Fairclough adds that “the stake is more than ‘mere words’; it is controlling the contours of the political world, it is legitimising policy, and it is sustaining power relations” (Fairclough 2001: 75). My focus is on the level behind the ‘mere words’, and on the political issues of cooperation between the institutions.

The primary domains in which social struggle occurs are the social institutions. In my case these social institutions are the Regional Planning Committee of *Berner Oberland-Ost* and four conservation organisations. As Fairclough (2001: 75) maintains, institutions are complex structures likely to involve various kinds of discourse in various situations. A number of different sets of ideologically competing discourse types corresponding to these situations may therefore be observed. Nevertheless, Fairclough (2001: 75) states that “there are important similarities and

overlaps between the discourse types associated with a particular ideological position, not only across situation types associated within an institution, but also across institutions.” In my study I will focus on power relations between institutions.

In the results part (5.2) I will present data related to the (lack of) cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations during the development process of R-LEK. In the synthesis part of this thesis (6.2) I will relate the data to the theoretical approaches to power and, supported by Watts’, Ng and Bradac’s and Fairclough’s theoretical approaches to power, show where power-related phenomena occurred in my data.

4. Bases

4.1 Research area: The *Berner Oberland-Ost* region

With a surface area of 1,274 sqkm, the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region is the largest in the canton of Bern (Regierungsrat des Kantons Bern 1998: 70). R-LEK divides the area into six sub-regions (Interlaken on the left and right banks of the Aare, Lauterbrunnen, Grindelwald, Brienz, Meiringen and Innertkirchen), comprising a total of 29 communities with 47,000 inhabitants (Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost 2004: 1, 4:2.1). The largest community is Interlaken, the smallest, Saxeten. The centre of the region with just under 14,000 inhabitants is formed by the three communities Interlaken, Matten and Unterseen on the so-called *Bödeli*, the plain between the lakes of Thun and Brienz (Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost 2004: 2.1). Each of the four communities with the largest populations (Grindelwald, Interlaken, Meiringen and Unterseen) is home to some 4,000 to 5,000 inhabitants (Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost 2004: 2.1). The *Berner Oberland-Ost* region provides approx. 27,000 jobs, some two thirds of which depend on tourism (Regierungsrat des Kantons Bern 1998: 70). 273 hotels and numerous tourist transportation facilities make the region a very important tourist destination year-round (Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost 2004: 2.1).

The *Berner Oberland-Ost* region is a perfect example of an Alpine landscape. It provides a diversity of ecosystems for flora and fauna, stable communities and attractive recreation areas (Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost 2004: 2.1). The preservation of this unique and marvellous mountain and lake landscape requires constant care. In the following section I will explain the role of R-LEK in the landscape management of *Berner Oberland-Ost* region.

4.2 The Regional Landscape Development Concept (R-LEK)

From a tourist, private-sector and ecological perspective the landscape of *Berner Oberland-Ost* is a precious commodity. What is the purpose of R-LEK?² On the one hand, legal bases referring to the environment and to landscape (e.g. in the fields of spatial planning, agriculture and tourism) have changed over the preceding years. Due to these changes the regional situation needs to be reassessed. On the other hand, the numerous demands of the people regarding landscape and the natural environment are changing constantly (e.g. trend sports, mobility). Moreover, agriculture and forestry, which are significant for landscape development, are undergoing profound changes. R-LEK states that it is not sufficient to make inventories and conserve areas. In the Regional Committee's opinion what is required is an active, object-oriented landscape management which enhances the quality of the landscape. Many areas which are important for the look of a landscape or as habitats for plants and animals, maintain their value only when they are cared for on a regular basis.

R-LEK was commissioned on 16th March 2001 by the Assembly of Delegates of the Regional Planning Committee. A regional landscape committee consisting of

- local representatives of the region,
- various regional and cantonal specialists and
- a representative of Pro Natura,

accompanied and oversaw the drafting of R-LEK from 2001 to 2003, presenting a draft proposal for public participation from 30th January to 2nd May, 2003 (Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost 2004: 6.1).

Among a number of institutions, the four conservation organisations which I chose to interview for the purpose of this study received a copy of the draft and were

² The source of the information supplied is: *Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost 2004*: 1.1, unless otherwise indicated.

invited to submit their public statement. Based on these public statements the Regional Planning Committee drew up a public participation report and, from May 2003 to March 2004, completed R-LEK (Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost 2004: 6.1). On 10th February 2004, the final draft of R-LEK was adopted by the president and committee; it was approved by the Assembly of Delegates on 19th March 2004 (Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost 2004: 6.1.), becoming operative in the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region after three years of work.

In order for R-LEK to become an effective instrument, however, its concepts must be implemented in the region. Currently, the Regional Planning Committee's chief task is to support this implementation. As a step in this direction, the Regional Planning Committee and the KILA group of IKAÖ invited representatives of the Swiss Confederation, the canton of Bern, communities, as well as tourist, agricultural and conservation organisations, etc., to a workshop held in April 2004. Its intention was to assist in collecting and developing ideas for a successful implementation of R-LEK. As described in section 2.2.3.3 of this thesis that workshop provided some of the data for my study.

R-LEK is an important basis for future landscape development in the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region. It is a regional instrument which serves to develop ideas and strategies for the future of the landscape; to propose arrangements and projects; to establish contacts between communities, organisations and interested people; to stir people's interest for landscape maintenance; and to inform regional residents of landscape developments. R-LEK also states that agriculture is of great significance (Regionalplanung 2004: 1). Therefore, in parallel to the development process of R-LEK, the Regional Planning Committee introduced steps regarding the implementation of incentives for high-quality landscape management (*Öko-Qualitätsverordnung* – *ÖQV*). It also created a regional landscape fund to promote activities aimed at preserving and caring for significant or unique landscapes (Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost 2004: 1). However, R-LEK is not intended to be a forerunner of further landscape conservation areas, nor should it restrict human

movement or the economy (Raumplanung 2004: 1). R-LEK recommends where and how attractive natural landscapes, traditional cultural landscapes and valuable ecosystems can be preserved by specific actions, in the interest of the inhabitants of as well as visitors to the region (Regionalplanung 2004: 1).

4.3 Actor groups

R-LEK is an important basis for landscape development in the *Berner Oberland-Ost* and affects many different actor groups, i.e. communities as well as tourist, agricultural and conservation organisations. In this paper I have decided to concentrate on the actor groups of conservation organisations as well as the Regional Planning Committee.

4.3.1 The Regional Planning Committee *Berner Oberland-Ost*

The Regional Planning Committee *Berner Oberland-Ost* consists of the General Assembly (delegates from 29 communities, the Jungfrau Railways and KWO), a supervisory board, the Committee (9 members), the Office as well as several special committees for energy, transport, landscape, etc. (Regionalplanung 2003: reverse side of cover). The main tasks of the Regional Planning Committee are development planning, spatial planning and the promotion of cooperation across communal boundaries (Inäbnit interview 2004).

The following groups were involved in the development of R-LEK (Regionalplanung 2004: 1.2):

- the landscape committee of the Regional Planning Committee Berner Oberland-Ost (one representative from each of the six sub-regions, plus one representative each from the agricultural association of Brienz-Oberhasli and Pro Natura Berner Oberland);
- the Office of the Regional Planning Committee Berner Oberland-Ost;
- four expert consultants (a planning expert, an agricultural service consultant, a representative from the cantonal Department of the Environment, and a spatial planner);
- members of the working groups of the six sub-regions.

My interview partner representing the Regional Planning Committee was its chairman, Urs Inäbnit. Apart from the consultant planning expert (Roland Luder), who was responsible for the content, form and text of R-LEK, Inäbnit was the driving force in the process of developing R-LEK.

4.3.2 Conservation organisations in the *Berner Oberland-Ost*

In the sampling process of my study I tried to trace all the conservation organisations which are in some way active in my research area, the *Berner Oberland-Ost*. I found numerous associations, unions, societies, etc., which in one way or another are concerned with landscape protection in the *Berner Oberland-Ost*.

- Berner Ala (society for bird protection and ornithology);
- Bernese Heritage Society , regional group Interlaken-Oberhasli;
- Swiss Landscape Fund (association for the conservation, care and restoration of endangered cultivated landscapes and semi-natural habitats);
- Fishing inspectorate Bernese Oberland;
- Gemeindeverband zur Erhaltung der Wälder - GEWO (association for forest preservation);
- Grimselverein (association for the protection of the Grimsel area);
- Group for settlement geography and landscape history (Prof. H.R. Egli, Institute of Geography, University of Bern);
- IG Velo Bödeli (bicyclists' regional interest group);
- Hunting inspectorate Bernese Oberland;
- Nature conservation inspectorates for the Bernese Oberland;
- Ökogruppe Oberland (ecologists);
- Pro Natura Bernese Oberland;
- UTB (Association for the protection of the shores of the lakes of Thun and Brienz);

- Verein Berner Wanderwege (Bernese rambling trail association);
- Verein Höhenweg Thunersee (Association for the development of culture, landscape and tourism);
- Unesco World Heritage Area, Jungfrau-Aletsch-Bietschhorn;
- VCS-ATE (Transport and Environment Association) ;
- WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature).

As mentioned under 2.2.2.2 for my study I chose the four conservation organisations invited by the Regional Planning Committee to submit a public statement commenting R-LEK:

- Pro Natura Regionalgruppe Berner Oberland (interviewee: Hans Fritschi, former president);
- Berner Heimatschutz Regionalgruppe Interlaken Oberhasli (interviewee: Heinrich Sauter, construction foreman);
- Grimselverein (interviewee: Emil Feuz, member of the board);
- Uferschutzverband Thuner- und Brienersee (UTB) (interviewee: Andreas Fuchs, president).

The table below presents brief portraits of the selected conservation organisations:

Diagramme 1: Portraits of the selected conservation organisations

	Pro Natura Berner Oberland	Grimselverein	Berner Heimatschutz	Uferschutzverband Thuner- und Brienersee
President [in spring 2004]	Nadja Keiser-Berwert Spiezbergstr. 45A 3700 Spiez	Urs Eichenberger Ottenbergstr. 77 8049 Zürich	Peter Vögli Eigerstrasse 2 3800 Unterseen	Andreas Fuchs Unterdorf 6 3800 Unterseen
Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efforts in nature conservation in the <i>Berner Oberland-Ost</i> (e.g. preservation and safeguarding of natural monuments, attractive landscapes, courses of rivers and streams, lakes and of fauna and flora); • Protection of the <i>Berner Oberland-Ost</i> region from hydroelectric power projects; • Fighting increase of tourism (i.e. immoderate artificial snowing, adventure-tourism in valuable landscapes, illegal levelling, and other destructive interventions); • Planting of hedges; • Rescue operations for amphibians. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of landscape and water in the Hasli valley, environmentally compatible use of hydropower, sensible regional development; • Safeguarding the protected Grimsel landscape from the construction of Grimsel West, a pump-storage reservoir; • Sensible energy policy (e.g. cooperation with <i>Energy 2000</i>). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of landscapes and communities as well as natural, cultural and historical monuments and buildings; • Support of visually harmonious development of communities and landscapes; • Support of local customs, folklore and handicraft; • Protection of native fauna and flora. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of aspect of the Bernese Oberland lakeland with lakes Thun and Brienz and adjacent small lakes; • Protection from changes which could endanger beauty of shores and existing settlements; • Preservation of valuable natural, cultural and historical monuments.
Homepage	www.pronatura.ch/be/media/organisid.htm	www.grimselverein.ch	www.bernerheimatschutz.ch	www.u-t-b.ch
Public statement on R-LEK draft	yes	yes	yes	no
R-LEK Committee member	yes	no	no	no

5. Results

This chapter focuses on the presentation of the data gathered. As mentioned in Chapter 3 on theories, I will divide the findings of my research study into two parts. The first part concerns the first two research questions which are intended to ascertain the conservation organisations' and Regional Planning Committee's aims with regard to landscape management. It refers to the first hypothesis that the different aims and backgrounds of the institutions are interrelated to their view about landscape and may be responsible for the lack of cooperation during the process of developing R-LEK.

The findings presented in the first part will be supported by some approaches to views about landscape and Fleck's theory of *thought collective* and *thought styles*, as well as by a set of other theoretical approaches dealing with views about landscape. Furthermore, the institutions' opinions about landscape management are related to their ideologies. Since the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations have different views about landscape management there is some form of *ideological struggle* (Fairclough 2001: 73) between them. I will therefore examine the findings by means of Fairclough's (2001) notion of *political discourse*.

The second part refers to research questions concerning the R-LEK process. It will show in what way conservation organisations participated in the process of developing R-LEK, how they are involved in and affected by R-LEK, and how they assess the strengths and weaknesses of R-LEK. This part is related to the second hypothesis that power played an inherent role in the (lack of) cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations in the development process of R-LEK. I will support these findings by invoking theories of power. The last section will provide suggestions for improved cooperation.

5.1 Actors' divergent views about landscape management

This section presents answers to the first two research questions which refer to the different actors' views about landscape management. By means of the resulting findings I will try to verify or refute the hypothesis that the different institutions' divergent views about landscape management (negatively) affected cooperation during the development process of R-LEK.

Basically, all interviewed institutions share the aim to manage and care for the beauty and quality of the landscape of the *Berner Oberland-Ost*. This would seem to be a good basis for successful cooperation. However, during my research work I became aware that despite the fact that all interviewed institutions are interested in an attractive landscape, I could find no evidence of close cooperation between the conservation organisations and the Regional Planning Committee. Puzzled by this, I tried to find out why this was so. It became apparent to me that different institutions commented differently on issues of landscape management.

Based on my interviews and other collected data I will first present the Regional Planning Committee's and the four conservation organisations' views. These divergent views about landscape management may be a reason for the lack of cooperation or even conflict between the institutions. I will examine how these views about landscape affect cooperation in landscape management, and will support my findings by Fleck's theory on different *thought styles* and *thought collectives*.

5.1.1 The Regional Planning Committee's view about landscape management

As the Regional Planning Committee is a planning committee constituted by representatives of various institutions (i.e. communal representatives, the Jungfraubahnen and the Kraftwerke Oberhasli), it has to coordinate ideas and aims of different fields (e.g. agriculture, tourism, economy and ecology). The Chairman of the Regional Planning Committee of the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region maintains that

their major task is development and spatial planning, and above all the funding of cooperation across communal boundaries (Inäbnit interview 2004). In R-LEK the Regional Planning Committee of *Berner Oberland-Ost* region defines the significance of landscape as follows:

Die schöne Landschaft und die intakte Natur sind in Kombination mit schönen Ortsbildern und Einzelbauten Eckpfeiler der touristischen Entwicklung, welche für die Region Oberland-Ost eine hervorragende volkswirtschaftliche Bedeutung hat (Regionalplanung 2004: 1).

The chairman of the Regional Planning Committee has the following view about the landscape of *Berner Oberland-Ost* region:

[...] als Lebensraum und Wirtschaftsraum. Für unsere Entwicklungsregion, wenn man dem so sagen will, als Berggebiet hat das wirtschaftliche Umfeld eine grössere Bedeutung als vielleicht in der Mittellandregion. Einerseits die Landwirtschaft, die Berglandwirtschaft, die doch vieles prägt und andererseits der Tourismus, bei dem man immer sagt, die Landschaft sei das wichtigste Kapital, das sie haben. Die beiden [Landwirtschaft und Tourismus] stehen miteinander natürlich sehr stark in Beziehung (interview Inäbnit 2004).

This shows that for the Regional Planning Committee the notion of landscape involves touristic and private-sector aspects. The chairman of the Regional Planning Committee states that he perceives the landscape as both a working and living space because it is mountain agriculture and tourism which shape the landscape in the *Berner Oberland-Ost* (Inäbnit interview 2004).

Furthermore, the Regional Planning Committee emphasizes that in R-LEK agriculture plays a crucial role regarding landscape management (Regionalplanung 2004: 1). The introduction of R-LEK states:

Bei der Landschaftsgestaltung und der Landschaftspflege kommt der Landwirtschaft eine hervorragende Bedeutung zu. Gleichzeitig mit der Erarbeitung des R-LEKs durch einen regionalen Fachausschuss wurden deshalb erste konkrete Massnahmen im landwirtschaftlichen Bereich eingeleitet (Umsetzung der Öko-Qualitätsverordnung) und ein regionaler Landschaftsfonds zur Mitfinanzierung von landschaftspflegerischen Massnahmen eingerichtet (Regionalplanung 2004: 1).

Agriculture therefore plays an important role in connection with R-LEK as an instrument to obtain agricultural subsidies.

To the Regional Planning Committee landscape means more than pristine nature. Even though the Regional Planning Committee say that the beauty of the landscape depends on the contrast between sustainably cultivated regions and areas scarcely affected by human activities (Regionalplanung 2004: 3.1), they point out that the emphasis of R-LEK is on landscape development rather than conservation:

Beim R-LEK geht es um Entwicklung, Landschaftsentwicklung, und nicht um Schutz, weil man doch festgestellt hat, dass mit dem Schutz allein der Landschaft nur zum Teil geholfen ist (Inäbnit interview 2004: 1).

In this sense R-LEK is an instrument to develop ideas, strategies and projects for the future landscape (Regionalplanung 2004: 1). The Regional Planning Committee of ***Berner Oberland-Ost*** region formulate the major aim of R-LEK as follows:

Das R-LEK soll Aktivitäten zur Erhaltung, Pflege und Entwicklung von Landschaft und Natur in der Region Oberland-Ost in Bezug auf Menge und Beschaffenheit auslösen, fördern und koordinieren, ohne den Lebens- und Wirtschaftsraum des Menschen zu beeinträchtigen (Regionalplanung 2004: 3.2).

However, the Regional Planning Committee emphasize that interventions in ecological networks should be as slight as possible (Regionalplanung 2004: 3.2).

Moreover, the Regional Planning Committee also focus on architectural aspects, considering the visual appearance of human settlements as part of the landscape and wishing for the local populations to maintain the appearance of villages and cultural landscapes (Regionalplanung 2004: 3.2). Thus, the Regional Planning Committee have quite an open view about landscape management. Since their main interest is to actively develop landscape, their view about landscape management involves touristic, private-sector, agricultural, architectural as well as ecological aspects.

5.1.2 Conservation organisations' view about landscape management

5.1.2.1 Pro Natura Berner Oberland

Pro Natura Berner Oberland are a regional section of the Swiss Conservation Association, the largest Swiss environmentalist and conservation organisation. According to the statutes of their mother organisation, Pro Natura Berner Oberland profoundly respect God's creation and therefore promote environmental conservation (Zentralvorstand des Schweizerischen Bundes für Naturschutz 1987: 1). In particular, Pro Natura Berner Oberland support the conservation of nature in the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region and are interested in the protection of natural historic sites, attractive landscapes, rivers, streams and lakes, as well as fauna and flora (Vereinsversammlung 1999: 1).

Another main interest of Pro Natura is the re-naturalization of the landscape after human interventions for the benefit of the economy or agriculture (e.g. canalisation of streams and rivers) (Fritschi interview 2004). Furthermore, Pro Natura Berner Oberland represent the interests of communities, corporations and private individuals against hydroelectric power projects or similar plans for utilising the waters of the Bernese Oberland (Vereinsversammlung 1999: 1).

The focus of Pro Natura is on pristine landscapes rather than intensive private-sector, touristic or agricultural landscape management. Hans Fritschi, the former President of Pro Natura Berner Oberland, states that over the past few years the natural environment has suffered subtle, but dramatically increasing destruction because even the most remote areas are being made accessible to tourism as well as agriculture and forestry, almost regardless of natural resources (Fritschi interview 2004). Fritschi fears that if we continue in this way, the last remaining habitats will soon be destroyed (Fritschi interview 2004). This shows that Pro Natura Berner Oberland view intensive agriculture, tourism and economy as destructive factors.

Pro Natura Berner Oberland focus on gentle, nature-related landscape management which allows landscapes to develop naturally.

5.1.2.2 Grimselverein

The Grimselverein is an environmentalist and conservationist organisation founded to oppose the Kraftwerke Oberhasli's huge reservoir and water pumping project of "Grimsel West". The Grimselverein homepage (www.grimselverein.ch) with its beautiful pictures and poems demonstrates the organisation's admiration of the landscape. According to their statutes (www.grimselverein.ch), the aims of the Grimselverein are ideological. The organisation oppose ecologically harmful hydropower projects in the Haslital, e.g. "Grimsel West" or similar, which endanger the environment, or are to be rejected for reasons of landscape conservation. Moreover, the Grimselverein are interested in a sustainable and environmentally compatible energy utilization in the Haslital. Related to this, the principal aims of the Grimselverein are

- to protect and conserve for coming generations numerous areas (e.g. Grimsel, Susten) with their glaciers and waterways located in the BLN region "Bernese High Alps";
- to enhance the endangered landscapes and waterways in the Haslital in an ecologically sustainable manner;
- to satisfy the needs of the local population for a safe, intact and healthy environment, which is quiet and suitable for recreation (e.g. protection from harmful effects, higher levels of danger, physical and mental health risks);
- to maintain the present installations for energy utilization in an environmentally compatible way (ecologically sustainable quantity of residual debits, balanced drainage regimes);
- for the region to keep control over the utilization of regional hydropower;
- to support sustainable energies and decentralised units of production and supply;
- to prevent economically questionable energy projects and policies.

Emil Feuz focuses on a very gentle and honest landscape management (Feuz interview 2004). He does not like to see the landscape as a mechanism which has to “produce” tourists (Feuz interview 2004). He compares landscape with a dressed body, i.e. the landscape in its form is unchangeable but its dress might be adorned with beautiful lace and jewels (Feuz interview 2004). Feuz also maintains that private sector, agriculture and forestry have changed the landscape incredibly over the years (Feuz interview 2004). He is worried about current landscape developments but points out that he is not against changes in landscape as such. To him it is important that things of value are conserved and that we should care for them as we do for beautiful paintings (Feuz interview 2004). He adds that these aims may not necessarily agree with the private sector and agriculture (Feuz interview 2004).

To sum up, the Grimselverein’s focus is not on intensive private-sector, agricultural and touristic landscape management. The organisation’s interest is in the conservation and protection of the landscape and waterways, an environmentally compatible utilization of hydropower in the region, and gentle nature-related landscape management.

5.1.2.3 Bernese Heritage Society, Interlaken-Oberhasli regional section

The Bernese Heritage Society acts as a promotor of the visual appearance of regional settlements and landscapes. Heinrich Sauter, the Construction Foreman of the Bernese Heritage Society’s regional section of Interlaken-Oberhasli, states that his organisation is dedicated to the advancement of the architectural heritage of the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region (Sauter interview 2004). Moreover, the organisation supports the harmonious visual development not only of regional towns and villages, but also of the numerous buildings in agricultural zones, both in the plains as well as in the mountains (Sauter interview 2004).

The Bernese Heritage Society as a branch of the Swiss Heritage Society focuses on the preservation of important landmarks, the development of the structural

environment and the promotion of good architectural design. The inclusion of modern agricultural buildings and tourism constructions is part of their concept as well as the useful reutilization of historical industrial buildings. The organisation's focus is on maintaining "Heimat", which they describe as a sense of familiarity or intimacy related to a particular location (www.heimatschutz.ch/d/shs/leitbild.shtm). They say that "Heimat" is created where people live. And where people live, there is change and development. In this sense, the society focuses both on the conservation of the architectural heritage and on development of the architectural environment. Sauter maintains that they also focus on the modern world (Sauter interview 2004), for example, on how cableway-stations or hotels are built. Moreover, the organisation's focus is on the cultural landscape rather than on pristine nature (Sauter interview 2004).

The organisation mainly pursues its goals through public relations activities, technical consulting on construction projects and planning committees, appraisals, legal action, and financial grants for pioneering projects. Furthermore, the organisation rewards exemplary achievements by awarding prizes (<http://www.heimatschutz.ch/d/shs/leitbild.shtm>).

5.1.2.4 Uferschutzverband Thuner- und Brienersee (UTB)

The Uferschutzverband Thuner- und Brienersee focus on the conservation of the landscape of the lakes of Thun and Brienz and on public access to most of the shores (UTB 2003). Its President, Andreas Fuchs, considers the main activities of the UTB as the consultation in construction matters and, since the association own some shore areas, their main aim is the preservation of the shores of the lakes of Thun and Brienz (Fuchs interview 2004). In their new guidelines the UTB state that their most important concerns are nature, culture and landscape values, tourism, economy and cooperation with the inhabitants of the region (UTB 2003). The UTB support sustainable regional agriculture and forestry, tourism and industry (UTB 2003). The

UTB maintain that the visual appearance of the landscape and biodiversity cannot be safeguarded without sustainable agriculture and forestry. The UTB support projects dealing with the conservation or creation of landscape values which function as economic impulses and thus support the regional creation of value (UTB 2003). The role of the UTB is to be both the preservers and the promoters of the landscape (Fuchs interview 2004). Fuchs maintains that the landscape has a great potential to ensure the region's touristic and industrial future (Fuchs interview 2004). In this context, the UTB stat that tourism also benefits from the beauty and attractiveness of the landscape (UTB 2003). It is important to the UTB to reach the entire population in the lakes of Thun and Brienz regions to increase their awareness for landscape. The UTB try to create regional identity, understanding and solidarity by offering to the regional actors a communication platform (UTB 2003).

Diagramme 2: Actors' divergent views about landscape management

	Regional Planning Committee	Pro Natura Berner Oberland	Grimselverein	Bernese Heritage Society , regional section of Interlaken-Oberhasli	UTB (Uferschutzverband Thuner- und Brienersee)
Background, context	planning institution	environmentalist and conservation organisation	environmentalist and conservation organisation	conservation organisation	conservation organisation with focus on landscape development
Aims	development and spatial planning	Conservation and/or renaturation of the landscape	conservation of the Grimsel landscape	conservation or promotion of architectural heritage	conservation and development of the region and shores of the lakes of Thun and Brienz
	Focus on landscape factors				
Ecology	~	~	~	-	~
Economy	~	~	~	~	~
Tourism	~	-	-	~	~
Agriculture	~	-	-	-	~
Architectural heritage	~	-	-	~	~

The size of the rectangle (~) corresponds to the degree of priority

5.2 Conservation organisations in the R-LEK process

As mentioned in preceding parts of this thesis, during my research work I found that in the development process of R-LEK there was not much cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations. The organisations interviewed confirmed that, except for the public participation process, there was virtually no exchange with the Regional Planning Committee concerning R-LEK (interviews Pro Natura 2004: 170-180; Grimselverein 2004: 253-25; Bernese Heritage Society 2004: 97-99; UTB 2004: 90-100). This is supported by the Committee's statement that, apart from contacts with Pro Natura's representative in the Landscape Committee which drafted R-LEK, there was no cooperation with the conservation organisations (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 72-74). Moreover, at the data collection stage I repeatedly found that R-LEK is not a well-known document in the region (interviews Grimselverein 2004: 70-72; Regional Planning Committee 2004: 95).

In the following sections I will analyze my data to show that there were several reasons for lack of cooperation between conservation organisations and the Regional Planning Committee in the development process of R-LEK. I will first present public statements by conservation organisations, followed by the Regional Planning Committee's report on the public participation process (henceforth, public participation report). Next I will describe the Regional Planning Committee's and conservation organisations' mutual expectations with regard to their functions in landscape management. Then I will present the conservation organisations' assessments of R-LEK, i.e. what they consider to be its strengths and weaknesses. In a fourth section I will show whether or to what extent conservation organisations feel implicated by R-LEK. Finally, I will introduce the conservation organisations' suggestions for possible future cooperation with the Regional Planning Committee.

5.2.1 The public participation process and the involvement of conservation organisations in R-LEK

From 31st January to 2nd May 2003 the R-LEK draft of 30th January 2003 was presented for public participation. As I have stated previously, the Regional Planning Committee sent R-LEK drafts to numerous institutions inviting them to participate. The conservation organisations interviewed by me all received a copy of the R-LEK draft; three of the four organisations responded accordingly. In the introduction to their public statement, Grimselverein welcomed the structure of R-LEK, emphasizing that the document is a valid and interesting basis for discussion (public statement Grimselverein 2003: 1). Since Grimselverein's field of interest is the Grimsel region they restricted their reaction to the sections concerning the Haslital region (public statement Grimselverein 2003: 1). Similarly, the Bernese Heritage Society maintained that they reacted from the perspective of an organisation whose main interest is the visual appearance of settlements and buildings (public statement Bernese Heritage Society 2003:1).

I will first deal with the public statements of the environmentalist organisations, Grimselverein and Pro Natura, followed by the Bernese Heritage Society. In their public statements, Grimselverein and Pro Natura regretted that R-LEK is insufficiently concrete or defined (public statements Pro Natura 2003: 1; Grimselverein 2003: 2). Referring to the initiation of specific projects rather than general project proposals, both organisations wished for R-LEK to be a substantial, effective instrument (e.g., R-LEK should address the renaturation of a specific river section rather than express the general desirability of renaturized streams) (public statements Pro Natura 2003: 1; Grimselverein 2003: 2).

Both conservation organisations also mentioned that since landscape management is a supra-communal issue, communities must be encouraged to cooperate. The organisations were concerned that with R-LEK the Regional Planning Committee will hand over responsibility for projects and functions to communities

(interviews Grimselverein 2004: 93; Pro Natura 2004: 71), failing to guarantee the initiation of projects or supra-communal cooperation.

Moreover, in their public statements Grimselverein and Pro Natura referred to several specific landscape management aspects. Pro Natura thought that important issues such as developing land for tourism and agriculture, the Interlaken military airfield, the destruction of listed historical traffic routes, uncoordinated development of industrial zones on the Bördeli, landfills, excessive tourist development, destruction of the natural heritage, artificial snowing, heli-skiing and adventure sports are considered in passing only, if at all. They presented a list of about a dozen weaknesses and problems in several sub-regions and communities which should be addressed in R-LEK. Both Pro Natura and Grimselverein stated that the R-LEK assessment of the situation in the *Bernese Oberland-Ost* region is too optimistic. According to Grimselverein, being part of a World Heritage site is not necessarily beneficial for the Meiringen region from a present-day perspective and with regard to landscape management (public statement Grimselverein 2003: 1). However, both the public participation report and the final R-LEK document fail to refer to this point. Pro Natura also felt that the Regional Planning Committee are too optimistic about the situation while admitting that new conservation areas have been created, but emphasizing that many violations of environmental law have occurred – proof that people are not sufficiently aware of environmental and natural heritage issues (public statement Pro Natura 2003: 2).

It is striking that all of the above-mentioned concerns voiced by the conservation organisations are commented on in the public participation report with the expression *Kenntnisnahme*, i.e. „note taken“ (public participation report 2003: 11, 13), but that none of the points raised were included in the final R-LEK document. I found that the Regional Planning Committee deliberately did not mention any specific projects, but only referred to general ideas. Their intention was to focus on specific projects only at the implementation stage of R-LEK:

Und weil wir keine konkreten Projekte vorgelegt haben, zu denen sie [conservation organisations] sich hätten äußern können, haben sie ihre Vorbehalte angebracht: Wir sähen das so und so in dem und dem. Dann sagen wir, dass wir ihre Anliegen zur Kenntnis nehmen, und kommen dann bei der Umsetzung wieder darauf zurück [...] Wenn wir konkret sagen, wir wollen einen Wald zurück behalten, dann kommen die Schutzorganisationen und wollen wissen, um welchen es geht. Und in dem Sinn sagen wir, wir nehmen das zur Kenntnis (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 53).

Moreover, the Regional Planning Committee stated that they did not include specific projects because it might confuse the local population inhibiting the development process of R-LEK. However, they added that they want to stimulate active landscape management among interested circles (public participation report 2003: 12). Also, during my participation in the workshop concerning the implementation of R-LEK it became apparent that the aim of the Regional Planning Committee is to realize specific projects in the implementation process of R-LEK. In the interview with the Regional Planning Committee I queried the meaning of the comment „note taken“ in their report on the public participation process. They replied that while they did take note of conservation organisations' concerns, they did not intend to change their concept of R-LEK. However, conservation organisations would be invited to become involved in public participation processes regarding specific future projects (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 53). With regard to the conservation organisations' concern that they would expect communities not to be handed full responsibility concerning landscape management, the Regional Planning Committee emphasized that, while they do want to encourage communities' involvement in landscape management projects throughout the implementation process of R-LEK, they are an institution constituted by the communities, and therefore act in their interest (public participation report 2003: 11, 13). Again, these two concerns were commented on in the public participation report with the remark “note taken”. The comment „note taken“ therefore is intended to show that the Regional Planning Committee have read the respective statements, without committing themselves to take the issues raised into further consideration or

include them in the final R-LEK document. One may assume that the expression „note taken“ means that these aspects will not affect R-LEK.

Grimselverein demand platforms for permanent regional landscape development, a supra-communal ecological network, a themed long-distance hiking trail, and a biosphere programme (public statement Grimselverein 2003:1-2) . The Committee responded that such projects, e.g. historical trails in the Susten and Grimsel regions, already exist. With regard to the ecological network they pointed to the Committee itself, founded in 2001, as well as mentioning the Regional Landscape Fund created for the purpose of financing landscape projects (public participation report 2003: 13). These points have not been considered in R-LEK (public participation report 2003: 13). They also expected a superior eco-networking concept to be developed. In this regard the Committee noted that this issue will be considered in the context of implementing the incentive bonus related to regulations on eco quality³ (public participation report 2003: 13). R-LEK is part of ÖQV (Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost 2004: 1). Finally, Grimselverein were satisfied to find that the Regional Planning Committee emphasized the importance of a beautiful landscape by illustrating their report with an impressive photo of the Unteraar glacier, concluding that the Committee support Grimselverein's endeavours to protect this unique landscape. However, in the final R-LEK document the photo of the Unteraar glacier was replaced by that of a flower. Apparently, the Committee do not wish to be associated with Grimselverein.

Pro Natura mentioned missing the Regional Planning Committee's cooperation with regard to the project "Höhenweg Thunersee" (public statement Pro Natura 2003: 2), expressing a need for coordination among the partners, and desiring the Committee's full support of this project. In their response the Committee emphasized that coordination with the people involved in the project "Höhenweg Thunersee" has been good (public participation report 2003: 12). This issue is not addressed in the final R-LEK version.

³ *Öko-Qualitätsverordnung, ÖQV*

In their public statement the Bernese Heritage Society requested to consider settlement areas as part of cultural landscape (public statement Bernese Heritage Society : 1), an aspect that the Committee integrated in the relevant sections of R-LEK (Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost 2004: 1.1). Moreover, the organisation referred to the fact that the notion of urbanization should not be as negatively connoted as in the R-LEK draft, emphasizing that a higher population density in residential areas relieves stress on the surrounding landscape (public participation Bernese Heritage Society 2003: 2). This point was taken into consideration in the final version of R-LEK (Regional Planung Oberland-Ost 2004: 2.2). The remaining four issues raised by the Bernese Heritage Society again received the comment „note taken“ (public participation report 2003: 12); none of them are included in the final R-LEK document.

My analysis of the public participation process shows two distinct areas of conflicting interest between conservation organisations and the Regional Planning Committee. Conservation organisations consider R-LEK to be too loosely formulated. They would prefer specific project proposals over vague references to possible future projects. They also expected communities to cooperate in landscape management since there are many supra-communal concerns. Moreover, the conservation organisations are concerned that individual communities will be made responsible although experience has shown that this does not encourage cooperation with others.

Compared to the conservation organisations' extensive public statements, the Regional Planning Committee's comments were quite terse. It is striking to see the remark „note taken“ added on to most of the conservation organisations' concerns. Contrary to the introduction to the public participation report, which states that most of the public statements' proposals for corrections and changes would contribute to a qualitative enhancement of R-LEK and thus be considered in R-LEK (public participation report 2003: 1), almost none of the conservation organisations' concerns were in fact included in R-LEK. Moreover, in contrast to the communities which

were each given a chapter in R-LEK, there was no chapter on conservation organisations.

The conflict of interest between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations may be a reason for lack of cooperation in landscape management. In section 6.2 (instances of power in the R-LEK process) I will focus on the role of power with regard to the public participation process and the inclusion of conservation organisations in R-LEK.

5.2.2 Institutions' views of each others' functions

In this section I will discuss how institutions describe their own function or role in landscape management, and how they view other organisations. In particular, I will demonstrate that these differences negatively affect cooperation. The Regional Planning Committee claimed that their functions correspond to their aims and activities, i.e. development planning, spatial planning and encouragement of supra-communal cooperation, with a focus on development rather than on conservation (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 14). As discussed above, conservation organisations think that the Regional Planning Committee, by handing over most of the responsibilities to individual communities, fail to attend to their role as initiators of supra-communal cooperation (interviews Pro Natura 2004: 71; Grimselverein 2004: 93; Bernese Heritage Society 2004: 194). Pro Natura stated that it should not take R-LEK to tell people which community is responsible for which projects (interview Pro Natura 2004: 83).

Pro Natura also stated that to defend their aims they have had to play the role of "landscape-police" by objecting to illegal projects (interview Pro Natura 2004: 35-38). They expressed unhappiness about seeming to be the only ones trying to enforce the law, which has given them a bad name (interview Pro Natura 2004: 263). Moreover, they were deeply irritated about the Committee's explicit support –

against Pro Natura's will – of communities in their traditional cultivation of an area which is Pro Natura's property:

Entgegen den Absichten des Grundeigentümers (Pro Natura) unterstützt die Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost die Bestrebung der Gemeinde Lauterbrunnen und der Bewirtschafter, die traditionell bewirtschaftete Kulturlandschaft als solche zu erhalten (Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost 2004: 5.73).

Pro Natura demanded such issues to be discussed before issuing public statements (interview Pro Natura 2004: 101-107).

Similar to Pro Natura but from a somewhat different perspective, Grimselverein may play the obstructionist role, or that of those who remind others of what needs to be done, or even the role of a mastermind (interview Grimselverein 2004: 35). The Bernese Heritage Society wish to play the role of mediator between professional circles and the general public by trying to sharpen people's awareness of the visual appearance of settlements and buildings (interview Bernese Heritage Society 2004: 39). The Regional Planning Committee primarily expect conservation organisations to ensure respect of legal regulations concerning landscape management, and to intervene if necessary (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 22). Conservation organisations, on the other hand, expect the Regional Planning Committee to object and intervene against illegal projects. However, the Regional Planning Committee admitted that there is considerable potential for conflict between conservation organisations wanting to abide by nature conservation regulations, and communities interested in economic or general societal development and interpreting landscape regulations as it suits them. The Chairman of the Committee, did, however, concede that without conservation organisations' insistence in past years on landscape conservation there would have been more damage in the region, giving the example of the A8 freeway along the left shore of the lake of Brienz (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 22).

Revealing considerable conflict of interest, the Regional Planning Committee stated that in contrast to conservation organisations whose aim it is to allow nature

to take its course, even if this involves the degradation of landscape into wilderness, the Committee's own function is to manage landscape actively and with care (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 25). The Committee are concerned that without suitable management forested areas will expand, resulting in a more monotonous, less attractive landscape (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 25). The Committee also expect conservation organisations to accept its plans regarding agriculture, cultivated landscape, curbing forest expansion, and development of certain tourist facilities, claiming that the conservation organisations' relative economic independence should make it easier for them to agree to a compromise. The Committee also seemed to promise that conservation organisations would receive compensation in kind if they agreed to surrender some of their properties in favour of a specific landscape project (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 37).

Pro Natura were rather sceptical about the nature-friendliness of the Regional Planning Committee's landscape management, and therefore prefer to pursue their own strategies. In their opinion the Committee are not sufficiently active with regard to landscape conservation (interview Pro Natura 2004: 79).

There seems to exist a discrepancy between conservation organisations' and the Regional Planning Committee's conceptions of each others' functions. Contrary to the Committee's opinion that Pro Natura aim for a pristine environment, it can be said that Pro Natura very actively pursue landscape management projects, such as the renaturation of creeks, planting of hedges, or creation/management of biotopes. Pro Natura believe that the Committee are not always nature-friendly and sometimes do not intervene against projects that are detrimental to the landscape. This clash of opinions may in part explain the lack of cooperation in landscape management.

Conversely, the Regional Planning Committee felt that conservation organisations should focus not only on conservation but also on development, fearing that a landscape that is not allowed to change or be developed will deteriorate (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 29). The Committee

accused conservation organisations of stubbornness and of provoking conflicts. They suggested that, apart from observing conservation regulations, conservation organisations should also have sections dealing with landscape development (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 62). In contrast, Pro Natura often missed the Committee's opposition to projects which violate planning regulations (interview Pro Natura 2004: 152):

Anstatt dass sie [die Regionalplanung] ganz klar sagen würden, erstens widerspricht das dem tourismuspolitischen Leitbild des Kantons Bern, zweitens widerspricht es der Regionalplanung und dem Richtplan, macht einen Stopp und plant sauber. Und da habe ich das Gefühl, dass die Region in diesem Bereich ihre Verantwortung nicht wahrnimmt (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 83).

Pro Natura resented the fact that the Committee usually fail to do their job, waiting for Pro Natura to oppose projects which violate planning regulations (interview Pro Natura 2004: 152).

The UTB felt that the Regional Planning Committee consider this conservation organisation in the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region to be redundant (interview UTB 2004: 98). Furthermore, the organisation would expect the instruments developed in the context of R-LEK also to be available to the UTB and – since some communities are also members of the UTB – to be informed about R-LEK projects (interview UTB 2004: 84).

The Bernese Heritage Society believed that the Committee do not consider the visual appearance of buildings and settlement as very important (interview Bernese Heritage Society 2004: 243). They demanded architectural quality to be significantly improved, feeling that currently it is much too poor (interview Bernese Heritage Society 2004: 166).

As mentioned above, another discrepancy between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations is their different approaches to communities. The Committee's intention to encourage supra-communal cooperation does not yet seem to have borne much fruit. Conservation organisations observed a lack of focus on matters of supra-communal, regional importance. However,

community representatives do sit on the Regional Planning Committee, whose decisions and rulings depend on the communities, who were in turn involved in the development of R-LEK:

Die Fachausschussmitglieder [für die Entwicklung des R-LEKs] haben wir mit den Gemeinden zusammen bestimmt (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 61).

Even though the Regional Planning Committee stated that they want to develop supra-communal cooperation, the conservation organisations expected a greater emphasis on regional cooperation beyond community projects (interviews Pro Natura 2004: 71; Grimselverein 2004: 93). Also Grimselverein stated that communal autonomy is a high priority for the Committee, wishing for more regional cooperation (interview Grimselverein 2004: 163). Pushing in the same direction the Bernese Heritage Society emphasized that the autonomy of the community is very highly rated in the region, but that spatial planning is a regional concern which has to be considered beyond community borders (interview Bernese Heritage Society 2004: 172).

With regard to conservation organisations' and Regional Planning Committee's view of each others' roles there seem to be some major discrepancies which may negatively affect cooperation in landscape management. One of the two most striking divergences is that Pro Natura expect the Regional Planning Committee to raise objection to illegal projects, whereas the Regional Planning Committee believe this to be Pro Natura's mission. Another important discrepancy is that the Regional Planning Committee seem to believe that it is the conservation organisations' aim to allow landscape to degrade into wilderness, while conservation organisations think the Regional Planning Committee's landscape management is too remote from natural processes. Last, but not least, conservation organisations expect the Committee to encourage supra-communal cooperation more emphatically.

5.2.3 Conservation organisations' assessment of R-LEK

In the section on the public participation process of R-LEK I discussed the comments from conservation organisations on R-LEK as expressed in their public statements. Mainly based on interview data the following section presents the responding conservation organisations' general assessment of R-LEK. Basically, R-LEK is felt to be well structured and to represent a good basis for discussion (public statement Grimselverein 2003: 1). All conservation organisations agreed that if R-LEK was a complete inventory giving an overview of all representative landscape management factors, and suggesting specific projects assigned to communities in the context of regional cooperation, it would be a useful instrument for landscape management in the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region (interviews Pro Natura 2004: 71; Grimselverein 2004: 105; Bernese Heritage Society 2004: 69; 85 UTB 2004: 65). However, they were rather sceptical whether R-LEK will ever actually be implemented in a sensible, useful way.

Pro Natura believed that R-LEK neglects many aspects (e.g. the development of Gental/Engstlen, adventure tourism and many more – interview Pro Natura 2004: 124). Conservation organisations believe that R-LEK is incomplete, noncommittal, blurry and inefficient, all in all a “toothless paper tiger” which will have no impact at all on landscape management (interviews Pro Natura 2004: 71; Bernese Heritage Society 2004: 89; Grimselverein 2004: 157). The Bernese Heritage Society were wary of assessing R-LEK at this point since its impact on landscapes will (or will not) reveal itself only in some years' time (interview Bernese Heritage Society 2004: 89). The Grimselverein were sceptical about the implementation of R-LEK, doubting that there will be sufficient funds to realize sensitive landscape projects (interview Grimselverein 2004: 175). UTB were concerned that R-LEK is too bureaucratic an instrument and that it will be difficult to implement (interview UTB 2004: 73). They fear that R-LEK will be an instrument for agricultural development rather than landscape conservation (interview UTB 2004: 65).

To sum up, conservation organisations were rather critical of R-LEK, mentioning more weaknesses than strengths. They were concerned that it will prove

to be a rather inefficient instrument with no significant positive impact on landscape management. The large number of negative aspects of R-LEK also results from the fact that concerns voiced in their public statements have not been included in the final document. The conservation organisations' critical assessment of R-LEK shows that there does not yet exist an adequate basis for successful cooperation in landscape management.

5.2.4 Points of contact between conservation organisations and R-LEK

In this section I will discuss how conservation organisations feel affected by R-LEK. I have chosen this aspect because cooperation relies on points of contact. If conservation organisations feel neglected by R-LEK, they will feel no need for cooperation in landscape management with the Regional Planning Committee. As mentioned above, conservation organisations' concerns have not been specifically addressed by R-LEK.

The most striking points of contact between R-LEK and Pro Natura are probably the passages where regions are mentioned which are Pro Natura's property. Pro Natura were disappointed since they would have liked to be better informed about what was going to be published in R-LEK. Moreover, R-LEK mentions conservation organisations as potential financial investors:

Massnahmen sollen grundsätzlich durch die Region koordiniert und teilweise mit regionseigenen Mitteln mitfinanziert werden, unter Einbezug der Finanzierung durch Kanton, Bund und weiteren Geldgebern (z.B. Fonds Landschaft Schweiz, Schutzorganisationen) (Regionalplanung 2004: 3.2).

This would seem to imply that conservation organisations are also addressed in a prominent position in R-LEK. As we have seen, this is not the case. Moreover, Pro Natura were irritated that the Regional Planning Committee did not invite their comment on their willingness to invest prior to publishing this passage (interview Pro Natura 2004: 195).

The point of contact between Grimselverein and R-LEK is the Grimsel region, in particular the project of increasing the crown height of one the Grimsel dams. Grimselverein expect at least to be compensated in kind for the land to be submerged, suggesting that R-LEK could affect such arrangements in the future (interview Grimselverein 2004: 87). Although this seems to be an important point of contact between the Regional Planning Committee and Grimselverein, it is not addressed in R-LEK and again indicates that the basis for cooperation between the institutions is inadequate.

The Bernese Heritage Society considered settlements or buildings (e.g. visual appearance of villages, cableway stations, dry walls or avalanche barriers) as points of contact between them and the Regional Planning Committee (interview Bernese Heritage Society 2004: 65). This point is taken up in R-LEK in that a beautiful landscape and intact nature, in combination with visually attractive settlements and buildings, are said to be an essential basis for tourist development (Regionalplanung 2004: 1). Since the architectural heritage in the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region is essential to the Bernese Heritage Society there is a potential for cooperation between them and the Committee.

UTB do not see many parallels between their aims and those of the Regional Planning Committee or R-LEK. They did not submit a public statement because at the time of this public participation process they were re-structuring their organisation. Also, as an organisation whose focus is on shore areas, they did not feel concerned by R-LEK since, in their opinion, it only affects other areas (interview UTB 2004: 37). In their area of action, i.e. the shore regions of the lakes of Thun and Brienz, UTB do not see major points of contact between them and the Regional Planning Committee. Only if they consider the areas which can be seen from the shores of the lakes of Thun and Brienz, e.g. mountain ridges, forest edges or hiking trails, may there be some connection. But they emphasized that this is of no major importance to them (interview UTB 2004: 51).

The following statement in the introduction of R-LEK could be a possible point of contact between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations:

Viele Gebiete, die für das Landschaftsbild oder als Lebensräume für Pflanzen und Tiere bedeutend sind, behalten ihren Wert nur, wenn sie regelmässig gepflegt werden. Andere haben ihren besonderen Wert gerade in der langfristigen ungehinderten, von Menschen nicht beeinflussten Entwicklung (Regionalplanung 2004: 1.1).

This statement may not directly address conservation organisations. But they might feel intended since it is also their task to conserve and promote the long-term protection of landscapes. However, it was not my impression during my research work that the Regional Planning Committee intended to address conservation organisations by this sentence.

We have come full circle, since this statement is a very good example of divergent views and interpretations. The Regional Planning Committee has a different notion of landscape conservation. As mentioned in the earlier, theoretical part of this study, the Committee also include agricultural and private-sector factors, while conservation organisations aim to protect landscapes.

As we have seen, there are points of contact between all interviewed conservation organisations and the Regional Planning Committee and R-LEK, respectively, i.e. that there would be a basis for cooperation. However, there does not currently exist much cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations. During my research work I became aware that cooperation tends to be initiated by conservation organisations. In the next section I will discuss the institutions' suggestions for future cooperation.

5.2.5 Suggestions for future cooperation

All interviewed conservation organisations wish to participate more closely in R-LEK and with the Regional Planning Committee. To improve cooperation with the Committee Pro Natura considered it essential to meet (even informally) from time to time and to discuss problems at an early stage (interview Pro Natura 2004: 213).

Grimselverein would welcome closer cooperation with the Regional Planning Committee. They would also appreciate it if the Committee supported them in projects against which there is opposition from the KWO or communities (interview Grimselverein 2004: 134). One way of improving cooperation might be to meet every three or six months for informal talks over cheese and wine. They felt that such regular meetings might have a more positive outcome (interview Grimselverein 2004: 239).

The Bernese Heritage Society strongly favoured closer cooperation with the Regional Planning Committee since both institutions have supra-communal functions and are active in the same regions (interview Bernese Heritage Society 2004: 170). Examples given were workshops or excursions during which ideas of common interest could be discussed (interview Bernese Heritage Society 2004: 176). As mentioned above, in their public statement concerning R-LEK the Bernese Heritage Society suggested cooperation in planning matters (public statement Bernese Heritage Society 2003: 2), for example by participating in architectural planning, as well as by providing incentives, i.e. for projects to re-establish traditional architecture using ancient craftsmanship. The latter would have a concrete economic component (interview Bernese Heritage Society 2004: 198).

UTB stated that contact with the Regional Planning Committee had been virtually inexistent, never having felt that the Regional Planning took something away from them, and vice-versa (interview UTB 2004: 110). However, especially in the context of the new organisational concepts, closer cooperation would be welcome (interview UTB 2004: 118). It would, for example, make sense if projects were

discussed before being launched; UTB would also volunteer to manage projects (interview UTB 2004: 110, 33).

To sum up, all interviewed conservation organisations would welcome regular meetings with the Regional Planning Committee, and are willing to contribute in some way towards more effective cooperation. Essentially, the Regional Planning Committee welcomed regular meetings with conservation organisations. However, from experience they were sceptical regarding meetings because they might be time-consuming without producing the desired results. The Committee emphasized that the most important kind of cooperation is conservation organisations' involvement in the public participation processes concerning specific projects as and when they are launched in the context of implementing R-LEK (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 114, 33). The Committee also assert that they would be willing to initiate or implement projects, but only if this could be fitted into their limited time-budget of a mere 1.6 full-time posts (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 115). Moreover, the Regional Planning Committee's interest in cooperation, especially with environmentalist organisations, is limited, since they are not exactly popular with the majority of the local population, and the Committee do not want to be tainted by the organisations' obstructionist image (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 119). Thus, they see certain limitations regarding cooperation with conservation organisations and are sceptical about the outcome of cooperation with them. The Committee believe that what is above all required is mutual respect (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 119).

6. Synthesis

In this chapter I will relate the findings of my research work to two strands of theory, i.e. the theoretical backgrounds of divergent views about landscape management, and aspects of power. The purpose is to apply the former to verify my first hypothesis, i.e. that divergent views about landscape management result in a lack of cooperation, and the latter to support my second hypothesis, i.e. that power plays an inherent role in landscape management related to the R-LEK development process.

6.1 Theoretical concepts related to a lack of cooperation

This section refers to the first part of the results chapter dealing with the interviewed institutions' divergent views about landscape management (5.1). I will try to verify the hypothesis that divergent views about landscape management negatively affect cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations. I will analyse the data presented in section 5.1 on the actors' views about landscape management by means of theoretical aspects concerning divergent views about landscape management, and by Fleck's theoretical framework of different *thought styles* and *thought collectives*. I will also examine the data with regard to the institutions' different discourse styles based on Fairclough's (2001) concept of *political discourse*.

6.1.1 Lack in cooperation due to divergent views about landscape management

The way the interviewed institutions consider landscape is affected by their background and context. The actors addressed by this study can be mainly divided into two groups, i.e. the conservation organisations and the Regional Planning

Committee. The focus on landscape factors in Diagramme 2 on p. 46 represents the clashes of interest between the Regional Planning Committee and the conservation organisations. While the latter organisations' background is the conservation of their specific areas of interest (e.g. ecological and architectural factors), the Regional Planning Committee's focus is on several aspects, i.e. on ecology, the private sector, tourism and agriculture; hence its difficult task of coordinating the interests of institutions in different fields, such as tourism or agriculture. My findings about the Regional Planning Committee show that the institutions' perspectives with regard to landscape management mainly correspond to three points in Hebertshuber's list of perspectives (2000: 90-92).

- Spatial planning: the Regional Planning Committee's major task is spatial planning.
- Landscape managers and nature conservationists: the Regional Planning Committee want to develop a landscape-related model which should include aspects concerning sustainable landscape management.
- Incentive programmes: the Regional Planning Committee act as a financial promoter in two ways. On the one hand, they strive to support mountain farmers by rewarding their landscape management and conservation efforts. Subsidies provide an incentive to landscape conservation. On the other hand, R-LEK is intended to promote and coordinate activities which contribute to the safeguarding and increase of the region's "value" (Regionalplanung 2004: 3.2).

These different perspectives are also indicative of the wide range of tasks of the Regional Planning Committee which must reconcile the ideas and opinions of several interest groups (tourism, the private sector, agriculture and environmentalism). Historically speaking, the Regional Planning Committee is a spatial planning institution. It is the only actor group with a strong focus on active landscape development with regard to their fields of interest (e.g. spatial planning, agriculture, tourism). The conservation organisations, on the other hand, either have an environmentalist background or aim to protect and conserve their specific fields of interest.

Pro Natura's major focus is on conservation and the return to a near-natural state of landscape and the natural environment. This organisation views landscape

from a different perspective than the Regional Planning Committee. Pro Natura fit in with the following perspectives in Heberthuber's (Heberthuber 2000: 90-92):

- The scientific perspective: the main focus of Pro Natura is on a pristine environment and great bio-diversity.
- Landscape managers and nature conservationists: Pro Natura try to conserve or re-establish the balance between the natural environment, agriculture and people.

Thus, for Pro Natura landscape management means caring about the natural environment and landscape in the sense of protection and conservation.

The background of the Grimselverein clearly is the conservation of the attractive Grimsel landscape. Therefore, the organisation see landscape rather in its pristine, original form. As a conservation organisation with a strong environmentalist background, the Grimselverein fit in with the following perspectives in Hebertshuber's list (Hebertshuber 2000: 90):

- The scientific perspective: the Grimselverein try to protect or re-establish the balance in the natural environment. Their focus is on the protection of natural water resources.
- The perspective of landscape managers and nature conservationists: the Grimselverein's focus is on the conservation and protection of a pristine natural environment.

For the Grimselverein landscape management means gentle, near-natural interventions in landscapes.

The focus of the Bernese Heritage Society's regional section of Interlaken-Oberhasli is on the conservation as well as the development of the architectural heritage. Since spatial planning is one of the major functions of the Bernese Heritage Society, the regional section of Interlaken-Oberhasli represents the perspective of spatial planners on Heberthuber's list of perspectives on landscape (Hebertshuber 2000: 90). For this organisation landscape management means the preservation and maintenance of the architectural heritage and the construction of aesthetically pleasing buildings which are well integrated into the attractive landscape.

The focus of the Uferschutzverband Thuner- und Brienzensee (UTB) is on the attractiveness of the shores of the lakes of Thun and Brienz. The UTB are interested in the maintenance of the ecological balance and in making attractive areas accessible to tourists. Their emphasis is not only on the conservation of natural and cultural landscapes of the *Bernese Oberland-Ost* region but also on landscape development. They focus on sustainable development of natural environments, the private sector, agriculture and tourism. The UTB's perspective on landscape matches the following items on Hebertshuber's list of landscape perspectives (Hebertshuber 2000: 90):

- Spatial planning: One of the major focuses of the UTB is on spatial planning.
- Tourism: The UTB is interested in providing tourists with an attractive landscape along the shores of lakes Thun and Brienz.
- Economy: The UTB values cultural landscape for its marketability.
- Landscape management and nature conservation: The UTB tries to conserve or re-establish a harmonious balance between the natural environment, agriculture and people.

Thus, for the UTB landscape management includes ecological, agricultural, private-sector as well as touristic considerations.

Generally, all institutions are interested in an attractive landscape. For this reason one could expect the institutions to work together in order to be most effective in landscape management. However, as I observed when collecting and analysing my data, there was not much cooperation between the institutions. One possible reason is their different backgrounds, resulting in an entirely different concept of landscape. Hence, they do not refer to the same phenomenon when talking about landscape. While some institutions mainly refer to private-sector aspects, others have ecological, etc., aspects in mind. These different concepts of landscape result in divergent views about landscape management and may at least partly be responsible for a lack of cooperation between the institutions. Another possible explanation of the institutions' divergent views about landscape management and the ensuing (lack

of) cooperation may be provided by Fleck's theory of different *thought styles* and *thought collectives*.

6.1.2 A lack of cooperation in landscape management due to different *thought styles* and *thought collectives*

There are various reasons for the lack of cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations in the *Bernese Oberland-Ost*. One reason may be the institutions' different views about landscape management. This hypothesis can be supported by Fleck's theory of *thought collectives* and *thought styles*. According to Fleck (2002: XXII), social groups, i.e. the institutions interviewed for this study, are embedded in a specific social context which determines their view about a certain object. I have shown that the contexts or backgrounds of my interviewee institutions determine their view about landscape management. As Fleck (2002: 130) states, the *thought style* of a social group is characterised by the fields of interest to a *thought collective*. As Diagramme 2 (p. 46) shows, the field of interest of the Regional Planning Committee is active landscape development, while that of the conservation organisations – especially the ones with an environmentalist background – is, ideally, the maintenance of natural environments in their pristine state. At most, they agree to very gentle interventions and near-natural landscape management. The actor groups in my study are not part of the same *thought collective* and have different *thought styles*. The institutions are caught in their own *thought collectives* involving specific views about landscape and landscape management; other views and opinions are difficult to understand. The Bernese Heritage Society, whose focus is chiefly on architecture, only partially shares the aims of the Regional Planning Committee. The UTB with its emphasis on the attractiveness of the lakes and lakeshores, is focused on ecological, private-sector, touristic and agricultural factors. The institutions are limited by their own *thought styles* so that those of the other institutions appear alien to them. This explains why the institutions interviewed for

my study do not refer to the same thing when talking about landscape and landscape management. This may result in a lack of cooperation or even in conflicts between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations.

To sum up, I can say that the Regional Planning Committee is focused on the combination of agricultural, touristic and ecological interests, while the conservation organisations' focus is either on environmentalist interests (Pro Natura, Grimselverein), or on their own specific aims (Bernese Heritage Society, UTB). These different backgrounds affect their views of landscape management and may result in a shortfall in cooperation or even in conflicts between the institutions. Therefore, the first hypothesis that the institutions' divergent views about landscape management affect cooperation can be completely verified. Another possible impact on (lack of) cooperation is related to Fairclough's concept of different types of discourse.

6.2 Power and different discourse types in the R-LEK process

6.2.1 A lack of cooperation in landscape management due to different forms of discourse

In the former sections (6.1.1. and 6.1.2) I have demonstrated that conservation organisations and the Regional Planning Committee have divergent views about landscape management. In Fleck's words they belong to different *thought collectives* and think in different *thought styles*. The diverging views of the institutions interviewed for this study can be related to their organisation-specific ideologies, norms and conventions. As Fairclough (2001: 75) states, ideological struggle manifests itself between ideologically diverse *discourse types* which refer to the organisations' rules and conventions. I will first present the institutions different competing forms of discourse and then try to find out who has more power in the R-LEK development process.

Using different kinds of texts (e.g. statutes, articles or interviews) I am now going to show that the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations have divergent views about landscape management influenced by their ideological background and context. The textual analysis revealed a clash of ideologies between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisation. While the ideological background of the conservation organisations is mainly related to environmentalist ideas involving emphasis on nature or landscape conservation, the Regional Planning Committee's ideological background comprises ecological as well as agricultural, private-sector and touristic factors of development. This clash of interest is manifested in the language they use.

The analysis of my interviews shows a few striking features. In the interview with the Regional Planning Committee the expression "development" is used in 34 sequences relating to landscape management, e.g. landscape development (14, 29, 37, 41, 62, 99, 117, 119), development planning (13, 199), regional development (18, 107), landscape development projects (14, 33, 41, 47), development aims (37, 70), tourism development (37, 62), cultural development (91) (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004). This shows that the aspect of development is a key topic for the Regional Planning Committee.

The conservation organisations, on the other hand, use the expression landscape development significantly less: Pro Natura in three, Grimselverein in six, Bernese Heritage Society in six and UTB in only two sequences. Whereas Pro Natura mention the notion of landscape development (interview Pro Natura 2004: 43, 135, 239), Grimselverein emphasise regional development (interview Grimselverein 2004: 39, 47, 76), the Bernese Heritage Society mainly focus on architectural development (interview Bernese Heritage Society 2004: 35) and the UTB talk about development planning (interview UTB 2004: 20).

It appears that the Regional Planning Committee's selection of vocabulary is geared towards landscape development rather than to landscape conservation. The selection of expressions concerning agricultural and private-sector aspects mark their

interest in landscape development. However, the selection of expressions of conservation organisations (e.g. “nature-related”, “conservation”, “protection”, etc.) is oriented towards landscape conservation and nature protection. These expressions mark their focus on ecological factors.

The fact that the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations select textual features with contrasting values shows that there exists a clash of interests or, in other words, an *ideological struggle* between the institutions.

As Fairclough (2001: 75) states, struggle between discourse types often occurs because in a social domain there is always one discourse type which tries to establish or maintain certain ideological assumptions as commonsensical. In some sense, both the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations are attempting to achieve acceptance of their own discourse types as the *natural* one (Fairclough 2001:75). Each institution tries to control the contours of the institutional network, to legitimise their policies and to sustain power relations (Fairclough 2001:75).

Who, then, is more powerful in this ideological contest? From the previous paragraphs, it has become quite clear that the Regional Planning Committee, i.e. the initiators of R-LEK, are in a more powerful position than the conservation organisations. The discourse of the Regional Planning Committee is, in Fairclough’s (2001: 144) words, ideologically *determined by*, and ideologically *determinative of* power relations and power struggle. The institutional matrix of the Regional Planning Committee’s and conservation organisations’ discourse is rather complex, because politics cut across the R-LEK process. The discourse types of the institutions belong to their specific institutional circumstances. The discourse of the Regional Planning Committee plays a crucial role in the development of R-LEK and so determines its ideological framework.

I will now focus on ways in which the discourse of the Regional Planning Committee is politically determinative and creative and discuss ways in which it is politically determined. The discourse of the Regional Planning Committee can be regarded as potentially politically determinative with respect to the fact that it is the

initiator and developer of R-LEK. On the other hand, the discourse of the Regional Planning Committee is in so far determined as the Committee are bound to do what is accepted by the communities of the region *Bernese Oberland-Ost* and by the government of the Canton of Berne. This is a particular illustration of Fairclough's (2001: 140)⁴ general claim that determinative factors are often not as wilful as they appear; there are often particular circumstances (at both national and community level) which enable or constrain this discourse.

In summary, the fact that the organisation-specific topics of the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations repeatedly occur in different forms of texts, e.g. statutes, mission statements, interviews, results in a *naturalised discourse style*. In the R-LEK process both the Regional Planning Committee and the conservation organisations tried to maintain their discourse type as commonsensical and to sustain or achieve a powerful position. It was not only the struggle concerning discourse types but also the institutional circumstances which determined the extent of an organisation's power. The Regional Planning Committee, in control of the R-LEK process (e.g. evaluation of public statements), clearly were in an advantageous position over the conservation organisations, who could only contribute their ideas and interests.

The clash of interests and different *discourse types* and the unequal distribution of power in the R-LEK development process may be another reason for a lack of cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and the conservation organisations. However, divergent *discourse types*, views and *thought styles* concerning landscape management are only part of the reason for this lack of cooperation. Below I will show to what extent power plays a role in the development process of R-LEK. I will try to support my assumption that power (negatively) affects cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations in the development process of R-LEK. In the following section, based on the data collected, I will explain how R-LEK was drafted, and how the

⁴ Fairclough (2001: 161) calls it the relationship between individual creativity and social determination.

conservation organisations were involved in the process and included in the final R-LEK document. I will also show how the conservation organisations assess R-LEK and in what way they feel affected by it. By means of some text samples I will then show in what way the aspect of power may be responsible for lack of cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and the interviewed conservation organisations throughout the R-LEK process.

6.2.2 Instances of power in the R-LEK process

This section refers to the second part of the results chapter dealing with conservation organisations in the development process of R-LEK (5.2). I will try to verify the hypothesis that during the development process of R-LEK power played an important but not necessarily overt role in the (lack of) cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations. I will present examples from section 5.2 of my thesis, which show who is in a powerful position and how power played a role in the R-LEK process as defined by Watts (1991), Ng and Bradac (1993) and Fairclough (2001). Since R-LEK concerns regional political processes, I will present power-related instances of political discourse. However, as this is an interdisciplinary thesis, my focus is not restricted to linguistic aspects.

In contrast to the (non-governmental) conservation organisations, the Regional Planning Committee are an official-status planning body providing an interface between the cantonal government and communities. The development of R-LEK was delegated to the Regional Planning Committee by the cantonal government. The Committee therefore operate from a different position than conservation organisations. The fact that they are the actual initiators of R-LEK *creates* the Regional Planning Committee's position of power (Ng and Bradac 1993), investing them with the authority to organise and influence the R-LEK development process. The Committee's power is *reflected* in the way they decided which institutions were addressed, and what issues voiced in the public statements were included in R-LEK

(Ng and Bradac 1993). Pro Natura made explicit reference to issues of power when describing the composition of the Development Group of R-LEK:

Es geht um Macht im Prinzip. Und mir ist schon klar, dass man nicht die halben Pro Natura Mitglieder [in den Fachausschuss, der das R-LEK entwickelt hat] nehmen kann und dann noch ein paar Touristiker. Aber ich habe das Gefühl, bei diesen Zusammensetzungen, solange das politisch läuft, und es wird natürlich politisch laufen, ist das so (interview Pro Natura 2004: 213).

However, since the Committee can only become active with the communities' consent, they are not entirely free agents and their policies are determined by what is acceptable to the cantonal and communal governments. So, along the lines of Watts (1991), it may well be the case that the Regional Planning Committee do not necessarily exercise their power deliberately, but are bound to support the ideas of the institutions they represent.

The conservation organisations' power to influence the development process of R-LEK was limited, indeed:

Wir haben keine andere Möglichkeit, als ihnen bei Mitwirkungen etwas entgegenzubringen, Einsprachen zu machen, Beschwerden zu machen, und das ist natürlich jedes Mal schade. Aber wir sind die Anwältin der Natur und wir werden uns bis zum Gehnietmehr wehren für die Natur (interview Pro Natura 2004: 235).

In other words, the only way of influencing R-LEK was to express the conservation organisations' interests via public statement. However, with regard to their institutional status as non-governmental organisations they may have more freedom of action since they are not answerable to communal or cantonal governments. Moreover, Pro Natura are the owners of considerable tracts of land in the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region and therefore control what happens in these areas.

In their public statements conservation organisations criticised R-LEK for being an indeterminate, incomplete document which fails to refer to specific projects. They demand for R-LEK to address current landscape-relevant projects in the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region. Apparently, to avoid disagreement with the communities involved, the Committee deliberately did not include specific project proposals.

Unless the communities ratify the contents of R-LEK its development will be inhibited. The Committee's powerful position allows them to neglect delicate issues so as to avoid conflicts with the actors involved. This aspect is related to the phenomenon of power *behind* discourse (Fairclough 1993: 36); it reflects the Committee's exercise of power and how its imbalance between the Committee and conservation organisations is shaped and constituted.

During my research work it became apparent to me that conservation organisations and communities have diverging (political) opinions regarding supra-communal cooperation. All conservation organisations expect of the Regional Planning Committee not to delegate responsibilities to individual communities, which leads to uncoordinated actions, but to stimulate and support supra-communal cooperation. Since the majority of the members of the Committee are community representatives, it is unlikely for the Committee to accept the conservation organisations' suggestions. The fact that they seem to prefer to work independently rather than across communal boundaries *reveals* another power aspect in the R-LEK process in the sense of Ng and Bradac (1993).

As I have stated earlier in this thesis, the expression "note taken" appears with striking frequency in the public participation report on R-LEK. In the sense of Ng and Bradac (1993), this expression reflects the Regional Planning Committee's power by leaving undetermined whether or not issues raised in the public statements will be addressed by R-LEK. In this sense, the expression "note taken" can be related to Ng and Bradac's fourth point (1993: 191), which states that language is used to *obscure* the exercise of power. According to the Committee the expression "note taken" means that they wanted to indicate having noted the conservation organisations' concerns, and that the issues raised will be addressed during the implementation process, when specific projects will be dealt with (interview Regional Planning Committee 2004: 53). Therefore, only a few of the conservation organisations' concerns have been included in R-LEK. The non-committal "note taken" seems to mean that the Committee did not want to reveal their real intentions

towards conservation organisations, and reflects its power to decide which aspects should be included. This policy of the Committee can be regarded as *dominant* in relation to the conservation organisations.

Moreover, Pro Natura expect the Regional Planning Committee's support against projects which are not compliant with landscape regulations. However, the Committee believe that it is Pro Natura's task to intervene against such projects. Since the Committee want to avoid being associated with an obstructionist image by the regional population, they will not immediately intervene against possibly illegal projects, but rather leave this onerous task to conservation organisations. Therefore, conservation organisations have to oppose projects which violate landscape regulations, a mechanism that reinforces their negative image. According to Ng and Bradac's concepts of power (1993), the Committee's attitude *creates* power, confirming their powerful position over conservation organisations by forcing them to oppose illegal projects. The Committee's policy can be compared to Fairclough's (2001) phenomenon of *political discourse* which seeks to be persuasive and is likely to influence the way conservation organisations will act in order to achieve their own concepts and ideas.

As we have seen, conservation organisations were not closely involved in R-LEK although they feel affected by it with regard to various issues. This situation shows that the Committee and conservation organisations have different views concerning this point. Contrary to the conservation organisations, the Committee do not seem to feel that landscape management aspects in R-LEK are of any concern to conservation organisations, an attitude which may relate to how they view their function in landscape management. Should the Regional Planning Committee deliberately have excluded conservation organisations from R-LEK, it would demonstrate another aspect of the exercise of power in the R-LEK process, i.e. the imbalance of power between conservation organisations and the Committee.

The Regional Planning Committee's institutional context, defined by their role as the communities' representative, influences their policies, which in turn affect the

development of R-LEK, thereby influencing the underlying ideology of R-LEK. The Committee's policies are a good example of how power relations can manifest themselves, and can be considered dominant with regard to conservation organisations. This again reflects Watts' (1993) assumption that power is not necessarily exercised intentionally, but arises from an individual being a member of a certain institution and acting according to institutional precepts.

In the sense of Fairclough's (2001) notion of political discourse, the more powerful Committee endeavour to impose their ideology or interests on conservation organisations. Conversely, the conservation organisations stick to their ideologies and common sense, so that there will always remain some degree of ideological disparity. Ideological uniformity between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations will never be achieved in the R-LEK process, which might be a reason for the lack of cooperation in landscape management that I have found.

Fairclough's (1993) concept of political discourse also fits well with the public participation process. Through their two different discourse types or policies, the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations each tried to maintain a dominant role, thereby establishing their respective ideological assumptions as commonsensical. By means of their public statements the conservation organisations also tried to win acceptance for their own policies or discourse type. According to Fairclough, the (lack of) cooperation between the Committee and conservation organisations shows that what is at "stake is more than 'mere words'"; at issue are the control of (regional) political balance and the attempt to sustain power relations (Fairclough 2001: 75). Due to their institutional status the Committee are in a more powerful position in the R-LEK "game".

I have been able to verify my hypothesis that power played an inherent role in the development process of R-LEK. The numerous aspects discussed confirm that the Committee, largely due to their status as developers of R-LEK, are in a more powerful position than conservation organisations. However, the Committee's exercise of power may not be deliberate since they must act according to the aims

and interests of their institutional framework. Nevertheless, regardless of whether the exercise of power is deliberate or not, the power issue manifests itself in the (lack of) cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations.

7. Summary and Conclusion

Having dealt intensively with my research objects, the R-LEK, the actors and the cooperation between them, over the course of one year I will now draw some conclusions with regard to the methodology, research process and findings of my research work. I will then comment on the findings of my study and, finally, make some suggestions for improved future cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations.

7.1 Methodology in retrospect

Considering my research methods with hindsight, I see several negative and positive aspects of the procedure.

- **Choice of the research approach:** The choice of qualitative research methods was undoubtedly adequate with regard to my research topic. Qualitative research allows a continuous adaptation to the complexity of the object of study and an ongoing optimisation of research strategies. The openness and flexibility of the qualitative research approach was proven in pursuing the proposed research aims. Since the chosen qualitative research methods involved a step by step approach to my complex research subject, they allowed a continuous improvement of the acquisition of new knowledge in my field of research.
- **Timing of the interviews:** Since my research work advanced in parallel to the development process of R-LEK, I conducted my interviews at different stages of this process, meaning that the first two interviews occurred before R-LEK was published and the other three after the publication of R-LEK. Correspondingly, I had to adapt some of my interview questions. With hindsight I think it would have been interesting if I could have interviewed all

organisations after the publication of R-LEK, since this would have enabled me to compare how the public statement reports were integrated in R-LEK. However, I found the first two interviews to provide useful and valuable data, which corresponded to and was confirmed by the findings based on data gathered later. Subsequent interviews benefited from this enhanced knowledge of the subject matter.

- **Choice of interview partners:** As described in section 2.2.2.1 (sampling strategies) I applied the method of *critical case sampling*, which involves choosing the most representative interview partners with regard to the subject matter of R-LEK. Thus, I established contact with several organisations and asked who could best represent their concerns with regard to R-LEK. This strategy was a suitable start into the data collection process. However, after the stage of analysing documents and the public statements I realized that some other interview partners might have been more adequate for my study. I considered conducting more interviews in order to gather more representative data – an idea I had to abandon due to limited research time. To obtain a broader view it would have been interesting to interview two representatives from each institution; I would also have liked to have a female interviewee.
- **Quality and accuracy of the data:** The quality and accuracy of the interviewees' statements and hence of the results can differ vastly, depending on the interviewee's knowledge of the interview topic. The most detailed and comprehensive statements were given by interviewees who were directly involved in R-LEK. Other interviewees were not very interested in the R-LEK topic, which resulted in an inferior quality of data.
- **Transcription of the interviews:** Due to my excellent digital recording equipment and a quiet interviewing environment, the sound quality of the data was good and I did not have to deal with background noise. Another advantage was my knowledge of the interview topic, which helped me understand the recordings. However, I conducted one interview in a

restaurant and did have to spent an inordinate amount of time transcribing the statements nearly drowned out by background noise. The transcription method is an adequate instrument since it converts recorded data to a source which can be referred to at any time.

- **Coding methods:** The method of thematic coding proved to be an excellent strategy to provide a good basis for the evaluation. I worked with MaxQDA, a computer application which turned out to be a very useful and effective instrument. MaxQDA allows to define code categories and mark the respective sequences of the interviews. All sequences with the same markers can subsequently be assembled in one document, enabling quick searches for statements and sequences.
- **Objectivity, or the limitations of qualitative data:** Qualitative research methods involve personal interpretation methods and subjectivity, and cannot therefore produce absolute truths. Despite the structured methodological framework, objective research is impossible to achieve. The researchers' and actors' interests, cultural and social backgrounds will inevitably impinge on the study with subjective and interpretative aspects affecting all stages of the research process. The findings are in so far representative as the application of analogous methodological steps produces identical or at least similar results. In order to reduce subjectivity to a minimum, I defined and structured my research process with the greatest possible precision.

7.2 Summary of research process and findings

Since the tourism-based region of the eastern part of the Bernese Oberland depends on an attractive landscape, it is essential for touristic, private-sector, agricultural, ecological as well as aesthetic landscape requirements of landscape management are satisfied. Landscape management therefore is a collective task requiring collective patterns of action on a supra-communal level. R-LEK tries to accomplish the manifold tasks in landscape management in an innovative and cooperative manner.

The aim of this study has been to analyse cooperation between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations in the development process of R-LEK. Several reasons (i.e. interest in an attractive landscape, missions involving landscape management) promise cooperation between my chosen institutions. However, as my work progressed I realised that despite several unifying factors there was not much cooperation between these institutions. I therefore attempted to find explanations for this lack of cooperation.

Two assumptions emerged as I was gathering data in order to answer my research questions. On the one hand, I realised that different things were intended when representatives talked about landscape management. I therefore assumed their divergent views about landscape management to be a reason for the lack of cooperation in the development process of R-LEK. I also observed that the R-LEK process was affected by an imbalance in power, likely affecting the R-LEK process, which was my second hypothesis. Consequently, I chose two suitable theoretical approaches which helped me to interpret my observations and which were appropriate to obtain answers to my research questions, and to support or refute the hypotheses of this study. The first theoretical framework concerns divergent views about landscape management, the second the impact of power on the development process of R-LEK. Let me briefly summarise the two theoretical frameworks.

Landscape management can be approached from different backgrounds in several ways. Hebertshuber (2000) distinguishes six different views on landscape:

- Scientific perspective;
- Spatial planning perspective;
- Perspective of tourism;
- Private-sector perspective;
- Conservation organisations' perspective;
- Perspective of incentive programmes.

Given the fact that landscapes are affected by private-sector, ecological, agricultural and touristic decisions and actions, the different approaches to landscape management create tensions which may cause regional or communal conflicts. The divergent views on landscape management can also be compared with Fleck's (1983) concept of different *thought styles* and *thought collectives*. Fleck states that *thought styles* are characterised by common features in the fields of interest to the *thought collective*. Since we look through the eyes of the *thought collective*, we can be limited by our own *thought style*, so that other thought styles appear alien to us. However, our own thought style appears imperative to us, because our perception functions unconsciously. In my study the institutions represent different *thought collectives* which are strongly influenced by their own *thought styles*. In my study the chosen institutions represent *thought collectives* whose *thought styles* correspond to the different institutional backgrounds and fields of interest.

With regard to the first hypothesis, i.e. that divergent views about landscape management (negatively) affect cooperation, I first examined my chosen institutions' ideological background and interests in landscape management. I found that they can be separated in two groups. On the one hand, there is the Regional Planning Committee as a regional authority with the task of coordinating the interests of institutions in different fields, e.g. agriculture, tourism, private-sector and conservation organisations. Consequently, the Regional Planning Committee's view about landscape management turned out to include agricultural, private-sector,

touristic and ecological factors. The Regional Planning Committee's view about landscape management corresponds with Heberhuber's (2000) perspectives of spatial planning, landscape managers, nature conservationists as well as that of incentive programmes, since as financial promoters they reward nature-related landscape management.

On the other hand, the conservation organisations I selected for my study, are non-governmental institutions. Their focus on landscape management corresponds to their mission to protect and conserve their specific fields of interest, e.g. lakes and riverine systems, specific geographic regions, architectural heritage etc., and is mainly on ecological factors. Thus their view about landscape management mostly corresponds with Herberthuber's (2000) perspective of natural scientists and nature conservationists.

The different *thought styles* of my chosen institutions are characterised by their fields of interest to a *thought collective*. In my study I have shown that the actor groups are not part of the same *thought collective* and have different *thought styles*. The institutions are limited by their own *thought styles*, so that the *thought styles* of the other institutions appear alien to them which makes it difficult to understand the other institutions opinions. Landscape management has different meanings to my chosen institutions, which means that they do not talk about the same thing when talking about landscape management. So the theoretical framework of different perspectives and different *thought styles* and *collectives* helped me to support the assumption that different views about landscape management (negatively) affect cooperation.

The concepts of power and different discourses was the other important theoretical framework used to support or refute my second hypothesis, i.e. that power affects the R-LEK development process. Let me briefly summarise the main aspects of the chosen power concepts. In general, power can be defined as intentionally imposing one's will on another actor. Watts (1991) emphasises that the aspect of intentionality is problematic, especially in institutional settings, since an

actor may be endowed with the ability to make others act against their will, but not necessarily intentionally so.

Along the line of Ng and Bradac (1993) I analysed in what way language in the R-LEK process *revealed*, *created* or *reflected* power. Furthermore, I used Fairclough's (2001) notion of power *in* and *behind* discourse to show how the social order of my institutions is constituted. Another essential aspect of power relations in the R-LEK process is Fairclough's notion of *political discourse*. All chosen institutions constantly vye for a position powerful enough to impose an ideological common sense and to impose their own *discourse type* as the *natural* one. But there will always remain a certain ideological diversity. This can result in *ideological struggle* or, in my study, in a lack of cooperation. Ideologically different *discourse types* refer to the institutions' underlying conventions and norms.

The *discourse type* of the conservation organisations manifests itself by the frequent use of expressions related to nature and landscape conservation and protection. This marks their focus on ecological aspects. The discourse type of the Regional Planning Committee, on the other hand, frequently reveals expressions related to private-sector, agricultural and tourist development, which marks their focus on active landscape development. Both the Regional Planning Committee and the conservation organisations try to achieve acceptance of their own *discourse type* as the *natural* one. In the R-LEK process, then, it was not only the struggle concerning discourse types but also the institutional framework which determined the extent of the organisations' power.

The Regional Planning Committee as the initiator of the R-LEK, the coordinator of the public participation process and the executor of Federal or cantonal orders clearly were in a more powerful position than conservation organisations, who were limited to submitting their opinions. This shows that the Regional Planning Committee do not necessarily exercise their power deliberately, but are bound to support the ideas of the institutions they represent. However, in the public participation process there were some instances when the Regional Planning

Committee *created* power, e.g. their non-committal comment of “note taken” in the public participation report, which seems to indicate that the Committee did not want to reveal their real intentions to conservation organisations. With the help of the theoretical framework of power and political discourse I have verified my hypothesis that power played an inherent role in the development process of R-LEK.

In sum, I have been able to verify both of my hypotheses. Institutions’ different backgrounds and views about landscape management, as well as power differences do affect cooperation (or lack thereof) in landscape management. This is a problematic basis for the development of corporate landscape management strategies. However, the landscape of the *Bernese Oberland-Ost* region would require and benefit from cooperation between conservation organisations and Regional Planning Committee. A beautiful landscape is essential for the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region for ecological, private-sector, touristic and social reasons.

7.3 Recommendations

Cooperation between organisations can be improved by common norms and values, regular contact and mutual trust. These factors build a stable framework which is a stringent condition to realise new ideas and common aims. The responsibility to further and support cooperation often depends on a few committed individuals. With the following recommendations for an improvement in future cooperation I intend to address the members of the interviewed institutions and all individuals who have any influence on landscape management in the *Bernese Oberland-Ost* region.

The findings of my research work show that the institutions’ different status (official vs. non-governmental) should not only be seen as an impediment to cooperation. On the contrary, the institutions’ different backgrounds could complement each other and thus create more potent forms of landscape management. This potential could be supported in several ways. As conservation

organisations have suggested, meetings on a regular basis (e.g. twice a year) might be a way to raise mutual awareness of different views about and definitions of landscape management. This might improve mutual understanding and benefit landscape management. The meetings could be in the form of sessions, workshops, or common landscape projects. The problems mentioned in this study should be discussed during such meetings, addressing the issue of defining landscape or landscape management, so that misunderstandings could be reduced. Moreover, expectations of the others' role in landscape management should be discussed to highlight points not dealt with before and to reveal hidden problems which have up to now impeded cooperation. The obscurities and ambiguities with regard to the institutions' views about landscape management have to be discussed thoroughly. Another possibility would be for the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations to organise joint public events both to stimulate cooperation and raise public awareness for landscape problems and landscape management.

I would suggest that such meetings and projects should be organised on a regular basis. This would open up ways for constructive cooperation in landscape management and thus be a great benefit for the wonderful landscape of the *Berner Oberland-Ost* region. Before the projects and suggestions for improved cooperation can be put into practice they will have to be discussed with the concerned actors. Unfortunately this task cannot be covered by my research study. The stimulation of the implementation of projects, and meetings between the Regional Planning Committee and conservation organisations and their influence on cooperation in landscape management would be an interesting topic for a further study.

References

- Barnes, B.
1988 *The nature of power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U. and Bonß, W. (eds.)
1989 *Weder Sozialtechnologie noch Aufklärung? Analysen zur Verwendung sozialwissenschaftlichen Wissens*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Becker, H.S.
1986b *Writing for social scientists*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P.
1977 *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Bruner, E.M.
1993 Introduction: The ethnographic self and the personal self. In P. Benson (ed.), *Anthropology and literature*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1-26.
- Denzin, N.K.
1989b *The research act* (3rd edn). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Fairclough, N.
1994 *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London Longman.
2001 *Language and power*. Essex: Longman.
- Fleck, L.
1979 *Genesis and development of a scientific fact*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1983 *Erfahrung und Tatsache*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Taschenbuch Verlag.
2002 *Entstehung und Entwicklung einer wissenschaftlichen Tatsache*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Flick, U.
1996 *Qualitative Forschung*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.
2002 *An introduction to qualitative research*. London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Fry, P.
2001 *Bodenfruchtbarkeit: Bauernsicht und Forscherblick*. Weikersheim: Margraf Verlag.

Hebertshuber, M.

- 2000 Anmerkungen zur Landschaftswahrnehmung. In Békési S. et al., *Landschaft: Begriff und Wahrnehmung*. Wien: Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Verkehr.

Hoppichler, J.

- 1994 Die Ökonomisierung der Kulturlandschaft. In *ZOLLtexte* 2/94, 31-35.

Lincoln Y.S. and Denzin, N.K.

- 2000 The seventh moment. In Denzin N.K. and Lincoln Y.S. (eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd edition). London : Sage, 1047-65.

Locher, M.

- 2001 *The interface of power and politeness in disagreements: An analysis of three speech situations*. Selbstverlag: Hasle bei Burgdorf, Bern.

Meuser, M. and Nagel, U.

- 1991 ExpertInneninterviews: vielfach erprobt, wenig bedacht. Ein Beitrag zur qualitativen Methodendiskussion. In Garz D. and Kramer K. (eds), *Qualitativ-empirische Sozialforschung*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 441-468.

Morse, J. M.

- 1998 Designing funded qualitative research. In Denzin N. and Lincoln Y.S. (eds), *Strategies of qualitative research*. London: Sage, 56-85.

Ng, S. H. and Bradac, J. J.

- 1993 *Power in language. Verbal communication and social influence*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Regierungsrat des Kantons Bern

- 1998 *Landschaftsentwicklungskonzept*. Bern: Amt für Gemeinden und Raumordnung.

Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost

- 1996 *25 Jahre Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost. Überkommunal tätige Organisationen in der Region Oberland-Ost*. Meiringen: Oberhasler AG.
- 2003 *Landschaftsentwicklungskonzept. Region Oberland-Ost (R-LEK)*. Entwurf für die öffentliche Mitwirkung vom 31. Januar bis 2. Mai 2003. Interlaken: Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost.
- 2003 *Landschaftsentwicklungskonzept. Region Oberland-Ost (R-LEK)*. Interlaken: Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost.

Strauss, A. L.

1999 *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strohmeier, G.

1994 Anästhetisch oder ästhetisch? In *ZOLLtexte* 3/94, 41-43.

2000 Zur Wirklichkeit von Landschaft: Ästhetische Konstruktion und Erfahrungswelt. In Békési S. et al., *Landschaft: Begriff und Wahrnehmung*. Wien: Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Verkehr.

UTB - Uferschutzverband Thuner- und Brienersee

2003 *Jahrbuch vom Thuner- und Brienersee*. Uetendorf: Schaer Thun AG.

von Saldern, M.

1986 *Mehrebenenanalyse. Beiträge zur Erfassung hierarchisch strukturierter Realität*. München: Psychologie Verlags Union.

Wartenberg, Thomas E.

1990 *The forms of power. From domination to transformation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Watts, Richard James.

1991 *Power in family discourse*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Zwatz, Wolfgang

1994 Zwischen Schönheit, Ökologie und Produktion: Das Kärntner Kulturlandschaftsprogramm. In *Die Bergbauern* 188/189, 10f.

Electronic resources:

Berner Heimatschutz, <http://www.bernerheimatschutz.ch>, 24.8.2004.

Grimselverein, <http://www.grimselverein.ch>, 24.8.2004.

NRP 48, <http://www.nfp48.ch>, 24.8.2004.

Pro Natura, <http://www.pronatura.ch>, 24.8.2004.

Regionalplanung Oberland-Ost, <http://www.eregio.ch/d/regions/index.cfm?action=detail&schlüssel=Oberland-Ost>, 24.8.2004.

Schweizer Heimatschutz, <http://www.heimatschutz.ch/d/shs/leitbild.shtm>, 24.8.2004.

Uferschutzverband Thuner- und Brienersee, <http://www.u-t-b.ch>, 24.8.2004.

Statutes:

Statuten des Schweizerischen Bundes für Naturschutz, 1987.

Statuten Pro Natura Berner Oberland, 1999.

Statuten Grimselverein, <http://www.grimselverein.ch/verein/statuten.html>, 24.8.04.

Leitbild des Schweizer Heimatschutzes: www.heimatschutz.ch/d/shs/leitbild.shtm, 24.8.2004.

Statuten Uferschutzverbandes Thuner- und Brienersee, <http://www.u-t-b.ch/portraet/statuten.gos>, 24.8.04.

Interviews:

Interview Bernese Heritage Society: Interviewee Heinrich Sauter, construction foreman, 9.3.2004.

Interview Grimselverein: Interviewee Emil Feuz, member of the board, 5.3.2004.

Interview Pro Natura: Interviewee Hans Fritschi, former president, 27.2.2004.

Interview Regional Planning Committee: Interviewee Urs Inäbnit, chairman, 20.4.2004.

Interview Uferschutzverband Thuner und Brienersee: Interviewee Andreas Fuchs, president, 10.2.2004.