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Volunteering and collaborative governance innovation in the Wadden Sea National Park

Abstract:
This study is motivated by the financial scarcity allocated by governments to nature conservation, national park maintenance and sustainable development in many parts of the world. The article explores how governance structures are transformed from a top-down, state-driven model towards a “third way,” with more extensive collaborative and participative structures. The willingness to volunteer in the Wadden Sea National Park in Denmark are examined in detail. The volunteers constitute a considerable labor resource. Volunteers participate in well-structured events, such as beach cleanups and festivals, but they increasingly assist with facilities maintenance, nature restoration, citizen science activities, etc. Findings show that residents from the vicinity of the national park express the most interest, but visitors from other parts of Denmark are also willing to volunteer. This suggests a strong potential for integrating volunteering with tourist experiences and meaningful engagements with others. Advantages and disadvantages of gradual state withdrawal of protected area governance are discussed, which exposes a significant obligation to ensure that goals of protection and sustainability are aligned with volunteer engagement, which urgently calls for governance innovation in national parks.
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Introduction
In Denmark, the designation of national parks is a recent phenomenon. The Wadden Sea National Park (WSNP) was inaugurated in 2010. The study examines the willingness of locals and tourists to
participate in the completion of tasks and (statutory) obligations related to national park management, specifically the collaboration with volunteers and their evolving dedication. Institutional capacity building and the formation of governance processes are addressed. Considering the short history of the WSNP, structures have already been introduced in entirely new ways. The aim of this paper is to investigate the alignment of volunteer commitment with the obligations of Wadden Sea National Park. Possibilities for collaborative management in a manner perceived as valuable to both the volunteers and Wadden Sea National Park are discussed. Finally, the study addresses critical issues related to third way governance innovation and stewardship of national parks.

Tourism development in national parks is a longstanding paradox. On the one hand, an increased number of visitors pose a risk for conservation efforts in fragile or protected nature. On the other, visitors spend time and money, which can be considered as resources and an advantage as “it is people who care for nature – or not!” (Liburd, 2018). The assumption behind the latter is that the paradox of preservation versus use can be transcended through governance innovation. Governance innovations are new government arrangements that rearticulate the state-civil relationship and thereby reposition the meaning of citizenship. This is explained by Swyngedooduw (2005) as innovation where some actors/holders make something happen to change incentives/access and the way that they build/modify institutions. The relationships established between the national park actors and the visitors thus rely on both the formal regulatory power of designated authority and on culturally embedded, mutual understanding and reciprocity. Addressing the volunteers as stakeholders in national park governance structures, underpinning nature values and mutual trust are central tenants (Liburd & Becken, 2017) to be carefully considered in the development of research methods and interventions.

This study seeks to find answers to the following research questions (RQs):
RQ1: What are the inclinations to become a volunteer, and what problems do volunteering locals and tourists want to solve? In relation to this, do the types of commitments address the present and predicted future needs of the Wadden Sea National Park?

RQ2: What are the demographic characteristics of the volunteers and non-volunteers (age, sex, education, income, group affiliation)? How likely are tourists willing to be volunteers compared to the locals and for what types of tasks? How do the demographic factors align with the current setup of supportive physical and institutional infrastructure for volunteers?

RQ3: Do visitors’ general leisure interests and behaviors in the Wadden Sea National Park support the need for increased volunteering, and how can new governance strategies to recruit, retain and empower be informed through deeper insight into this?

RQ4: More generally, is there a case for “co-governance” in a national park setting, and what are the innovative characteristics?

The Wadden Sea National Park and its governance

There are no predefined conditions for an area to qualify as a national park in Denmark. Rather, the Danish National Park Law of 2007 defines several unique aims for national parks. These encompass the preservation and improvement of natural areas and landscapes of national and international significance, ensuring biodiversity, quality and natural dynamics; the protection of geological and cultural values. Aims include opportunities for outdoor recreation, cultural experiences, and education. Further, research and interpretation must support awareness rising, local development, including national park residents and business communities, in respect of preservation interests. In addition, by-laws for each national park specify supplementary conditions. In Wadden Sea National Park, this involves the sustainable development of the shared Danish-German-Dutch Wadden Sea and the support of local development, including tourism, agriculture and fisheries. It is very important to note
that Wadden Sea National Park does not own land within its territory, which is in the possession of a multitude of private, public and institutional land owners. This is a distinctive and critical difference from most national parks.

The multiple (possibly even incompatible) national park aims may appear at odds with the purpose of protected areas as defined by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN). The IUCN (2008) has identified seven management categories to distinguish the specific aims, objectives and concerns of protected areas. National parks and marine reserves belong under category II, which encompasses large natural or near-natural areas set aside to protect large-scale ecological processes and recreation, where the aim is to protect natural biodiversity, promote ecological structure, and support environmental processes.

When comparing the IUCN category II to the Danish national park aims, it is noteworthy that nature conservation is not a priority ranked above interpretation and educational activities but sits alongside the aims to preserve cultural heritage and support recreation and local business development when aligned with preservation efforts. The rationale may be found in existing nature regulations. The majority of Danish national park areas are protected under NATURA 2000, which is the largest coordinated network of protected areas in the world. In addition, the Wadden Sea is protected under the European Union Habitats Directive and the European Union Bird Protection Directive, which makes it one of the most protected areas in the world. Neither the national park nor the 2014 UNESCO World Heritage inscription brought additional nature preservation measures, though this was highly contested prior to the 2010 national park designation.

Wadden Sea National Park covers an area of approximately 1,500 km², of which 300 km² are land-based. It is the largest national park in Denmark, and the only international national park that is also a UNESCO World Heritage Site. In 2014, the Danish part of the Wadden Sea followed the Dutch-
German 2009 inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List. The Wadden Sea spans 500 km along the coastline of three countries—the Netherlands, Germany and Denmark. The Wadden Sea is the largest unbroken system of intertidal sand and mud flats in the world and is of outstanding universal value, which is the terminology used by UNESCO to indicate World Heritage status. The Wadden Sea was inscribed for its globally important geology, ecology and biodiversity as “a seascape of immeasurable importance” (Marencic & Domnick, 2014, p. 4). The three countries have been committed to jointly conserving and protecting the Wadden Sea as an ecological entity since 1978.

In Denmark, the power to designate national parks rests with the Minister of Environment and the parties behind the signing of the 2007 National Park law. To date, five national parks have been established, all of which were subject to extensive public consultation and stakeholder involvement before designation to help raise awareness. The Danish Wadden Sea National Park is governed by a board of 15 members appointed by the Minister of Environment for a four-year period. Board members include a broad range of stakeholders from the four Wadden Sea municipalities, the hunters’ association, agriculture and fisheries, nature protection organizations, namely the Danish Society for Nature Conservation, the Danish Ornithological Society, the Outdoor Council, the dyke guild, museums, the Sport Anglers association, and the Nature Agency, which represents the Minister of Environment. Two board members are appointed by the National Park Advisory Council, which consists of 30 local representatives also appointed for a four-year period. The Advisory Council advises the Board on select issues and enables local influence and support on given initiatives. The Advisory Council represents an important voice in the articulation of local concerns and community perspectives. The decisive capacity is vested in the National Park board.

Daily management of Wadden Sea National Park is carried out by a secretariat consisting of only five full-time staff including the secretary manager, and a few consultants subject to project grants.
With a broad portfolio of projects reflecting the multiple aims of the national park, the secretariat is also tasked by a board mandate to generate external funding. For the past three years, the annual budget has amounted to approximately 1.7 million Euros, generated via close collaboration with local, regional and trilateral partners as well as regional, national and European funding agencies. Daily management and governance of the national park are enabled by collaboration and facilitation, as national parks in Denmark are created without judicial mandate.

Responsibilities for management of WSNP volunteers rest partly with one staff who oversee volunteers performing nature tasks. In addition, a volunteer coordinator is responsible for volunteers on the national park ship and a mobile exhibition. A communication officer manages the partner and ambassador programs. To secure the best possible allocation of resources, a tight control of activities is implemented. The limited staff operates via a flat managerial hierarchy with substantial influence from their own activities, economy and resources. Although the secretariat puts great effort into an open and collaborative atmosphere, the decision-making power and resource allocation for volunteers lies with the secretariat manager and the board.

Liburd (2018) explains that collaboration rests on the hypothesis that the sum of work is more than its individual parts. The concept of collaboration thus suggests that the creation of joint outcomes cannot be engendered by a single organization or individual. Liburd (2018) emphasizes that collaboration is not a neutral undertaking. Collaboration implicates interests and power, which are easily diluted in the abbreviated use of co-operation, co-creation, co-ordination, etc. Collaboration is substantiated by reciprocal norms and exchanges that require trust for their consummation. At the same time, mutual relations create trust (Boisot, 1998, p. 141). A failure to re-engage in a just and reciprocal manner implies that collaboration and trust in others may be impeded (Liburd, 2013 & 2018). Since its inauguration in 2010, Wadden Sea National Park has had to earn the trust of others. Without a mandate to force anyone into action, partnerships and collaboration with others to realize the vision
and aims of the national park are voluntary. The vision of Wadden Sea National Park is described in the national park plans (2013-2018 & 2019-2025) as follows: "Wadden Sea National Park is internationally known as an outstanding marsh, geest and tidal zone of world class value. The national park is used, protected and developed through sustainable interactions between human beings and nature." (Wadden Sea National Park, 2013, p. 12).

Tourism in Wadden Sea National Park is an important area of business, and after several years of stagnation, key tourism numbers are on the rise. Annually, the national park receives 3-4 million day visitors and nearly 3 million overnight visitors, with a yearly turnover of 400 million euro (Wadden Sea National Park, 2017). The tourism industry in the Wadden Sea area inherently depends on a healthy natural environment, likely to benefit from the World Heritage brand. Nevertheless, the positive impacts of a conservation designation on local communities and tourist visitation are contested in the literature (e.g., Buckley, 2004; Hall, 2006; Selman, 2009; Shone, Espiner & Stewart, 2016). However, Liburd and Becken (2017) report that symbiosis between tourism and nature conservation remains a possibility. They cite Gschwind (2013) “A strong argument can be made that World Heritage Areas that have high visitation levels are more likely to remain protected and well managed as a result of political and commercial pressure” (p. 178 in Liburd & Becken, 2017, p. 3). A trilateral strategy for sustainable tourism development was created after the UNESCO World Heritage listing in 2014, which “invites all stakeholders to participate in its delivery. It [the strategy] describes and guides how stakeholders can actively contribute to and benefit from the aims of the World Heritage Convention in protecting the natural values of the Wadden Sea” (Marencic & Frederiksen, 2014).

What emerges from this is that governance of the Wadden Sea National Park is a mixed political, cultural and practical project. There is a defining element of the “first paradigm” statutory obligations and activities. However, the constitution of the area with private ownership of most of the space leads
to a “de facto” sector approach. The need for processual approach signifies that concepts are open to multiple interpretations, culture and values, which may be contested and adapted over time (Liburd & Becken, 2017). In addition, the fiscal situation of the national park necessitates new approaches to solve both mandatory and other tasks for the protection of nature. The “Third way” emerges as a combined yet novel form of governance, where the WSNP can identify latent opportunities for innovative governance measures and structures. The following section will explore the role of volunteers (locals and tourists) in the national park and the in the management and governance of the WSNP; it will investigate volunteer commitment in a situation with contested resources and ambiguous priorities.

Literature review

National park governance and development towards collaborative structures

National parks are established to ensure the consistent protection of outstanding natural areas as “public goods” or assets that benefit anyone (Cornes, & Sandler, 1996). Protective endeavors comply with ideas regarding the consolidation of ecosystem services and biodiversity reserves (De Groot et al., 2010; Rands et al., 2010) and contribute to the multifaceted spectrum of values of essential importance for humankind. From this perspective, such areas should be protected from intensive use by locals and tourists, which has been found to be a threat to wildlife, biodiversity, etc. (Niedziałkowski et al., 2012). However, national parks are often not strictly economically feasible, and their operations and maintenance depend on the inflow of public and private resources and revenue creation via tourism and other commercial activities. Generally, national parks are considered an obligation for nation states. Sources in the academic literature point to the fact that in recent years, national parks and other protected areas have tended to become increasingly underfunded as a result of public fiscal crises (Dinica, 2018). Complementary funding from NGOs, charities and private sources seems to be crucial
not only to ensure the implementation of additional protection activities, but to guarantee basic maintenance (Igoe & Brockington, 2007).

Nation states have been criticized for the low priority of national parks in the neo-liberal turn in political ideology and governance (Dinica, 2018; Job, Becken & Lane, 2017; Nyahunzvi, 2016). Withdrawal of public funding from parks is sometimes motivated by the fact the parks have little or no evidence of their positive contribution to standard growth and employment targets (Dietz & Adger, 2003). Across political observation, politicians urge national parks to ensure funding from charities and other sources in order to maintain or increase activity levels, particularly regarding protection and conservation (Gazkey, Chen & LaFontant, 2018). From this perspective, national parks should act more as private profit-seeking businesses, and they must continuously rebalance priorities and investments to satisfy funding bodies, whoever they might be.

A change in financing for national parks is also a call for an amendment of governance objectives and principles. When financed by taxpayers via governmental bodies, the strategizing and management of the national park will obviously remain top-down. As soon as other funding bodies and contributors – small or large – come on board, a requirement for open and widened decision making arise, coupled with claims for transparency. A wider involvement with externally generated funds, e.g. public-private partnerships, outsourcing arrangements, marketization arrangements, etc. means that donors expect respect and recognition for their “gifts” to the national park. Involvement in decision making processes and empowerment in implementation are examples of new governance restructuring. This second way of governance, with emphasizes market mechanisms and private property rights, has been criticized for leading to unbalanced priorities and closed decision making. Action is thus taken if strictly economically feasible, and decisions are chiefly made by property owners or land users. Concerns are raised as to whether protective efforts that are environmentally essential, but
difficult to prove and communicate, are given lower priority than very visible, emotionally appealing activities (the “panda-effect”) (McCuaig, 2012; Gazkey et al, 2018).

Considerable changes in the management of protected areas and national parks have occurred in recent decades. Such changes are not entirely unwelcome, not even among people who dislike ongoing neo-liberalism and privatization (Weaver & Lawton, 2017; Job, Becken & Lane, 2017). Still, and as a response to the setbacks of both the first and the second paradigms, a paradigm shift towards a “third way” is in the making (Dover, 2010; Rose, 2000). The third way embraces governance arrangements that empower groups and communities to form local structures of decision making and resource allocations. The third way characterizes new notions of citizenship (Reddel, 2004) with significant active responsibly and continuous involvement. Considerable transparency seems to be a prerequisite, especially if community groups are expected to commit to solving vital social or environmental obligations. Overlapping governance structures, for example, the participation of public officials on boards and committees, are measures within this realm. The forms of governance are fuzzy, and for the third way regulation comes under many denominations, such as for example co-management contracts and networks governance. As such, the state deliberately disperses power and remains behind the scene to intervene in the relationship, if necessary.

The third way is characterized by more integrated approaches assuming that effective management of the national park requires collaborative processes that engage rather than exclude local resource users (Cent et al., 2014; Griffiths, 2015; Indrawan et al., 2014). Therefore, the third governance paradigm tends to align well with ideas regarding integrating conservation and other development functions of the national parks as living landscapes (Bruyere & Rapper, 2007; Job, Becken & Lane, 2017; Mose & Weixlbaumer, 2017). Finally, the third way significantly broadens the scope of citizens’ responsibilities and ethics. They are viewed not only as integrated “bottom-up” approaches, but rests on Aristotelian “other-regarding” ethics and stewardship. Putting the interests of others above
their own, stewardship theory recognises intrinsic as well as personal values and dynamic interrelations beyond selfish gain, while not excluding the latter (Neubaum, 2013). Liburd (2018) argues that stewardship resonates well with the concept of collaboration, which possibly captures the “co-“ in the third way.

This brief outline of three governance paradigms represents the framing for understanding emergent volunteering in national parks and underlying potential controversies. The ideas of co-governance and collaborative management (Lane, 2010) point to the potential of a third paradigm implementation, which will be subsequently addressed. It is of critical interest in this context to discuss the empowerment opportunities of volunteers. Are they just an available workforce, or can they be decisive in the collaborative governance of a national park?

The importance of volunteering

The third-way paradigm opens for different forms of public participation and the co-governance of resources in which voluntarism occupies a central role (Lane, 2010; Pages et al., 2017). Currently, voluntarism is vital to many protected areas and national parks. As indicated by Ryan et al. (2001, p. 629), ”both public and private environmental organizations rely on unpaid volunteers to further the cause of protecting and helping the imperiled natural environment.” Consequently, volunteers are a priceless resource, without whom many protected areas could not exist (Grese et al., 2001; Measham & Barnett, 2008; Pages et al., 2017). From the national park point of view, volunteers provide multiple benefits. Grese et al. (2001) even claim that the contribution of volunteers to the functioning of protected areas is imperative, that their roles are varied and include environmental monitoring, collecting waste, clearing invasive plants, collecting seeds, maintaining infrastructure and many other tasks that are directly associated with land stewardship. Furthermore, some volunteers perform services that are less tied to the land, of which knowledge dissemination, education and promotion are notable examples. Measham (2008) identified five dominant modes of voluntarism in protected areas. The first,
activism, relates to tasks directly targeted towards environmental protection, stopping environmental
destruction, and saving wildlife. The second type of environmental volunteering concerns education.
The third is environmental monitoring, whereas the fourth includes environmental restoration and
focuses on the removal of noxious weeds, vegetation replanting, and providing wildlife habitats. The
fourth and last type of environmental volunteering refers to reducing ecological footprints by imple-
menting effective means of energy use and reducing waste at the household level. Measham (2008)
labels this mode as sustainable living. Common to these understandings of volunteering is that they
are supplementary elements that align well with the statutory and management obligations of national
park authorities. Under some circumstances, “activism” may be an exception.

Volunteer motivation

Bearing in mind the elevated profile of voluntarism in protected areas and its varied forms, research
has been concerned with investigating what prompts volunteers to devote their time and energy to the
challenge of volunteering, and what benefits they may derive from such activities. This research may
provide national park leaders with a clearer picture of what makes volunteers a resource in co-gov-
ernance and collaboration (Bruyere & Rappe, 2007; Vantilborgh, Bidee, Pepermans, Willems, Huy-
brechts & Jegers, 2011; Devereux & Holmes, 2018).

Research conducted by Stebbins in the context of serious leisure indicates that volunteering
yields eight “durable benefits” for volunteers: “self-actualization, self-enrichment, recreation or re-
newal of self, feelings of accomplishment, enhancement of self-image, self-expression, social interac-
tion and belongingness, and lasting physical products of the activity” (Stebbins, 1992, p. 7). How-
ever, ”having fun,” ”seeing change,” ”attention,” ”friendship” and ”being part of a larger community”
are also common benefits associated with volunteering in protected areas (e.g., Grese et al., 2001;
Gingrich, 1994, McCarthy, 1991). Furthermore, Miles et al. (2001) points out that ”being a part of
meaningful action,” ”fascination with nature,” ”getting away from daily routine“ and ”social and
community involvement” are equally important benefits. Miles et al. (2001) state that first, regular participation in environmental restoration is associated with greater benefits, and second, more overall satisfaction from the activity leads to greater life satisfaction and higher levels of life functioning (Miles et al., 2001, p. 36). These findings clearly indicate that volunteering activities generate a high level of reciprocity, meaning that they not only have environment benefits but also benefit the individuals who take part in the activities. This standpoint has also been stressed in other studies (Bruyere & Rappe, 2007, Ryan et al., 2001). Building on an extensive literature review, Weawer concludes that "While wanting to make a difference, volunteers also seek social interaction as well as personal development goals variably construed as a desire for learning and/or education, personal fulfilment, career progression, skills acquisition and understanding” Weawer (2015, p. 686).

Despite studying the benefits of volunteer activities, attention has also been paid to volunteers’ motivation – a concept similar to benefits yet theoretically different. This angle of examination has been mainly developed in relation to functional theory (Asah & Blahna, 2012), which in essence, assumes that while people may perform the same actions, they may be motivated by different psychological functions. In this context, Clary et al. (1998) identified six dominant functions (i.e., motives) of voluntarism: (1) value expression, (2) understanding, (3) social adjustment, (4) career, (5) protective, and (6) personal. The first function argues that people may volunteer to express or act on altruistic values that are important to them. The understanding function refers to people’s willingness to learn something new or increase their practical skills. The social adjustment function pertains to people’s desire to gain psychological development and increase their self-esteem. The career function highlights that people may volunteer because they believe it will strengthen their job and economic prospects. The protective function assumes that people uses volunteering to reduce negative feelings, such as guilt, or to address personal problems, whereas the social function stresses that voluntarism may help people to get along with social groups that they value. Clarke et al.’s (1998) contribution
has become a basis for more tailored approaches aimed at testing the motivations of volunteers within different environmental contexts (Ryan et al. 2001; Martinez & McMullin, 2004; Bruyere & Rappe, 2007). A review of these studies indicates more than 20 motives that underpin volunteer activity in protected areas.

For example, Ryan et al.’s (2001) study on volunteer motivations for participation in environmental stewardship activities showed that “helping the environment” was a key driver of participation in the activities. In addition, Ryan et al. (2001) provide evidence that the motivation to volunteer is not permanent and may change over time. While altruistic values (e.g., helping the environment) are the initial motivation for volunteering, more self-interested motivations (e.g., learning/fulfillment/social interaction) became more important for continued participation in volunteer efforts (Ryan et al., 2001).

**Volunteer profiles**

Understanding the sociodemographic profile provide useful information for the recruitment and development of volunteers and the facilitation of their contributions. For example, Measham (2007) showed that both income and education are the most powerful modifiers of volunteer activities, where higher income and better education tend to positively influence the decision to volunteer. Occupation has also been acknowledged as an important predictor of volunteer behavior, where part-time workers tend to be more active than full-time workers. Furthermore, age has been linked to the modes and degree of volunteer activity, as the stock of human capital varies throughout life. Thus, different age cohorts might be differently involved in volunteer activities. Younger volunteers might be more active in cleaning, service and maintenance jobs, whereas older volunteers, by contrast, may be more interested in guiding, supervising and teaching others. However, it is important to note that all sociodemographic characteristics vary considerably among different case studies, and no clear-cut associations between age, education, income and occupation are found. It is also worth mentioning that
context matters enormously, and the types of volunteer activities might attract different segments of volunteers.

**Governance innovations and national park volunteering – knowledge gaps**

The “third way” of governance has emerged in the post neo-liberal era as an attempt to ensure less regulatory rigidity and include a stronger notion of societal cohesion and civil responsibility. The governance of tourist areas is indeed multi-faceted (Hall, 2011). Literature on national parks’ involvement of and collaboration with local and tourist volunteers provides good evidence for the creative transformation of governance structures and supplementation with new modes of operation. Literature on stewardship formats illustrates the way that national parks attempt to test modes of involvement and participation with the organization, incentives and benefits and how governance attempts to overcome resource constraints and address new tasks, such as the 2030 UN Sustainability Goals (Devereux & Holmes, 2018). Encouraging volunteers to join and promote sustainable tourism activities or stewardship programs are significant tasks in daily, national park management. Examples hereof include sensitivity to changes in the volunteers’ quest for meaning, and to stay aligned with the main environmental vision and policies, including dilemmas that might arise.

This literature review demonstrates the need to deepen understandings of the complex phenomenon of volunteering in national parks. Most studies have focused on the volunteers and their motives, while the role of the national park management has received much less attention (Getzer et al., 2014; Miller & Nakamura, 2018). The governance innovation perspective is new to this strand of inquiry and there is a need to substantiate the empirical basis.

**Methodology**

Data utilized in this study were sourced from a survey of 1321 respondents living in Denmark commissioned by Wadden Sea National Park in 2017. The survey purpose was to map the awareness and attitudes of respondents towards WSNP. The survey was undertaken by an independent bureau,
Epinion, and was based on the bureau’s panel to approach a representative selection in terms of sociodemographic factors. The sample was adjusted to distinguish by geographical proximity, and areas in or nearby the Wadden Sea are therefore deliberately overrepresented in the survey. The survey was managed on the internet by the panel, and telephone interviews were supplemented as necessary to reach the target number of respondents.

For the purpose of the study and to distinguish local visitors from tourists, three sub-groups were formed: The first group consisted of respondents living in the vicinity of the WSNP, the second were respondents living in Southern Denmark but outside the region of group 1 (Danish: Region Syddanmark), and the third group encompassed those living elsewhere in Denmark (see: Figure 1).

The content of the survey was guided by issues related to the main objective in the WSNP designation. The main issues related to the recognition of the national park and the respondents’ understanding of the benefits and disadvantages. Other principal survey contents included visits to the WSNP and leisure activities during visits. The activity category relied on a standard scale developed for this purpose (Jensen, 2003). Issues regarding the willingness to undertake volunteer work tasks were included as a reaction to the experience gained during the first years of the national park operation and the collaboration with individuals and NGOs. The question category was chosen carefully to reflect the operation’s collaborative patterns, and the envisaged needs for future voluntary involvement as understood by national park management. In addition, the questions were inspired by the international literature referenced above.

The data were processed in STATA. The examination builds upon summary statistics aimed directly at the research questions. No advanced statistical modeling was used. The survey was determined to possess a satisfactory reliability based on the panel information. The WSNP was the subject of a similar survey in 2013, although this survey did not include questions about volunteers.
Comparisons between the two surveys support the reliability, representativeness and robustness of the selected sample of respondents.

Results

Awareness and use of the Wadden Sea National Park for leisure purposes

The WSNP played an important recreational role among all groups of respondents. More than 90% of locals, half of the respondents from the southern Denmark region, and approximately one fifth of the respondents from remaining Denmark visited the park for leisure or work purposes. Accordingly, the national park has acquired significant recognition over its short time span of existence. Parts of the survey, not reported in the current study, show that the national park designation has increased local pride and awareness of potential leisure and tourist activities.

Table 1 shows activities undertaken by the respondents the last time of WSNP visit. This was found to be of importance, as leisure activities and volunteering may go hand in hand. Walks are the most prevalent activity among all respondents. To admire nature’s beauty is another important activity, which includes, for example, watching birds, seals, etc., which demonstrate keen attention to the natural environment. The activity of sightseeing from a car reflects the fact that the Wadden Sea area is large, poorly served by public transport, and that accessibility to sites where, for example, oyster picking or bird watching take place mostly involves driving some of the way. This survey does indicate that the respondents do not necessarily appear to participate in detailed activity planning.

[Table 1 near here]

Figure 2 shows a selection of the abovementioned activities according to the proximity of the respondents’ place of residence. It is obvious that visitors who come from further away have more
planned activities and seek (pre-defined) experiences to a larger extent than the locals. The locals use the national park as a “back yard”, a place to stroll, walk the dog, etc. However, the proximity provides them with the possibility to go more often.

[Figure 2 near here]

Visitors tend to be mainly passive enjoyers of WSNP in the sense that they experience the park during walks, cycling and by car. Four out of the ten most popular activities relate to active nature experiences, such as watching animals, learning about nature, and watching seals. The locals use the area for occasional strolls, while visitors from outside the local area are more likely to add experience-enhancing activities, including both nature-based outdoor actions and cultural experiences. Considering this list, volunteer activities could encompass a number of different themes.

Willingness to do volunteer work

In addition to the use of the WSNP as a scene for leisure activities, some respondents state an active interest in volunteering and unpaid work in the park. The recruitment basis for volunteer work is mainly limited to the immediate area, where approximately 14.4 % of respondents state an interest in contributing by volunteering. By contrast, only 4.8 % of the respondents living in the Southern Denmark region and 3.8 % of respondents coming from other parts of Denmark state this interest. The data also show a significant proportion of respondents who have not yet decided whether they want to engage in volunteer activities. The percentages for the undecided group vary from 15.8 % for people living elsewhere in Denmark to 20.4 % for local respondents, as illustrated in Table 2.

[Table 2 near here]
The presented shares of volunteering respondents may seem small, but they amount to a recruitment basis of approximately 250,000 volunteers when converted into the actual number of potentially interested people. This is way beyond what the national park secretariat of five permanent staff can accommodate for volunteer activities. This does not even include foreign tourists. The study also examined the preferred types of volunteer activities, shown in Figure 3.

[Figure 3 near here]

The most significant interest lies in participating in activities that take place once to a few times a year, such as annual beach cleaning and waste collection. Campaigns involving local sport and other associations have been organized for many years, and the efforts are recognized for its immediate meaningfulness and visible environmental impacts, as well as for its significant social aspects. It is noteworthy that people who live a considerable distance from the park can be recruited to participate in such activities, as shown in Figure 4.

Citizen activities are noted to be popular, such as observing wildlife and birds, counting seals or frogs, and reporting on changes in invasive or rare species. Such activities coincide with professional and leisure activities, particularly as the Wadden Sea is recognized as a world class area of interest for ornithologists. The National Park can count on people for such tasks, as illustrated by the survey.

Another important activity pertains to the item ‘performing practical tasks at events and festivals,’ where locals express the strongest interest. Danish rural festivals are not (yet) trans-territorial in their setups, and these data support this observation (Fisker et al, forthcoming).

Maintenance tasks may consist of repair work of fences and gates; cleaning picnic areas and signboards; supervising sign posts along hiking and cycling routes; signposting sailing routes;
performing daily maintenance on the national park ship and mobile exhibition; checking traps for foxes, mink and other predators; and maintaining forest playgrounds. The locals and people from the larger region of Southern Denmark can be recruited for these tasks. Participating in practical nature care tasks includes, for example, removing invasive and unwelcome vegetation along streams, creeks and clay pits; laying gravel in streams and creeks; planting wildlife-friendly fences; preparing ground hatching bird nesting areas; regulating predators; and fencing areas for grazing cows and sheep as well as for nesting birds, or other wildlife. Construction tasks consists of building of shelters, observations towers, kayak and boat ramps, and the renovation of information and welcome sites, and even historic houses. All these activities are attractive to participants located well beyond the local area.

The types of contribution can be organized as projects in limited and specific time intervals, which are of likely importance for inclusion of volunteer tourists.

[Figures 4 and 5 near here]

To a considerable extent, community work includes volunteering for museums and outdoor sights. Thus, and in addition to the national park, there are many conservation stakeholders in the Wadden Sea area who rely heavily on volunteers. The committed individuals are mostly loyal contributors who have participated for a long period of time, who are readily available. The answers seem to confirm this pattern. Help for the national park ship (used for surveillance, research and interpretative tours) falls into this category. The supervision of grazing cattle and sheep is interestingly an activity that attracts both locals and nonlocals. Grazing is a paramount prerequisite for landscape maintenance in the Wadden Sea area, and looking after the animals may have supplementary emotional benefits.
There are several professional, independent guides in the Wadden Sea area, who are associated with a range of institutions. This has clearly inspired local residents of whom many are interested in ways where they can meaningfully contribute, based on their specific knowledge, capacities and differing engagements with nature. The latter is confirmed in a study by Blichfeldt, Knudsen and Liburd (forthcoming) among older residents and second-home owners in the WSNP. Finally, media articles can mobilize some (local and tourist) interest. Active press handling and social media presence are essential for the national park’s success in rising awareness, generating external funding and support for conservation agendas, but volunteering is chiefly associated with outdoor activities.

This study demonstrates that there is a basis for volunteering and that volunteers have a clear understanding of individual preferences and qualifications. However, if motivational factors can be met, such as practical and temporal issues and social circumstances, volunteers appear to be willing to be rather flexible in offering their services on different occasions.

Who are the potential volunteers?
Sociodemographic information may be important for a more detailed understanding of the motivation to volunteer and a guide for the recruitment and management endeavors of the national park staff. Table 2 shows how the willingness to volunteer relates to age, education and income level. Table 3 shows the analysis of occupational differences.

First and foremost, socioeconomic differences are not distinctive. Regarding age, the youngest strata expressed a particularly good willingness to volunteer, but the number of respondents in this group was low, which must be taken into account. The middle-aged participants appear to be motivated to volunteer, similar to those older than 51 years of age. In fact, this group already constitutes most of the most active volunteers in the WSNP. In the survey, the small reservation might be due to health, and other issues.
Table 2 also illustrates the relationship between the educational backgrounds of the volunteers and their willingness to volunteer. Again, volunteers among all educational levels can be recruited, but the ones with the highest education express a higher willingness to allocate time and resources. Coinciding with this, those with higher incomes also tend to be more willing to volunteer than those with lower incomes. When assessing the results, the fact that the youngest groups of respondents typically have lower incomes than the older respondents should be kept in mind.

Investigation of the gender issue demonstrates that men are more willing to volunteer than women (8.9 % versus 7.4 %). The response “maybe” was marked by 18.5 % of the male respondents, while female respondents responded at slightly lower 17.0 %.

Furthermore, the results presented in Table 3 show that being outside the labor market does not uniformly impact the decision to volunteer, even if older retirees may have time to contribute to the sustainable development of the national park. Professionals and independents are also slightly less motivated, while those with manual and vocational jobs express a higher willingness to participate. The number of low-skilled respondents was low in this survey, but this group may represent an interesting resource.

The local area is a peripheral area of Denmark, with a proportionally higher proportion of un- and low-skilled workers and a higher average age composition. Even if these groups are less motivated to become volunteers, the national park has a sufficient recruitment base in the vicinity of the park.
Table 5 examines the relationship between the willingness to volunteer and information regarding what the respondents did during their last visit to WSNP. Firstly, the results show that respondents who more actively used the WSNP resources were more eager to be involved in volunteering. Specifically, those who were involved in at least four activities in the park tended to more interested in volunteering. There was considerably higher interest in volunteering among those whose main activities in the park refer to ‘photography’ or ‘learning about nature’. By contrast, merely passing the WSNP by car did not impact positive willingness to volunteer. Interestingly, the groups who merely passed the park by car or indicated their own activity as ‘walking’ dominated those not interested in volunteering in the national park. These results clearly indicate that more profound involvement in engagements with nature have positive connotations in terms of undertaking volunteer activities.

Discussion

This study contributes new knowledge regarding volunteering in a national park setting, i.e. the Danish Wadden Sea National Park. The answers to research questions utilized in this study demonstrate a significant inclination for the respondents to become volunteers. Based on the early years of the national park’s existence, many people clearly want to do something for nature, for the landscape, and for culture. This study demonstrates that the national park has a recruitment basis that actually exceeds its current management capacity. Predominantly, people living in the vicinity of the WSNP express the highest willingness to volunteer, but Danish tourists living in other parts of Denmark, are also likely to commit themselves to volunteer work.

The study does not include foreign tourists. Further investigation should include, for example, German tourists, who account for the majority of bed nights spent in the area and whose dedication to nature is know from other studies (Visitdenmark, 2016).

The study also addresses the activities in which people are willing to become involved. Solving practical tasks is rated highly. Supporting experience from past national park campaigns in all of the
three Wadden Sea countries, volunteers are readily engaged in critical maintenance and conservation jobs, support of events, festivals, etc. Regardless of educational level, volunteers are willing to contribute to mundane tasks, such as the collection of trash on beaches, which indicates that visitors are well-aware of the national park’s specific challenges and qualities. This result also suggests that the volunteers prefer well-described tasks that can be performed within a specific time frame. Overall, volunteer tourists tend to request a firm structure, whilst locals can offer more flexible services to the national park.

Sociodemographic factors provide further clues for recruitment and engagement in volunteer tasks. On the whole and with small variations, respondents of all ages, incomes, education levels, and occupations express some interest in volunteering. Considering the dominance of the older respondents as owners of, and visitors to second homes in the area, there might be further potential in augmenting volunteer opportunities to at least undertake systematic maintenance and conservation tasks involving these groups. The particularly active volunteers were characterized by being mindful of and active in outdoor leisure and holiday endeavors. When compared to the profile of current tourists, there is generally a good match, which opens attractive opportunities for meaningful participation in national park projects that can enhance the loyalty to the area, positive word-of-mouth, and reciprocal relations for active healthy ageing (Blichfeldt et al, forthcoming).

Questions asked in the study address the individuals’ inclination to volunteer. Evidence from national and other studies referenced in the literature review show that social context may be highly critical for the inclination to participate. For this reason, substantial recruitment is undertaken in close collaboration with sports, leisure, nature protection and other associations, wherein group dynamics are essential for not only solving a specific task, but also for interpreting meanings and prospects of the engagement with the WSNP. Locals being more likely to become volunteers than tourists might
be related to a higher density of such institutional networks in the local area, while fewer such networks exist for tourists coming from other parts of Denmark.

This study set out to discuss whether visitors’ general leisure interests and behaviors in the WSNP support the need for increased volunteering, and this can generally be confirmed. There is a distinct need for the capacity and competences of the volunteers and a sufficient recruitment base. Due to limited staff capacity of only five fulltime employees in the WSNP, unfortunately the park has had to decline volunteer requests, clearly disappointing those who are willing to become involved. Accordingly, the national park does not have to seek volunteers; they come on their own because they appreciate the concept of the national park and UNESCO World Heritage site and would like to contribute to protecting and securing this legacy. Furthermore, they also like the idea of ‘being part of’ the group. The social element is found to be critically important and the NPWS secretariat invests in training staff to collaborate with volunteers. For example, volunteers on the national park ship are increasingly encouraged to collaborate on the boat, performing tasks such as repairing and maintaining the ship together. Using their individual experiences and craftsmanship in a group context is a core element of achieving larger objectives, which neither the WSNP secretariat nor the volunteers could have accomplished alone.

Another lesson learned from the national park is that managing and accommodating the varied needs and aspirations of the volunteers is very time consuming. It is the assessment of the WSNP that one full time employee is needed for every 50-100 volunteers, depending on the type of activities. Regardless of their background and potential prior professional education, all volunteers are keen to learn more about the nature, culture and history in the WSNP. They are eager to undertake more courses, to learn and share knowledge as proud, volunteer ambassadors for the national park. In this respect, they do much more in terms of capacity building and multi-facetted engagements with the
WSNP than simply solving mundane jobs and task. In short, their meaningful engagements become integral to the third way of governance in the national park.

Conclusions

This study is framed within the context of national parks and protected areas, and points to the relevance of “third way” governance paradigms in this context. With scarce budgets and limited staff, national parks, like the WSNP are not capable of keeping pace with the significant conservation and interpretation demands as well as other obligations. The WSNP relies on the activities of other stakeholders, and of a wide portfolio of external funding and external commitments, and the engagement of volunteers. In this sense the WSNP lends measures and practices from both the first and second way of governance. In addition, and increasingly so, the national park board and management must navigate and prioritize interactions with volunteers. This raises the consideration of the need to balance first, second, and third way governance structures and measures.

In accordance with the notions of stewardship, the national park has put effort into establishing institutional structures to accommodate the volunteers and to experiment with and address recruitment, retention and empowerment measures and incentives. The WSNP board willingly shares (select) governance privileges and responsibilities with others, and the volunteering citizens and visitors are deemed of importance to ensure third way governance. As the WSNP has a heterogeneous land owner structure, making constructive alliances with volunteers can also be considered as a way to counterbalance dominance of governance arrangement that tend belong to the first and second way.

This study asked whether co-governance with volunteers can and will be enhanced in the future. As a relatively new national park, the WSNP is on a steep learning curve from national parks worldwide and add their own innovative positions. As described above, the national park has already a variety of heterogeneous bodies and associations of high relevance, which serve as a recruitment basis.
for the volunteers. However, volunteers are not systematically included in governance issues. Those present have a voice, and the mutable and ever-transformative mode of getting influence is generally accepted as an ingredient in national park capacity building. Power and influence are matters of continued negotiation. Some stewards and associations that pave the way may assume power and governance beyond what is embedded in current regulation. Generally, locals are generally better represented than tourists in volunteer tasks. In this respect, enthusiastic volunteer tourists lack a stepping stone to satisfactorily influence the sustainable development of the park. The potential of tourists to become involved as “bonus-citizens” in their favored tourist destination remains absent in the governance literature and protected area research. This study demonstrates the existence of such resource. However, it not conclusive in terms of knowledge about the willingness of tourists to become involved in governance or nature protection in the destination areas. This is topic that deserves further empirical inquiry and consideration in governance theory.

Whether a scope for further co-governance with WSNP volunteers exists remains in question. The significant interest in contributing suggests that there is room for deeper engagement and shared decision-making mechanisms. However, this study and the WSNP’s own observations suggest that many volunteers like tasks and jobs to be extremely well-defined, which implies distinctive prioritization and managerial precision, which appears to be at odds with the notion of stewardship. Consequently, and in accordance with international findings about volunteering, the WSNP envisages that governance innovations must integrate social incentives with immense meticulousness aligned with to motivations for contributing to nature protection, learning and experiencing, which may inspire locals as well as visitors to engage in stewardship.
This article described the governance development of protected areas from a “first” paradigm view with statutory obligations and amble funding over the “second” paradigm and a deregulation and market orientation to a “third way”, which relies on collaborative involvement and citizen institution building. This study of the WSNP represented the possibilities for the "third way” with its volunteering and latent stewardship approaches. The challenges yet to be addressed include how to include demanding conservation and protective tasks and keep up commitment from a large group of volunteers over time. Another challenge is how to utilize volunteers as spearheads for both governmental and private funding. Last but not least, the governance innovative endeavor will consist of building relationships with second home owners and tourists, who can not only assist with practical tasks but also provide new capacities and dedication and enhance a geographically wider attitude of citizenship and stewardship of the national park.

Danish National Parks are under some, but hardly substantial economic pressure compared to parks internationally. Still, national park maintenance is gradually shifting from being an entirely public task to reliance on other stakeholders, while the legislative and controlling capacity remains with the governing bodies. It is likely that the emerging institutionalization of volunteering and engagement of stewards will be subject to continuous negotiation and experimentation in the WSNP and as integral to third way governance innovation.
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### Tables and Figures

Table 1: Visitors’ activities in the national park during the last visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of answers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>70.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving a car</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>34.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing nature</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>33.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching animals</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>23.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>19.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about nature</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>17.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking a dog</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>12.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>12.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching seals</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling (not on a mountain bike)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>12.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovering historical sites</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunbathing</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting mussels/oysters</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in a guided tour</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing golf</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting plants</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorboating</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying overnight in nature</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geocaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watersports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of observations</strong></td>
<td>766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Interest in volunteering according to the respondents’ place of residence (percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of residence</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicinity of the park</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Denmark</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Denmark</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Willingness to voluntary and respondents age, education and income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to volunteer</th>
<th>Age cohorts</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>25-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to volunteer</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low education</td>
<td>Vocational and professional education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to volunteer</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>Mid-income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Willingness to voluntary by respondents’ occupation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to volunteer</th>
<th>In manual and vocational jobs</th>
<th>In professional jobs</th>
<th>Business owners and independence</th>
<th>Under education</th>
<th>Outside the labor market</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Willingness to volunteer by leisure activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to volunteer</th>
<th>Walking</th>
<th>Driving a ride by car</th>
<th>Experiencing nature</th>
<th>Watching animals</th>
<th>Photographing</th>
<th>Learning about nature</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Location of Wadden Sea National Park in Denmark.
Figure 2. Respondents’ activities during their latest visit to Wadden Sea Nation Park according to their area of residence.
Figure 3: Would you volunteer to contribute to the development of Wadden Sea National Park by performing unpaid work within the following fields? By percentage.

Figure 4: Would you volunteer to contribute to the development of Wadden Sea National Park by performing unpaid work within the following fields? Yes answers by percentage (N=341).
Figure 5: Would you volunteer to contribute to the development of Wadden Sea National Park by performing unpaid work within the following fields? “Yes” and “maybe” answers by the proximity of residence.