

# A critical investigation of the Visitors' experience at a man-made nature-based attraction

A thesis by Cecilie Sjelle



## Master thesis

**Title:** A critical investigation of the visitors' experience at a man-made nature-based attraction

**Institution:** Aalborg University Copenhagen

**Semester:** 10<sup>th</sup> semester

**Deadline:** 3<sup>rd</sup> of October 2019

**Supervisor:** Thi Linh Giang Phi

**Keystrokes:** 105.127

**Pages:** 44

**Student:** Cecilie Aagreen Sjelle (20172272)

## Abstract

The thesis is concerned with the visitors' experience at a man-made nature-based attraction. It deals with the specific case study of the newly opened Forest Tower on South Zealand.

It was found interesting to study as there appeared to be a gap between the visitors' expectations and perception of the attraction and the actual experience.

The project analyses the visitors experience by comparing data collected through qualitative interviews with visitors, participants observations, interview with the management of the attraction and the researchers own fieldwork.

The study aims to discuss different sides of the visitors' experience and how these are unique to a man-made nature-based attraction. The project aims to provide findings which can have both a theoretical and practical contribution by sharing information which could be beneficial for the Forest Tower and other man-made nature-based tourist attractions.

Keywords: Nature-based attraction, Visitors' experience

## Indholdsfortegnelse

<b>Abstract .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>Case presentation: The Forest Tower .....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Research aim and objectives .....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Contribution of study .....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Project structure .....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Clarifications of concepts .....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Customer vs. Visitor .....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Camp Adventure vs. The Forest Tower .....</i>	<i>11</i>
<b>Chapter 2: Literature review .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<i>Nature-based tourism attractions .....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>What makes the visitors' experience? .....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>A social constructivist approach to the Forest Tower .....</i>	<i>18</i>
<b>Chapter 3: Methodology .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<i>Philosophy of science .....</i>	<i>22</i>
The Interpretive approach .....	22
<i>Qualitative research .....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Credibility, transferability, dependability &amp; confirmability .....</i>	<i>24</i>
Credibility .....	24
Transferability .....	25
Dependability .....	25
Confirmability .....	25
<i>Data collection .....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Research ethics .....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Fieldwork .....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Participant observations .....</i>	<i>28</i>
Interviews .....	31
<i>Interviews with visitors .....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Expert interview with Ida Roed .....</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Secondary data .....</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Data analysis: Thematic approach .....</i>	<i>36</i>
<b>Chapter 4: Analysis .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<i>The visitors' expectations .....</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Man-made disturbance at a man-made nature-based attraction .....</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>The rules of visiting a man-made nature-based attraction .....</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>A multi sensuous experience .....</i>	<i>48</i>

<i>The visual experience</i> .....	49
<i>Putting a price on nature</i> .....	50
<b>Chapter 5: Conclusion</b> .....	<b>53</b>
<b>References</b> .....	<b>55</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Semi-structured interviews with visitors at The Forest Tower</b> .....	<b>60</b>
<b>Appendix 2: semi-structured Interview with Ida Roed</b> .....	<b>83</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Participant observations</b> .....	<b>100</b>

## Chapter 1: Introduction

The demand for nature-based tourism has steadily grown and is the most rapidly expanding sector within tourism across Europe and the rest of the world (UNWTO, 2009).

A study undertaken for the World Resources Institute found that this type of tourism is increasing at an annual rate of between 10% and 30% (Reingold, 1993). This means that nature-based tourism is becoming more and more popular with time. As this happens man-made nature-based attractions are showing up around the world in different shapes and sizes. As these man-made nature-based attractions starts to appear the question of the visitors' experience also come into question.

This case study will therefore investigate the man-made nature-based attraction known as the Forest Tower. The tower is one of Denmark's newest nature-based attractions, and only just opened its boardwalk on the 31<sup>th</sup> of March 2019 (Tv2Øst, 2019).

The Forest Tower is the newest addition to the attraction named Camp Adventure which is a place that includes both the Forest Tower, Denmark's largest tree top climbing area, a hostel and places to eat and drink (Campadventure.dk/facts). The tower is an attraction in itself as it is not necessary to combine it with any of the other activities in the area. However, the tower does not stand alone. The experience of walking to the top of the tower is combined with a wooden boardwalk which takes the visitors on a walk through the Danish forest on a 3,2-kilometer journey which includes the 650-meter ramp from the bottom of the tower and up. The Forest Tower itself reaches 45 meters above the ground and with its placement on top of a hill it is considered to be the highest point on Zealand, as it reaches 135 meters above sea level (Campadventure.dk, 2019, *Facts*).

The research of this project will concentrate on the Forest Tower and not Camp Adventure. Camp adventure and the experiences it holds are all situated in nature, but also very different from each other in how they are experienced and use by the visitors. Therefore, it was chosen to only concentrate on the man-made nature-based attraction the tower is.

As previous stated; The Forest Tower opened its boardwalk on April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2019 and it is already far more popular than expected (Tv2Øst, 2019). As stated by Ida Roed, head of communication, "well, all people have always been, historical speaking, been drawn to come up and look over something "(App 2, expert interview, p 83). Which inspired the management to build the tower in the first

place. Based on the visitor numbers it seems as if they were right in their statement (Tv2Øst, 2019).

The management had hoped to get 1000.000 visitors within the first year. However, this has already been exceeded by more than double. As of the end of August 2019 the number of visitors has exceeded 200.000 and is closing in on 250.000 (Tv2Øst, 2019).

The researcher's personal interest in the field was woken by the first announcement that the tower was getting build. The field of attraction is very interesting in the sense of how different they can be, what makes and most important how the visitors experience them and what they can offer their visitors'.

After the Forest Tower was announced no more information came out for a long period of time. Even after the opening it was still not clear to the researcher what one could expect from the experience and many people near me, where not clear on what the place was or what experience they would get out of it. This realization woke the researcher's curiosity and it was discovered that even though there exists much research within the field of both visitor experience and nature-based attractions and nature tourism not much concentrate on the visitors' experience within these settings. Knowing the demand for nature-based tourism and man-made attractions will only rise in popularity and the interest in visitor experience, it was found necessary to explore the subject.

### Case presentation: The Forest Tower

The Forest Tower is located near Rønnede on South Zealand in Denmark.

Camp Adventure have since 2013 leased the buildings and part of the grounds which belongs to Gissfeld Monastery (Gissfeld-kloster.dk, 2019). The area is known as a hilly terrain with large beech and oak trees and with small brooks running through the forest area (Campadventure.dk, 2019, *historien*). The idea of the Forest Tower first began in 2014 where applications regarding the build were sent out (Campadventure.dk. 2019, *historien*). The same year Camp Adventure build the tree top climbing park in the forest and the management realized that the forest had potential for even more and other nature-based activities (Campadventure.dk, 2019, *historien*).

The mission of Camp Adventure and the Forest Tower is to get people out and experience the beauty of nature by staging the nature in new ways and make it accessible to the visitors (Campadventure.dk, 2019, *historien*).

Five years after the first applications were sent out the Forest Tower opened its tower and boardwalk for visitors on 31<sup>st</sup> of March 2019. The tower was drawn by EFFEKT architects with the intent to create an aesthetically beautiful construction which matches the nature on South Zealand (Campadventure, 2019, *arkitekturen*). The Forest Tower brands itself as a unique nature-based experience which cannot be found anywhere else in Scandinavia (Campadventure.dk, 2019, *oplevelsen*).

Visitors can enjoy the nature on a 3.2-kilometer-long walk on the boardwalk which has been built on the premise of nature. This means that the boardwalk curves around the trees in the forest and as a visitor you get the understanding that the trees and nature decided where the boardwalk should go and not the other way around (Photo 1).



Photo 1- The boardwalk

The Forest Tower is built with the intent to create an aesthetic beautiful piece of work and creating a unique nature-based experience (Campadventure.dk, 2019, *arkitekturen*). It is built with nature in mind and make it possible to adapt to nature and built as sensible as possible (Campadventure.dk, 2019, *arkitekturen*). The tower is constructed with corten steel which has this red-brown color which matches the surroundings it stands in. Furthermore, the wood which makes the entire boardwalk is made from local oakwood (Campadventure.dk, 2019, *arkitekturen*).

The Forest Tower reaches 45 meters above the ground and with its placement on the highest spot in Zealand it reaches 135 meters above sea level ([www.campadventure.dk/facts](http://www.campadventure.dk/facts)). That makes it the highest point on Zealand. From the top of the tower you get a view over South Zealand. The Forest Tower claims to be for all types of visitors and for 150 DKK you can buy your way through the forest and to the top, in an estimated 2 hours (Campadventure.dk, 2019, *priser*). The tower is open for everyone year-round.

The Forest Tower is a self-proclaimed unique experience (Campadventure.dk, 2019, *oplevelsen*), but is also recognized by well-known medias. As the most recent Time Magazine put the Forest

Tower on their list of “World’s Greatest Places”. This list contains attractions, experiences, restaurants, bars and hotels from 48 different countries (Campadventure.dk. 2019, *Time Magazine Worlds greatest places 2019*).

The journey of visiting the Forest Tower starts at an old farmhouse which works as reception, introduction area for the tree top climbers, and area where it is possible to buy something to eat and drinks. Furthermore, it is also possible for the children to play on a nature-based playground or sit and enjoy the view of the small pond. When you arrive at the farmhouse the beginning of the boardwalk appears. From here you scan your ticket and start the walking to the tower. As the visitors walk on the boardwalk they will be introduced to several aspects of the Danish nature as different types of trees appear, small creeks and the diversity of the plants in a Danish forest. As you walk on you will arrive at the bottom of the tower, show your ticket and start to towards the top of the tower. From the top you will be able look out over South Zealand. As you come back down to the ground the boardwalk takes the visitors another way back to the farm and still introduce new areas of the forest which includes creeks, view post and beautiful scenery.

### Research aim and objectives

This project will attempt to contribute to the field of tourism, by focusing on the visitors’ experience at a man-made nature-based tourist attraction. Due to interest in the subject, attractions in general and a newly opened nature-based attraction the case study of the Forest Tower was chosen to be investigated.

The interest in investigating the visitors experience came from the perception of the Forest Tower being a complex experience. The researcher knew that experience economy and consumption of experiences and places were well researched but not in the field of experiencing man-made nature-based attractions. A search on Google scholar on the subject “Experiencing man-made nature-based attraction” shows that most of the research in the field are focusing on development of nature-based attractions or on the subject of why nature-based tourism is attractive to tourists. (scholar.google.com, 2019). Based on this it was decided to use the Forest Tower as a case study to critically investigate the experience of the visitors at the attraction. The aim of this project is therefore:

to critically investigate visitors’ experiences at a man-made nature-based attraction using the case study of the Forest Tower.

The aim of the research is supported by the following objectives:

- What literature are considered best practice within the field of visitor experience and nature-based attractions?
- What research approach is the most appropriate for exploring the nature of the visitors' experience at a man-made nature-based attraction?
- What makes the visitors experience at a man-made nature-based attraction?

To answer the aim, literature on what makes an attraction, nature-tourism and visitors' experiences have been investigated. The analysis will be based on a thematic analysis of in-dept interview with the head of communication from Camp Adventure, short semi-structured interviews with 24 visitors, 3 observations of participants who were requested to visit the attraction. Furthermore, the researcher's own perception and experience will also be included as she has been a visitor to the attraction on several occasions.

### Contribution of study

It is intended for this study to contribute to the future planning of the Forest Tower and give the management behind the tower a view into how their visitors experience the man-made nature-based attraction. Furthermore, the research will contribute to the existing theory within the field of man-made nature-based attractions from the point of view of the visitor.

The value of this project lies within the visitors' experiences at man-made nature-based attraction. Nature itself are in many ways seen as an attraction and, in some cases, as the Forest Tower, an attraction which has been built within the scene of nature. The combination of the man-made and nature therefore develops into an attraction. As nature tourism becomes more popular it is not unlikely that we will see more of this type of attractions, but how will the visitors experience the attraction? How is the combination between "regular" attractions and nature experiences and what can the visitors expect? Experience economy is a very well-known concept, but how does it work and add value to the visitors' experience at a man-made nature-based attraction?

### Project structure

This project is made of five chapters which are briefly outlined in this section.

**Chapter one** will present the research area, clarify the aim and describe the case study. This chapter will mainly focus on how the aim was reached.

**Chapter two** will introduce a literature review of literature and texts which have been significant to the research and have helped understand the theoretical framework. The chapter will also help summarize already existing knowledge within the field of research and define important theories such as experience economy, place-making, nature-based tourism.

**Chapter three** focuses on the methodologies and methods which will be used in order to answer the aim of the project. Here research philosophy, strategy and design will be discussed and furthermore, give an insight into the empirical research as of how data has been collected and analyzed.

**Chapter four** will give an introduction to how the analysis is structured and set up. The analysis is based in the researchers' findings within the collected data and theoretical considerations in order to answer the aim of the research.

**Chapter five** will contain the conclusions of the analysis which will be reflected and discussed. The last reflective thoughts will be followed by the conclusion of the research by reviewing the answers given to the aim of the project and include some closing thoughts.

### Clarifications of concepts

#### Customer vs. Visitor

When working with and at attractions, people visiting the place is often referred to as visitors within the industry. The same people are often referred to as customers or consumers within in literature. In this project the use of visitors will be used throughout the thesis, both in the literature review and analysis.

#### Camp Adventure vs. The Forest Tower

Camp Adventure is a place which consists of several attractions under the collected name of Camp Adventure. This thesis will only concentrate on the Forest Tower and the notion of Camp

Adventure will only be referred to as a location.

#### Man-made nature-based attraction

Within this project the concept of man-made nature-based tourism is used. The understanding of this is, in relation to the Forest Tower, a constructed experience in shape of an attraction placed in nature (Bell & Lyall, 2002).

## Chapter 2: Literature review

The literature review section of this project will concentrate on several concepts and issues within tourism. This will be done to make a conceptual basis to understand and analyze the empirical data collection. The literature will explore existing literature within the fields of experience economy, nature-based tourism and attractions. The literature within these fields are all well researched, but often focuses on other use within their own field. Based on this, the chapter will introduce the reader to the existing literature and critically discuss gaps which are being researched in this project.

### Nature-based tourism attractions

Nature tourism is described by the Oxford Dictionary of travel and tourism as travelling to unspoiled places to experience and enjoy nature (Beaver, 2012). Research on nature-based tourism often focuses on the subjects of wildlife, wilderness or ecotourism (Buckley, 2009). Furthermore, Caballos-Lascuráin (1996) argues that the term of nature-based tourism is used on tourism activities which are depending on the natural resources which remain in relatively, undeveloped state, including scenery, topography, waterways, vegetation, wildlife and cultural heritage (Caballos-Lascuráin, 1996). In the case of the Forest Tower the researcher would argue that the placement of the Forest Tower in the Danish forest, surrounded by wilderness, scenery and, to some extent, wildlife does fit within this category. However, the main attraction is the tower itself, which is built by man and does not categorize as a nature attraction itself. However, as the point of building the tower is to go up and enjoy the view of South Zealand the researcher would argue that it fits within the category of scenery and therefore belongs in nature-based tourism.

Furthermore, the researcher would argue that the Forest Tower is not an unspoiled place, as the attraction now is a combination of nature and a man-made building. It is also argued that all forms of tourism where relatively undisturbed natural environments form the primary attraction or setting are nature tourism (Buckley & Coghlan, 2012).

Nature-based attractions and experiences are seen in all corners of the world. Lovelock argues that any object or place will naturally become an attraction if it is under the "gaze" of a tourist (Lovelock, 2004). This is part of creating a marketplace for visual and physical experience by visiting destinations and exploring unique areas, such as nature-based attractions as the Forest

Tower (Jensen, 2014). As previously mentioned, the Forest Tower was built to let visitors reach the top and experience the scenery. Therefore, the Forest Tower is landscape featured and can draw from the belief that the experience can be created by the tourists themselves with the aim of reaching the “peak” (Bell & Lyall, 2002).

A landscape consists of a number of parts to create the collected scenery (Bell, 2012). When characterizing landscapes, the distinction between beautiful, picturesque and the sublime is made (Greer, Donnelly & Rickly, 2008; Zaring, 1997; Jacobsen & Tømmervik, 2016).

The beauty is perceived well formed, balanced and aesthetically pleasing (Löthian, 1999). The picturesque is, of course, looking good in pictures (McGillivray, 2008). The sublime is threatening, wild and uncontrollable. The sublime is supposed to create a feeling of awe and reverence (Schönle, 2000). In the world of nature-based attractions Bell & Lyall have developed the theory of the “modern sublime” concept. The concept is referring to observation platforms which is designed to facilitate possible dramatic “modern sublime” experiences (Bell & Lyall, 2002). These observation platforms are posed of “affordance”. An affordance relates to the qualities of an object or environment that communicate certain opportunities for involvement and activities. Objects and environments that communicate affordance are perceived particularly attractive (Gibson, 2014).

### What makes the visitors’ experience?

Experience is a well-known, broad and complex concept which has been defined by many theoreticians in several ways. Loureiro (2014) argues that within in the concept of tourism, experience is to some extent seen as the key to success, innovation, and competitiveness and can be associated with the heart of the entertainment business. In the following we will take a deeper look on theorists such as Pine & Gilmore, Lena Mossberg, John Urry, Haldrup & Larsen and Ole B. Jensen, who all offers similar but different takes on the staging and consumption of experiences.

When referring to experiences it is hard to avoid the names of Pine & Gilmore. Pine & Gilmore are by many seen as the front runners behind the concept and mindset of the notion of experience economy (Poulsson & Kale, 2004). Pine & Gilmore (1999) define experiences as *“Experiences are a for the economic offering, as distinct from services as services are from good, but one that has until*

*now gone largely unrecognized*". According to them, there has been a need to find new ways to create value to customers due to vibration in consumer consumption patterns (Pine & Gilmore, 2009). Pine & Gilmore (1998) have divided an experience into four realms which are entertainment, education, esthetics, and escapism. According to them an experience occurs when a service or goods are staged on purpose in order to create a memorable and unique event for individual customers (Pine & Gilmore, 1998). By arguing this they state that an experience is individual and a thing which businesses can provide customers. Furthermore, they argue that it is often created based on direct participation in an event or observations (Pine & Gilmore, 1998). They also argue that it is successful when the customer feels engaged because of the memorable relation is shaped between the customers and the business (Pine & Gilmore, 2009). Therefore, it is no longer sufficient for the businesses to provide customers with goods and services, they need to produce and stage an experience to create economic value for the consumers in order to create the most valuable business for its customers (Pine & Gilmore, 2009). However, Pine & Gilmore portrays the consumers as very passive recipients or actors in this staged experience (Hansen, 2014) which has been criticized by others.

To criticize Pine & Gilmore and their view on the experience economy, they believe that it is possible to create an experience, deliver it and it will become a success. However, is that always the case? We also know that depending on previous history, culture and perception people experience experiences differently (Madsen, 2010). Rolston (1998) argues that visitors bring their independent meaning to a particular location. Therefore, it will be possible to argue that experiences such as the Forest Tower can be experienced just as different as there are people. Jantzen and Jensen also argues that people are not as predictable as Pine & Gilmore (Jantzen & Jensen, 2015). I would therefore argue that the view Pine & Gilmore has could be used more as a tool to approach what the experience has to offer and not as a guideline to create the successful experience. The four realms of Pine & Gilmore are therefore used more as a tool to understand the Forest Tower as an experiencescape.

Another well-known take on "experience" is set by Lena Mossberg (2007). Her take on it is that experience is something that can be consumed (Mossberg, 2007). The difference between her point of view and Pine & Gilmore is that Pine & Gilmore view experience as something that is

produced, and Mossberg believes that experience is something which can be consumed. This point of view is most likely to come from the more marketing-based view she has. Mossberg argues that experience is *“a constant flow of thoughts and feelings that occur during moments of consciousness”* (Mossberg, 2007, p. 60). By saying this she gives the consumer a higher role and meaning than Pine & Gilmore. She therefore argues that the experience takes place inside the visitor and therefore sees the visitors as a co-creator of the space. Therefore, it will be almost impossible for businesses to create a specific experience that the consumer can experience but will be able to influence that environment and settings. Mossberg (2007) referred to this as an *experiencescape* and defines it as *“a space of pleasure, enjoyment and entertainment, as well as the meeting ground in which diverse groups move about and some in contact with each other”* (Mossberg, 2007, p. 62), the researcher believes a tourist attraction could be an example of this. Mossberg’s view on experience are mostly centered around social and physical factors that a business is able to have an influence on. However, to criticize Mossberg she does not seem to consider the human embodies performance, feelings and emotions as she describes the tourism experience as a diversion from the consumers’ everyday life. She refers to these experiences as peak experiences which are only created if the consumer experiences surprise moments or something unexpected (Mossberg, 2007).

Another take on experiences, with a somewhat similar view as Lena Mossberg, is John Urry. He states: *“Tourist experiences involve some aspect or elements that induces pleasurable experience which, by comparison with the everyday, are out of the ordinary”* (Urry, 2002, p.12). Urry argues that consumption of services and goods within environments that are different to the everyday life and bring pleasure which he calls *“tourist gaze”*. The so called *“tourist gaze”* involves a social aspect and something out of the ordinary (Urry, 2002). This is supported by Haldrup & Larsen who argues that a tourist gaze is a visual experience where people travel to experience environments that are out of the ordinary (Haldrup & Larsen, 2010). However, Urry also argues that tourists can experience places and therefore attractions in multi sensuous ways.

Haldrup & Larsen argue that tourism is not all about consuming but also about the social relations and materials (Haldrup & Larsen, 2007). They also include modern technology and consumption in relation to people’s everyday life. They bring examples of buying souvenirs and taking

photographs which are shared on social media platforms or become part of the decoration in the tourist's home (Haldrup & Larsen, 2010). Haldrup & Larsen agree with Urry and Mossberg who also argue that tourism experiences are generally defined as contrasts to the tourist's everyday life. Furthermore, when looking at visitor experiences within the setting of nature it is argued that more visitor contact with nature and participation in physical activities in nature, creates positive effects on human health (Chen & Prebensen, 2017).

Another theorist who can add an additional approach to the concept of experiences is Ole B. Jensen (2013). He focuses on mobility within everyday life experiences. Jensen argues that mobility is not only getting from point A to point B but also includes mobility of people, goods, information, signs and the constructed environment, and furthermore the embodied performance and social interactions. He further explains that mobility not just happens but is affected by the design and planned setting (Jensen, 2014). This can be used in the way an attraction is viewed and experienced. *"Mobilities are staged and people performing mobilities engaged in social interactions of staging mobilities. Staging mobilities is therefore a process of creating lived mobility practices and the material preconditions of these"* (Jensen, 2013, p. 5). Here Jensen defines his view on staging mobilities. According to him a mobile situation is staged from above which means that they are planned, staged and designed with a specific purpose in mind (Jensen, 2013). He provides an example of this with a traffic light which controls the flow of people's movements. He also argues that there can be drawn similarities to Pine & Gilmore's way of creating and producing experiences as they say it is possible to create and produce experiences for visitors (Pine & Gilmore, 2009). However, Jensen also argues that people are able to stage their experiences from below by staging themselves through embodied performances and social interactions (Jensen, 2013). This makes staging mobilities a combination between how the individual consumer perceives the experience and the staging by the business which is contradicting the previous statements by Pine & Gilmore. Jensen is therefore defining experiences of what happens in the cross fields between what is staged from below and what is staged from above (Jensen, 2013). The experience is therefore influenced by the set frames and how the visitor chooses to use these frames. Jensen (2013) argues that this can be seen within attractions or destinations, where visitors generally move around. With the case of the Forest Tower the visitors'

path is destined before the visitors even arrive at the attraction. However, it is up to the individual visitor to decide what the experience mean to them.

Furthermore, Sheller & Urry (2014) agree that mobility is more than just movement of people and objects. They involve memories, embodiment, atmospheres, emotions and performances into account as well. They add that tourism is several forms of mobility and tourism is shaping places in spaces where tourism is performed (Sheller & Urry, 2014).

However, none of these theorists seem to include the visitor experience at a nature-based attraction. Nature is not something which can be controlled as one can in other situations and attractions. This creates an uncertainty in the experience which is provided as one day rarely is the same. Therefore, it makes it very difficult to manage the visitor experience and behavior (Buckley & Coghlan, 2012).

#### [A social constructivist approach to the Forest Tower](#)

The following chapter will deal with the understanding of the Forest Tower as a place and what makes it. It is therefore deemed important to discuss how the Forest Tower can be defined.

Therefore, definitions of what makes a place and attraction will be discussed in regard to the Forest Tower.

One view on the subject is provided by Lew (1987) whom suggests that “tourist attractions, or destinations, can be addressed with a framework of ideographic, organizational, and/or tourist cognition-based features” (Saraniemi & Kylanen, 2001, pp. 133-134). Ideographic refers to material presence of the place, the organizational to the spatial character and the cognition the perceptions of the ones visiting the place. This point of view may be easy to use, but it does not add a point of view on the many layers of what makes a place (Saraniemi & Kylanen, 2011, p. 134). To understand the place at the Forest Tower and therefore the visitors’ experiences, it is therefore important to understand the place of the Forest Tower. The point made by Lew (1987) only sees the importance of what happens at the attraction/destination and does not look into the dimensions of the experienced product or in this case experience. It does however include the cognition-based features, but only in relation to the particular visit.

While doing research for this project and studying tourism in general, it has become clear to the researcher that the suggestion made by Lew lack the dimensions. It is believed that previous

experiences, have an effect on how visitors experience new attractions and experiences. Furthermore, that an experience is not only happening in the physical surroundings of the experience but also before, during and after the experience.

The way the researcher sees and understands the place of the Forest Tower is, as if, it is combined by many different layers or “mosaics” as Chapman & Light suggest (Chapman & Light, 2016, p. 254). Within the experience economy and as a common understanding of attractions and destinations Butler’s Tourism Area Cycle of Evolution model (Butler, 1980) is well known. However, this way of understanding and analyzing an attraction and destination seems very simplified as it mostly concerned with the economic oriented research.

Chapman & Light argue that viewing a destination or attraction as mosaics put pressure on the experience and the individual elements within the place (Chapman & Light, 2016, p. 256).

In regard to the Forest Tower we see the experience of the Forest Tower has developed since its opening and continue to have plans on developing further (App. 2, expert interview, p. 83).

Examples of this is the addition of a coffee cart at the tower, the upgrade of ticket system, parking spaces, information on the trees, places to sit etc.

When the Forest Tower was first opened there were only the boardwalk and the tower, no more. This means that it is already possible to see that the place is evolving and that there are different “cycles” developing within the attraction. Therefore, the Forest Tower should be viewed as a more complex attraction, especially when it comes to creating the place and experiences.

### What makes an attraction

As previously mentioned the researcher would argue that a place also depends on how the visitor sees and understands it. The making of a place and approaching placemaking refers to planning of a place but also insinuates how places are in the world. This, both, where it is located and what it is made of, but also how it is constantly creating and enacted.

Pierre Bourdieu sees places as emergent. This relates to how performance relates to places, he argues “*A given habitus is a reaching out to place, a being or becoming in place*” (Bourdieu 1984 in Sonneburg & Wee, 2016, p. 327).

He therefore argues that attractions are constantly under development (Saraniemi & Kylanen, 2011, p. 138), which one could argue fits well in relation to the Forest Tower, as the development so far has been ongoing and that it is placed in an everchanging forest.

Another definition of visitor attractions is made by Raluca & Strutzen (2008) who define an attraction as *“single units, individual sites or clearly defined small-scale geographical areas that are accessible and motivate large numbers of people to travel some distance from their home, usually in their leisure time, to visit them for a short, limited period of time”* (Raluca & Strutzen, 2008, p. 635). They also present four different definitions on attractions, which are; features within the natural environment; man-made buildings, structures and sites that were designed for a purpose: other than attracting visitors; man-made buildings, structures and sites that were designed to attract visitors and were purposely built to accommodate their needs; special events (Raluca & Strutzen, 2008, p. 635). Dividing the attractions into these types can possibly help get a wide image of how a specific attraction could be understood. However, in the case of the Forest Tower, one category does not fit. The researcher would argue that the Forest Tower is a combination of two of the categories; natural environment and man-made buildings that were built to attract visitors. As Raluca & Strutzen primarily write about theme parks some equalities can be drawn to the Forest Tower as *“theme parks often attempt to create an atmosphere of another place and time and usually emphasize one dominant theme around architecture, landscape, shows, food services, costumed personnel, retailing are orchestrated”* (Raluca & Strutzen, 2008, p. 635). The Forest Tower does have one dominant theme: nature.

Raluca & Strutzen also argue that the themes in parks are often history-periods, fairy tales, animals, water, marine and futurism, which is part of creating a feeling of life involvement in a setting where you are removed from your daily life. Nature as itself is not found within these themes, but nature both consists of water, animals and could easily bring the feeling of fairy-tales, as nature often is a big part of our childhood tales.

While Raluca & Strutzen focuses mostly on the permanent figure of an attraction Gunn et al. addresses the fact that an attraction is no more than the visitors latest visit. Gunn et al. addresses the temporary character of a place *“temporal aspects of place are critical to tourism planning. Visitor impressions and experiences vary greatly with the time a place is visited”* (Gunn et al., 2002, p. 227). By writing this he means that an attraction is not only a static place as it leaves out

important factors of the place and experience. The place will often be judged by its temporary character. In the case of the Forest Tower it could be the weather, “bad” and “good”, which often is mentioned in addition to the collected experience of a place. The season could be another, as the surroundings change all year round.

Places can also be understood by how they are described by words (Warnaby & Medway, 2013). In the case of the Forest Tower the wording describes the peak of the experience quite well, as there will not be any doubt in what it is. This also becomes clear as one of the visitor’s argues “*I just knew there was a tower in the forest*” (App. 1, Visitor interviews, p, 60).

Sense of place is the perception of place which is held by people and not the place (Altman & Low, 1992, in Hashemnezhad et al., 2013). According to Stephen F. Mills (2008) it is also important to note that sense of place is a symbiotic relationship between the environment, perception, and experience. It is thought to be the heart of an attraction (Lukas, 2008). Creating this sense of place or an atmosphere can be a very difficult job, as that can be seen as something intangible (Löfgren, 2014). Yi-Fu Tuan (1990) also argues that places are affected by the people visiting the place. Therefore, it is not only built once, but constantly re-build in accordance to what is being brought such as smells, people, noise etc. Consequently, it is important to understand that a place is not only made by the material that makes it. This is why sense of place is an important tool to bring when trying to understand what makes the Forest Tower as an attraction.

## Chapter 3: Methodology

The case study of the Forest Tower has been created through qualitative research with an interpretive approach. The research design is based on the lack of research within the field of visitors' experiences at nature-based attractions. This, itself, speaks for a qualitative approach. Furthermore, the project focuses on the visitors' experiences, which can differ from person to person, this makes it important that the researcher understands and empathizes with the social setting of the Forest Tower (Veal, 2011).

### Philosophy of science

#### The Interpretive approach

Interpretivist, positivist and critical are by some argued to be the most dominant research paradigms (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017). The research paradigm is defined as an explanatory matrix or philosophical way of thinking (Emig, 1982). Research paradigms are the researcher's basic beliefs which defines the nature of the world. However, they must simply be accepted as they are, as there is no way to secure the trustworthiness. The research for this research project is based upon the interpretivist paradigm. This paradigm focuses on the individual and tries to understand the thoughts and meaning of what the individual experiences. Furthermore, this paradigm believes that knowledge is created by the findings in the research.

The interpretive paradigm bases knowledge on the researcher's own experiences and understanding, which also is the case of this project as the researcher's own experiences mean a great deal to the development of the research. Furthermore, the knowledge is collected socially and therefore human interaction is highly important to the research.

For this project qualitative research has been conducted and different kinds of qualitative data has been collected to answer the aim of the research. The qualitative data which has been used is:

- An informal semi-structured interview with an expert in the field of research
- 24 Interviews with visitors of the attraction
- Participant observations
- Fieldwork

This project is based on a research aim and therefore it is based on the inductive approach (Veal, 2011, pp. 39-40). The research aim has been going through an ongoing development throughout the process of writing. The participant observations and various interviews were analyzed before concluding the final direction of research, which also included the final research aim.

This project is focusing on the visitors' voices and experiences. A qualitative approach has been used to find the most giving answers from the observations and interviews as the visitors' behaviors, opinions and situations will be analyzed (Veal, 2011, p. 35).

### Qualitative research

This project uses data from more than one collection of data and will therefore use a comparative approach (Bryman, 2016). When gathering several data collections with the same purpose it will be possible to find differences and similarities to analyze and draw conclusions from.

Comparing data can contribute to making it easier to understand and analyze the data (Bryman, 2016).

A. J. Veal explains *"In research, the triangulation method involves the use of more than one research approach in a single study to gain broader or more complete understanding of the issues being investigated."* (Veal, 2011, p. 142). This project makes use of triangulation as more than one method is used. In this case both expert interview, participant observations and visitor interviews are used (Veal, 2011).

A. J. Veal also suggests that to get closest to the *"full picture"* the used methods should complement each other as best as possible and they should, of course, be relevant for the chosen topic of research (Veal, 2011). *"True"* triangulation occurs when the different methods address the same question (Veal, 2011), which has been the case with this project. The theme, and therefore the focus of this project has been on how the visitors have experienced the man-made nature-based attraction.

The best approach to the triangulation method is when one method's weakness is another method's strength (Veal, 2011).

In this project, expert knowledge is provided via the interview with the head of communications at Camp Adventure Ida Roed. The visitors' interviews and participants observations and their view on before, during & after the experience together with knowledge about the expectations and reality

is combined and can help provide information from both the management and the visitor side of the Forest Tower. The participant observations provide the possibility to obtain a first-hand impression of the Forest Tower and what the experience has to offer. While combining these methods it is intended that the project will provide an all-round knowledge of the Forest Tower.

#### Credibility, transferability, dependability & confirmability

A. J. Veal argues that a research project needs to be trustworthy, valid and reliable. Therefore, a research project is often measured in its ability to produce results which can be used to generalize for other similar experiences (Veal, 2011). For a research project to be highly reliable the research needs to be able to get repeated by other researchers at a later time and still be able to provide identical data (Veal, 2011). However, in humanistic research subjective voices are seen as great value when understanding parts of the reality. When researchers are working with people, other researchers will not be able to get the same data out of the same questions or experiences. This can be explained by people's ability to change mood, behavior, trust or even alter their own reality which can affect the data coming from people. In this project, with the focus of a nature-based attractions, the weather could also be a great effect to the change of mood. This is also explained in the literature review. A. Bryman suggests that trustworthiness should be changed to credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability in humanistic research, which I therefore have chosen to do.

#### Credibility

Credibility focuses on conducting research according to the principles of good practice (Bryman, 2016). As this project makes use of triangulation by analyzing several sets of data the credibility has been ensured. Furthermore, the researcher has not only sought to use mixed methods but also used a comparative approach before concluding anything in the final chapter. The background of the researcher can also be influenced in how the research data is experienced (Veal, 2011). In the case of this project the researcher has visited the attractions several times and the perception of the place many change by every visit, as one may learn or notice different things from time to time. In the case of this project it is inevitable. However, the researcher has chosen to see previous experiences and gained knowledge as a positive and not a negative, as it possibly could help elevate the project.

Furthermore, the interviews with the visitors were all recorded and transcribed, just as the expert interview with Ida Roed. However, the visitors were never asked for contact information and it will therefore not be possible to find them again to confirm credibility. In the case of the interview with Roed it will be possible to contact her again based on the information given in this project. The three participants are anonymous within this project but is well-known by the researcher and therefore is able to contact them.

#### Transferability

In this project the researcher has made an effort to clearly explain the surroundings in which the research took place in order for the results to be transferable. This have been done to some extend in the case presentation and will also be done in the analysis to highlight certain parts of the visitors' experiences. The criteria of transferability focus on the researcher's ability to provide enough data so the readers will be able to relate to the findings (Veal, 2011).

#### Dependability

Dependability is about researching or observing the same thing twice. According to Trochim it is not possible to measure the same thing twice (Trochim, 2006). Therefore, it is very important that the researcher describes as much as possible during the research including changes and how they affected the research (Trochim, 2006).

During the researcher's own observations as much as possible was written down and photographed. Furthermore, some of the visitor's interviews were conducted on the same day, which will support some of the notes in regard to weather and other changing conditions.

#### Confirmability

Confirmability refers to the degree in which the results can be confirmed by other researchers. Documenting as much as possible such as procedures and recheck the data during the process is one way to secure the problem. Hereafter, it is possible for other researchers to be critical of documentation and process (Trochim, 2006).

In this project the researcher has tried to make as many notes as possible while in the field, by writing them down and taking pictures. Furthermore, the researcher has tried to be as transparent as possible in regard to challenges, feelings etc.

### Data collection

For this project it was found necessary to research the subject by including primary data.

The primary data has been collected through participant observations, semi-structured interviews, and an expert interview (Veal, 2011).

The secondary data collected has been through textbooks, scientific articles and case studies.

The reason for collecting new data for this project was because the attraction is as new as it is. It has not been studied before, at least not in relation to the visitors' experience at a man-made nature-based attraction. Furthermore, there is not much information on visitors' experiences at man-made nature-based attractions, which strengthened the reason to research the subject.

### Research ethics

While researching it is important that you, as a researcher, treat your participants or informants and data ethically correct. Because of this I have chosen to make all participants anonymous by only referring to them by numbers (Veal, 2011). The reason why they have been giving the numbers is to make it easier and clearer for the reader to navigate in the data. The interviewees were informed about the anonymity to enhance the interviewees being honest and forthcoming. Furthermore, the purpose and use of the interview was explained to the interviewees when approaching them.

In the interview with Ida Roed, it was chosen to use her name to ensure her status as an expert and to validate her point of view and knowledge in contrast to the visitors. Ida Roed was informed about the fact that she was going to be named in the project. In the case of the participant observations the researcher chose to do participant observations and disguising herself. Veal argues: *"the whole basis of such research may rely on the researcher being accepted and trusted by the group being investigated"* (2011, p. 109). Therefore, the researcher chose to make a point out of blending in and appear as a "regular" visitor. Ethical issues may appear in relation to the researcher disguising the identity. Furthermore, if a researcher does not disguise the purpose of being present, it can affect the subjects being observed, as they may change the way they act and

behave, in case they become aware of being observed. During the researcher's first visit to the Forest Tower no one knew of the observation, in order to blend in and just follow the flow of the experience and listen in and observe other visitors. However, one thing that may have made other visitors aware of the researcher is the fact that the researcher came alone. There were no other visitors who appeared to be alone, but it did not seem as if any took notice of this. The two following participant observations were made on separate occasions and in company with first one and then two participants. These participants were chosen to participate in the experience to get a more in-dept description of the visitors' experiences and to get other points of view of the experience. These participants are also anonymous but known to the researcher. The participants are in good relation to the researcher and are therefore comfortable in the company with each other. The participants were informed about the reason for visiting the Forest Tower and were asked to write down their expectations to the visit before arriving. The researcher chose to take pictures and write down notes during the visit and made semi-structured interviews after the visit to get their point of view and a good description of their experience. The fact that the participants knew the reason to why they were there and knew they were part of a research project may have affected their actions and behavior, but it has also opened a flow of communication and sharing opinions and thoughts, which otherwise, could be very hard to accomplish with other participants.

### Fieldwork

Having an ethnographic approach to research, fieldwork gives the researcher an opportunity to observe and experience the social activities and process their actual process and natural environment (Bryman, 2012, p. 431). It was chosen to do fieldwork to get close to the visitors' own experiences. This is also recommended by Bryman to participant in the social setting, if possible (Bryman, 2012). The initial fieldwork was done on the 14<sup>th</sup> of July at the Forest Tower. Before visiting the tower, the researcher had looked at the images under the hashtag #campadventure to get an idea of other visitors' experiences. Furthermore, the official website of Camp Adventure was visited to get some basis knowledge on opening hours, prices and what the attraction actual consists of. Before doing fieldwork, the researcher was not aware of the boardwalk and the walk through the forest as it was just believed that you parked near the tower and walked up to the top of the tower. The fact that the boardwalk was part of the attraction was a positive surprise as the attraction and experience seemed to build and grow bigger.

The researcher chose to do fieldwork to get firsthand participant observations and face to face interviews with other visitors. It is argued that by being present and documenting the research field and your own experience of the field, data is produced (Frederiksen, 2015). During the fieldwork the researcher chose to write down notes and take pictures on the way round the attraction.

### Participant observations

Participant observations is a qualitative method which is used as an observation technique where the researcher can gather information by being a participant in the field or on site (Veal, 2011). The participant observations allow the researcher to immerse themselves in the field of research, be part of the experience, interact with people, observe the people who are around, listen in on conversations and participate on equal terms as the rest of the participants (Szulevicz & Brinkmann, 2015) all part of a process to learn and better understand the nature of what is happening.

This method allows the researcher to collect detailed first-hand insights of the chosen research area. In this project it was chosen to use this research method to experience the attraction and the factors that are affecting the visitors' experiences at the attractions. The researcher was able to put herself in the view of the visitors and get more familiar with the experience as the Forest tower were visited and by doing that the researcher became a participant. The observations were made on several separate occasions – Sunday the 14<sup>th</sup> of July, Thursday the 25<sup>th</sup> of July and the 16<sup>th</sup> of August 2019 and all varied in duration and time. The primary goal of the observations varied from time to time. Three people were asked to visit the attraction together with the researcher to allow the researcher to observe them. The main focus with the three participant observations was to understand the sense of the place, the experience and to watch the visitors consumes the experience at the Forest Tower.

The first date of observations was closed observations, because the subjects of observations were never informed about their involvement of my observations (Rowley, 2002). The advantages of this is that it allows the researcher to observe the subjects in a natural setting and it is therefore not possible for the researcher to manipulate with the observations. However, it can also be difficult for the researcher to observe more than one individual at the same time and the

researcher's bias is difficult to remove completely from observations as the researcher can draw wrong conclusions. The observations made on the following occasions were open observations as the participants were aware of the fact that they were being observed and studied.

The reason why this method was chosen was to get a more natural and real response to the visitors' experiences at the Forest Tower and to watch the visitors' experiences at the attraction at first hand.

The participant observations were unstructured. The researcher wanted it to be as similar to a visitor's visit without any type of agenda as possible. Therefore, there were included a "before, during & after" method into the observations. That way it was possible to track the expectations, experience and thoughts both before, during and after the visits.

The researcher wanted to get to know the place, the atmosphere and get a first view on how the visitors' experienced the experience.

During the second and third visit the main focus were slightly different from the first one.

All three participants were asked to write down the expectations to the experience and send the through before visiting the Forest Tower, as it was also wished to get their expectations to the experience. As the researcher has already had her first experience it was possible to focus on other parts of the attractions. The researcher focused more on other visitors, allowing to follow others pace, keeping distance but still being able to listen in on their conversations. Furthermore, the researcher decided to place herself in positions where it was possible to study the flow, the interactions between the employees and the reactions to the main event, the top of the Forest Tower. These observations were unstructured which can be helpful while understanding and interpreting cultural behaviors (Szulevicz, 2015). Therefore, it was chosen to let the visitors and participants lead the way. By doing so the researcher believes that the most interesting places to observe were found such as clashing touchpoints, patterns in the visitors' movement and after that a more structured way to observe the visitors on the third visit.

The choice of not letting the visitors know they were being observed on the first visit was

intentional. By not letting them know it is believed that the patterns of behavior, movement and reactions will be more trustworthy (Bernard, 2011). The observations revealed several important observations, where some of the more obvious ones were the bottle neck flow at the foot of the tower, the traveling noise made from other visitors' in the tower, the confusion at the ticket sales and the surprise of discovering the wooden boardwalk.

To document these observations, the researchers own experiences and thoughts. The researcher wrote down notes on her phone as she walked through the forest, to the top of the tower and back. It was a conscious choice to write notes on the phone, as it is believed that if notes were made in a notebook, it would have stood out to the other visitors. Furthermore, the researcher had brought her own camera and took pictures of everything which were found relevant and important to the experience. This included everything from signs, fences, buildings, underlayer of the boardwalk, other visitors etc. Furthermore, it was chosen to record some of the audio on the phone to support some of the observations which were made.

However, even though it was intended to act like a regular visitor, I do acknowledge that this is not possible. The researcher had already done some desk research and approached the experience with a sense of purpose which surpasses a regular visitor.

Participant #1, #2 & #3 were all chosen to partake in the researcher based on their previous experience with attractions and tourism. Participant #1 visited the attraction on the 25<sup>th</sup> of July and participant #2 and #3 visited on the 16<sup>th</sup> of August.

They were all asked to write down their expectations to the visit at the attraction, as the experience were divided into before, during and after. This method of dividing the experience into three categories is used as a tool to analyse an experience (Madsen, 2010). It helps the visitor to be and behave as much as a regular tourist as possible at the first visit. Furthermore, it makes you aware of the choices you make as a visitor, what the experience offers and how the communications between the visitor and management is.

The before, during and after method focuses on these exact stages; before the experience, during the experience and after the experience. Before the visitor engage in the experience the visitor builds expectations to what they might experience. The expectations are based upon previous

experiences, others' experiences, and by what the company or attraction communicates (Madsen, 2010). During the experience, one can argue that the four realms of experience (Pine & Gilmore, 2011) are playing their part. What the four realms are, if they are relevant for all experiences, or if they are even relevant can always be discussed. However, in the case of this project the four realms have been used to describe the different part of the experience. Furthermore, the experience can be seen as a break from everyday life which means that the visitor is brought into a situation which is different (Madsen, 2010). After the experience the visitors will have some memories of the experience. These memories can either be good or bad and it is, of course, in the interest of the attraction that these memories are good. The memories can be strengthened in several ways, such as merchandise, photos, videos and social media (Madsen, 2010). The before, during and after method can be very helpful when trying to get an overall image of the given experience and discover the strengths and weaknesses it provides (Bechmann, 2012). In this project the before, during and after method was used three times; one by the researcher herself, once by Participant #1 who volunteered to visit the Forest Tower, and a third time at the joint visit by Participant #2 and #3. All visitors were asked to write down the expectations and their understanding of the upcoming experience at the Forest Tower. They were followed by the researcher during their visit and were afterwards interviewed by the researcher when the visit was over. All the notes, comments and transcribing from the participants observations were conducted and written in Danish. In case it is used in answering the aim of the project, they have been translated into English by best ability.

### **Participant observations**

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Date</b>
Participant #1	Female	25	25 <sup>th</sup> of July
Participant #2	Female	25	16 <sup>th</sup> of August
Participant #3	Female	28	16 <sup>th</sup> of August

### **Interviews**

The purpose of interviews is to explore and get a deeper understanding of individuals' insights, views, experiences, knowledge and motivations that have connection with a specific place. Within qualitative research methods there can be found three interview types: Structured, semi-

structured, and unstructured (Brinkmann, 2015). This project made use of semi-structured interviews and therefore allowed visitors and experts to talk vary from questions and specify stories and comments about their experiences and views.

### Interviews with visitors

To obtain knowledge about the visitors and their experiences at the Forest Tower the researcher decided to make short interviews with them on sight. The interviews would focus on their expectations before arriving, their opinions of the experience, their wishes to change anything and their expectations on whether they would return or not. This approach was chosen in order to collect some knowledge which was not possible by participant observations and the interview with Ida Roed. This way it was made possible to get an insight into the thoughts and opinions of the visitors. The conducted interviews lasted between 1,5 – 4 minutes each. 24 interviews were collected.

It was not as easy to approach the visitors as first imagined. I chose to conduct the interviews at the courtyard of Camp Adventure which is where both the visitors from the tower and the tree top climbing arrive and depart. This made it a bit difficult to figure out who had visited what, and who to talk to. Furthermore, my own nervousness made it difficult to reach out to the visitors, which therefore each time took longer than expected. The first visit where interviews were part of the visit happened on Sunday the 14<sup>th</sup> of July and the second date was Thursday the 25<sup>th</sup> of July. There was a big difference in the number of visitors on the weekend and weekday. All the visitors I ended up talking to were very nice and eager to share their experiences. Some of them were holding back at first, but when they learned that I was a student and the interview would be very short, they agreed to be interviewed by me. I suspect the reason for this was that I interrupted their break and perhaps were very forward. All the interviews were conducted and transcribed in Danish. They were translated by best ability when used in this project.

## Interviewees profiles

Name of interviewee	Sex of interviewee	Age of interviewee	Date of interview	Length of Interview
Visitor interview #1	Female	43	14 <sup>th</sup> of June	01.45 min.
Visitor interview #2	Female & Male	68 & 70	14 <sup>th</sup> of June	03.00 min.
Visitor interview #3	Female	42	14 <sup>th</sup> of June	03.09 min.
Visitor interview #4	Male	57	14 <sup>th</sup> of June	01.33 min.
Visitor interview #5	Female	76	14 <sup>th</sup> of June	02.05 min.
Visitor interview #6	Male	73	14 <sup>th</sup> of June	01.57 min.
Visitor interview #7	Female	55	14 <sup>th</sup> of June	02.43 min.
Visitor interview #8	Male	37	14 <sup>th</sup> of June	00.58 min.
Visitor interview #9	Female	81	14 <sup>th</sup> of June	01.56 min.
Visitor interview #10	Female	33	14 <sup>th</sup> of June	02.07 min.
Visitor interview #11	Female	24	14 <sup>th</sup> of June	02.39 min.
Visitor interview #12	Male	63	25 <sup>th</sup> of July	01.45 min.

Visitor interview #13	Male	52 & 54	25 <sup>th</sup> of July	02.34 min.
Visitor interview #14	Female	37	25 <sup>th</sup> of July	01.26 min.
Visitor interview #15	Female	74	25 <sup>th</sup> of July	02.16 min.
Visitor interview #16	Male	47	25 <sup>th</sup> of July	02.26 min.
Visitor interview #17	Female	19	10 <sup>th</sup> of July	02.17 min.
Visitor interview #18	Female	20	25 <sup>th</sup> of July	01.47 min.
Visitor interview #19	Female	20	25 <sup>th</sup> of July	02. 10 min
Visitor interview #20	Female	36	25 <sup>th</sup> of July	02.07 min.
Visitor interview #21	Male	24	25 <sup>th</sup> of July	02. 44 min.
Visitor interview #22	Female	54	25 <sup>th</sup> of July	02.33 min.
Visitor interview #23	Male	13	25 <sup>th</sup> of July	01.52 min.
Visitor interview #24	Female	27	25 <sup>th</sup> of July	03.05 min.

#### Expert interview with Ida Roed

Ida Roed works as head of communication at Camp Adventure. Her experience and her field of work qualifies her to function as an expert in this research. The interview was conducted the 24<sup>th</sup> of June at the company's offices in Copenhagen. A semi-structured interview was prepared and chosen for the benefit of knowing which questions would be useful when starting the interview. However, the fact that the interview was semi-structured also allowed the interview to change its

course in case of follow-up questions, or to what could seem interesting or important in the moment (Veal, 2011).

The interview was conducted in Danish as both the researcher and Ida Roed are native Danish speakers. Keeping the interview in Danish also prevented any mistakes due to language barriers. When wanting a useful interview, it is important not to ask guiding or leading questions (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Bryman (2016) explains: The objectivity of the interviewer is seen as important as the project itself *“that interviewer’s attributes can have an impact on respondents replies...”* (Bryman, 2016) and therefore it is possible that the interviewer’s leading questions can hurt the validity of the answers provided. The researcher was aware of not asking leading questions and put own engagement in the interview. In interviews a certain body or facial expression is often enough for the interviewer to guide the interviewee towards a certain direction (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). It is therefore important for the interviewer to be in control of his or her physical behavior during the interview, so the interviewee is not affected. The researcher were attentive to this and tried to stay a natural and relaxed as possible.

### Secondary data

Primary data cannot stand alone, so to make the project stronger it was found necessary to support the primary data with secondary data. Secondary data is information which has been previously collected by others and therefore is available for others to use. However, one has to be critical of secondary data as the information most likely has been collected for a different purpose (Veal, 2011). This project has made use of academic textbooks to get a better understanding of the concepts within the methodology and furthermore included scientific articles to understand the field of research used in the chapter regarding literature review.

The Forest Tower’s official website, Facebook page, Instagram profile and LinkedIn profile has also contributed to the gathering of information about the experience and understanding of the place. These pages have led to other different sources of material such as journalistic articles, news articles, new letters etc. The researcher is aware that the information on the official pages of the Forest Tower is written to promote and provide the visitors with information.

As stated previously, the researcher is aware that the secondary data have been collected and conducted by others and with other purposes. Therefore, the researcher has viewed the data with a critical mindset to see the relevance and evaluation of the material.

#### Data analysis: Thematic approach

The data was analyzed by using a thematic approach which is often used within the field of qualitative research. The thematic approach is based on themes and codes which can be used to structure qualitative data and makes the classification easier. Therefore, it will be possible to address the theoretical concepts (Jordan & Gibson, 2004). The thematic approach requires the researcher to be very comfortable with the collected data and will be a tool to see the codes, themes and patterns in the data (Stark & Trinidad, 2007). This approach will also be helpful in order to avoid long descriptions and focus more on analyzing.

Working with the collected data, the thematic approach was used to understand and deduct the visitors' experiences. The qualitative interviews, both the expert interview and the visitors' interviews, were all recorded and afterwards transcribed in order to get the best understanding of the data. Furthermore, to have the possibility to analyse the interviews into further detail. After transcribing the interviews notes were made on each interview to help clarify any theme and topics regarding the visitor experience. The participant observations were severely photographed and at the same time notes were taken during the visits. The participants were asked to give their expectations before arriving at the attraction, which were all written down. Furthermore, they were interviewed about their thoughts after the visit, to round up the experience and get a more in-dept clarification of their experience.

In the last part of the analysis the researcher will analyze the complete visitor experience and see if there are base for any improvements based on the previous part of the analysis. Afterwards, the researcher will come up with some recommendations for the Forest Tower to give the visitors' a better experience.

## Chapter 4: Analysis

This chapter will present the collected data from the participant observations, the semi-structured interviews with visitors, the semi-structured expert interview along with the researchers own field notes. The data will naturally be held up against the literature previously presented. The following themes which will be analyzed are:

- The visitors' expectations
- Man-made disturbance at a man-made nature-based attraction
- The rules of visiting a nature-based attraction
- A multi sensuous experience
- The visual experience
- Putting a price on nature

### The visitors' expectations

In chapter 2 it was discussed that the visitors' experience is not only confined to the spatial experience of the attraction but that it also takes place before, during & after the visit to the attraction. Based on that and the collected data which suggests that the visitor's expectations to the nature-based attraction varies from person to person. Guest no. 18 states: *"I knew you came up in the tower but thought there would be more to look at and it was a little like "oh". Was that it?"* Guest no. 16 states: *"I thought that the view would be really beautiful"*. Both of these referring to the expectation of arriving at the top of The Forest Tower. Furthermore, another theme in the visitor's expectations at the attraction is Guest no. 1 who have some doubt in regard to the experience: *"I actually considered how you got there. Well, I thought if you would drive all the way to the tower or if you were walking a part of the way. I was surprised to see this... (red. Boardwalk)"*. This is not a singular statement. The question also was raised by participant #1 and participant #2. Both of whom were not sure on how to get to the tower, even though they both had visited the website before arriving to the attraction. While the researcher did her own fieldwork, it was not clear either on how to get to the tower.

At Camp Adventure's website it was possible to see a constructed image of the attraction which are portraying the tower, the boardwalk and the surrounding area (Photo no. 2). However, it is clearly a constructed and not a realistic image of the attraction. Based on that, it can be difficult

for the visitors' to know what to expect from the experience upon arrival.



Photo 2 – Constructed image of Camp Adventure.

The previously presented literature by Jensen (2013) suggests that the visitor's experiences are a combination between how the individual consumer perceives the experience the attraction and how it is staged by the business. However, as the data suggests the visitors are not properly informed by Camp Adventure. It is therefore difficult for the visitors to adjust their expectations in regard to how it is staged by the business.

While interviewing Ida Roed the subject of communication came up and she was informed of the findings in regard to the fact that some of the visitors are not aware of what the experience consists of: *"It is without a doubt the tower as the architectonic work, which has been the center for the storytelling"* (App. 2, expert interview, p. 83). Furthermore, she explains that the media themselves decide what stories they find interesting and from there it is their own job to communicate what else the area and attraction has to offer. It is possible to find information on their website about the experience as it states: *"The walk through the beech forest, up the Forest Tower and back is 3,2 km"* (Camp Adventure/facts?). However, here it is not mentioned that the walk to the tower will take place on a wooden boardwalk.

While looking through the visitors' interview it becomes clear that the visitors do not have high specific expectations to the experience. Most of the interviews are in the same category as the previous stated and therefore regarding the view from the tower and the beautiful surroundings (App. 1, Visitor interviews, p. 60). Therefore, it becomes clear that the expectations of the visitors

are dependable on what the management communicates. Furthermore, Ida Roed explains that they have a somewhat relaxed approach to communicating with the future visitors and let the visitor's experience do the talking "*... we take it nice and slow, because the best way to be mentioned, is from them who goes home and tells, well there is this long bridge and then there were these places you could sit and eat*" (App. 2, expert interview, p. 83). From that it can seem as if Camp Adventure does not see a problem in not being clear in the regard to communicating their expectations and leave their visitors expectations up to themselves and word-of-mouth. The fact that the visitors find themselves with limited information on what to expect from the attraction makes it difficult for the visitors to adjust their expectations to the attraction. By not informing the visitors of what to expect from the experience they allow the visitor to be a very large part of staging the experience and most importantly allowing themselves to miss an opportunity to influence the visitors experience in a positive way. Literature suggests that the visitors' previous history, culture and perception of the experience is a factor in how the experience is experienced by visitors (Madsen, 2010). Based on this, it is important that the management clearly present the scope of the experience, to have the most positive effect on the expectations they bring to the attraction.

#### [Man-made disturbance at a man-made nature-based attraction](#)

During the expert interview, Ida Roed categorized the experience at the Forest Tower as a "structured nature experience" (App. 2, expert interview, p. 83). Through the researchers own fieldwork, it was made clear what she meant by this as the boardwalk and tower structures a route through the forest. The literature also points out that this type of nature-based attraction with a platform is a "modern sublime" experience (Bell & Lyall, 2002) which could indicate a man-made factor in the nature-based attraction. Furthermore, it was made clear that the experience was not only a nature experience, as several places and points through the experience, bore the mark of human intervention.

Chapman & Light suggested that an attraction is made by "mosaics" and therefore consists of several layers. These layers are all put under pressure as they make the experience and the individual elements within the place (Chapman & Light, 2016). Furthermore, Haldrup & Larsen are referring to visual experiences where people are travelling to environments that are out of the ordinary and Urry (2002) adds that attractions can be experienced in multi sensuous ways. Based

on this and the disturbance in the nature of the experience which were found in the empirical data, it was deemed important to look at these disturbances as they can possible have a large effect on the experience.

The researchers own fieldwork alongside the participant observations made by Participant 1, 2 & 3 revealed places during the experience where more than one person experienced a disturbance in the scenery or flow.

The first place where it became clear that the experience was man-made, were upon arrival at the boardwalk. The boardwalk starts off with you meeting a hamster mill where you can scan your ticket and walk through (Photo 3).

As the visitors walk further, they will be presented to the idyllic noises of a water stream beneath a small bridge and immersing themselves into the forest.

Walking further on the boardwalk it was noticed by the researcher and the participant #2: “Wow, is that christmas trees? Is that not a bit weird?”. That a field of Christmas trees appeared on the left side of the boardwalk and stood out compared to the previous surroundings, as you can see in photo 4.

The landscape suddenly becomes very open and are abrupted by fence and several rows of Christmas trees (Photo 5). On the other side of the boardwalk the tree top climbing park appears. Camp Adventure have the largest tree top climbing area in Denmark, so naturally you, as a visitor, were deemed to see at one point (Photo 6).



*Photo 3 – The start of the boardwalk.*



*Photo 4 – The field of christmas trees*



*Photo 5 – The tree top climbing area*



*Photo 6 – The boardwalk*

As noticed by Participant #3 “There it is, I could hear some people yelling” and in another way by participant #1: “It looks fun! Maybe we should come try it someday”. Furthermore, participant #2 finds the activity very disturbing in regard to the noise: “Ej, they are making so much noise”. It is somewhat a disturbance while walking on the boardwalk as the visitors have experienced idyllic scenery previously.

As the visitor walks further and comes back into the forest the boardwalk ends for a few meters and allows the visitors to walk on the forest ground before it starts again (Photo 7). This is caused by a forest road which crosses the boardwalk which therefore needs to end. This was noticed by participant #1 who commented “Ups, and then we were allowed to visit the forest for real. But only for a second”. The researchers own impression of the missing boardwalk was the sudden lack of noise from footsteps and the softness of the ground.



*Photo 7 – The boardwalk ends*

As the journey to the tower continues, you come back into the idyllic forest and is being surrounded by green trees. Once again, the board walk is disturbed by a forest road which crosses the boardwalk. However, here you have to walk a few more meters and take a turn. The boardwalk here is decorated by an arch made of cut out tree trunks (Photo 8). The solution is very decorative and by using the tree trunks, kept in its natural environment. It was noticed by participant #1: “Wow, look at that!” It is bit weird, but very decorative”. Participant #2 adds: “This is a nice place for at photo”.



*Photo 8 – Arch made of wood*

Walking on, the visitors get closer to the Forest Tower and even though it is yet not possible to see the tower you can sense it as discrete fences with wooden poles and thin metallic wire starts to appear as seen on photo 9. It may not be a disturbance which very clearly indicate the arrival at the tower, but it is noticed by all three participants.

Participant #3 states: “Why is there fences here, it seems a bit odd, does it not”. Participant #2 adds “We must be there soon, but I still cannot see the Tower”.

However, participant #1 comes across somewhat more impatient “There is a fence again, now we must be there soon. How far have we walked yet?”. These fences are not far from the Forest Tower and as the visitor follows the boardwalk around the corner the tower appears in front of them. As you walk closer to the tower you are met by a sign which states “No access under the tower” (Photo 10) in both Danish and English.

Furthermore, as you pass the sign, fences which frames the boardwalk starts to appear around you (Photo 11). Participant #2 states: “Okay, they really do not want us to walk out on the ground here” (App. 3, Participant observations, p. 100). Participant #1 also takes notice “Arh, so now they do not trust us – we should jump the fence”.



*Photo 9 – fence along the boardwalk*



*Photo 10 – sign near the Forest Tower*



*Photo 11 – Fence around the boardwalk*

These are all some of the larger disturbances which were noticed by the participants who were asked by the researcher to visit the tower.

However, there were also some smaller disturbances which were not as obvious, but still noticeable. One example of this is the cut branch which can be seen in photo 12 during the



*Photo 12 – Cut of branch*

researcher's fieldwork more than one cut branch

were noticed and they were all cut in places where they would reach out over the boardwalk. It is therefore understandable, why they were cut but they also make a point out of making the researcher remember that the experience is man-made.

Many of the above-mentioned disturbances are caused by the attempt to separate humans and nature. Lovelock argued that any place will become an attraction under the "gaze" of a tourist (Lovelock, 2004). Many of the disturbances are met during the walk on the boardwalk, which is not the main part of the attraction. Based on the argument made by Lovelock, one could suggest that the boardwalk was not necessary to the attraction. It could even be analyzed that the attraction would be more authentic to the natural environment and nature-based if the boardwalk was not built and the forest paths were used instead.

Furthermore, it also argued that nature tourism is depending on the natural resources which remain in relatively, undeveloped state, including scenery, topography, waterways, vegetation, wildlife and cultural heritage (Caballos – Lascuráin, 1996). Viewing the images in this part of the analysis the scenery does not appear to be undeveloped. The natural environment has been altered to make room for the visitors and thereby remove some of the natural environment to make room for the man-made part of the attraction.

The disturbances are small moments in which the visitors are removed from the nature-based part of the experience and reminded in one way or another that the attraction is man-made. These disturbances pull the visitors out of focusing on the nature and the natural beauty of the experience.

## The rules of visiting a man-made nature-based attraction

As the analysis have shown there are some disturbances in the nature experience while walking on the boardwalk to the Forest Tower. These are all disturbance caused by the environment and scenery. However, when the attraction was visited by both the researcher herself and the participants it became clear that other visitors also could be somewhat of a disturbance.

In the literature previously presented Jensen (2013) argues that mobility at an attraction often are combination of what is staged by the company, from above, and what is perceived by the visitor, and therefore staged from below (Jensen, 2013). The experience is therefore influenced by the set of frames made by the company and the how these frames are chosen to be used by the visitors.

As the boardwalk and visit up the Forest Tower is a one-way the mobility and flow of the experience is already determined and staged from above. The flow of the visitors is also accompanied by a set of rules decided by Camp Adventure. These rules include: no cars or motorbikes allowed, no bicycles, no horseback riding, do not pluck flower, no camping is allowed, dogs



Photo 13 – sign with rules

must be on leach and the signs also tells that the area is under video surveillance (Photo 13).

These set of rules can be seen at the first entrance to the boardwalk and next to the arch made by trunks of wood. Furthermore, another sign with information and rules meet the visitors at the fence near the tower. This sign states that the area is under video surveillance, that the ticket to the tower must be bought at the reception and that the boardwalk is



Photo 14 – sign with information

one-way, must not be exited and that it is not allowed to walk on the forest floor (Photo 14).

These are the only written rules on what you are allowed to do and not while visiting the Forest Tower.

As Jensen (2013) argues the visitor choose on how to use the frames of the attraction. Ida Roed argues that the Forest Tower is for everyone *“We were going to do something, where it was possible to bring your old mother and father, your baby carriage and that is why the shape of the Tower is what it is. So, the new target group is actually something we have to see and feel. At this moment it is everyone...”*. Based on this the visitors could be everyone, which means that there can be many different ways to perceive the attraction and therefore different opinions on how to experience and use the attraction.

During the researcher’s fieldwork it became clear that the visitors used the attraction differently and with different awareness of others. Some examples of this were captured on photo. On photo no. 15. you can see a tribune with a coffee cart in front of it. The visitors are sitting down most likely talking and watching either the tower or the surroundings from the ground. On photo no. 16 you see a man walking two dogs on leach. They are walking down from the top of the tower and indicate that the man is taking some of his everyday chores and activities to the Forest Tower. Furthermore, the researcher arrived at the tower shortly before what seemed to be a school class. The young students arrived collectively at the bottom of the tower and a teacher approached the personnel at the bottom pf the spiral. Shortly after all the students were allowed to walk in. This happened at a high speed and enthusiasm (Photo 17). The students did not seem to have any regard for the other visitors as they kept yelling from different levels of the tower and did not mind other visitors which clearly seemed to annoy some of the other visitors. The students also walked in big groups which stood out to the rest of the visitors who most often visited the attraction in groups between 1-4 persons.



Photo 15 – Tribune seen from above



Photo 16 – Man walking dogs



Photo 17 – students going up the tower

On the next photo (Photo 18) it is possible to see a family with a father watching and two children laying on the ground at the very top of the tower. The place the children have chosen to lay on the ground is the very spot where the visitors coming up and going down are meeting. This means that every visitor who have walked around on the top of the tower needs to pass the places where the children are laying to be able to walk down again. This could suggest that the children see the attraction as a playground and not as lookout tower as many of the other visitors.



Photo 18 – children playing on the ground

Photo no. 19 shows the inside of the tower seen from above. From here it is possible to see the different formation of visitors both travelling up and down the tower.

While walking on the boardwalk it is possible to walk all the way to and from the tower without coming in to contact with other visitors as long as everyone walks in the same tempo. However, arriving at the tower you are no longer able to have the feeling of having the attraction to yourself. Here you share the tower, the space for walking as you have to make room for others, and perhaps both pass people going up and down the tower. The other visitors made a large impact on the researcher's own fieldwork and was also noticed by the tree participants. After her visit participant #1 talked about an group of older people who she found annoying during the experience *"they just walked slow and did not seem to notice or care that we tried to pass them"* (App. 3, Participant observations, p. 100). Furthermore, she also overheard part of a conversation between two visitors which sparked a subject of conversation between her and the researcher. The subject of the conversation where whether or not it was possible to see all the way to Sweden from the top of the tower on clear day.



Photo 19 – The Forest Tower from above

Participant #3 had her first encounter with other visitors at the bottom of the tower. Here she wanted to read a sign but had to wait as others wanted to read it as well *"wait, I just want to see*

*what it says. It will only take a moment*". As participant 2 & 3 walked to the top, they had to apologize several times as they passed other visitors and they also noticed the sound level and communication between other visitors. Participant #2 states: *"where do you think they come from, I could not recognize the language"*, she also states *"shall we try to pass them here? - Excuse me"*. Participant #3 notices the other visitors in another way and states *"I did not think there were so many visitors today"*.

Most visitors will most likely have a perception of a nature-based attraction that there are no rules or at least the same rules as if you visited a regular forest. The data which were just presented shows a different reality. The freedom of visiting a forest is no longer a possibility as the structure, management and other visitors plays a large part in how the visitors act, consume and experience the attraction. In the literature Tuan (1990) argued that places are affected by the people visiting the place and therefore, a place or attraction is constantly re-build in accordance is being brought by people, the place noise etc. It has become clear that the rules of a man-made nature-based attraction are not only dependent on the rules set by management and the structure but also by the other visitors. Gunn et al. addressed the point of view in which attractions are no more than a visitors' latest visit and that *"Visitor impression and experiences vary greatly with the time a place is visited"* (Gunn et al., 2002, p. 227). This allows the somewhat unwritten rules of the Forest Tower to have a high impact on the visitors' experience, which is not controlled by management but are more in the hands of how other visitors behave and make their own rules while visiting the attraction. The management of the Forest Tower has designed the experience as a one-way walk without many breakout points or other places to leave the flow of the attraction, this can be seen as a negative impact as visitors do not have many ways to escape other disturbing visitors in case they feel as if they need to. By arguing this the project seems to agree with the view on experience argued by Jensen (2013). He argues that the visitors experience is what happens in the cross fields between what is staged from the management and what is staged by the visitors. Furthermore, that the mobility which are found in an attraction are affected by the design and planned setting of the place but also by the social interactions between the other visitors.

### A multi sensuous experience

The visitors experience at the nature-based attraction is including all the human senses. Based on the literature by Saraniemi & Kylanden (2011) it is believed that an attraction can be experienced in multi sensuous ways.

While doing fieldwork and participants observations it became clear that many of the senses came into play, as one participated in the experience at the Forest Tower. The five senses which include taste, smell, hearing, touch and sight are all part of the experience at the Forest Tower. One could argue that most of the senses will be affected naturally as the experience takes place in the forest. However, by interviewing Ida Roed it became clear that the route of the boardwalk was closely planned and therefore the effect on the senses were taken into account "we made a nice walk this way, but it was not where we wanted it to go, so we decided that it had to go past certain places".

The visitor's sense of taste does not appear organic as the experience in itself does not include any tasting. However, the management have made it possible to buy a cup of coffee next to the tower are buy a meal and beverages while arriving back to the courtyard after the visitor's visit to the tower. This way the management have made it possible to associate a special taste to the experience.

The sense of smell is affected during the entire experience from start to finish. As you arrive on the parking lot there will most likely be a smell of cars, dust from the ground and for some it will be possible to start smelling the fresh air and forest. As the visitors' walk through the forest, they will most likely be able to smell the trees, the plants, other people and the smells which are carried by the wind on the day of their visit. The sense of smell will always be individual as people's ability to smell will be different.

The sense of hearing is also affected during the entire experience. As with the sense of smell this will most likely start from arriving at the parking lot and back to when you are leaving. At first it will be possible to hear the cars and other people. However, when the experience on the boardwalk starts it will also be possible to hear some of the sounds which are connected and expected in nature surroundings. Furthermore, the previous discussed man-made disturbance will also be heard.

The sense of touch is a sense of large variability. The sense of touch can be anything the visitor touch by him- or herself or anything that touches the visitor. A visitor touches many things during

their experience at the attraction it can be anything from tickets, wooden railing, branches, trees, metal fences, coffee cups, the steel on the tower, other people and the wooden sitting spots. The sense of sight is by many of the visitors' the reason to go. The highlight at the attraction is in many ways to go to the top of the tower and enjoy the view of South Zealand. Furthermore, the sense of sight is stimulated during the journey on the boardwalk as there is everchanging surroundings. The sense of sight is also one of the senses which will change during the year as the colors and the forest will change with the seasons.

Based on this, the involvement of the senses is deemed very important in the experience of the visitors. The collected data showed that the structure of the experience at the attraction were controlled by the management as the boardwalk decides the visitors' route. Furthermore, it is in some ways possible to control which senses will be involved in an experience at an attraction. However, it is not possible to control the sense completely as there in nature always will be some factors which cannot be controlled. Examples of this can be the weather, the visitors' history and perception, other visitors and nature itself (Madsen, 2010) Furthermore, Mossberg (2007) argued that the experience takes place inside the visitor which aligns with the understanding that the senses are affected by impressions from the outside but experienced by the visitor on the inside.

### The visual experience

As argued in the previously stated literature the tower is a man-made nature-based attraction which is a "modern sublime" observation platform (Bell & Lyall, 2002). This describe the structure of the experience and the tower but does not say much in regard to the visitors' actual experience. The Forest tower is a tower made in brown-red steel, which makes it blend in with the natural colors of the forest. The management states this as an active choice for the tower to blend in with the natural environment (App. 2, expert interview, p. 83). According to Bell (2012) a landscape consists of a number of parts to create the collected scenery. Furthermore Löthian (1999) argues that the beauty in nature is perceived well formed, balanced and aesthetically. The sublime is threatening, wild and uncontrollable, which is supposed to create the feeling of awe and reverence (Schönle, 2000). The shape and choice of material in which the tower is build is deemed "beautiful" by visitors. Furthermore, it can also be viewed as sublime based on the first reactions of the participants as their first reaction can be assimilated with the understanding of awe (App. 3,

Participant observations, p. 100). The tower in itself is a very visual experience and by choosing to walk to the top also a physical experience.

As the visitors walk up the tower the walk further up the surrounding trees and above the tree line. As they reach the top, they get a view over South Zealand. Ida states: *“Well you could say that we had a setting every stenograph would envy. The backdrop changes all the time”* (App. 2, expert interview, p. 83).

Bell & Lyall argue that an experience can be created by the tourist themselves with the aim of reaching the “peak”. In this case the top of the Forest Tower is the peak and from there it is possible for the visitors to have a visual experience. However, the visual experience can also be deemed temporary. Gunn et al (2002) argues that places and therefore, the attraction and experience, often are judged by its temporary character and could be influenced by uncontrollable factors such as the weather. As the experience will often be judged by its temporary character. In the case of the Forest Tower it could be weather, “bad” and “good”, which often is mentioned in addition to the collected experience of a place. The season could be another, as the surroundings change all year round.

The visual experiences of visiting an attraction can also be prolonged and appear as a long-term memory of the experience. During the participant observation participant #2 were especially aware of some of the good photo options, both on the boardwalk and tower. Madsen (2010) argues the importance of memories regarding merchandise or photos to strengthen the experience after the visit. Haldrup & Larsen who argues that visual experiences which are out of the ordinary are often brought home as a decoration in the visitors’ home or posted on social media platforms. The visitor interviews are also a testament to the fact that many visitors are finding the visual experience important as they expect to return to the Forest Tower as the seasons, and therefore the visual expression changes.

#### [Putting a price on nature](#)

The topic of the price of visiting the attraction came up in several of the visitor interviews (App. 1, Visitor interviews, p, 60). During all of the participant observations and also came into question during the researchers own fieldwork. Therefore, it was found interesting to look at the effect on

the visitors' experience. The price of visiting the Forest Tower is 150 DKK upon arrival and 125 DKK when buying tickets online, at least the day before the visit (Campadventure.dk/priser, 2019).

Furthermore, the visitor's also pay 50 DKK to park their car on the premises.

While the researcher conducted visitor interviews, the visitors were asked if there were anything about the experience at the attraction they would like to change or make better. Some of the visitors were referring to the price. Visitor no 10. Stated: *"The price. It is expensive"*. Visitor no. 7 elaborated *"Parking is expensive – actually, the same is the entrance. We took our time and have only just spent 1,5 hours. I think that is a little expensive. It costs more than going to the cinema. But I do think it is quite unique"*. Visitor no. 11 adds: *"We have paid 150 DKK and 50 DKK for parking. That is a little expensive compared to another things"*.

During the interview with Ida Roed she was asked about her perspective on the complaints in regard to the price: *"..we have built on this (ed. Tower) in 5 years, it is our little child, right? And again, you just want to write, just stay away..."* By saying this she argues that the price is not going to change and if the visitors' do not want to pay, they are free to stay away.

During participant #1's trip to the tower she talked about the price as she stood on the top of the tower: *"Would I pay 150 DKK for this? I do not think so. The view is not really something spectacular and I am honestly a little disappointed"*. Her point of view was supported by Participant #3 who as the visitor from interview no. 7 takes the duration of the experience into account. She states: *"It only took us about an hour and 25 minutes. That is not a long time to experience an attraction for 150 DKK. I think it was beautiful and a special experience, but I do think it is too expensive. We have also paid for parking and to even get here"*.

Ida Roed continued her explanation: *"We just have a culture in Denmark which is a complaining culture"*. She continues *"luckily there are more people who think it is very beautiful, right? And amazing that this tower stands in the middle of a forest"*. These differences of opinion can be part of different perceptions of the experience. Ida Roed have been part of the building the attractions from day one and is understandable very close and protective when it comes to it. Furthermore, some of the visitors measure the price against time spent at the attraction. This way of seeing the

price against the attraction from many different people, agrees with the point argued in the literature review that visitor's previous history, culture and perception make visitors experience differently (Madsen, 2010). The same counts of agreeing on the price of an attraction such as the Forest Tower. I could imagine that Ida Roed sees the attraction and all the work which lays behind it, which make her find the price fair compared to what you get. However, I do also understand the point of view made by some of the visitors as they present the view on the timeframe. The fact that many visitors believe the price is too high may be connected to the setting. In Denmark we are used to nature being a free experience and is not something which are viewed as a product that are for sale. The visitor may therefore view the attraction somewhat differently than the management. The management are seeing the entire experience from the start to the end of the boardwalk, where visitors only see the tower. The fact that many of the visitors were not aware of the boardwalk from the beginning may just add to the feeling of the experience only being the tower. Furthermore, the visitor interviews were made as the visitors returned to the courtyard at the farmhouse after their trip to the Forest Tower were done. The fact that some of the visitors were still not agreeing with the price may suggest that the experience did not live up to their expectations and value for money.

## Chapter 5: Conclusion

The aim of this project was to critically investigate the visitors' experience at a man-made nature-based attraction with the Forest Tower on South Zealand as a case study.

To answer this the researcher investigated the existing literature. It was established that there is a lack of literature investigating the visitors experience at man-made nature-based attractions. Therefore, it was found necessary to broaden the discussion and in the explorative phase the subjects of nature-based tourism, what makes an attraction and experience economy were discussed.

Before diving into the analysis, it was necessary to consider the methodology. Due to the lack of data on the visitors' experience at a man-made nature-based attraction and to get a view on the visitors' experience, minds and perceptions it was chosen to do qualitative researcher with an interpretive approach. The visitors who were interviewed were all different ages and sexes, which concur with Ida Roeds view on who the target group of the attraction is.

In the analysis a number of interesting findings were found:

- That it is important for the visitors' expectations to agree with the reality of the experience.
- That man-made disturbances are a large part of a man-made nature-based attraction.
- The rules of visiting a nature-based attraction are largely made by the visitors.
- The changing environment are a large influence on the visitors' perception of the experience and wish to revisit the attraction.

The investigation of the visitors' experience at the Forest Tower shows that there are as many ways to experience a man-made nature-based experience as there are visitors at the attraction. The analysis shows that there are many parameters which come into play during visitors' experience at a man-made nature-based attraction. In the analysis it was discussed that attractions and experiences are like mosaics and made up by different and changing factors. In the case of the Forest Tower it has become clear both factors controlled by the management but also

factors which cannot be controlled are largely affecting the visitors' experience as nature-based attractions often are in environments which cannot be controlled. Furthermore, the importance of other visitors was also discussed as the analysis showed that the other visitors are a large part of the experience. Other visitors are part of making the experience and the way they behave and consume the experience can be a large factor in how the individual visitor experience the attraction.

## References

- Allan Beaver. (2012) *A Dictionary of Travel and Tourism*. Oxford University Press.
- Bell, C., & Lyall, J. (2002). *The accelerated sublime: Landscape, tourism, and identity*
- Bell, S. (2012). *Landscape: pattern, perception and process*. New York: Routledge.
- Bernard, H. R. (2011). *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (5 ed.). Altamira Press.
- Bryman, A (2016). *Social Research Methods*. (5<sup>th</sup> ed.) Oxford University Press.
- Buckley, R (2009) *Ecotourism: Principles and Practices*. Griffith University
- Buckley, R & Coghlan, A (2012) *Nature-based tourism in breadth and depth*. Griffith University
- Butler, R, W. (1980) *The Tourism Area Life Cycle, vol. 1*. Channel View Publications
- Campadventure.dk (2019). *Arkitekturen*. Camp Adventure. Retrieved the 25<sup>th</sup> of September 2019 from <https://www.campadventure.dk/arkitekturen/>
- Campadventure.dk. (2019). *Facts*. Camp Adventure. Retrieved the 25<sup>th</sup> of August 2019 from <https://www.campadventure.dk/facts/>
- Campadventure.dk. (2019). *Historien*. Camp Adventure. Retrieved the 25<sup>th</sup> of August 2019 from <https://www.campadventure.dk/historien/>
- Campadventure.dk. (2019). *Kontakt*. Camp Adventure. Retrieved the 25<sup>th</sup> of August 2019 from <https://www.campadventure.dk/kontakt/>
- Campadventure.dk. (2019). *Oplevelsen*. Camp Adventure. Retrieved the 25<sup>th</sup> of August 2019 from <https://www.campadventure.dk/oplevelsen/>
- Campadventure.dk. (2019). *Priser*. Camp Adventure. Retrieved the 25<sup>th</sup> of August 2019 from <https://www.campadventure.dk/priser/>
- Campadventure.dk. (2019). *Time Magazine Worlds greatest places 2019*. Camp Adventure. Retrieved the 25<sup>th</sup> of August 2019 from <https://www.campadventure.dk/time-magazine-worlds-greatest-places-2019/>
- Chapman, A. & Light, D. (2016). *Exploring tourist destination as a mosaic*. *Tourism Management* (52). (pp. 254-263).
- Ceballos – Lascuráin.(1996). *Tourism, Ecotourism and protected Areas*. The World Conservation Union.
- Chen, J & Prebensen, N. (2017). *Nature tourism*. Routledge.

- Emig, J. (1982). Inquiry Paradigms and Writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 33(1), p.64.
- Frederiksen, J, S (2015) *Regional development and Collaboration in Tourism: A Cross Border Perspective*.
- Gibson, J. J. (2014). The ecological approach to visual perception: Classic edition. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Gissselfeld-kloster.dk. (2019). *Kloster historie*. Gissselfeld Kloster. Retrieved the 25th of August 2019 from <http://www.gissselfeld-kloster.dk/content/Kloster-historie.aspx>
- Scholar.google.com (2019). *Experiencing man-mad nature-based attraction*. Retrieved the 21<sup>st</sup> of September 2019 from [https://scholar.google.com/scholar?start=10&q=experiencing+man-made+nature-based+attraction&hl=da&as\\_sdt=0,5](https://scholar.google.com/scholar?start=10&q=experiencing+man-made+nature-based+attraction&hl=da&as_sdt=0,5)
- Greer, C., Donnelly, S., & Rickly, J. M. (2016). Landscape perspective for tourism studies. In D. C. Knudsen, M. M. Metro-Roland, A. K. Soper, & C. Greer (Eds.), *Landscape, tourism and meaning* (pp. 176). IN: Ashgate.
- Gunn, C. et al. (2002). *Destination Planning Concepts*. *Tourism Planning: Basics, Concepts, Cases*. (pp. 225-280). Publisher undefined.
- Hashemnezhad, H. et al. (2013). *Sense of Place & Place Attachment*. *International Journal of Architecture and Urban Development*. Vol. 3, No. 1, Winter 2013. Retrieved the 3rd of September 2019 from: [http://ijaud.srbiau.ac.ir/pdf\\_581\\_a90b5ac919ddc57e6743d8ce32d19741.html](http://ijaud.srbiau.ac.ir/pdf_581_a90b5ac919ddc57e6743d8ce32d19741.html)
- Haldrup, M., & Larsen, J. (2007). *Material Cultures of Tourism*. Routledge, (pp. 275-289).
- Haldrup, M., & Larsen, J. (2010). *Tourism, performance and the everyday: Consuming the orient*. London and New York: Routledge
- Hansen, A. H. (2014). *Memorable Moments*. Consumer immersion in nature-based tourist experiences. PHD Project. Bodø.
- Jantzen, C., & Jensen, J. (2005). *Oplevelser: Koblinger og transformationer*. Aalborg: Aalborg Universitetsforlag.
- Jensen, O. B. (2013). *Staging Mobilities*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jensen, O. B. (2014). *Staging Mobilities*. Retrieved 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2019, from Mobile Lives Forum: Temporary Congregation

Jensen, Ø. (2014). Approaches for the evaluation of visitor experiences at tourist attractions. In Prebensen, N. K., Chen, J. S., & Uysal, M (Eds.), *Creating experience value in tourism*, (pp. 139-156.). Oxfordshire: CABI Publishing

Jordan, F & Gison, H. (2004) *Let your data do the talking: Researching the solo experiences of British and American woman*. Qualitative research in tourism.

Kivunja, C. and Kuyini, A. (2017). Understanding and Applying Research Paradigms in Educational Contexts. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 6(5), p.26.

Kvale, S & Brinkmann, S. (2009) *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Lothian, A. (1999). Landscape and the philosophy of aesthetics: is landscape quality inherent in the landscape or in the eye of the beholder? *Landscape and urban planning*, 44(4), 177-198.

Loureiro, S. C. (2014). *The role of the rural tourism experience economy in place attachment and behavioral intentions*. Elsevier, (pp. 1-9).

Lovelock, B. (2004). Tourist-created attractions: The emergence of a unique form of tourist attraction in southern New Zealand. *Tourism Geographies*, 6(4), 410-433.

Løfgren, O. (2014). *Urban Atmospheres as brandscapes and lived experiences*. Place branding and public diplomacy. 10(4). (Pp. 255-66). Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

Madsen, J. (2010). *Oplevelsesøkonomi*. (1. edition). Systime A/S,

McGillivray, G. (2008). *The Picturesque World Stage*. *Performance Research*, 13(4), 127- 139.

Mossberg, L. (2007, April 11). *A Marketing Approach to the Tourist Experience*. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, Routledge, (pp. 59-74).

Pine J. & Gilmore J., (2009). *Oplevelsesøkonomien*. (1. edition). Published by Klim.

Pine, J. & Gilmore, J. (2011). *The experience economy*. Boston: Harvard Review Press.

Pine, J. & Gilmore, J. (1999). *The experience economy: Work is theater & every business a stage*. Boston: Harvard Review Press.

Pine, J. & Gilmore, J. (1998). *Welcome to the experience economy*. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved the 17th of May from: <https://hbr.org/1998/07/welcome-to-the-experience-economy>

Poulsson, S. H., & Kale, S. (2004). *The Experience Economy and Commercial Experiences*. *The Marketing Review*, (pp. 267-277).

- Raluca, D. & Strutzen, G. (2008). *Theme park - The main concept of tourism industry development*. Retrieved the 15th of August 2019 from: <http://steconomice.uoradea.ro/anale/volume/2008/v2-economy-and-business-administration/113.pdf>
- Reingold, L. (1993). *Identifying the Elusive Ecotourist*. Supplement to Tour and Travel News.
- Rolston, Holmes. 1998. Aesthetic experience in forests. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 56 (2):157-166.
- Rowley, C & Benson, J. (2002). *The management of Human Resources in the Asia Pacific Region*. Frank Cass Publishers.
- Saraniemi, S. & Kylanen, M. (2011). *Problematizing the Concept of Tourism Destination: An Analysis of Different Theoretical Approaches*. *Journal of Travel Research* 50(2) (pp. 133–143). SAGE Publication.
- Schönle, A. (2000). Gogol, the Picturesque, and the Desire for the People: A Reading of “Rome”. *The Russian Review*, 59(4), 597-613.
- Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2014). *Tourism Mobilities: Places to Play, Places in Play*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Sonnenburg, S. & Wee, D. (2016). *Introduction to touring consumption*. Vol. 16(2) (pp. 323–333) in *Journal of Consumer Culture*, SAGE Publications.
- Stark, H & Trinidad, S, B. (2007) *Choose you method: A comparison of phenomenology, Discourse Analysis, and Grounded Theory*. University of Washington
- Szulewicz, T & Brinkmann, S (2015) *Educational Psychology Practice: A New Theoretical Framework*. Springer
- Trochim, W. M. (2006). Qualitative Measures . *Research Methods Knowledge Base*, pp. 1-16.
- Tuan, Y (1990) *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values*. Columbia University Press
- Tv2øst.dk. (2019). *Besøgende strømmer til skovtårnet – dobbelt så mange gæster som forventet hele året*. Tv2øst. Retrieved the 25th of August 2019 from <https://www.tv2east.dk/artikel/besoegende-stroemmer-til-skovtaarnet-dobbelt-saa-mange-gaester-som-forventet-hele-aaret>
- UNWTO. 2009. *World Tourism Organization. Tourism Highlights, , Edition 2009*[http://unwto.org/facts/eng/pdf/highlights/UNWTO\\_Highlights09\\_en\\_LR.pdf](http://unwto.org/facts/eng/pdf/highlights/UNWTO_Highlights09_en_LR.pdf)[www.unwto.org](http://www.unwto.org)

Urry, J. (2002). *The Tourist Gaze* (Vol. Second edition). London: SAGE Publications.

Veal, A. J. (2011). *Research methods for leisure & tourism - a practical guide*. (4. edition). Essex:  
Pearson Education Limited

Warnaby, G. & Medway, D. (2013). *What about the 'place' in place marketing?*. Marketing Theory.  
Vol 13. (pp. 345–363). SAGE Publications.

## Appendix 1: Semi-structured interviews with visitors at The Forest Tower

### **Template for Semi-structured interview with visitors**

Information on the interviewee:

How did they get to the attraction?

How are they visiting the attraction with?

How were they informed of the attraction?

What were the expectations to the experience?

How did your expectation measure up to the actual experience? Is there anything you would change?

Would you visit again?

Would you recommend the attraction to others?

### **Visitor interview no. 1**

**Conducted on the 14th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du fortælle mig dit navn, alder, hvor du kommer fra og hvad du laver til daglig?

Interviewee: Jamen jeg hedder Anne-Sophie, jeg er 43 og bor i Næstved.. og jeg er ergoterapeut.

Interviewer: Og hvem er det du er her med i dag? Familie?

Interviewee: Ja min søn og hans far

Interviewer: Ja, og hvordan kom i så hertil i dag? Med bil eller offentlig transport?

Interviewee: bil

Interviewer: Og hvordan har du hørt om Skovtårnet derude?

Interviewee: Øhh.. Ved du hvad det tror jeg faktisk at jeg så i fjernsynet

Interviewer: Tv2 øst? Nyhederne?

Interviewee: Nyhederne – det var ikke TV2 for det ser jeg ikke

Interviewer: Heheh, fair. Og hvilke forventninger havde du til oplevelsen herude i dag? Var der noget ud havde tænkt inden i kom herud?

Interviewee: Nej jeg overvejede faktisk hvordan man kom derud. Altså jeg tænkte om man kørte helt ud til tårnet eller om man skal gå et stykke vej. Jeg blev faktisk overrasket da jeg så denne her...

Interviewer: boardwalken

Interviewee: Ja

Interviewer: Så du havde ikke været inde og kigge inden..

Interviewee: Nej

Interviewer: Og så fra dit perspektiv, hvilken del af den her tur var den fedeste? Er der sådan én ting der..

Interviewee: det synes jeg faktisk er svært at sige.. for jeg synes også at turen gennem skoven, den har været fed. Men det var da nok at komme op, hovedattraktionen.. det var at komme op.

Interviewer: og hvis der var noget du kunne forbedre, noget du skulle ændre ved det er der så noget du ville lave om? Det kan være de helt små ting også.

Interviewee: For i dag? Næ, det tænker jeg ikke, men jeg kommer igen når løvet det sprænger ud.

Interviewer: Det var det jeg skulle til at spørge om – kommer du igen? Og så til sidst, er det noget du ville anbefale til andre?

Interviewee: Helt sikkert

Interviewer: Helt sikker – super. Jamen jeg siger mange tak.

## **Visitor interview no. 2.**

### **Conducted on the 14th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Nå.. vil I fortælle mig jeres navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee 1: Ja. Jeg hedder Tove, jeg har sommerhus nede i Karrebæksminde og bor i Tølløse. Og så er jeg 68 og er pensionist.

Interviewee 2: Jeg hedder Niels og er gift med Tove og jeg er 70. Det har jeg været i 2 timer.

Interviewer: Tillykke med det!

Interviewee 2: Og vi har hele vores børn med

Interviewer: Jeg skulle lige til at spørge, hvem det er i er her med i dag – men det er hele familien så? Børn og børnebørn?

Interviewee 1: Ja to børn, der har to børn hver. Og så din søster.

Interviewer: Hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee 2: Det er faktisk vores søn. Vi fik det i julegave '17

Interviewer: Til at komme ud og se det?

Interviewee 1: Gavekort..

Interviewee 2: Så blev det lid forsinket

Interviewer: Hehe, en lille smule

Interviewee 1: en anelse ik'

Interviewer: Jo og hvorfor har i så valgt at besøge det? Det er så fordi i har fået gavekort?

Interviewee 1: Ja ja, og så tænkte vi at vi skulle lave en skovtur i anledningen af Nielses fødselsdag, og tænkte vi " hvad med at køre ud til Gisselfed" og nu kører vi hjem og laver frokost i sommerhuset og så kommer de andre

Interviewer: Det lyder som en god dag. Hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen herude?

Interviewee1 : jeg havde forventet at det var solskinsvejr og blå himmel (der grines).

Interviewee 2: Ej vi havde jo hørt at det havde fået nogle af de internationale priser, så designet ville sikkert være fantastisk. Men egentlig altså ikke rigtig det store. Vi har allerede aftalt at vi skal herud igen når det bliver bedre vejr og træerne er sprunget ud. Men det var Så fedt, det var en fed oplevelse.

Interviewee 1: Altså og så synes jeg.. Jeg havde nok set tårnet, men jeg synes det var fedt.. sleve gange der ind og gangen derud.

Interviewer: Ja selve boardwalken..

Interviewee 2: Ja, jeg forstår godt det blev forsinket. For når vi kigger rundt omkring, så er det lavet Så fint. Der er ikke noget med at så er der sådan et mellemrum og så er der sådan et mellemrum.. det er fedt

Interviewer: Ja, så hvis der nu i skulle vælge én tingi synes der satte prikken over i'et

Interviewee2: Ja det var faktisk de 3 bøgetræer..

Interviewee1: Inde i tårnet.

Interviewer: ja, det er også fedt

Interviewee 1: Og så var det også dejligt at ende oppe i en stor legeplads, hvor ungerne de leger.

Interviewer: det er der alle de andre er oppe nu eller? (der grines) Hvis i kunne forbedre noget eller ændre noget . Er der så noget i ville ændre der?

Interviewee 1+2: Nej egentlig ikke

Interviewer: Nej, det er så fint

Interviewee2: Jo jo, vejret (der grines) altså det store er jo at den mindste på 3 og mig på 70.

Interviewer: ja, det er noget for hele familien?

Interviewee 1 +2: jaaa

Interviewer: Og er det noget i ville anbefale til andre?

Interviewee 1+2: Ja, helt bestemt

Interviewer: jamen så jeg mange tak!

### **Visitor interview no. 3**

#### **Conducted on the 14th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Ja vi laver lige et fællesinterview hvis du vil være med.. må jeg bede om dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse

Interviewee: ja, Julie og jeg bor i Skovshoved og jeg er 42 og jeg arbejder.. Jeg har et firma med marketing.

Interviewer: ja, og hvem er du her med i dag? Jeg gætter det er familien.

Interviewee: Ja det er med familien

Interviewer: Ja, og er det med 2 børn?

Interviewee: ja altså det her er min søn og det her er en der på en eller anden måde er i familie.

Interviewee2: Ja altså det er hendes far. Det er min morfars, søsters, mands.. som hun så ikke lige har børn med og så ved jeg ikke..

Interviewee1: Mands nieces datter.. (der grines)

Interviewer: Ja okay.. Hvordan kom i herud i dag? Er i kørt i bil?

Interviewee: Ja vi er kørt i bil

Interviewer: og hvor har i hørt om tårnet fra?

Interviewee: Julegave. Jeg fik det afvide af min mor

Interviewer: Hvem har du fået det i julegave af?

Interviewee2: Min mor

Interviewer: mmm. Og hvorfor har i valgt at komme her? Er det julegave udelukkende eller har i hørt noget om det?

Interviewee1: ja vi har hørt noget om det, fra de andre der er med.

Interviewee2: Jeg har hørt det i TV avisen

Interviewer: Tv avisen har du hørt det fra – jaa. Og hvilke forventninger havde i til turen herud i dag.

Interviewee1: Jeg ved ikke om i vidste det, men ellers har vi ikke sådan vidst eller tænkt over at der var en masse andre aktiviteter.

Interviewee2: Hvad er forventninger?

Interviewer: hvad regnede du med? Regnede du med at der var sådan en trængang hele vejen derud?

Interviewee2: jeg regnede bare med at der var et tårn man kunne se. Jeg regnede ikke enagng med at man kunne komme der op for jeg havde ikke hørt så meget om det.

Interviewer: Blev du så glad da du fandt ud af at man kunne komme op i det? Var det fedt at kunne komme op i det?

Interviewee2: jeg blev også meget bange..

interviewer: Synes du det var lidt højt?

Interviewee3: det synes jeg ikke..

Interviewee2: Da jeg kom ned krammede jeg jorden og kyssede jorden

Interviwee3: Du løb også væk fra tårnet

Interviewer: okay, hvad synes i var det bedste ved dagen i dag?

Interviewee2: At være sammen..

Interviewer: At være sammen med din familie?

Interviewee3: At komme helt op i toppen

Interviewer: jaa.. og hvad synes du?

Interviewee 1: årh ja.. det var også at prøve tårnet synes jeg.

Interviewer: Hvis der var noget i kunne ændre eller forbedre herude, hvad skulle det så være?

Interviewee1: Højere tårn (der grines) jeg ville sige vejret, det skulle være lidt varmere..

interviewer: ja og kunne i finde på at komme igen i løbet af sæsonen?

Interviewee: ja ja

Interviewer: og er det noget i kunne finde på at anbefale til nogen andre?

Interviewee: ja aj

Interviewee2: det der klatre det så bare så sjovt ud.

Interviewer: Ja, det kunne du også godt tænke dig at prøve? Jamen så vil jeg sige tak for dig dag.

#### **Visitor interview no. 4**

**Conducted on the 14th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Jan, vi kommer fra Svendborg, jeg er 57 og arbejder ude på nordsøen

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Min kæreste og nogle venner

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Ja vi er kørt i bil

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Jamen, vi så det i morgen TV og så var det tilfældigt at vi var i området. Vi var i Næstved i går og tænkte at det var da det vi skulle ud og prøve.

Interviewer: der var lige en smuttur forbi..

Interviewee: Ja, det var ren impulsivt.

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee2: Altså jeg havde ingen, jeg havde ikke set noget om det.

Interviewee: narj.. altså jeg har nok fået opfyldt minde forventninger.. ej mere til.. det var imponerende. Meget imponerende også i øvrigt omgivelserne og det hele.

Intevriewee2: Det var også alt det her med at de har lavet uden om alle træer

Interviewee: Ja, det var væsentlgi bedre end forventet. Vi kommer bestem igen til efetråret.

Interviewee2: Vi snakker om at vi skal komme igen til nogle andre farver.

Interviewer: det var også det der var mit næste spørgsmål – kunne i finde på at komme igen.

Interviewee: ja helt sikkert

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: Narh.. det synes jeg egentlig ikke, altsåå.

Interviewer: nej, og er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: absolut, helt sikkert

Interviewer: Jamen ved i hvad, det var det. Tak for det.

### **Visitor interview no. 5.**

**Conducted on the 14th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: selvfølgelig. Jeg hedder Inger, min mand og jeg kommer fra Korsør og er pensionister. Vi er begge lige fyldt 76 i år.

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Jamen det er så min mand og vores ældste barnebarn, der har inviteret på tur.

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi er i bil. Hun (barnebarn) hentede os i morges.

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Det har vores barnebarn fortalt om og så har vi set det på tv2 øst. De har vist noget om det flere gange

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: ja altså, vi gik ud fra at tårnet var som på billederne. Og det var jo mægtig flot. Jeg havde dog regnet med at det ville være nemmer at komme derud. Jeg tog ikke turen op for det kan min ben ikke klare længere. Der var nogle lidt stejle stigninger på vej derud. Jeg troede at man gik på skovbunden på vej der ud. Men det var en rigtig flot tur.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: Parkering er meget dyr. Jeg ved ikke hvad billetterne koster, for dem har vi fået gratis. Jeg finder det lidt ærgerligt at der er så meget larm ved tårnet. Vi kom samtidig med en masse unge, måske var det derfor.

Interviewer: det var også det der var mit næste spørgsmål – kunne i finde på at komme igen.

Interviewee: Nu har vi jo set det, så det må være fint.

Interviewer: Er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: tja, hvis det er nogle venner vi ved der kan lide naturen eller den slags oplevelser.

### **Visitor interview no. 6.**

#### **Conducted on the 14th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Jeg hedder George og er gift med Inger du lige talte med. Så jeg er også fra Korsør og pensionist.

Interviewer: Og hvor gammel er du?

Interviewee: 73

Interviewer: Så du er her med Inger og dit barnebarn?

Interviewee: Ja med Inger og Camilla

interviewer: og så kom du også med bil

Interviewee: ja, det gjorde jer. Jeg håber også at komme væk igen med bil. haha

interviewer: Det kan jeg godt forstå. Der er langt til Korsør på gåben. Hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Jamen jeg har hørt om den gennem mit barnebarn og fra fjernsynet og også fra min lystfiskerklub. Der er en af medlemmerne der kommer fra Faxe og han har fortalt en del om byggeriet fra allerede da de startede med at bygge.

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: jeg havde høre om trægangen gennem skoven og set billeder af tårnet. Men jeg troede at det ville være mere isoleret. Det var ret sjovt at kunne se svingbanerne i træerne og juletræerne på vej derud. Men det havde jeg ikke lige regnet med. Udsigten fra toppen var fin nok.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: hmm. Jeg ville gerne have mere at trægangen var lidt mere plan.

Interviewer: Kunne i finde på at komme igen?

Interviewee: Ja, det tror jeg da godt. Måske til efteråret.

Interviewer: Er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: Alle i min omgangskreds har allerede været her. I hvert fald dem der kunne finde det interessant.

### **Visitor interview no. 7.**

**Conducted on the 14th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Jeg hedder Helle og bor inde i Næstved. Jeg er 55 og førtidspensionist. Det er derfor jeg kan være her på det her tidspunkt – der skal jo være nogle fordele ved at være førtidspensionist, så kan man komme når der ikke er fyldt.

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Jeg er her med to veninder – Hanne og Helle

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi er i bil herud.

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Jeg tror alle i Næstved har hørt om det. Det har jo været virkelig meget i nyhederne og så er det nemt at tage ud og bruge et par timer her, når man bor så tæt på.

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: Det jeg havde set i TV2 øst, på deres hjemmeside og på Instagram. Jeg har set rigtig mange billeder, men blev lidt overrasket over hvordan man kom ud til tårnet. Jeg havde ikke forventet træ.. boardwalk – er det det de kalder den?

interviewer: ja, det er det. Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: parkering er dyr- det samme er indgangen egentlig også. Vi har tage os god til og har kun brugt lige knap 1,5 time. Det synes jeg er lidt dyrt. Det koster mere end at gå i biografen. Men jeg synes det er ret unikt.

Interviewer: Kunne i finde på at komme igen+

Interviewee: Ja, med nogle andre farver. Men jeg ville nok vente nogle år, så kan det være prisen er faldet.

Interviewer: Er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: Ja, jeg synes man skal komme ud en tur og se det. Men jeg tror børnefamilier villw kede sig lidt.

### **Visitor interview no. 8.**

#### **Conducted on the 14th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Kenneth, København, 37 og jeg arbejder med marketing et lille opstarter firma.

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Med min kone. Vi holder weekend fri fra børnene

interviewer: Det lyder lækkert og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi er kommet i bil. Vi er kørt fra Møn hvor vi lejer et sommerhus

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Gennem medier og venner der har set og besøgt det

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: Ikke det store. Natur og højde.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: Det ved jeg ikke lige om der er.. Jo, det var lidt irriterende at man kunne høre perosnerne fra trætop banerne. Det ødelagde lidt idyllen. Jeg ville også gerne vide hvad jeg så på toppen. Det hele er bare marker og træer. Jeg må indrømme at jeg slet ikke ved hvor vi er. Hvor er Næstved placeret?

Interviewer: God pointe. Kunne i finde på at komme igen?

Interviewee: Der skal nok gå nogle år, når børnene er blevet lidt større.

Interviewer: Er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: ja, jeg tror en del af min omgangskreds ville se det som en givende tur. Det er jo ret unikt.

### **Visitor interview no. 9.**

#### **Conducted on the 14th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Ja, jeg hedder Birthe, jeg er 81. Jeg bor i Faxe Ladeplads og jeg er pensionist.

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Jeg er her med min stavgangsklub. Vi er 10-12 pensionister fra Faxe Ladeplads der arrangerer nogle ture et par gange om ugen og i dag havde vi planlagt at tage en tur herud. Vi fyldte vist en del på den der boardwalk, men jeg tror ikke der var nogle der var generet af os. Det har været en rigtig hyggelig tur.

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi bestilt nogle flextaxaer, så det var ikke så dyrt når vi alle kunne dele.

interviewer: Nej, i har jo heller ikke så forfærdelig langt.

Interviewee: Nej, lige præcis, så det er rigtig fint at man ikke behøver være væk hele dagen. Det kan godt være lidt meget i vores alder.

Interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Jamen det fortæller folk jo bare om. Det har været noget i lokalsprøjtjen og så bor vi lige ved siden af.

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: At vi ville få en hyggelig gåtur. Der var længere op end. Jeg havde regnet med og jeg er lidt træt nu. Det var godt at vi havde vores stave med. Det var flot natur, men lidt synd med det hegn derude. Der er mere natur på vejen derud end ved tårnet.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: Jeg ville fjerne hegnet og der er nogle steder tingene sr halvfærdige ud. Jeg ville også gerne have et sted at holde pause både på vej op i tårnet, på toppen, men også på vej der ud. Der er pladser inden man går op, men det er lidt sent.

Interviewer: ja, det kan jeg godt forstå - kunne i finde på at komme igen.

Interviewee: Ja, hvis jeg skulle vise det til nogle andre

Interviewer: nej, og er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: ja da. Jeg må hellere følge med de andre. God dag unge dame.

### **Visitor interview no. 10.**

#### **Conducted on the 14th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Jeg hedder Maria, jeg er 33 kommer fra vejle og arbejder som sygeplejerske på en privat klinik.

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Jeg er her med mand og søn. Vi holder ferie i et sommerhus ikke så langt herfra, Karrebæksminde, så vi tænkte at vi lige ville se det, nu når det var så tæt på.

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi er i bil

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Fra medierne, de er jo alle vegne. Vi har også kigget på deres hjemmeside inden vi kom.

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: at det ville være flot. Det kommer bag på mig hvilken naturoplevelse det egentlig er. Det kom bag på mig hvor meget gennem skoven man kommer. Men det er stadig et sjovt mix af

dansk idyllisk skov og bygget. Altså man kan jo godt se at det hele er lavet af mennesker. Det er til gengæld flot at de har gjort det med så stor respekt for skoven og naturen.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: prisen. Det er dyrt. Min søn kunne også godt have brugt nogle flere pause steder. 4 km er langt for de små ben.

Interviewer: det var også det der var mit næste spørgsmål – kunne i finde på at komme igen.

Interviewee: Hvis i var i området, men jeg ville ikke køre hele vejen fra Vejle for kun at se det. Så ville vi nok kombinere det med BonBon-Land, det tror jeg min søn var mere begejstret for.

Interviewer: Det er måske også mere interessant for ham. Hvor gammel er din søn?

Interviewee: Han er kun 5, så det er ikke så sjovt det her og han forstår ikke helt at man skal blive på stien. Haha

Interviewer: er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: Ja, helt bestemt.

### **Visitor interview no. 11.**

#### **Conducted on the 25th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Camilla, 24 fra Nykøbing Sjælland og jeg er studerende

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Vi er 4 veninder der er på tur. Vi læser sammen og tog en kollektiv fridag

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi har lånt en bil til at komme hertil

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Jeg har en del venner der har postet på instagram, men også gennem medierne.

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: Jamen, vi talte om at der ville være dejlig roligt. Flot natur og så tårnet selvfølgelig. Vi snakkede om muligheden for fuglelyde og dyr. Men også at man forhåbentlig får noget for pengene.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: Nu når vi har været rundt, så synes jeg det er en dyr oplevelse. Det har kun taget os ca. 1 time og 20 min.. Vi har betalt 150 kr og 50 kr. for parkeirngen. Det er altså liiidt dyrt i forhold til så meget andet. Vi kom lidt i kambolage med en ældre gruppe, der gik langsommere end os og så kan det godt være svært at komme uden om dem på boardwalken. Det var lidt irriterende og så gik vi generelt meget tæt på folk – kunne man lave en maks limit på antallet af mennekser?

Interviewer: Det var da nogle gode observationer, var der andet i talte om undervejs?

Interviewee: hmm.. vi havde ikke forventet at der var en juletræsfarm eller hvad sådan noget hedder. Det kom lidt bag på os. SÅ bliver det pludseligt industri og at der var hegn med skiltning om videoptagelse rundt om tårnet brød lige som ens hoved lidt.

Interviewer: ja, tak for uddybningen. Kunne i finde på at komme igen?

Interviewee: Der kommer nok til at gå noget tid – måske år. Jeg tror umiddelbart ikke at det bliver med pigerne igen.

Interviewer: Er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: Tja, jeg har nogle venner der sikkert ville synes det var en rigtig god oplevelse. Men der er nok en del der venter til at der kommer noget tilbud eller lignende.

### **Visitor interview no. 12.**

#### **Conducted on the 25th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Henning fra Odense, 63 og sømand.

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Min søn og datter har taget mig med

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Bil

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Jeg har hørt om det fra mn børn

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: Ingen ting, jeg gik ud fra det var et tårn i skoven

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: Jeg forstå ikke hvorfor man vil bruge så mange penge på at bygge det. Der er jo ingenting at se. Det er for dyrt og intetsigende. Vi kunne jo næsten havde været taget i Tivoli for de penge.

Interviewer: det var også det der var mit næste spørgsmål – kunne i finde på at komme igen.

Interviewee: Det bliver uden mig

Interviewer: nej, og er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: Jeg tror ikke der er mange af mine bekendtskaber der vil bruge penge på det her

### **Visitor interview no. 13.**

**Conducted on the 25th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Vi hedder John og Helle og kommer inde fra Næstved af. Jeg (Helle) arbejder i butik og John arbejder som sikkerhedskonsulent. Vi er 52 og 54

Interviewer: Er det "bare" jer to der er på tur i dag?

Interviewee: Ja, det er det. Vi holder lige en fridag fra børnene.

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi er kørt i bil. Parkering er godt nok dyr hva?!

interviewer: Ja det er nok som man ser der og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Vi bliver jo bombarderet gennem de lokale nyheder og så snakker alle jo om det når det er så tæt på. Jeg smalt talker en del på arbejdet og tårnet er et godt emne at bringe op. Så vi tænkte at vi heller selv måtte tage ud og se det.

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: At det ville være en god tur i skoven, beroligende og frisk. At det så er alt for varmt og her er fyldt med mennesker er så en anden del. Turen op i tårnet var fin og udsigten var rigtig flot. Det

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Jeg ville måske gerne have vidst hvad jeg kiggede på og så er her lidt for mange mennesker til at man rigtig kan fornemme skoven og naturen. Folk snakker jo, så det larmer.

Interviewer: ja, kunne i finde på at komme igen?

Interviewee: ja bestemt, men jeg tror vi ville gøre det på den dag hvor man var sikker på at der ikke var nær så mange mennesker.

Interviewer: nej, og er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: Ja bestemt. Men vi ville også give vores erfaring med.

**Visitor interview no. 14.**  
**Conducted on the 25th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Jeg hedder Carina, er 37 og lige pt arbejdsløs. Men jeg har tidligere arbejdet som sygeplejerske.

Interviewer: Og hvor kommer du fra?

Interviewee: nå ja, jeg kommer fra Vesterbro

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Jeg er her med min familie. Min mand og 2 børn.

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi er i bil

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Fra nyhederne, men også fra venner og familie. Vi kender mange der allerede har været her og så også ret meget fra de sociale medier.

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: Naturoplevelse, storslået, roligt, flot.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: Jeg synes måske godt det kunne være mere børnevenligt. Det er en lang tur for de små ben. Måske flere siddepladser eller stop i skoven. Det ville også være rart at vide at der ikke var flere toiletter på turen udover her på gårdspladsen.

Interviewer: det var også det der var mit næste spørgsmål – kunne i finde på at komme igen.

Interviewee: narh.. nu har vi set det og det ligner jo billederne. Men det er fint.

Interviewer: nej, og er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: Ja, men måske mere vores venner uden børn. Eller med større børn.

**Visitor interview no. 15.**

**Conducted on the 25th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Jeg hedder Kirsten, er 74, pensionist og fra Skanderborg. Jeg er på besøg hos et vennepar der er flyttet til Møn for nyligt.

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Med det vennepar. Erik & Jytte. De er flytet fra Skanderborg og vi har kendt hinanden i de sidste 17 år.

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi er kørt fra Møn

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Jeg havde ikke hørt om det før de talte om det for et par dage siden. Det er et flot byggeri.

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: Jeg havde ikke rigtig nogen. Jeg blev fortalt at det var et tårn man kunne gå op i, men vidste ikke hvordan det så ud, at det stod i skoven, at man skulle gå der ud eller andet. Jeg troede faktisk bare at man skulle parkere og så op. Men det er rigtig fint.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Øh, det kan jeg ikke lige svar på, på stående fod.

Interviewer: Kunne du finde på at komme igen?

Interviewee: Jeg tror ikke det bliver aktuelt, men ja, det kunne jeg vel godt. Det må være flot i de forskellige årstider.

Interviewer: Er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: Ja, det er jo rigtigt fin. Udsigten er god.

**Visitor interview no. 16.**

**Conducted on the 25th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Jeg hedder Gert, er 47 bor i benløse og arbejder på en boreplatform i Norge.

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Jeg er her med et vennepar

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: De er kommet i bil, men jeg kom fra den anden side af og har taget tog og bus.

interviewer: Og hvordan var det at komme med det offentlige?

Interviewee: Ja, det kunne jeg godt forestille mig.

interviewer: Ja og hvor har du hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: over det hele. Det er jo alle steder i nyhederne, på de sociale medier. Vi har endda hørt om det ude på platformen i Norge. Så dte når da rundt omkring.

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: Jeg tænkte at udsigten ville være rigtig flot. Flot natur og idyllisk. Jeg havde ikke forestillet mig at der ville være den der boardwalk, men det er en rigtig fin ide. Så bliver skoven nok mindre ødelagt.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: Det er svært at komme her til med det offentlige – så det må de gerne arbejde på. Der er også lidt for mange mennesker. Jeg tror jeg ville nyde det mere hvis der var færre mennesker. Det larmede overraskende meget ude i tårnet.

Interviewer: Kunne du finde på at komme igen?

Interviewee: ja, jeg vil gerne se det med sne på eller i rigtig ruskende vejr.

Interviewer: Og er det noget du ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: Ja, helt bestemt. De skal bare overveje dagen

**Visitor interview no. 17.**  
**Conducted on the 25th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Er det kun den ene af os eller vil du have os alle tre samtidig?

Interviewer: Hvad med at jeg interviewer jer en ad gangen? Det kan jo være at i har forskellige oplevelser.

Interviewee: arg ja, okay – det giver mening. Jamen jeg hedder Line, er 19 fra Køge og studerede. Vi har muligvis pjækket i dag og bruger dagen her.

Interviewer: Haha, Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Jeg er her med mine to veninder som også er studerende

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi har lånt en bil. Vi har ellers tænkt at tage bussen, men det virkede lidt besværligt.

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Fra vores venner. Eller egentlig mest fra Facebook og Instagram. Det gik helt amok lige ås snart det blev forår, så så man ikke andet end billeder af det her Skovtårn.

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: At det ville være en flot udsigt. Men også at det ville tage længere tid. Troede man kunne bruge hele formiddagen.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: Længden. Og jeg fik forlagt min billet efter vi havde scannet den. Jeg vidste ikke at man også skulle vise den ved tårnet. Det kunne de godt lige have sagt.

Interviewer: det var også det der var mit næste spørgsmål – kunne i finde på at komme igen.

Interviewee: tja.. det ved jeg faktisk ikke helt. Det er jo ikke fordi der kommer de store ændringer. Går jeg ud fra.

Interviewer: nej, og er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: ja, jeg synes lige folk skal se det

### **Visitor interview no. 18.**

#### **Conducted on the 25th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Jeg hedder Sine, jeg er 20 og kommer også fra Køge. Og er studerende ligesom Line.

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Med mine to veninder

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi er i bil

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Det samme som Line. Primært sociale medier og venner

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: Nærmest ingen. Jeg vidste at man kom op i tårnet, men troede at der ville være mere at kigge på det var sådan lidt "nå". Var det bare det? Det var også lidt forstyrrende at man kunne se og høre dem fra trætopbanerne.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: Lyden fra de andre baner og måske noget så man vidste hvad man kiggede på (red. Fra toppen)

Interviewer: det var også det der var mit næste spørgsmål – kunne i finde på at komme igen.

Interviewee: Ja, det kunne jeg nok godt

Interviewer: nej, og er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: ja, det vil jeg gerne. Men stadig fortælle pros og cons.

### **Visitor interview no. 19.**

#### **Conducted on the 25th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Thea, jeg er 20, kommer fra Faxe og er også studerende.

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: min 2 veninder, som du også lige har talt med

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi er i bil

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Nyhederne og så taler folk i Faxe ikke om andet

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: At det ville være flot, højt og rigtig fint.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: Jeg havde godt hørt om boardwalken, men synes næsten af den tur er bedre en op i tårnet. Det er meget mere naturagtigt og afslappende. Det bliver lidt crowded ude i tårnet og på toppen. Det er næsten som om man bliver tvunget videre og ikke kan nyde det på samme måde.

Interviewer: det var også det der var mit næste spørgsmål – kunne i finde på at komme igen.

Interviewee: Ja det kunne jeg godt. Kommer igen om et par uger med min familie

Interviewer: nej, og er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: Ja, helt sikkert.

### **Visitor interview no. 20.**

#### **Conducted on the 25th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: ja, jeg hedder Trine, arbejder som sygeplejeske, jeg er 36 og kommer fra Svendborg

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Jeg er her med min familie. Min mand, søn, mine forældre og min mands forældre.

Så det er en rigtig familietur

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi er i bil. Vi bor i sommerhus på Enø.

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Fra medierne tror jeg. Og så undersøgte vi området da vi skulle på ferie og så at det lige var åbnet.

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: Jeg havde egentlig kun set tårnet. Så havde forventet en flot udsigt fra toppen.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Mere info om parkering. Jeg er faktisk lige kommet retur fra bilen fordi vi ikke havde forstået at vi skulle købe p-billet. Det kom bag på mig at der var en boardwalk. Og så kunne vi godt have brugt et par hvile steder på vej der ud.

Interviewer: det var også det der var mit næste spørgsmål – kunne i finde på at komme igen.

Interviewee: Ikke lige i den nærmeste fremtid. Der er trods alt lidt af en køretur herover.

Interviewer: nej, og er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: Ja, hvis de var i området, vil jeg mene at det var et besøg værd.

### **Visitor interview no. 21.**

### **Conducted on the 25th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Jeg hedder Jonas. Jeg bor i København men kommer fra Vordingborg. Jeg er 24 og studerende.

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Jeg er her sammen med min mor.

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi er kørt i bil

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Fra venner og familie, og fra medierne selvfølgelig. Vi har mere eller mindre fulgt med fra de startede med at bygge. Så der har været konstante remindere om byggeriet.

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: At det ville være flot, god udsigt. Flot byggeri. Flot skov. Ja, altså lidt det man forventer af en tur i skoven og at komme op i et tårn. Jeg ved ikke helt hvad jeg ellers havde forventet.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: øhh.. det ved jeg ikke lige. Hvad talte vi om mor?

Interviewee 2: Det var ikke lige så meget natur som jeg havde regnet med. Det er lidt mere bygget eller konstrueret end jeg havde regnet med

Interviewee: aj det er rigtigt. For meget hegn

Interviewer: Kunne i finde på at komme igen.

Interviewee: ja, måske til efteråret når det hele er orange

Interviewer: nej, og er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: ja, det vil jeg. Det tror jeg bestemt.

### **Visitor interview no. 22.**

#### **Conducted on the 25th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Ja da, jeg hedder Hanne. Jeg er 54, bor i Haslev og jeg er førtidspensionist.

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Jeg er her sammen med 2 veninder, der også er førtidspensionister. Så vi laver tit sådan nogle ting her sammen.

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi er kørt sammen

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Hvem har ikke hørt om det? Fra medierne, mine børn har talt en del om det. Det har været en del om det i avisen.

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: At det ville være rigtig flot. Imponerende. Storslået. Jeg havde ikke tænkt over at der ville være så meget natur. Men det er rigtig fint

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: Umiddelbart ikke noget. Det er virkelig et godt initiativ. Vi skal jo normalt til udlandet for at opleve attraktioner som det her.

Interviewer: det var også det der var mit næste spørgsmål – kunne i finde på at komme igen.

Interviewee: Ja da, uden tvivl

Interviewer: nej, og er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: ja, jeg vil anbefale alle mine bekendte at tage en tur herud.

### **Visitor interview no. 23.**

#### **Conducted on the 25th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Hej, jeg hedder william, jeg er lige fyldt 13 år. Jeg bor sammen med min mor og far i Dalby og jeg går i skole og spiller fodbold.

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Jeg er her sammen med min mor og far og min farmor og farfar

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Min far kørte og min farmor og farfar kørte i deres egen bil

interviewer: Okay og hvor har du hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Vi har talt om det i skolen i dansk. Så hele min klasse har snakket om det.

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: Øh det ved jeg ikke rigtig. At det ville være højt? Ellers ved jeg det ikke.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting du skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: Der er lidt langt ud til tårnet. Turen skulle være kortere. Jeg vil faktisk heller ind og klatre i deres træer. Det kunne være fedt hvis man kunne klatre op i tårnet i stedet for at gå

Interviewer: det var også det der var mit næste spørgsmål – kunne i finde på at komme igen.

Interviewee: Så skulle det være for at klatre i træerne

Interviewer: nej, og er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: ja, måske. Det ved jeg ikke helt. Måske ville mine forældres venner synes bedre om det.

**Visitor interview no. 24.**  
**Conducted on the 25th of July 2019**

Interviewer: Vil du lige kort fortælle dit navn, alder, by og beskæftigelse?

Interviewee: Hej, jeg hedder Mary. Jeg er 27, kommer fra Fodby. Det er lige uden for Næstved mod Slagelse. Øh, jeg arbejder i detailbranchen.

Interviewer: Ja og hvem er du her med i dag?

Interviewee: Jeg er her sammen med min kæreste. Vi tænkte at vi ville bruge eftermiddagen her.

interviewer: ja og hvordan kom i hertil i dag?

Interviewee: Vi er kørt herud i bil

interviewer: Ja og hvor har i hørt om skovtårnet henne?

Interviewee: Primært gennem venner og så har jeg set rigtig mange opslag på Instagram..

Interviewer: Ja og hvilke forventninger havde i til oplevelsen her?

Interviewee: Øh at det ville være flot natur og god udsigt fra toppen. Jeg gik også ud fra at vi ville kunne købe noget at drikke. Men der er vist ikke rigtig plads til at vi kan sidde ned, så vi kører hjem i stedet for. Vi regnede også med at der ville være en del mennesker.

interviewer: Hvis der var en ting i skulle ændre eller forbedre – var der så noget? Det er helt fra i kommer til parkering/billetter mm.

Interviewee: sådan helt ærligt?

Interviewer: ja da, bare kom med det.

Interviewee: Okay, jeg er faktisk skuffet. Udsigten var kedelig, der er nogle steder det ikke virker så gennemført, hvorfor er der kameraer i naturen? Der var nogle ting der afslørede at det ikke var en rigtig naturoplevelse som jeg ellers havde regnet med.

Interviewer: det var også det der var mit næste spørgsmål – kunne i finde på at komme igen.

Interviewee: ja det kunne jeg sikkert godt, hvis der var en vennegruppe eller min familie der spurgte. Men jeg ville nok ikke selv foreslå det.

Interviewer: nej, og er det noget i ville anbefale andre?

Interviewee: ja, det vil jeg.

## Appendix 2: semi-structured Interview with Ida Roed.

- Head of communication, Camp Adventure.
- Conducted on the 24<sup>th</sup> of June

Interviewer: Vil du korte fortælle om dig selv og din rolle hos Camp Adventure?

Interviewee: Ja, det vil jeg i hvert fald gerne. Jeg sidder ansat i Camp Adventure og har været med fra starten. Det vil sige i 6 år og fra vi startede klatre parken. Min baggrund er at jeg er Cand.merc'er med speciale i virksomhedskommunikation og har arbejdet en del med oplevelsesøkonomi blandt andet på Roskilde Festival, hvor jeg var leder af det der hed underholdningssektionen på det tidspunkt. Så jeg sad med alt og var ansvarlig for 2500 mennesker på det tidspunkt der var kunstnere, performere og kreative arkitekter og designere og så videre. Alt der havde med publikum at gøre, undtagen musik. Det vil sige alt det man kunne se og opleve og mærke. Og på Camp Adventure der sidder jeg også med oplevelsesøkonomi, der sidder vi lidt med det alle sammen fordi det er det vi lever af, men jeg sidder også med kommunikationsopgaver og det kan både være kundekommunikation men også.. hvad er det vi ønsker at vise ud ad til. Og det er jo en levende organisme når man laver sådan noget.. specielt når man har sådan et iværksætterfirma som vi har, så det forandre sig hele tiden. Og.. det næste spørgsmål er.. Vi er ikke så mange så mange ansatte og det giver også fin mening med at der ikke er én der har en bestemt rolle. Vi deler lidt og skifter over til den der har de bedste kompetencer.

Interviewer: Ja så alle træder ind hvor de kan..

Interviewee: Ja, alle træder ind hvor de kan og alle er gode til et eller andet og bedre end nogle andre, sådan vil det altid være i sådan en organisation. Så indtil nu har vi været 4 faste, indtil vi åbnede Camp Adventure eller Skovtårnet. Og en helt masse freelance og nu har vi ansat 3 til fast så nu er vi oppe på de der 7 stykker og det vil nok forandre sig lidt her over det næste stykke tid i forbindelse med åbningen af tårnet. Men fordi vi er et privat firma er det hele tiden en vurdering af hvor ressourcerne skal være og vi kan ikke bare ansætte en hel masse for vi skal lige se om vi kan betale løn til dem, så mange af dem der er hos os er timelønnet eller det vi kalder freelance. Så det vil sige folk der har et andet job ved siden af, voksne mennesker, men som godt kan lide at være nede i skoven og hjælpe til, så det er sådan et side job kan man sige, som de har hos os kan man sige. Så har vi selvfølgelig nogle piger i receptionen og studerende som hjælper os lidt.

Interviewer: Vil du med dine egne ord fortælle lidt om hvad Camp adventure og Skovtårnet egentlig er?

Interviewee: Ja, Camp Adventure er en naturoplevelse. En struktureret natur oplevelse. Det er i virkeligheden bare en skov som vi har taget og fundet ekstrem flot, smuk helt almindelig dansk skov og så har vi iscenesat den ved at lave et klatreanlæg så man kan se skoven fra alle mulige vinkler, det var det vi startede med og det er danmark's største klatrepark. Så har vi bygget det man kalder en boardwalk, som er en struktureret tur gennem skoven og så har vi som det nyeste bygge skovtårnet hvor man kan komme op og se skoven fra oven. Og vi har det sådan at vi altid laver noget vi godt selv gad at besøge, så når vi laver noget tænker vi "ville jeg selv gide at glo på det der?" Hvis vi vil, så synes vi selv at vi har så god sans for kvalitet at så laver vi det på den måde. Så vi bruger os selv som pejlemærke på om det er noget vi gider. Materiale – gider vi glo på de materialer? Ja det gider vi godt. Okay det gør vi så.. så på den måde er det ikke så velovervejet. Det er klart at når man laver så stor en ting som skovtårnet, så er det meget velovervejet fordi det er en meget lang process, fra man starten med ideen til man er der hvor man er i dag, så der kan man ikke bare lige lave noget. Der har vi så valgt at tage nogle rigtig sygtige arkitekter ind indover så ja.. Men det er nok det jeg vil kalde for en struktureret naturoplevelse.

Interviewer: struktureret naturoplevelse. Det kan jeg godt lide. Og hvem er skovtårnets målgruppe?

Interviewee: Ja, det har vi jo været meget spændt på. I virkeligheden så den målgruppe vi lige nu, nu har vi jo kun været åben i 14 dage. At vi havde en klatrepark som vi kunne se var for fysiske mennesker, altså nogen der godt kunne lide at komme ud og bruge sin krop og som også godt kan lide naturen. Det var i virkeligheden en lidt afgrænset målgruppe, så ret hurtigt efter vi havde åbnet klatreparken, fandt vi ud af, vi skulle lave noget andet. Vi skulle lave noget, hvor man også kunne tage sin gamle mor og far med, sin barnevogn, og det var derfor at det blev skovtårnets form, kan man sige. Så den nye målgruppe er i virkeligheden noget vi lige skal se og føle os frem til. For lige nu er den for alle, kan man sige... alle der har lyst til at gå op i det, vi har aldrig haft en intention om at lave noget for alle, fordi vi ikke tror på, at man kan lave noget for alle, men målgruppen er i sig selv alle, indtil vi finder ud af, hvem der ikke gider komme, eller hvem der har en dårlig oplevelse, dem vil der også være nogle af, eller dem der ikke synes at det er noget specielt.

Interviewer: Jeg var faktisk imponeret da jeg var derude den weekend, at der kom både ældre og der kom folk i kørestol, der kom børn eller familier med helt små børn, og der kom, du ved, 20+ venindegrupper, og sådan noget. Det var sådan okay.

Interviewee: Ja det var bare alt ikke?

Interviewer: Ja det var rimelig sjovt at se egentlig. Og tyskere og svenskere, dem var der en del af lige da jeg ramte i hvert fald. Ja det var sjovt. Har I en vision med det I gør? Altså hvorfor gør I, det I gør og for hvem?

Interviewee: Vi har ikke nogen nedskrevet vision, jeg tror vores vision skal nok findes i vores organisation, det er så vores virksomhed. Jeg tror man kan tage mange andre iværksættervirksomheder og det der driver en iværksættervirksomhed og så kan man putte det ned over det her. Nu er det et produkt, som vi har, men det kunne også være noget andet. Vi

synes det er sjovt at udvikle noget, vi synes det er sjovt at lave noget vi igen godt selv kunne besøge, så vi tager bare os selv og bruger i det, men visionen er at udvikle stedet, kan man sige, hele tiden, indtil vi ikke kan mere, så finder vi på noget andet at udvikle.

Interviewer: Ja, så det er i princippet også jeres vision, at tænke langsigtet eller?

Interviewee: Ja altså vi plejer faktisk at sige, at vi hverken har visioner, missioner eller strategier, vi har drømme, og det er forskellen fra mange andre steder, der bruger enormt meget tid og energi og ressourcer på at lave strategier, på at sætte sig ned og sige, hvor er vi om to år? Så hyrer man nogle dyre konsulter ind og så bruger man enormt meget arbejdstid på at finde ud af det, og så bliver det et dokument, og så ser verden anderledes ud, det er det der er med verden, den forandrer sig hele tiden. Så om to år ser det helt anderledes ud, det kan være det ikke handler om penge mere, det kan også være at andre fandt på ideen, du vidste det bare ikke, altså så i virkeligheden, så det eneste, der er til at tage og føle på i vores verden, det er drømmene. Hvis du har en god drøm, umiddelbart så viser det som om at skovtårnet det var en god drøm ikke? Der er i hvert fald rigtig rigtig mange besøgende allerede nu, så vi har en drøm om at udvikle stedet. Vi kalder det bare en drøm i stedet for, men det er det de andre vil kalde en strategi, og så skriver vi ikke så meget ned, men vi har selvfølgelig en tegning af hvad vi godt kunne tænke os.

Interviewer: Har I nogle gennemgående værdier? Man kan sige lige det i laver ude ved tårnet ved Camp Adventure, så er det meget struktureret naturoplevelse, har I noget andet der er gennemgående, når I tænker, planlægger, drømmer?

Interviewee: Ja, altså vi har sådan en værdi, en virksomhedsværdi der hedder handlekraftig og det er ikke nødvendigvis fordi det behøver at være nedskrevet, det tror jeg faktisk endda det er, men det er det vi er gode til. Altså vi er gode til at handle og så handler vi på det. Vi synes i virkeligheden også selv, at vi er meget gode til at, jeg ved sgu ikke om det har noget med værdi at gøre, altså vi er... vi bruger ikke lang tid på at beslutte noget, altså hvis vi tager beslutningen, så er det sådan det er.

Interviewer: Kort fra tanke til handling.

Interviewee: Meget meget meget kort. Det er ikke sådan at vi siger, lad os lige snakke om det i næste uge, det bruger vi ikke. Altså vi snakker om det nu, er der nogle der har en ide, eller hvis der er brug for at blive lavet om på noget, og så gør vi noget ved det. Så handlekraftig er nok i virkeligheden det der gennemsyrrer organisationen og dermed også virksomheden, virksomheden og de mennesker der er i den.

Interviewer: Fedt. Så har jeg lidt omkring processen med fra tanke til handling. Hvordan ideen med skovtårnet opstod? Hvordan kommer man på sådan en?

Interviewee: Jamen ideen var faktisk, det der med at vi skulle finde på noget, der kunne være ude i en skov, som samtidig ikke begrænsede sig af en målgruppe. Og så er vi sindssygt nysgerrige vi rejser rigtig meget rundt og ser hvad andre gør. Og vi er meget på Instagram og Pintrest og sådan noget, og så faldt vi så over tårnene i Tyskland på et tidspunkt. De har nogle udsigtstårne i Tyskland og Jesper og Kasper var nede og se det og også nogle andre steder i Europa og se de tårne der var. Så kunne vi ret hurtigt finde ud af, okay det kunne egentlig være meget interessant at lave det i Danmark, for der er ikke noget i Skandinavien, altså nord for Tyskland er der ikke nogen udsigtstårne. Så udsigtstårnet i sig selv er ikke specielt specielt. Altså alle mennesker de er altid historisk set været draget af at komme op og se udover noget ikke? Men det vi så gjorde, det var at sige, okay jamen så Tyskland gjorde det på deres måde, det er ikke specielt visuelt charmerende i vores øjne, men nu hvis vi kombinere det med noget dansk ovenikøbet som er det vi er gode til i Danmark nemlig design og arkitektur, og får nogen med på vognen på den måde, kunne det så ikke være interessant? Og så gik vi i gang med først selvfølgelig at finde ud af, må vi overhovedet få lov til at bygge tårnet? I Danmark har vi en skovlov, der siger at man ikke må bygge i dansk skov og al skov er dansk skov, så det er kun tredje gang i historien at der er givet tilladelse til at bygge i fredet skov, og den fik vi så, og så snakkede vi så med arkitekterne og spurgte om de kunne tænke sig at være med, få nogle pengene up front og så tegne et tårn, det ville de gerne, og så var det egentlig bare derudaf.

Interviewer: Ja stille og roligt tempo. Jeg huske at du... vi har ude på Giffelfeldt, hvor du snakker om fx det der med bare at få et vejskilt, det var lidt besværligt fordi så var det ikke et dansk navn – eller hvordan? Er I stødt på andre af sådan nogle lidt spøjse udfordringer, hvis man kan sige det sådan?

Interviewee: Ja, altså man kan sige det sådan, den største udfordring... Danmark er jo ikke skabt til iværksætter, Danmark har stadigvæk offentligt flere ansatte og det er jo en helt anden dynamik i det offentlige system, end det er i sådan et lille firma som vores. Det vil sige, det der med at der ikke er ret langt fra ide til handling, altså hos os kan man ikke lave fejl fx, altså der er ikke noget der hedder fejl, der er, du kan godt gøre noget der var mindre smart end noget andet, men så skal du ikke gøre det igen, fordi så bliver den en fejl, men det er ikke sådan at vi dvæle ved noget, hvis der er nogen der har brugt penge på noget forkert eller et eller andet. Det er bare videre afsted, og så møder man i det offentlige system bare en helt andet proces og det er klagetider, frister, høringer osv. Osv. Osv. Det er sindssygt demotiverende i en virksomhed som vores og uforståeligt i virkeligheden, at det er offentlige kroner, der bliver brugt på mange af de her ting, dermed ikke sagt at der ikke også er nogle rigtig dygtige mennesker i det offentlige system, men det er en helt anden proces og det har i virkeligheden nok været den største udfordring, at når der er noget vi har brug for for at komme videre i processen, så bremser det, så det vil sige, hvis nu vi siger vi vil gerne gøre det her, og det kan vi få svar på om fire måneder fordi der skal høringer og frister til hver gang, så skal vi stadig betale løn til nogle mennesker i fire måneder inden vi kan nå vores mål, som gør at nu står skovtårnet, nu kan vi begynde at tjene nogle penge ind igen. Så altså det offentlige mod det private er en meget meget stor... vi er jo heller ikke politiske, dvs. Vi siger lige præcis hvad vi vil og så møder vi det offentlige system, hvor alle skal gå under... når man er alene med folk så, jamen det kan jeg ikke sige, fordi det... jeg er jo offentlig ansat, vi synes det er vildt mærkeligt, tænk ikke at kunne sige, hvad man mener. Det er jo sindssygt demotiverende på en arbejdsplads, det ville vi slet ikke kunne være i, hvis det var os. Så det er meget de der to organisationsformer, der møder hinanden. Det er nok det største, tror jeg, og så er det netop, det der med, når ja okay, nu har vi så fået et skilt, hvor der står Camp Adventure inden på sidevejen, så kommunerne... men uden på hovedvejen, der må vi ikke lave en bedre skiltning, end vi gør nu, hvilket gør at folk parkerer alle mulige mærkelige steder, kører forkert, der er total trafikkaos, og det er ikke

svingbanen, der er problemet fordi... hvis bare der var skiltet godt nok, nu har de lige ringet vejdirektoratet fordi... vi var nødt til at vente på, at de selv ringede fordi vi kan ikke beslutte at der skal være bedre skiltet, men vores gæster tror jo at det er os, der ikke skilter bedre, og det... hvis man ikke kender det offentlige system, så ved man jo heller ikke bedre kan man sige. Vores gæster ved ikke bedre, de tror bare at det er os, der ikke gider at sætte et skilt op ikke? Så på den måde, der er der... alt har hver deres styrelse, eller ministerium, og det er ja, der er mange ting, hvor at man godt kan mærke, at der er meget at langt fra at være offentlig ansat i et ministerium til ude i virkeligheden, som er den virkelighed som vi er i. I går fx der skulle jeg prøve at finde ud af, hvordan vi kunne få nedlagt flyveforbud med droner i vores område, det kan man ikke, og så ringede jeg til trafikstyrelsen, det er dem der laver sådan et dronekort, og han var sådan ja det kunne... helt stille og roligt... godt se, de sad også og var ved at opdatere dronereglerne og om et år vil det nok være anderledes, og bare sådan et år?! Hvorfor kan du ikke bare gå ind og markere det, det er privat skov, der er en risiko for at folk får en drone i hovedet, der bliver bare fløjet rundt med dem, og du kan bare køre ind et eller andet sted og sætte din drone op, så vi kan ikke, med mindre de laver sådan et kort, hvor der står at man ikke må flyve, så kan det være at der er en der får en drone i hovedet, fordi at... ja... folk flyver alligevel med dem, med mindre der står at man ikke må. Så et år måske, der kan jo være mange der når at få en drone i hovedet ikke? Altså du ved,, det kan jeg simpelthen ikke forstå, det kan jeg simpelthen ikke forstå at man ikke kan arbejde hurtigere. Det undrer mig, altså sådan noget ikke? Det er sådan noget der er helt demotiverende... så er det sådan noget med igen, fx sådan noget med faglige organisationer altså nu begynder folk så at klage over alle mulige mærkelige ting, som er sådan okay hvis alternativet var at der ikke kom noget tårn op, hvad vil du så helst? Bare dig og din lille faglige organisation synes det er synd for dig, men hvad med alle de andre, der havde en god oplevelse? Eller sådan det kan vi heller ikke forstå, altså hvorfor ikke bare... vi tvinger ingen til at komme, man kan jo bare lade være med at komme, hvis man synes det er for dyrt, så lad være med at komme, altså vi tvinger dig jo ikke til det, at stå og skabe sig dernede, det er sådan... men det er måske ikke lige så meget med processen at gøre, men jo altså...

Interviewer: Men det er nogle fede pointer. Og så lidt omkring hele oplevelsen derude, du snakkede også selv om, at det var noget du arbejder, generelt arbejder meget med og det gør i

her. Er der noget I aktivt er inde over eller er I også ude i at oplevelsen skaber lidt sig selv, når man laver en board walk og et tårn ude i træerne?

Interviewee: Altså det er klart at vi... vi har jo valgt at gøre det i en skov, fordi vi synes, at skoven i sig selv kan noget, og jeg oplever i virkeligheden, at der er... inden vi kom ud på det område i den skov, der var der jo ikke nogen mennesker derude, altså der er jo ikke nogen, der bare kørte derud og gik en tur i skoven, selvom det har man jo i virkeligheden ret til i hele Danmark at gå en tur på skovstierne. Der var ikke nogen mennesker. Så man kunne sige vi havde jo en kulisse, altså enhver scenograf ville være misundelig på vores kulisse, der hele tiden ændrer bagtæppe ikke? Og vi synes selv det var fantastisk, når vi gik alene rundt i den der skov. Hvis man lige lavede en pæn gang hen her, men det var ikke hvor man skulle gå, så bestemt at den skulle gå forbi bestemte steder, og det er jo i virkeligheden det oplevelsesøkonomien også er. Så man kan sige skoven i sig selv er jo en oplevelse værd, og så prøver vi så bare at tilføjer den noget kvalitet, produkter og noget visuelt pirrende og anlægge det, altså vi laver en sikker tur i skoven, du kan ikke fare vild. Der er rigtig mange der er bange for at fare vild, i store skove der går man ikke ud medmindre man kan vide, hvor man kommer tilbage, man er bange for at fare vild ikke? Så det er klart det gør vi, på den måde.

Interviewer: Man kan sige det er jo også lidt den oplevelse I ønsker at give jeres gæster ikke? Den som I selv har haft ud i skoven.

Interviewee: Ja.

Interviewer: Og hvad så når dagen er slut for dem, for gæsterne? Er der så en speciel følelse eller tanke I gerne vil have de går hjem med?

Interviewee: Altså... i klatreparken, der ved vi, at størstedelen af dem der går hjem, de har brugt deres krop fysisk ude i naturen, været udenfor en hel dag, blevet påvirket af farverne, altså sanserne er blevet påvirket og der kan vi se, at de går derfra med et andet udtryk i ansigtet, et positivt andet udtryk i ansigtet. Det kræver ikke lige så meget at besøge skovtårnet, men det vil

stadigvæk for nogen være grænseoverskridende at skulle gå op fx, hvis man har højdeskræk ikke? Altså så vi har en ide om at naturens påvirkninger påvirker dig, når du er sådan et sted som hos os, og skønheden påvirker dig. Altså mennesker har godt af at se på noget smukt, de har også godt af at være ude i nature, de har også godt af at røre sig, ligesom prøve at kombinere det, vi har ikke... vi beslutter ikke hvordan altså... vi sætter ikke et målestoksforhold for oplevelsen, det gør vi ikke.

Interviewer: Det er der jo nogen der arbejder med... Omkring kommunikation og lidt omkring det her med I gik viralt, det var jo lidt ekstremt, hvor tidligt var I ude at melde nyheden ud?

Interviewee: men faktisk så er det jo... der er mange der tror vi er 30 mennesker herinde, fordi vi er kommet så langt, som vi er, men den korte version den er at da vi ligesom havde lavet det her tårn, på tegnebrættet og arkitekterne havde lavet det man kalder en rendering, altså som er de billeder som er hele processen indtil tårnet... som ligner rigtige billeder, men det er en tegning og dem har vi haft hele vejen igennem, hele tiden, hver gang vi har fortalt om, hvad det var vi gerne ville lave så har vi kunne vise en tegning, det er det her. Så det er ikke bare ord, vi har visuelt kunne bygge det op. Så skrev vi til et magasin der hedder Dizeen, som er sådan et design magasin, og hvis man er i det, så er man... det er the shit inde i denne her verden her arkitektur, design verden, hvis de bringer noget på deres sociale medier så er det noget ikke? Og de var bare sådan, det vil vi vildt gerne bringe og vi var sådan, når men vi skal lige finde ud af om det overhovedet bliver til noget og om vi har råd til det og finansiering og plads og sådan noget, og så da vi havde det så fik de så lov til at bringe en lille video på deres Instagram og så gik der en halv time, så ringede Politiken og sagde de ville gerne være de første i Danmark til at bringe det, de ville gerne ligesom hele tiden følge med processen og være de første til at bringe det i nyhederne, og sådan er det jo i Danmark, at hvis man gerne vil noget med kultur så er det i Politiken man skal være.

Interviewer: Det er ikke et dårligt sted at være i hvert fald.

Interviewee: og alle kigger på Politiken, når de kigger på noget kultur, så på den måde så er det den måde man laver journalistisk nu om dage ikke? Og så det kan man sige, det er den danske del, det er derfor vi også har været bragt så meget i medierne herhjemme, men det er helt klart det

generelle, der har gjort at også er kommet ud til udlandet, og bredt sig efter Dizeen havde sendt den her, så postede World Economic Forum nogenlunde den samme video, det har de faktisk gjort et par gange, og den fik ja lynhurtigt 6 millioner views og delt 140 tusinde gange, og sådan en lille virksomhed som vores, der er det jo ret vildt, der kommer selvfølgelig også en masse negativt, sådan er det når man kommer ud til den store brede masse, men det har i virkeligheden været det der har været processen. Så hver gang der har været noget nyt så har Politiken fået det og Dizeen ville også have mulighed for at bringe det og så er det gået, ja viralt på den måde og så tror jeg også at vi har været heldige, at vi lige har ramt en bølge, vi har arbejdet med det her i fem år og der er vi kommet i den her klimabølge og affaldsbølge og pas på naturen bølge og der har vi lige ramt derned i kan man sige, følelsen af at vi skal værne om naturen, vi skal mere ud i naturen og på den måde...

Interviewer: Ja sådan en god trend man lige er ramt ned i...

Interviewee: Ja det tror jeg, som ikke er planlagt men nogle gange er det også bare meget tilfældigt, når man laver sådan noget her, hvor rammer det lige ikke? Og så er vi jo også first mover på og det er bare sådan når man er first mover så er det mere interessant for medierne, end hvis du er nummer to. Så ja det er vel tre år siden historien blev meldt ud og så har vi så formået at pirre medierne hele tiden, vi har også hele tiden tænkt internationalt, så vi har jo hele tiden været... haft fokus på det store i hele og ud af Danmark også og så har vi tænkt så skal indad nok også følge med ikke? Og det har nok været den rigtige strategi, så vi har ikke brugt så mange ressourcer på alle mulige lokale tiltag, men mere fokuseret på det ud af landet, her på de store mediebureauer og aviser, så det tror jeg har været en god strategi.

Interviewer: Det lyder som om, det er lykkedes meget godt i hvert fald. Nu når I er åbnet, I har jo kørt meget, eller man har jo... nyhedsværdien i det og nu åbner vi og nu er vi klar og hvad så nu her, når I er åbnet? Kører I stadig på nyhedsværdien? Men I kan så også sige at så laver I multiarena eller har i hvert fald været ude med planer om det, så er det stadig sådan fortsat nyhedsværdien i det, I kører på?

Interviewee: Ja altså, sådan en virksomhed som vores, der er det alle pengene der ligger i det tårn lige nu, så vi er sindssygt afhængige af, at selvfølgelig er vi afhængige af en masse gæster, men vi er også meget taknemmelige over al den PR vi har fået, fordi det er jo gratis markedsføring, det er ikke nogle penge vi skal ud at betale for, al PR er gratis, der er ikke noget af det du selv betaler for og det betyder selvfølgelig rigtig rigtig meget, fordi så kan vi få nogle penge ind i kassen igen og for at vi kan udvikle stedet, så skal vi have nogle, tjene nogle penge ind ikke? Og hvad var det du ville spørge om? Det har jeg allerede glemt...

Interviewer: Det lyder meget godt hahah, ja om I stadig kører på nyhedsværdi eller om I arbejder videre... men har jeg blandt andet været ude at snakke med nogle af jeres gæster, hvor de var sådan, nå ja men vi har hørt at der var et tårn, vi har ingen ide om, om vi parkerer lige ved siden af tårnet og går op eller om vi kommer igennem board walken og igennem... så det er bare lidt sjovt at se, at de vidste faktisk ikke hvad det var, altså hvad de egentlig fik ud over at de kom op...

Interviewee: Det er helt klart selve tårnet som er sådan arkitektonisk værk, det har været det, der har været fortællingen, det er selve tårnet, det at komme op og det er sådan set også derfor vi begynder at sige at det koster 125kr. At komme ind, jamen Adventure er sådan er helhedsoplevelse for hele området ikke? Og der kan man sige, der har medierne nok været sådan, medierne bestemmer selv, hvilken historien de synes er interessant og så kan man sige, så er det vores opgave, at kunne forklare, hvad er der ellers i området og der har vi bare lært også med klatreparken, det tager vi rimelig stille og roligt, fordi den bedste omtale, det er dem der går hjem og siger, nå men der er også en lang bro derude eller sådan så var der nogle steder man kunne sidde og spise ikke? Fordi medierne de tager det de vil, folk læser det de vil, der er virkelig også mange der slet ikke går ind på vores hjemmeside og det er også sådan lidt vildt, synes jeg jo, man kommer derud og aner ikke hvornår vi er åben, man aner ikke hvornår hvad det koster, man har slet ikke undersøgt noget inden man tager derud, det synes jeg er ret vildt egentlig. Men på den måde der er vi bare... sidste år der havde vi... der havde vi 17.000 gæster måske ikke? I sæsonen i klatreparken, fra april til efterår ja oktober, og jeg tror vi har haft 25.000 gæster indtil videre på tårnet, altså det vil sige... på tårnet alene, på hvad tre uger? Så det er jo en hel anden volumen, det betyder også det er en meget meget større gæsteskare, vi har helt andre mennesker, altså hvor

vores tidligere klientel var anderledes, så er der jo nogen nu, der siger, hvorfor skal vi betale penge for at gå op i et tårn? Du ved, hvor det er sådan... et igen vi har ikke tvunget dig til at komme, to det er ikke alle der kan se skønheden i et tårn, et arkitektonisk bygningsværk, det er ikke alle, så derfor er det heller ikke for alle, og den målgruppe skal måske til at justere sig lidt nu ikke? Vi behøver ikke at have alle med, vi har aldrig bedt om at få alle med, hvis vi fik 100.000 gæster på et år, så ville det være fint ikke? Og nu er der kommet 25.000 på tre uger ikke? Så... og vi forestiller os at vi holder åben alle dage hele året ikke? På en eller anden måde, så... ja men altså så lige nu kører vi på nyhedsværdien og det tror jeg vi kan et stykke tid, så går vi selvfølgelig i gang med andre kanaler, der kan støtte op om det ikke? Men lige nu, der de første måneder, der tror jeg... ja altså det er jo sådan, at vi nærmest havde håbet på en regnvejrsdag ikke? Bare lige for at få lidt fred, ja nemlig... så vi lige kunne trække vejret igen.

Interviewer: Det lyder som om, I skal kigge længe efter den. Hvis man tjekker vejrudsigten i hvert fald. Og så om I har modtaget noget feedback fra jeres gæster? Du snakkede lidt om det her med, at nogle de synes de ikke synes de skal betale 125kr for det...

Interviewee: Altså det har vi, og det er jo i virkeligheden meget dejligt, specielt dem der skriver, bare skriver ind til os og siger sådan hey I skal lige kigge på det der, eller der var et bræt der var løst eller et eller andet ikke? Altså det er jo de gode gæster, det er j dem der godt ved at man skal jo bare skrive pænt og stille og roligt og tale ordentligt ikke? Og så har vi vores TripAdvisor, Facebook, jeg har ikke en gang nået at kigge på dem, fordi vi har...

Interviewer: Jeg tror ikke der er kommet så meget på Facebook...

Interviewee: Er der ikke det? Nej og det er lidt sjov...

Interviewer: Det er mere klatreparken...

Interviewee: Det kan godt være og det der er lidt sjovt det er, at det der Google my business, der kan jeg se, der er virkelig mange der går ind og rater det, så det er der åbenbart mange, der

bruger, jeg ved ikke om, det er fordi man måske har søgt på Google med vejvisningen og så spørger den, vil du rate stedet? Det tror jeg måske er sådan noget, for ellers så... det er vi ikke så vant til, så TripAdvisor og så det der Google der, der er rimelig mange, alt muligt der ikke? Og det er meget forskelligt altså, og det skal vi også lige vende os til fordi med klatrebakken, der havde vi igen så meget afgrænset klientel, som var... det kan jeg jo godt sige... sådan folk med arbejde, der gerne ville give deres børn en naturoplevelse, tit folk, der er vant til at rejse, der kommer i store biler ikke? Som man kunne snakke og ja, som satte pris på naturen og sådan noget ikke? Og pludselig så er det jo også dyrt at komme derned med en hel familie og klatre en hel dag ikke? Så åbnede vi skovtårnet, det koster 125 hvis man har booket derhjemmefra, det er lidt flere der kan være med og vi har bare en kultur i Danmark som er sådan en brokkekultur og sådan en jeg har lov til ytre mig om alt uden filter, og det skal vi lige lære også at håndtere tror jeg, fordi vi er også bare helt almindelige mennesker, vi skal lige lære det der med at... ikke at fare i flint over nogle mennesker, hvor man... det er sådan noget hvor man bare skal sige okay, det havde du brug for at sige eller sådan, og så have fokus på alle dem der vender tilbage og synes de har haft en fantastisk smuk oplevelse eller ude af kroppen oplevelse, altså der er jo også... der er heldigvis flest mennesker som har syntes at det er sindssygt smukt ikke? Og fantastisk at det her tårn står midt i ude i en skov ikke? Men der er også nogle hvor det bare... ja... der er også nogle der giver os en stjerne, de har ikke været der, men de synes det er for dårligt at man ikke har ledsagerkort fx, altså sådan noget og det kan vi jo ikke bruge til noget, altså det er pisseirriterende, men sådan er det bare... ja

Interviewer: Ja jeg kender til det hahah

Interviewee: Ja du kender alt til det ikke? Som i rigtig rigtig meget, det har jeg også snakket med Mette og Mette om, fordi jeg ved hvad I får derude altså... og der har de jo ikke en gang været, men jeg synes det er rigeligt det vi får ikke? Og vi har gået og bygget på det i fem år, det er vores lille barn ikke? Og igen har man lyst til at skrive, bare blive væk, altså...

Interviewer: Du behøver ikke at komme, have en god dag.

Interviewee: Altså ligesom der var en der ringede i går, noget med noget handikappet, og det var strengt og alt muligt, altså jeg er alene med to børn, mine børn er ikke kommet ud at rejse før i år, men jeg tuder jo ikke over det, det er jo ikke sådan at jeg laver en demonstration omkring det eller klager eller siger alle dem der har mange penge, de ikke må rejse for det er synd for mig, at jeg skal kigge på dem der gerne vil rejse, altså, jeg brokker mig jo ikke over det, jeg har ikke engang ondt i røven over det, jeg synes det er skønt, at der er nogle der har råd til det, men hvorfor så ikke være glad for dem der synes det er en fed oplevelse, hvorfor er det man skal være en idiot? Altså jeg forstår det simpelthen overhovedet ikke, og den del skal vi lige sådan...

Interviewer: og så folk de har også mere en tendens til at... altså folk der har haft en god oplevelse, skriver ikke nødvendigvis altid, for de går jo bare hjem, og tænker det var en fed oplevelse og så siger de det videre, hvor dem der har haft noget negativt eller noget de er sure over, den kommer helt sikker ikke?

Interviewee: Fuldstændigt, ja

Interviewer: Forventer I folk de kommer igen flere gange om året?

Interviewee: Hmm ja vi... egentlig så tænkte vi ikke de gjorde det, men det vi kan høre det er, at der er rigtig mange der siger at de kommer igen når det hele bliver grønt fx, så håber vi jo de siger de kommer igen, når det hele brunt, det ved vi ikke endnu, men jeg havde egentlig tænkt at det var noget man var i en gang og det vil det jo sikkert også være i mange tilfælde, men igen så er vi tilbage i det med scenografien ikke? At bagtæppet det skifter jo hele tiden, så det er en anden oplevelse, ligeså snart det bliver tæt, så vil du jo gå inde i den her tætte skov, et lukket rum, og så oplevelsen af at komme op i det fri, hvor lige nu er der jo stadigvæk luft og man kan se tårnet på lang afstand osv. Ikke? Så ja...

Interviewer: Jeg tror jeg snakkede med 10 hold gæster da jeg var derude, jeg tror 9 ud af 10 de tænkte at det ville komme igen senere...

Interviewee: Det er ret vildt ikke?

Interviewer: Jo det er ret vildt, det er sådan lidt nå okay, også fordi der var meget forskel på hvilke slags mennesker det var jeg talte med, så det var sådan lidt sjovt. Den feedback I modtager fra gæster og anmeldere, anmeldere måske nok, ikke dem der bare brokker sig for at brokke, men kommer med noget konstruktivt eller noget... er det noget I regner med at benytte jer af?

Interviewee: Ja og man kan sige det gode ved det er, at alt det vi får, det er nok vi selv også ved, altså det er meget tit sådan nogle detaljer de ser, som egentlig også er nogle detaljer vi ser, men som vi bare ikke bare ikke har nået, til sidste var det jo sådan nu åbner vi det tårn ikke? Er vi færdige med tårnet? Ja vi er færdige med tårnet, men der er jo alt det udenom, og det er jo igen det der med at alle tænker de er færdige med tårnet, men alt det som der er ingen, der ser... hjemmeside, billettering, hvordan skal det se ud, hvordan skal det skiller, alt det der og der er vi bare sådan, der har vi også bare lært at sådan, det tager vi med tiden, eller det kan vi gøre, når vi er åbnet-agtigt ikke? Og det er så det vi gør nu, det er detaljerne nu og det ser gæsterne også, og det er fint, det er bare fedt at de skriver det, for så er der mulighed for at skrive at det er vi faktisk... eller det er godt I siger det, vi har lige sat de skilte op eller sådan ikke? Så jeg tror ikke vi har fået nogen, hvor vi slet ikke havde tænkt det selv, men det er klart at vi er anerkender det og siger tusind tak og dejligt, at I ville skrive det, så på den måde bruger vi dem, men der er ikke noget vi sådan ikke selv vidste.

Interviewer: Og så lidt til slut med, hvordan er jeres samarbejde med Visit Sydsjælland Møn? Ja bare sådan lidt, hvordan har I samarbejdet med dem op til, jeg ved at I satte nogle billeder på kryds og tværs og der er blevet lavet nogle posts...

Interviewee: Ja, altså ift. Skovtårnet?

Interviewer: Ja, skovtårnet.

Interviewee: Jamen, hvordan har vi det?

Interviewer: Er det primært Mike (red. Marketing ansvarlig) du måske har snakket med?

Interviewee: Altså jeg var ude den dag, vi åbnede, der var jeg ude kl. Kvart over fem om morgenen med nogle fotografer som Visit Sydsjælland havde, dem der hedder Frameworks, dem kender du også? De drenge der, og det har primært været det, vil jeg sige.

Interviewer: Så primært billeder?

Interviewee: Ja

Interviewer: og lige et post i ny og næ?

Interviewee: Ja, men det har vi jo ikke rigtig noget med at gøre...

Interviewer: Nej

Interviewee: Altså det er jo ikke sådan at vi ensretter kommunikation på den måde, Visit Sydsjælland har også lavet de her VNR, altså sådan nogen world news, et eller andet, som vi jo kom rigtig langt ud med, altså med... så det har været det, og så de billeder der, og så bruger vi dem jo lidt jo, altså vi bruger hinandens billeder også så... jeg har også brugt nogle af de billeder og sendt ud med dem ikke? Fordi jeg synes det var nogle meget flotte farver, men altså

Interviewer: Så ikke det store sådan?

Interviewee: Nej det synes jeg ikke, og i virkeligheden så er det jo lidt... igen man har en organisation og så er der en anden organisation og så skal man ligesom koble de to ting...

[interruption]

Interviewee: Jamen igen, så tror jeg også lidt det der med, hvad er det for en organisation man er i? Det er sådan noget jeg altid har syntes var mega spændende også da jeg læste min [cand.mer.?], hvad er det når man er i en slags organisation, der skal samarbejde med en anden, som har en anden politisk dagsorden, hvordan kan man gøre det? Altså fordi man bliver... bruger enormt hurtigt tid på... det kan vi ikke, det kan vi godt, og hvorfor kan I ikke det? Og hvorfor kan I det? Altså i stedet for at holde fokus på bolden og ligesom sige, okay i burde jo alle sammen have samme mål, få nogle flere gæster eller få bla. bla. et eller andet ikke? Og der er det tit at vi gør tingene... det er den korte version, det er bare meget meget nemmere for os at gøre tingene selv, altså...

Interviewer: Det går hurtigere?

Interviewee: Det går hurtigere, vi har kompetencerne til det synes vi også selv ikke? Altså vi skal ikke spørge nogen om lov, vi skal ikke vente på at der er nogle andre der beslutter eller et eller andet eller høre på nogle politiske dagsordener altså vi har jo hele tiden sagt at det her tårn det bliver en succes, så vi har ikke... nu er det ikke kun Visit Sydsjælland, men generelt hvorfor fanden, hvorfor putter I ikke noget energi i det, fordi det her vil jo naturligvis hive hele området op, Visit har aldrig haft så mange gæster som det havde den her weekend, altså du ved, vi havde set den komme, og alle andre har bare siddet sådan lad os nu lige vente og se, i stedet for at tro på tingene ikke?

Interviewer: Eller bare give den gas fra første dag...

Interviewee: Nemlig, der er vi mere sådan gør noget, så tror vi på det, ellers ville vi ikke gøre det, så kaster vi alt hvad vi har i det ikke? Energi og tid og kræfter og... ja så...

Interviewer: Fedt, det var egentlig i korte træk det jeg havde.

## Appendix 3: Participant observations

The experiences of the three participants are divided in before, during & after their visit.

Participant #1 visited the Forest Tower on the 14<sup>th</sup> of July

Participant #2 & #3 visited the Forest Tower on the 16<sup>th</sup> of August 2019.

### **Before: Expectations to the experience and visit**

#### **Participant #1**

Jeg forventer at det er varmt fordi vejret er godt. Jeg har taget vand med for jeg ved ikke om det er muligt at få vand derude. Jeg ved ikke meget om oplevelsen, men jeg har set billeder på de sociale medier og ved godt hvordan tårnet set ud og at man skal gå op. Jeg har kigget på deres hjemmeside, men er stadig ikke sikker på hvordan man kommer ud til tårnet. Parkere man ved siden af? Er der en sti? Vi er nødt til at tage bilen for det er for langt fra byen og bus stoppe stedet. Jeg forventer at det er gennem tænkt or godt organiseret. Jeg regner også med at det er afslappende som alle andre skove. Jeg regner med at udsigten er smuk.

#### **Participant #2**

Adventure:

- Meget højt
- Fysisk krævende
- Familier er target group
- Ligger in the middle of nowhere, svært at komme dertil med andet end bil
- Er attraktiv i alle sæsoner, da naturen skifter
- Jeg forestiller mig at det er et kunstprojekt

#### **Participant #3**

Jeg synes, at tårnet er smukt og en fantastisk attraktion for området! Jeg har set mange billeder af stedet online, hvor jeg har lagt mærke til tårnets arkitektur og form.

Det er et tårn som folk kender, og folk taler om. Jeg har haft lyst til - og haft løse planer om at besøge stedet, fordi det tiltaler mig som person. Jeg kan godt lide kunst, smukke steder og at være i naturen, og så kan jeg godt lide at tage billeder og forevige eks. 'Smukke steder'.

Jeg tror, at det bliver en smuk og æstetisk oplevelse måske a la Olafur Eliasons værker, som jeg synes formår at slå benene væk under en. Jeg tror at tårnet på en eller anden måde kan sidestilles mere med en kunstoplevelse, end en traditionel museumsoplevelse.

Jeg tror mere, at man bare 'er' og ikke stiller så mange spørgsmål.

(Hvordan) bliver et besøg til tårnet lærerig? Er der formidling på stedet, mere end det naturen byder ved 'bare' at være i den? Eller er der klassiske skilte?

Er der noget man kan læse om bygningsprocessen, kunstneren bag eller området og den natur man bevæger sig i - eller er det mere ment som en slags eskapistisk oplevelse hvor man bare er og går mod toppen?

Jeg forventer en oplevelse uden sammenligning (noget unikt) og noget, jeg ikke har oplevet før. Men på samme tid, har jeg har hørt på de sociale medier, at det er dyrt, og det har jeg med mig i baghovedet inden besøget, selvom jeg selv ikke tænker at det er urimeligt. Bliver 'under' oplevelsen påvirket af dette?

Jeg har set tårnet på billeder, men jeg har ingen forventning eller viden om området, og hvordan man kommer hen til tårnet eller hvordan man egentlig kommer op. Er det behageligt at gå derop eller bliver man stakåndet? Er det for alle?

Mine forventninger er, at det bliver oplevelsen værd, men jeg ved ikke, om det er noget, man kun besøger en gang. Jeg tænker over, om hvordan stedet kan anvendes i forskellige årstider og om hvordan stedet kan markedsføres i de 4 årstider.

### **During: Visiting the Forest Tower**

#### **Participant #1**

#### **Collected on the X**

Hvor pokker skal man dreje henne? Hvorfor er der ikke noget skilt?

Åh, det er da godt vi lige har fået skiftet dæk – det kommer nok til at tage lidt tid. Jeg vil ikke køre for stærkt. (red. til grus/jord vejen)

Hvor ser det sejt ud!

Hvad er det her nu? (red. Parkeringsbom)

Wow 50 kr!?

Jeg forventer en flot udsigt og så er jeg spændt på om der er andet. Hun har tjekket hjemmesiden inden og så at man skulle bestille tid. Men ved ikke hvorfor? Hun forventer at man kan tage et godt billede og har set at man af hendes venner der tager billeder af arkitektoniske ting har været her. De har smidt billeder op på indtagram. Hun forventer også at man kan få en splint i fingeren. Det er dyrt hvis det bare er trut i røven.

Hun har hørt at det er for alle – men kommentere på at første stigning på boardwalken er stejl. Der mangler noget madpakkespisning ved tårnet. Kan man købe kombi-billet med tårn og klatring? Boardwalken er en god måde at opbygge suspense på. Men lidt underligt at man ikke kan se tårnet. Overvejer om klatrebanerne der er ved siden af mon er irriterende for oplevelsen. Det ser sjovt ud! Måske skulle vi prøve det en dag

Hun kan godt lide at de holder det i træ. Synes turen er lidt lang, hvis den skulle være for alle, hvorfor er der ikke flere bænke?

Der er det!? Det er flot!

Der tales om pris for oplevelsen og sammenligner med tivoli – Julie mener at man får meget mere for pengene i Tivoli. Hun troede tårnet var bygget af træ, ikke stål. Det er flot.

Hun kan godt lide boardwalk, men er også lidt ironisk omkring det.

Ups, og så fik vi lov til at besøge skoven rigtigt. Men kun i et sekund.

Om buen siger hun: Wow, se der! Det er lidt underligt, men meget dekorativt

Der er et hegn igen, så må vi snart være der. Hvor langt har vi gået nu?

Arh, så nu stoler de ikke på os – vi burde hoppe over hegnet

Vi er nu på vej op i tårnet.

Ser skriften på stålet, man bliver lidt rundtosset fordi det her går ind (red. Yderste gelænder)

Vi er halvvejs oppe. Hold kæft der er lang op! Det er fedt med træerne i midten. Lægger mærke til at de handicappede med kørestole vendte om. Julie føler sig sikker. Udsigten er flot og det er fedt

at der er mere vej tilbage. Det er lidt klamt at kigge ned. "Hej Sydsjælland". Vil tage et billede og siger på afstand "flyt dig dame". Gad vide om der er lys på i forhold til fly?

Vi er nået til toppen.

Der er godt nok lang ned. Det snurrer lidt i benene.

Jeg er sådan lidt "nå" er det det? Det er lidt kedeligt – træerne er flotte. Jeg kan ikke sætte mig og nyde udsigten. Jeg kan gå en runde og så er det det. Jeg ved ikke rigtig hvad jeg ser på. Motorvejen larmer, så det tager lidt af charmen. Jeg kan godt lide at der ikke er nogen for så kan jeg tage et flot billede. Ville hade når der var mange mennesker, for så kan jeg ikke tage et godt billede. Jeg ved ikke hvad jeg skal lave her. Jeg bruger mine øjne og ører – hører motorvejen og ser grønne ting. Sammenligner det med ..., hvor er hvad? Vi ser en mand med kikkert – Det var smart!? Jeg ville have dårlig samvittighed over ikke at nyde det nok, jeg føler mig forpligtet til at brug længere tid end jeg har brug for. I virkeligheden skal jeg bruge 30 sek. Til at tage 4 billeder, bliver kun hængende her fordi vi taler sammen. Men jeg ville gerne se det i de forskellige årstider. Måske man kunne lave et kort med 4 opstigning? Julie ville betale for oplevelsen i udlandet, men synes her er kedeligt. Placer det ved Møns klint, så er det muligvis noget andet. Eller måske i Spanien. Hvis det var i udlandet, ville jeg researche det på en anden måde og finde ud af om det virkelig var noget jeg havde brug for at opleve.

Vi går på boardwalken som ophører og starter lidt længere henne. Hun kommenterer lidt sarkastisk at wow, der fik vi lov til at træde på skovbunden, men kun lige hurtigt.

Jeg kan virkelig godt lide den her indgang. Wow, se nu der. Det er lidt underligt, men meget dekorativt.

Er der studierabat? (nej) Det er virkelig et minus. Rabat øger helt sikkert chance for om jeg kommer igen. Nå nu nærmere vi os. Der hegnet igen, så vi må da snart nærme os. Hvor langt har vi gået endnu? Okay, så gik de amok med hegnet. Arh de stoler sikkert ikke på os – vi burde overveje at hoppe over hegnet.

Hun taler om en ældre gruppe mennesker. De gik langsomt og virkede det ikke som om de var lidt ligeglade med at vi prøvede at komme forbi.

From the top of the tower: Der er ikke noget jeg kan kende. Jeg kan ikke engang se hvor vi har købt vores billet. Ville jeg betale 150 kr. for det her? Det tror jeg ikke. Udsigten er ikke rigtig noget vspektakulært og jeg er helt ærligt en smule skuffet

Julie forslag er at man laver kilte "Bangkok den vej" "Pandaer i København, den vej". Prisen er jo næsten en måneds fitness. Måske skulle der være en præmie for børnene for at nå til tops.

Det er da lidt småfarligt med boardwalken – jeg var lidt ved at gå ved siden af (Et sted der ikke var hegn). Platformen ser sej ud.

Generelt synes jeg det virker som et halvhjertet forsøg på at skabe noget der ikke helt er. Det tog 1 time og 15 min. Den "rigtige" tid på 2 timer forstår jeg ikke helt hvordan man skal bruge. Det er et tårn på Bornholm der er pænere og gratis.

### **Participant #2 & Participant #3**

**Conducted on the 16<sup>th</sup> of August 2019. The transcription have been limited to the theme which regard the project.**

Participant #2: Ej hvor er her hyggeligt

Participant #3: Ej hvor dufter det godt det kaffe der – lad os tage en når vi kommer tilbage.

Participant #2: Næste toilet er om 3,2 km. Ej det kunne være hyggeligt at man lå der i hængekøjen og fik det der med i baggrunden.

Participant #3: ej det er lidt svært med den billet. Haha. Ej her er godt nok fint her var.

Participant #2: ja virkelig.

Participant #3: er det der det er b & b?

Participant #2: Det er ellers virkelig hyggeligt. Jeg forsøgte at stemple billetten i stedet for at scanne

Participant #3: jeg havde ikke forventet at der var alt det her nu

Participant #2: jeg havde slet ikke forventet at der var så meget. Troede der var almindlige sko og at der slet ikke ar så meget der lå op til det. Det er godt de har lagt metal så man ikke skøjter rundt her. Ej hvor er det grønt.

Participant #3: Beautiful. Ej det er godt de har lavet de her billeder, så kan man også lære lidt. Jeg kan godt lide at komme ud og gå lidt.

Participant #2: ej jeg ville så gerne ind og klatre (Støj hører fra klatrebanerne). Ej hvor de larmer. Wow, er det juletræer? Er det ikke lidt underligt?

Participant #3: der er da en juletræsplantage. Der er da også en kælk på klatrebanen, som man kan køre på. Der er det, jeg kunne høre nogle råbe

Participant #2: vil du ikke tage et billede af mig der går? Der skal bare være grønt hele vejen omkring mig. Ej det er meget fedt at de får turen til at gå rundt om træerne og lader naturen bestemme. Ej den er jo giga, den der klatrebane. Det kan være man skal prøve det en dag, hvis man kan komme herved uden bil. Nå. Går man ikke den samme vej tilbage? Jeg vil også lige pointere at jeg mangler nogle skraldespande, så jeg kan smide mit tyggegummi ud. Vi skal lige tage nogle billeder her.

Participant #3: Det er en flot bue de har lavet.

Participant #2: det er et godt sted til et billede. Vi må være der lige om lidt, men jeg kan ikke se tårnet. Nå, så er vi der allerede nu? Det tog ikke lang tid.

Participant #3: De er ikke særlig pæne de der bænke, men det behøver de jo heller ikke være. Hvorfor er der et hegn her, det virker lidt underligt, gør det ikke?

Participant #2: jeg er spændt på at se om det påvirker mine ben at gå op. Hvor går man op henne?

Participant #3: jeg tror bare man går ind derhenne. Fedt der er lidt info om construction.

Participant #2: det er sjovt at der er kaffe herude, når der ikke er noget toilet. Skal man brug billetten for at komme op i tårnet, for jeg ved ikke hvor jeg har gjort af min. Hvorfor er der ikke noget toilet? Går man ind og ud sammen sted? Jeg synes godt de kunne have informeret om at man skulle gemme billetten. De sagde de slet ikke noget om.

Participant #3: jeg er helt vild med det her, det er lige noget for mig. Der er sørget for at alle kan være med. Men selv rullestole og barnevogne. Men det må være lidt hårdt at køre derop.

Participant #2: altså de kunne de godt lide skrive "husk at gemme billetten". Okay, de vil virkelig ikke have os til at gå på jorden her med alle de hegn.

Participant #3: Vi skal lige se det inde fra. Det er vist det eneste sted man kommer indenunder. Jeg tænkte også over ikke at bruge min telefon, så jeg kunne have strøm til at tage billeder. (skiltet) Vent, jeg vil bare lige se hvad der står. Det tager kun et øjeblik

årh, tårnet bliver da større endnu. Gelænderet peger meget indad. Gad vide om det er tænkte om en enkeltmandsoplevelse. Der er ikke så meget plads, så man bliver nødt til at splitte op. Man kan ikke rigtig gå og nyde det for der kommer andre hele tiden.

Participant #2: Det er også lidt for stejlt til at man kan stå og nyde

Participant #3: jeg kan vildt godt lide at de har beholdt de her træer. Det er virkelig en fin detalje.

Participant #2: Hvad er tallene? Hvor langt man har gået? Det kunne de godt lige have skrevet. Jeg tænker faktisk lidt, på afspærringen, hvad hvis der kommer en hjort flyvende og bliver fanget? Det er da ikke særlig dyrevenligt. Vil du ikke tage et billede af mig der går herovre?

Participant #3: det er sjovt at der er mange med forskellige sprog. Svenskere, tyskere, hollændere, der var amerikanere. Hvad har de gjort med stålet?

Participant #2: Hvor tror du de kommer fra, jeg kunne ikke genkende sproget. Skal vi prøve at komme forbi dem? Undskyld mig

Participant #2: jeg synes det er lidt ubehageligt nu, nr man kommer over træerne. Kan lokal få medlemskort?

Participant #3: hvad mon det koster? Det er sikkert dyrt, men jeg kunne godt tænke mig at komme her med familien og det er et nice date sted.

Participant #2: bortset fra at man ikke kan komme hertil uden bil.

Participant #3: hvis man er meget højdeforskrækket, så skal man bare kigge ind mod midten af tårnet.

Participant #2: det er sådan lidt jungle feeling, når man ser det på toppen og der bare er grønt.

Participant #3: det er nok det tætteste man kommer på at der er grønt.

Participant #2: de har da ikke taget særlig meget højde for selvmord, det er ret lige til, hvis man vil hoppe.

Participant #3: jeg tror ikke det er et spørgsmål om hvornår og ikke hvis. Men man skal have nogle balls for at gøre det. Der er virkelig kommet gang i vinden efter vi er kommet herop. Ej det er da en meget fin udsigt. Der er mange forskellige træsorter. Der er godt nok langt ned. Der er noget med at man skal kunne se til Sverige.

Participant #2: Der er flot at der kan være så meget forskellige grønt. Mange forskellige træer.

Participant #3: Man kunne nemt lave noget undervisning. Både arkitektur, billedkunst og naturfag.

Participant #2: Man kan mærke at det giver sig i rækværket. Eller er det fordi folk går?

Participant #3: ej det er så fint. Nogle gange tænker vi ikke stort nok i Danmark

Participant #2: Jeg kunne godt tænke mig at der rendte nogle dyr rundt.

Participant #3: du kan høre fasanerne nu..

Participant #2: jamen jeg ved jo ikke hvordan den lyder, jeg skal kunne se den. Det kunne jeg godt tænke mig.

Participant #3: de kunne jo godt lave motionsløb herude.

Participant #2: det ville da være meget sjovt, eller walkathon til et godt formål.

Participant #3: det der med at de har træerne i midten, gør at man ikke føler at man er meget højt oppe. Der er lige som en bund i forhold til når man kigger ud.

Interviewer: Nu er i oppe, hvad så?

Participant #2: jeg kan godt lide det. Men jeg er glad for at her ikke er flere mennesker.

Participant #3: det er også i forhold til at det er hele året, så man kan komme når der ikke er flere mennesker. Jeg troede at platformen ville være større. Jeg troede udsigten ville være mere spektakulær.

Participant #3: jeg troede toppen ville være fyldt ud, så der var mere plads.

Participant #2: det ville være fedt hvis man kunne lave julemarked her. Jeg synes faktisk prisen er lidt dyr for at man går i en skov, det er næsten det samme som zoologisk have.

Participant #3: Jeg synes det er så fair. Jeg synes det kan give alt muligt hvis man selv går op opdagelse i det.

Participant #2: Man kan bare ikke lave så meget andet.

Participant #3: Der skal måske laves noget mere til børnefamilierne. Noget mere med leg. Men jeg ved ikke om der måske er lidt dyrt for børnefamilier, i forhold til hvad man får.

Participant #2: Det er da meget fint at der er tag på, hvis det begynder at regne.

Participant #3: Det er meget fint at der står at det er 3,2 km. Der kan de flest være med. Med det havde jeg ikke lige forstået fra starten af der troede jeg det var hver vej, så man gik omkring de 7 km.

Participant #2: Vi har lige rundet de 2 km. Se skiltet.

Participant #3: Der burde være et særlig kort for dem der bor i området, så de kunne komme og gå deres daglige tur. Det kunne være fedt med et kort til årstiderne, så man kan se at det ændre sig. Så sikrer de vel også at folk kommer igen. Så der kommer noget fortælling med forskellighed.

Participant #3: Jeg er ikke så vild med deres logo og hvorfor er det hele i laminat? Lav dog nogle rammer og sæt op.

Participant #2: Jeg er vild med at der er nogle der har vandret støvler på, det synes jeg ikke er nødvendigt. Men det ved man jo sikkert ikke. Alle der ikke bor i Danmark ville synes det var småt, eller at skoven var lille.

Participant #3: Men det er meget fint med klassisk bøgeskov. Altså boardwalken er flot, men de kunne godt have lavet noget mere plads til træerne.

Participant #2: Se der er dyr! Kæmpe snegl. Ej se, der er en i svævebane. Det ser så sjovt ud.

Participant #3: Ej det er virkelig et flot udsigtspunkt her. Tror i ikke det er sådan et sted der lever salamander. Der er lidt regnskovsagtigt fordi der er så fugtigt. Det er så fint med den lille bæk her. Men det er ærgerligt at man ikke kan høre nature når der er så mange mennesker.

Participant #2: Jeg synes faktisk ikke at der var så flot som jeg havde regnet med. Jeg kan til gengæld slet ikke forestille mig at der skulle være flere mennesker. Man kan jo lige blive buffet ned herfra (boardwalken).

Participant #3: ja, men så må man bare håbe at man bliver puffet. Jeg har også taget for meget tøj på. Det er ikke et issue nu, men der mangler lidt nogle toiletter. Det er sådan lidt basale needs, især nu når de har kaffe ude ved tårnet. Jeg tror til gengæld kun det er et spørgsmål om tid før der kommer et toilet.

Participant #2: og der må også gerne komme en skraldespand snart. De har også lavet alle de siddepladser ude ved tårnet, så burde der også være et toilet. Jeg kan godt lide at alle dem vi har gået forbi, går alle sammen og evaluere stedet. Man kan høre at alle har en mening om stedet. De bliver hele tiden dømt.

Participant #3: Her er rigtig fint. Men man kan virkelig høre motorvejen her fra var?. Det her er en rigtig fin udkigspost. Her må man gerne være. Oppe i tårnet er man nødt til at gå rundt og man kan ikke rigtig stå der så længe. Jeg troede ikke der var så mange besøgende i dag

Participant #2: det opfordrer heller ikke til at man bliver stående. Det er lidt synd at man ikke kan sidde ned oppe på toppen. Det er jo alligevel en hurdle for nogle.

Participant #3: Jeg synes ikke de har gjort så meget ud af at fortælle hvad det egentlig går ud på.

Participant #2: camp adventure er også et lidt fejlagtigt navn

Participant #3: Ja, det er ikke helt på brand. Der er nogle ting der ikke er helt gennemført med blandt andet skiltene eller rækværkerne. Men det er da ikke super lækkert lavet. Materialerne er virkelige simple. Det må gerne blive lidt lækkert og naturen taler også for sig selv, men altså...

Participant #2: Man kan virkelig høre vejen meget.

Participant #3: Der mangler lidt formidling omkring naturen. Jeg er selv vant til at færdes i naturen og forstår ikke helt hvorfor vi skal være så begrænset. Der kunne måske godt være noget mere formidling om hvordan man begår sig.

Participant #2: jeg kunne godt tænke mig at vide noget mere om dyrene der er her. Eller en oversigt over træerne. Jeg ved da ikke havde det er for nogle træer.

Participant #3: Måske noget med noget skattejagt for børn. Og noget for børnene.

Interviewer: kunne i bruge mere af det på toppen?

Participant #3: nej det var egentlig fint nok. Men jeg kan godt se at familier der ikke ved hvad de skal kigge efter, kunne bruge det.

Participant #2: men du kan jo heller ikke rigtig se det der oppe fra.

Participant #3: jeg synes egentlig det er fint at der ikke er så mange skilte deroppe.

Participant #2: men det kunne være meget fint at vide at Sverige er i den retning. Pandabjørne i Zoo der.

Participant #3: Det er meget hyggeligt med den her naturlegeplads. Og så er der lidt reklame.

Participant #2: vil i tage et billede af mig i hængekøjen?

Interviewer: Jo men den er våd.

Participant #2: pokkers, så lader jeg værd.

Participant #3: Der er mange mennesker her, var? Jeg tror jeg havde forventet at det ville være helt meditativt. Men det synes jeg ikke rigtig at tårnet var det. Det var mere når man kommer ned nu at man er helt afslappet.

Participant #2: Jeg synes sikke rigtig at klatreparken og tårnet passer sammen.

Participant #3: Det her med naturturisme og oplevelsen. Tårnet kan noget andet og på en måde modarbejde at det er en naturoplevelse. Det er lidt noget andet.

interviewer: Hvad er jeres overordnet..

Participant #2: jeg synes det er rigtig fint, men det er helt anderledes. Jeg havde forestillet mig at det lå ude i en skov, jeg synes alt det er lægger mere op til at der er mere i oplevelsen, man kommer ind her og det er mere en adventure park, men der er i virkeligheden kun klatrebanen og tårnet.

Interviewer: Så du synes ikke at navnet Camp Adventure passer til oplevelsen?

Participant #2: Nej, for det første synes jeg ikke at navnet Camp Adventure passer til tårnet for det hele er brandet på at det er tårnet tårnet tårnet og havde slet ikke fattet at man kunne klatre. Jeg synes også at indgang lægger op til at vi skal ud på en stor opdagelses ting og så er der ikke så meget, så er der kun en skov.

Interviewer: Ja. Hvad er højdepunktet for i dag?

Participant #3: For mig er det meget omgivelserne og turen efter man har været oppe i tårnet. Det lyder mærkeligt for det er jo egentlig samme boardwalk som på vej ud. Der får jeg den ro og oplevelse jeg havde forestillet mig at få oppe i tårnet.

Participant #2: ja det tænker jeg også, nature omkring og ikke så meget tårnet.

Participant #3: ja, jeg havde måske forestillet mig at kunne nyde det mere. Man er meget fokuseret på at man ikke kan stå stille

Participant #2: der er hele tiden mennesker man skal tage hensyn til

Interviewer: Hvad synes i var øv eller skuffende? Hvis i har noget?

Participant #2: & Participant #3: Nej det her jeg egentlig ikke umiddelbart.

### **After: Thoughts after the visit**

#### **Participant #1**

Jeg synes det var en rigtig fin tur. Jeg har ikke tænkt så meget over det efterfølgende, så den har vist ikke gjort det store indtryk på mig. Jeg synes måske det er en lidt underlig måde at bruge naturen på. Vi er jo vant til at kunne gøre hvad vi vil i skoven, men her bliver man pludselig afgrænset og skal dele med andre. Det er lidt underligt. Udsigten var ikke det vilde og jeg savnede en eller anden form for underholdning. Der var også for mange mennesker og nogle var lidt lige glade. Der var en gruppe ældre mennesker, De gik bare langsomt and det virkede overhoved ikke til at de lagde mærke til os eller var ligeglade da vi prøvede at komme forbi dem.

#### **Participant #2**

Ikke så kunstnerisk som forventet.

Mindre krævende end forventet.

Jeg gik ud som et lys da jeg kom hjem

Det var rigtig fint bygget.

Mere info om hvordan det fungerer vil stadig havde været rart.

### **Participant #3**

Jeg havde forventet at føle mig høj på oplevelsen og det skete ikke rigtig. Det levede ikke op til de forventninger jeg havde gjort mig inden. Måske er det min egen skyld fordi jeg ikke er god nok til at være i nuet. Det var heller ikke den kunst oplevelse jeg havde regnet med og fysisk var det ikke lige så hårdt som forventet. Jeg kan dog godt forstå at folk besøger det og jeg vil helt sikkert komme igen. Jeg tror stadig det er rigtig flot på forskellige årstider. Det tog os kun en time og 25 minutter. Det er ikke lang tid for en oplevelse der koster 150 kr. Jeg synes det var smukt og en speciel oplevelse, men jeg synes det er for dyrt. Vi har også betalt for parkering og for at komme hertil.