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Abstract

The focus of academic planning literature is on urban and metropolitan areas. As a result there is a dearth of literature related to planning in the more remote regions. The purpose of this research is to create an analytical framework to make a coherent examination of the planning knowledge production process applied by a remotely located community that supplies a bird watching tourism product. This thesis examines the relationship between the three types of planning theory in the planning knowledge production process to describe how planning theory contributes to the practices applied in a remote locale.

A mixed methods research strategy was developed to determine the characteristics that are inherent to a bird watching tourism product and those that differentiate the product within a product range. The quantitative results from 714 bird watchers and 51 Tour Operators indicated that the differentiating characteristics of bird watching tourism products are dependent upon the presence of pre development conditions such as governance structures and infrastructure. The qualitative analysis of the decision making process found that the case study community planned for tourism development in isolation to knowledge about tourist preferences and in its stead focused upon the visiting Tour Operators perceptions of market demand.

The results suggest that planning knowledge production is not limited to quantifiable data to substantiate financially competitive development in a remote location. The case study community demonstrated that planning knowledge that sustains the development within the community locale can be internally produced and more credible than quantifiable data. The thesis concluded that the application of urban derived planning theory serves to reinforce a marginalised perspective of remoteness and that a place based conceptualisation of planning for development in remote areas that considers the unique qualities of the people and the environment is required.
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Preface

Planning in the Anglo American systems is about reducing uncertainty and addressing risk. The literature abounds with research in both tourism and planning that justifies empiricism under the auspices of substantiating market realism and the distribution of social benefits. When I originally designed the research strategy associated with this thesis I assumed that the market data that I planned to collect would have application in the decision making processes associated with tourism by the case study community. I therefore completed the data collection of the bird watcher preferences for tourism development and the Tour Operators perceptions of these preferences before I conducted the case study research. The results from this data collection phase are reported in Chapter 6 and constitute an important component of my research strategy. After reading Chapter 7 it will become evident that this form of knowledge is largely irrelevant to the case study community, yet highly relevant to a risk adverse culture such as my own. I initially thought that market knowledge was a critically important aspect of planning and that assessing the gap between community perceptions of the market and the market's perceptions of itself would be necessary to understand the planning process, however this was not the case. This finding explains why the data analysis in Chapter 6 forms such a small part of the discussion and conclusions which in turn represents the consolidation of my journey of learning.

The research strategy represents a rationalists approach to planning that is largely reflective of a practitioner that has been shaped by a modernist planning system. The results from this research strategy suggest that planning is value laden whereby processes evolve as responses to situations and knowledge is sourced in formats that can be easily integrated into the unique system.
Chapter 1
Introduction to the Study

1.1 Introduction

The purpose of this research is to undertake an examination of the planning knowledge production process applied by a remotely located community engaging in bird watching tourism development. Planning as a practice has evolved from the organisation of urban environments and as a means of providing a community with access to decision making and a range of benefits associated with development. The literature within the planning body of knowledge does not specifically address remote area locations, their characteristics or development processes as being distinctly different to urban areas. The methods and theory associated with urban development issues are generally applied across all landscapes rural and urban alike. Low Choy (2005) firmly asserts that urban planning methods and theory cannot be applied to rural and remote areas. The nature of the relationship between the components within planning systems is not transferable from urban to non urban areas. Similarly, Markey et al (2006) attributes the failures of development strategies in remote areas to (amongst other things) the misapplication of urban planning notions.

Remote communities often possess highly specialised resource dependent local economies that are exposed to the influences of the global commodity markets. As a consequence of this exposure, remote communities attempt to minimise the impact of market fluctuations upon their local economy by improving their competitiveness, creating new markets for their goods and services or diversifying their economic platforms to include new industry development (Walter 2003). Bird watching in particular has received a great deal of publicity as a potential economic development strategy for remote areas (Scott and Thigpen 2003, Tourism Queensland 2001). The literature suggests that bird watching has a significant economic impact to communities located near birding hot spots (Scott and Thigpen 2003). A monolithic image of bird watchers has emerged and perpetuates a myth that participants in the activity are a group of equally wealthy individuals in pursuit of birds (Scott and Thigpen 2003). However, the academic literature describes a different perspective of the bird watching market than the popular press.
The purpose of this thesis is to create an analytical framework in the form of a series of models to investigate the relationship between planning theory and a planning practice in a remote location. The analytical framework developed for this thesis describes the planning knowledge production process that is created and used by a community in the Arfak Mountains of West Papua. The framework is used to provide an insight into how the community makes decisions about the provision of a bird watching tourism product, and describes the material consequences of the planning process. Remoteness is seen as a key determinant of planning theory and practice for alternative tourism.

This chapter is presented in nine sections including this introduction. An overview of the thesis is summarised in three sections immediately following this introduction. The first (Section 1.2) describes the overall research process adopted in making the examination of both the theory and practice of planning for alternative tourism in a remote area. Section 1.3 outlines the theoretical hierarchy of planning for alternative tourism and considers how this may transpire to a remote area. Section 1.4 describes the case study site to provide the context to the real life planning practice undertaken by the remotely located West Papuan community. Subsequent sections provide an overview of the thesis. Section 1.5 describes the contributions that this thesis makes to the field of planning generally and specifically to tourism planning in remote areas. Section 1.6 provides a summary of the study limitations, Section 1.7 provides the definitions of key terms used throughout the thesis, Section 1.8 provides an overview of the structure of the document and Section 1.9 presents the chapter summary.

1.2 The research process
The research process adopted in the development of this thesis applies Burch’s (2003) description of a model based view of theory, whereby models as opposed to laws are the central element to theoretical analysis. A model according to Burch is any abstract representation of some portion of the real world that is constructed for the purpose of gaining an in depth understanding, explanation or prediction of the phenomena under examination. A theoretical model represents a formal system, and the propositions that underpin the model describe the components of the system, and the inter relationships where theory may or may not reflect empirical reality. Burch (2003) maintains that a model is true if it fits some portion of the real world:

1. closely enough;
2. in certain respects; and
The analytical framework developed for the purpose of this thesis describes the theoretical planning knowledge production process, and guides the analysis into how a remote area community in the Arfak Mountains of West Papua makes decisions about the provision of a bird watching tourism product in their locale. The planning knowledge production process is discussed briefly in the following to provide context to the planning practice conducted in the Arfak Mountains.

1.2.1 Remote area planning knowledge production process
The overarching philosophy that guides the design of this research is pragmatism. According to Rorty (1999) pragmatism treats theory as an aid to practice rather than seeing the practice as a degradation of theory. Planning is action that is based on knowledge. However, it is the ‘ways of knowing’ that is central to the production of knowledge. According to Hoch (1984) pragmatism is a philosophy of action rather than knowing or being. The ideal pragmatic planning theory according to Hoch (1984) would not separate the process from the substance and in doing so would focus on defining problems in relation to the particular histories and attachments of people to specific locales. This ideal theory would explore and recognise the influence of corporate and government bureaucracies as problems by the people subjected to such insecurity, as well as collaboratively learning to overcome this uncertainty by drawing up a plan of action, based on the strength of diverse emotional bonds that secures a common purpose and legitimises democratic participation (Hoch 1984).

However, there is no consensus on planning theory and Hoch’s ideological perspective on pragmatism still requires some form of procedural and substantive theoretical knowledge from which to base the planning action. McConnell (1981) maintains that there is a contrast between the scientific approach to theorising and the critical approach associated with social sciences. To this end McConnell (1981) proposed a categorisation of planning theories. Since this categorisation these types of theories have been referred to throughout the planning literature (Halpern 2007, Yiftachel 2006, Williams 2006, Taylor 2003). This categorisation is comprised of three types of planning theories, namely:

1. Normative theories that explain why society and planning is as it is and how it should be.
2. Procedural theories that describe the processes and operations of planning. These types of theories also include a normative description of how to improve these theories and operations such as how planning should be organised and operated.

3. Substantive theories are derived from many disciplines and describe the basis of the action (i.e. subject matter). These types of theories include those that explain the phenomena with which planners deal, for example, a specific land use such as housing, industrial development or transportation.

McConnell maintained that these three types of theories are interrelated and that there are no boundaries around categories of planning theory since they are interdependent. Accordingly planning theory is a changing set of loosely interrelated subsets of theories, concepts and ideas. However, even McConnell concedes that it is important to relate the work of a number of theories in an attempt to produce a coherent body of planning knowledge. This does not imply that there is one general theory of planning. Donaghy and Hopkins (2006) describe coherentism as web of belief, and a coherentist perspective on planning theory as a description of the theories that assist in managing change and making decisions about what is the best action to take all things considered.

Taylor (2003) suggests that for planning theory to be of use both theoretically and practically the underlying concepts must be capable of further analysis to enable an explicit description of their inherent meanings. The relationship between the three types of planning is characterised in Figure 1.1 to describe the planning knowledge production process, and the relationship between the three types of planning theories. The normative planning theoretical concepts describe the philosophical influences upon both the procedure undertaken and the search for substantive knowledge. The planning literature is scrutinised in Chapter 2 to establish the normative theoretical concepts as these relate to planning in a general sense, and remote areas specifically. Similarly the procedural planning theoretical concepts are strongly influenced by the norms of the society that the plan is to be implemented within and by the history and attachment of people to a specific locale. The notion of alternative tourism as a planning procedure is investigated in Chapter 3 as the basis of the decision making framework that guides community decision making about tourism. The substantive planning theoretical concepts refer to the knowledge sought and applied in relation to what to consider in the planning process. The
literature on special interest tourism is examined in Chapter 4 to establish both the planning theoretical concepts inherent to bird watching and the planning system.

**Figure 1.1**

Remote Area Planning Knowledge Production Process
(developed for this thesis)

Figure 1.1 is used in this thesis to create a coherent body of planning knowledge about alternative tourism in a remote area. In creating this body of knowledge, the special interest of bird watching in West Papua is examined to provide a real life account of the relevant planning theoretical concepts applied by the community in making decisions about tourism development in their locale.

**1.2.2 Research Aim and Objectives**

The remotely located community within the Arfak Mountains is examined to gain an understanding of the concepts applied in the spatial transformation of their locale for the specific purposes of bird watching tourism.

The overall **Research Aim** is:
To characterise the planning knowledge production process associated with alternative tourism in a remote area.

The planning theoretical concepts that are identified in the literature review provide the structural foundations of the analytical framework. The first model created within the analytical framework describes the normative planning theoretical concepts inherent to planning generally and remote areas specifically.

**Research Objective 1:**

To identify the normative planning theoretical concepts that underpin the planning knowledge production process applied by a remote community.

The second stage of the analytical framework is an investigation of the planning theoretical concepts associated with alternative tourism.

**Research Objective 2:**

To describe how a remote area community makes decisions about the level of development associated with an alternative tourism product.

The third and final stage in the creation of the analytical framework scrutinises the special interest tourism literature to identify the underlying substantive planning theoretical concepts. The spatial development pattern of the remotely located case study is also examined to describe planning as an action that realises the material consequences of decision making.

**Research Objective 3:**

To identify the substantive planning theoretical concepts that were applied in the planning procedure and how these influenced the spatial transformation of the locale.

The following sections of this chapter provide an introduction to the planning knowledge that influences alternative tourism in a remote area. The structure of the analytical framework is used to describe the planning knowledge production process applied by the case study community.

**1.3 Planning theory for remote areas**

Many non urban communities, and particularly those located in remote areas, are highly vulnerable to economic dislocation which is in part due to a small population, a highly specialised economy and a geographically isolated location (Slack et al 2003). Communities in these areas are particularly vulnerable to external economic
conditions for example the commodity markets and in many instances lack the capacity (human and capital) to rapidly adapt to external economic shocks. Planning for development in remote area locations according to Markey et al (2006) requires a paradigmatic shift from the traditional comparative advantage approach to that of achieving competitive advantage within the global marketplace. However, the interpretation of competitiveness that is applied in government intervened remote area planning, replicates strategies and borrows recommendations from urban planning processes (Markey et al 2006). The misapplication of these development notions promotes smoke stack chasing, particularly in the absence of any realistic assessment of the ability to match remote supply with global demand.

Research in health (Dixon and Welch 2001, Singh 2004), education (Bryceson 2002, Schollar 2001), business development (North and Smallbone 1996) and tourism (Buckley 2007, Beyer et al 2005) refers to the concept of remoteness. However, scant attention has been paid to either differentiating the planning characteristics of urban from remote, or describing how the socio economic attributes of remote areas differ from those present in many urban areas (Copus and Crabtree 1996). Rural development literature (Cloke 1996, Marsden 1998, Higgins and Lockie 2002, Mather et al 2006) has described planning in respect to the intensification of agricultural productivity through deregulation (Cloke 1996) and rural governance (Higgins and Lockie 2002, Wilson 2004). However, neither of these approaches has taken a holistic and integrated approach to the development of an entire region. As a consequence, rural areas are examined from a 'post productivist' perspective, and urban areas continue to develop in isolation to the development needs of the rural and remote area populations.

Remote areas according to Slack et al (2003) are characterised by sharing some or all of the following:

- small size, in terms of population, market and labour supply;
- physical isolation from other, and particularly larger, urban centres;
- lack of economic diversification;
- a weak and declining economic base and limited employment opportunities;
- limited range of public and private services; and
- high production and servicing costs.
Spatial planning theory and practice within the urban centre is essentially related to and has evolved from, the management of change within complex urban and industrial systems and the political and legislative processes that govern the change in land uses (Selman 1995). Rural and remote areas by comparison have been neglected in relation to planning theory and practice. This may be attributed to a perception by planners that rural areas possess less complex and competitive economic structures associated with local primary industries. However, Selman (1995) maintains this is largely as a result of the rural and remote area being outside the scope of statutory planning, and being treated as little more than a conduit for urban activity systems.

Markey et al (2006) maintains that the application or misapplication of development notions from urban settings is particularly problematic for remote areas. This misapplication according to Markey et al (2006) creates planning strategies that reinforces the existing urban based industrial resource economy and the dependence upon external capital and business opportunities. This misapplication may be caused by a mismatch between urban planning theory and the material consequences of its application to a remote area.

1.3.1 Tourism development in remote areas
In order to overcome the troughs and peaks associated with market fluctuations, weather events and input costs, communities in remote areas have sought to supplement income streams through development including tourism. It is a commonly held belief that tourism is a cheap and easy solution (Carson and Hanwood 2007b, Galagoda et al 2004) to addressing the troughs and peaks associated with commodity markets.

However, location is a very important and an often over looked attribute in the planning of economic development, and subsequent land use planning in remote areas. Spatial externalities in the form of transport costs invariably mean different returns to different uses, which are further exacerbated by remoteness from processing centres. Accordingly, all other things being equal, the comparison of returns over distance from the originating source of the product to the market will generate different zones for different uses when location decisions are exogenous (Segerson et al 2006). This in turn means that returns generated from a land use will generate different profit zones, and the further the distance from the centre, the higher the transport costs and the lower the profit. In other words, if a particular type
of land use is profitable in an urban node, it may not be equally profitable in a remote area because of the associated transport costs.

Research in outdoor recreation use of national parks (Clawson and Knetsch 1966) has demonstrated an inverse relationship between the distances from residence to the intensity of use of a national park. This means that the greater the distance from the residence the lower the visitor intensity. This has also been referred to as distance decay (Blomgren and Sorenson 1998). What this has meant for tourism in remote areas is a smaller share of the market because of location and subsequent transport costs (time and money). Planning for tourism development in remote areas requires an entirely different approach to areas that have international airports, public infrastructure and highly accessible attractions. Butler (1990) maintains that many people, i.e. the mass of tourists, enjoy not having to travel vast distances and expend large amounts of time and money to achieve their travel goals.

Those communities in remote areas who consider providing for tourism must invariably cater to a smaller size market. Moreover, Carson and Harwood (2007a) maintain that remote areas may be better suited to tourist markets with highly specialised interests where there is lower substitutability of both the activity and the settings. However, to attract these highly specialised tourists, the uniqueness of the setting must be significant enough to offset the costs associated with the time and money spent in accessing the area.

Planning for remote area tourism requires an understanding of the potential market size, the specialised interests of the market, and the unique natural and/or cultural attributes of the setting that may attract the potential market. The conventional approach applied in tourism planning does not address the relationship between the setting, the activity, market preferences and industry structure. Planning for tourism that is alternative to mass tourism may provide a conceptual framework to enable a more in depth understanding of the relationship between the market and the physical environment.

1.3.2 Planning for alternative tourism in remote areas
Remote areas are becoming increasingly popular as places that enable people to connect with real life experiences (Williams 2008). These experiences are derived from getting outside the comfort zone and being physically or mentally challenged from interactions with the natural and cultural values of the area. These real life or
authentic experiences are one of the many defining features that describe alternative tourism.

The term alternative tourism is much like sustainable development, inferring that the term can mean anything to anyone. This has led to a range of planning practices and different forms of tourism being referred to as alternative. Weaver (2007) maintains that alternative tourism can be regarded as an early form of engagement with the idea of sustainability and contrasts the features of mass tourism with the most ideal types of tourism being described as alternative. However, Butler (1990) is less convinced and suggests that it is alternative to the least desired and most undesirable type of tourism referred to as mass tourism.

Alternative tourism is characterised as catering to lower numbers of visitors that invariably means that development is small scale, possesses the potential to be controlled by the local community (Weaver 2007), tourism income is low and therefore supplementary to the local economy (Telfer 2007) and that the market will be seeking out the satisfaction of specific interests and experiential outcomes associated with the characteristics of the setting as opposed to developed accommodation facilities such as resorts (Brotherton and Himmetoglu 1997).

Alternative tourism can be examined from many perspectives. The provision of tourism products and services can be organised by a community seeking specific experiential outcomes, rather than by multinational firms that tend to supply to a larger number of tourists that possess homogenous experiential preferences. The mass of tourists according to Brotherton and Himmetoglu (1997) seek out consistency in their destination choices particularly in relation to their social reference frames at home. The alternative to this market is special interest tourists who do not follow the majority.

This research examines an alternative supply system of products and services to mass tourism in the form of community based tourism. Similarly, this alternative supply system is believed to attract tourists who chose to engage with a product or service that satisfies particular interests or needs, that offer active identification with a host community (Derrett 2001).
1.3.3 Community based tourism as alternative tourism
The practice and study of community based tourism (CBT) is inherently multidisciplinary by nature. This form of tourism incorporates investigations into the extent and influence of social capital (in the form of networks and access to support via these networks), an appreciation of the land cover attributes including the ownership thereof, and the system of tourism at both a local and global scale.

The notion of community is intrinsically good, much like the term sustainable. These prefixes are never used in a negative sense and in the past have been applied to legitimise projects and development proposals. According to the literature on community based tourism (Singh et al 2003, Reid 2003), tourism is in itself not a bad thing, just badly planned and managed. The structure and planning of CBT is seen as an alternative to conventional mass tourism. CBT has been hailed (Murphy 1985, Reid 2003) as the most appropriate form of tourism as the benefits accrue directly to the community as opposed to large externally based companies. CBT centres on the involvement of the host community in the planning, construction, maintenance and management aspects of tourism development. This implies that the host community has involvement in, control over or ownership of, the planning outcomes such as tourism enterprises (Blackstock 2005, Simpson 2008). CBT is a form of development that is centred upon a community as the lowest level of aggregation at which people organise for common efforts in the form of a community as a small, homogenous and territorially bound unit (Kumar 2005). CBT is viewed as the alternative and therefore more sustainable approach to conventional mass tourism styles of development (Weaver 2007).

However, the relationship between tourism, community and development remains poorly understood, with many divergent views on the matter. Reid (2003) maintains that if tourism is to be sustainable then a community must reach a collective decision about the appropriate level of development. This collective decision is determined through the identification of commonly held values and aspirations for development that suits the particular community circumstances. For Reid (2003), planning for CBT is a learning process about a form of development that sees the community aware of the terms of exchange in relation to the costs and benefits.

CBT has also become the alternative to all things unsatisfactory with mass tourism. Accordingly, CBT allows the community to free themselves from the grasp of outside tour operators and powerful leaders at the national level, by being empowered with
decision making and business ownership (Timothy and Tosun 2003). However, results from research undertaken on participatory processes in a tourism community (Blackstock 2005), showed that processes at the local level do not alter the external pressures and that these externalities have the power to structure the destiny of each community. Moreover, Blackstock maintains that CBT focuses on maximising the economic stability of the industry under the auspices of legitimating tourism development as locally owned and controlled. This research will characterise the form of CBT undertaken by a remotely located community, and determine if there are any differentiating characteristics to those described in the literature.

1.3.4 Special interest tourism as alternative tourism

Special interest tourism is the term used to describe the providers and consumers of products and services that cater to a specific interest or activity. Special interest tourism in this instance is viewed as alternative to mass tourism because the product and service is not related to transport or accommodation facilities (Hall and Weiler 1992). The focus of this form of tourism is upon a particular special interest and alternative destinations as the context for the pursuit of the special interest.

Alternative tourism is not effective if there are no tourists. Proponents of alternative tourism who disregard the preferences and needs of tourists are dependent upon ‘pious hope’ according to Butler (1990). There needs to be sufficient attractions to attract tourists and most alternative tourists have many options available to them. To gain competitive advantage requires a highly differentiated product with the tourism market place, and an understanding of the preferences and needs of the tourist market.

Special interest tourism caters to the specific interests of individuals and groups (Derrett 2001). A special interest tourist chooses to engage with a product or service that satisfies a particular interest and need (Derrett 2001). It was previously established (Section 1.3.3) that the ownership of a tourism enterprise is described as alternative when it is owned and controlled by the community. The role of the tourism enterprise irrespective of whether it is described as alternative or mass is to provide a service or product to a market. However, alternative tourism products and markets are collectively described as special interest tourism, whereby the product caters to specific interests of the consumer (Derrett 2001). In remote areas, there are two providers that cater to the tourism market, those being the community and the tour operator as the intermediary within the supply system.
1.3.5 The special interest tourism system in remote areas

Like most tourism systems, the special interest system is comprised of those that supply the tourism product and/or service, and those that consume the product and/or service. However, unlike those localities that receive the bulk or mass of tourist numbers, remote areas are dependent upon tour operators or intermediaries (Trunfio et al 2006), to attract tourists to their destination. The role of the tour operator is to seek out a destination that meets the needs of the tourists, and develop a product that will motivate them to purchase with the expectation that their needs will be met. The tour operator does the marketing and product development, while the remote area destination provides the setting for the interest including accommodation and food requirements. The tour operators are not only intermediaries, as they perform other roles within the system beyond acting as a distributor, they also influence and address the demand for destinations, stimulate the need for tourism and exert a great deal of influence upon the primary choice of destinations, by providing the means to satisfy the demand (Trunfio et al 2006).

There are two types of tour operator within the remote area system. One is located at the destination, and the other at the tourist generating region which may or may not be internationally based. The tour operators provide specialist knowledge and skills in the specific interest pursued by the tourists. In the case of fishing or bird watching, the intermediary that is located in the tourist generating region, connects with, and responds to, the product demands of the tourists. To provide for many markets within the special interest, the tour operator also connects with operators that are based at a variety of locations and are able to provide specialist skills and knowledge about the activity at the specific location. For instance the destination tour operator may provide the boat to take the tourists fishing in, or in the case of bird watching provide tour guiding services.

However, it is the primary concern of the tour operator to satisfy their client’s needs, not the destinations, in order to remain and grow within the industry (Trunfio et al 2006). This in itself has ramifications for the remote area destination in that it must satisfy the requirements of the destination tour operator, the tour operator located at the tourist generating area and the tourists in order for it to remain within the industry. It is assumed that the tour operator represents the demand preferences of the tourists and therefore seeks out destinations that will satisfy these preferences. This research will examine the role of the tour operator in the special interest system to
determine the extent of their influence in the planning knowledge production process regarding tourism development.

1.4 The planning practice: bird watching in the Arfak Mountains of West Papua

The case study site is located in the remote Arfak Mountains of West Papua. The community under examination provides a range of services such as food, accommodation and guiding services to bird watching tourists. This research analyses the planning knowledge applied to describe how the special interest of bird watching was initiated and organised by the remote area community.

This research was structured and designed to provide an insight into how the decisions were made about development and the spatial transformation process associated with CBT. This research is particularly interested in finding out what types of planning knowledge are used by the community in making decisions about the supply and the material consequences of these decisions.

1.4.1 Study area: Village #3

The community is referred to as Village #3 to protect its identity and to distinguish it from the two other villages within the Arfak Mountains that had been used in times past for the purposes of bird watching tourism. Village #3 was selected because of its remote location and the community based structure that co ordinates the range of services and development related to the tourism enterprise.

The island of New Guinea lies just south of the equator between the Asian and Australian continents. West Papua is located at the most eastern part of Indonesia and is also the western half of the island of New Guinea. The Indonesian province of West Papua was previously known as Irian Jaya Barat. However, in February 2007 West Papua (the state) was divided into two self governing provinces, one being the Papua Province (bordering Papua New Guinea) and the other West Papua (including the birds head). West Papua is comprised of eight (8) regencies and one city (referred to as City # 1 within this study). The Regency of West Papua is led by a democratically elected Bupati.
The economy of West Papua is dependent upon natural resource exploitation (Fernandes 2006). Ownership of the forest, mineral and marine resources are vested in the Province. Despite the national Indonesian government declaration that no logging is permitted in West Papua, the devolution of legislative power to the provinces enables the sale of forest, fish and mineral licenses without national government approval. The province possesses legal ownership of the resources and the land that they occupy. Traditional land tenure systems are not recognised in the legislative provisions.

West Papua, specifically the Arfak Mountains and the Mamberamo Basin, contain large tracts of undeveloped tropical forests that provide habitat to globally threatened species. Fernandes (2006) maintains that the threat to West Papua’s virgin forests has intensified since the fall of Suharto (Indonesian President from 1967-1998), and is directly attributed to the devolution of powers to the provinces.

The case study community examined in this study and referred to as Village #3, is approximately 60km (3.5 hour drive) from the closest urban centre (refer to Map 1.1).
Village #3 is seasonally accessible by road from the capital of City #1 and is comprised of 17 houses and one church. Farm lands surround the village and these areas are enclosed by montane forest and steep topography. The people of the
community all speak the local language of Hatam, the younger generations speak Bahasa Indonesia and only one resident within the community (tour guide) speaks limited English.

The Arfakans are Melanesians and as such have a strong affinity with the land and a marked sense of belonging to a place (Sillitoe 2000). Customary land tenure depends on kin relationships and as such individuals do not have freehold title to any parcel of land and the rights to use the land are allocated by the ‘landowner’. The landowner inherited the Village #3 territory from his forebears, and allocates use rights to specified areas for his kin to live, farm and hunt. Notwithstanding this fact, the land is legally owned by the ‘state’, which invariably means that should the state want access to the resources of Village #3 such as its timber, they are legally able to take these without consulting or compensating the community.

At the time of the data collection (May 2008) 80% of the village community were involved in tourism and are dependent upon tourism for 100% of their cash income. The remaining 20% of families are dependent upon agriculture of which they sell 50% of their produce and consume the remainder (interview: tour guide). All families have a house in the main village area, a farming allocation to grow their own food, and were able to access the forest (for food such as mushrooms and possum) to supplement their diet and timber for firewood or construction.

The village has no public infrastructure such as electricity, water, sewerage or telecommunications. There are no schools within the village and children must walk to a neighbouring village to attend primary classes. All secondary education is located within City #1, and children must be sent away as the village is not within commuting distance. The national government does not provide for secondary school for the remote area communities and as such the family must pay for tuition and boarding fees. The primary goal of the landowner of Village 3# is to see ‘all of the children within the village educated at a university so as to make the village a better place’ (Interview: Landowner). To achieve this goal requires self sustaining development that would enable access to income streams that are greater than what are available from traditional subsistence agricultural industries.
1.5 Contribution to the field

The major positioning of this study is within the planning literature as a contribution to understanding the role of planning theory in the conduct of a community based planning practice. The research makes four specific contributions to the field of planning generally and specifically to tourism planning in remote areas. These contributions are outlined in the following:

1. **Remote Area Planning Theory:** There are vague applications of the term remote within the literature and an emerging field of enquiry has begun to characterise remoteness as distinct from those characteristics associated with peripheral and urban locations. This thesis contributes to this field of study in the identification of the general characteristics that describe a remote area and some specific characteristics about the nature of planning for and in a remote area.

2. **Location Theory:** The research highlights the importance of applying appropriate location theory in creating remote area planning strategies. Markey et al (2006) suggests that remote areas must move from the adoption of plan strategies that promote comparative advantage to those that examine competitive advantage. However, one of the major limitations to this transition is the application or more aptly the misapplication of urban based theories, such as the reliance upon the core periphery model of development and industrial location theories relating to economies of scale within tourism planning. The research highlights an approach to gaining competitive advantage for remote area tourism products through the introduction, adaptation and examination of the locational characteristics associated with tourism.

3. **Conceptualising CBT:** Alternative tourism has been hailed as the ideal sustainable alternative to mass tourism. The supply characteristics of alternative tourism are described as being community based and the demand characteristics as a market that pursues a special interest. This research contributes to an insight into the concept of community based tourism practiced by a remotely located community.

4. **Characterising Special Interest Tourism:** This study advances the theoretical understanding of special interest tourism through the creation of a system that incorporates community, industry, place characteristics and tourists. This system enables the identification of product specifications that describe the special interest tourism product and the characteristics that
enable a community to identify the competitive advantage of their product within the overall product range.

1.6 Study limitations
This thesis has a number of limitations that must be taken into account. This research created and utilised an analytical framework to examine a planning practice that is conducted in a remote location and applies to the special interest of bird watching. In sum, the topic will be of interest to tourism planning with particular respect to alternative tourism, community based tourism and special interest tourism. The works of Getz (1986), Gunn and Var (2002), Butler (1980), Hall CM (2008, 2007) Inskeep (1991) applies distinctly different paradigms to tourism planning from that applied in this study. The aforementioned authors do not specifically address remote area locations, community based planning (theory or methods) or alternative tourism.

The analytical framework provides a theoretical structure to CBT, which is in reality a worldview perspective of tourism. In this respect, the contribution that this thesis makes to the literature is that CBT in a developed nation materialises differently to how it is planned, and thought about, in a less developed country. This research demonstrates that CBT theory is based on two prerequisites. The first of which is that the development occurs in an urban setting; and the second of which is that the setting must be in a developed country. I specifically wanted to examine the notion of planning for CBT rather than planning for ‘development’ from an economic perspective. Therefore, I do not refer to the popular development literature such as Todaro (1997), as this genre of literature does not specifically address the theoretical perspectives of how CBT materialises in a remote setting.

In addition while there are many forms of travel that are included in the study of tourism such as business travel and visiting friends and relatives, this research is specifically concerned with tourism as a leisure activity undertaken away from the home environment.

1.7 Key definitions
The integration of theories and studies from more than one academic discipline can provide for a rich source of concepts for research. However it can also set limitations to the study such as application of models, theories and concepts to practice. In particular, terms such as scale, intensity and development in spatial planning have
different applications in tourism. This study has attempted to overcome these differences in the following section so as to establish the positions taken in this research. The planning terms have applied the accepted definitions applied in spatial planning and tourism related terms are those derived from the tourism literature.

Each community and planner have their own interpretation of their environment. All planning documents define the terms and types of land uses at the commencement of a planning scheme. In keeping with this tradition the definitions of the key terms used in this text are listed in alphabetical order:

**Community:** refers to people whom one identifies with in a specific locale (Young 1990).

**Development:** in spatial planning is measured and defined as ‘the making of any material change in the use of any buildings or land’ (Greed 2000, State of Queensland 1997). A material change in the use of land includes starting a new use, or an increase in the scale and intensity of the use.

**Intensity:** A change in intensity according to the State of Queensland (2009) involves a change in some measurable quality of the activity, and may involve changes to one or more of the following:
- annual throughput; or
- type, quantity or quality of inputs or outputs.

**Locale:** the place that includes reference to the physical environment, the location and the people who imbue value upon and inhabit the defined spatial area within.

**Place:** is a space that is endowed with value (Tuan 1977) and encompasses the physical setting as well as human experience and interpretation (Stedman 2002) of the space.

**Place Sensitive Products:** those products that are produced, traded and consumed at the same physical location where its geographic location is a product differentiating characteristic (or set of characteristics) (Bull 1998).

**Place Characteristics:** specifiable characteristics of a location that influences the demand for a place sensitive product. These characteristics are capable of
differentiating a product upon the basis of importance to the consumer and as such are quantifiable.

**Remote Area:** A location characterised by its distance from an urban node, absence of infrastructure, unique demographic characteristics and highly specialised resource dependent economy.

**Scale:** The notion of scale incorporates both spatial and production features of the product. A change in scale relates to a change in the size of the activity and may include a change to total site area used for the activity and the scale of the tourism product production process (no development to highly developed node with full range of tourism related services). With respect to tourism, some activities require facilities and others depend upon the absence of facility development (Manfredo et al 2002). In the case of tourism, reference is made to a continuum of development to describe a low scale node that contains few facilities to high scale nodes that contain highly developed facilities and infrastructure.

**Special interest tourist:** a tourist whose motivation and decision making are primarily determined by a particular special interest (Hall and Weiler 1992). This special interest can be related to either an activity, destination or setting (Trauer 2006).

**Tour operator:** Best described as an intermediary between the tourist and the destination, the tour operator provides a range of services including but not limited to planning, preparing and marketing of a tour and the preparation of an itinerary for a departure on a particular date to a specific destination.

**Tourism development:** The use of premises for the purpose of providing facilities for tourists. This term includes ancillary uses such as accommodation and food establishments where they occur on the same site.

**Tourism product:** The tourism product is defined as involving a commercial exchange transaction (Trauer 2006, Scott 2003) between the provider and a consumer and includes the manipulation of the physical environment and development to cater specifically for the leisure demands of non locals. Those types of tourism activities that do not involve a commercial exchange are not defined as tourism products for the purposes of this research.
**Tourist:** Persons who travel away from their normal residential region for a temporary period of at least one night, to the extent that their behaviour involves the search for leisure experiences from interactions with features or characteristics of places they choose to visit (Leiper 2004:35).

### 1.8 Thesis structure

Figure 1.2 provides an overview of the thesis structure. This thesis is presented in nine chapters including this first introductory chapter.

Chapter 2 provides an overview of the purpose of planning, planning theory and its relationship with planning practices and the influence of philosophical orientations upon planning. The chapter characterises remote areas to emphasise how a mismatch of urban planning theory can affect the material consequences of planning in a remote area, and concludes with a description of the normative planning concepts identified in the planning literature and those specifically related to remote area planning strategies. These concepts are used to create the normative foundation model of the analytical framework.

Chapter 3 provides a review of location concepts that affect the supply of a tourism product in a remote location. The application of relevant location theory to the creation of competitive advantage development strategies exerts significant influence upon the selection of both procedural and substantive theoretical concepts. This chapter introduces the notion of place sensitive products as the basis of the demand for specifiable attributes at a locale. These attributes may be demanded by tourists and at the same time highly valued by a community for its identity, and as such the chapter discusses the procedural theoretical concepts inherent to community based tourism to form the second model in the analytical framework.

Chapter 4 discusses the substantive knowledge that a community may or may not apply when making decisions about the supply of a tourism product. This research is concerned with the special interest of bird watching and the chapter provides an insight to the relevant theoretical concepts identified in the literature that describe both the product and the market for bird watching tourism. This chapter establishes the third model for incorporation in the analytical framework.
Figure 1.2
Thesis Structure (developed for this thesis)

Chapter 1
Introduction to the Study

Chapter 2
Planning for Remote Areas: Normative Planning Theoretical Concepts

Chapter 3
Planning of Alternative Tourism in Remote Areas: Procedural Planning Theoretical Concepts

Chapter 4
Special Interest Tourism in a Remote Area: Substantive Planning Theoretical Concepts

Chapter 5
Research Strategy and Methods

Chapter 6
Data Analysis: Tourist Preferences and Tour Operator Perceptions

Chapter 7
Data Analysis: Community Based Tourism

Chapter 8
Discussion: The Planning Knowledge Production Process

Chapter 9
Conclusion: Implications for Planning and Tourism in Remote Areas
Chapter 5 describes the research strategy and how the concepts inherent to the analytical framework are examined for their application in the Arfakan planning knowledge production process. The strategy also makes provision for the investigation of the views of bird watchers from the UK and Australia regarding their development preferences, and the perceptions that a range of bird watching tour operators have of their client’s preferences. This investigation runs parallel to describing how the community makes decisions about the level of development to determine the extent to which the planning knowledge production process incorporates the views of the tour operators and the tourists as consumers of the product.

Chapter 6 is the first of two data analysis chapters and examines the perceptions that bird watching tour operators have of their client’s development preferences. This chapter compares and contrasts these perceptions with the preferences stated by the bird watchers. The analysis focuses on the place characteristics that are used as the basis of the product specifications associated with the different bird watcher typologies.

Chapter 7 is the second data analysis chapter and specifically focuses on planning as a decision making process, and planning that results in the spatial transformation of the locale. This chapter describes the history of tourism in the Arfak Mountains and how this has influenced the level of development associated with tourism and the distribution of benefits derived from providing tourism in the village. Chapter 7 describes how the supply of tourism is organised, controlled and assessed within the locale and in doing so characterises the planning knowledge production process associated with community based tourism.

Chapter 8 consolidates the knowledge and the resultant action pursuant to the analytical framework to provide a coherent analysis of planning theoretical concepts and practices, as they relate to Village #3. The chapter discusses how the community accesses and processes knowledge when thy plan for tourism according to the analytical framework, Research Objectives and Research Aim. The chapter culminates in a phenomenological model that describes the normative, procedural and substantive theoretical concepts applied in the planning knowledge production process by Village #3.
Chapter 9 concludes the research findings in relation to the implications that these have upon the planning knowledge production process for remote locations. This chapter highlights the conceptual and theoretical advances of the research and includes suggestions for further research.

1.9 Chapter summary
This chapter has provided the background to the research and broadly introduced the structure of the thesis to provide context to the planning knowledge production process that may be applied by a remote community in the supply of a tourism product. The chapter identified the Research Aim and Objectives to validate the research strategy and in doing so consolidates the theoretical structure and gives form to the analysis of the planning practice.

The purpose of the following three chapters is to review the literature to identify the inherent theoretical concepts to the analytical framework. Those being the norms that underpin a planning practice (Chapter 2), the procedures that satisfy the normative requirements (Chapter 3) and the substantive knowledge that provides context to the planning outcomes (Chapter 4).
Chapter 2
Planning for Remote Areas: Normative Planning Theoretical Concepts

2.1 Introduction
Chapter 1 provided an introduction to this study and the structure of the thesis to provide context to the types of planning theories underpinning the various models within the analytical framework created for this thesis. The purpose of Chapter 2 is twofold. The first of which is to describe how the term planning is used in this thesis, and the second purpose is to identify the normative planning theoretical foundations inherent to planning generally, and remote areas specifically.

Planning literature addresses a range of topics and issues relevant to metropolitan and urban areas, for instance infrastructure, urban design and community engagement. However, less research has focused specifically on remote areas. This chapter introduces the fundamental principles and events that have helped to define and shape planning in contemporary society. Planning theory is central to the conduct of planning activities. Yet there is very little agreement on how to define planning theory, or the underlying purpose of planning theory in relation to planning practices. Planning theoreticians such as Alexander, Maundelbaum, Friedmann, Innes, Healy, Harper and Stein emphasise the importance of planning theory and its relationship to planning practice. However, despite the centrality of planning theory to planning as a profession, practitioners fail to see the relevance of theory to practice (Harper and Stein 2006). The purpose of planning theory is to address planning practice and similarly the purpose of planning practice is to inform planning theory. There is an inextricable link between planning theory and planning practice, yet the vocabulary of theory has become irrelevant to practitioners (Harper and Stein 2006). This separation between theory and practice can be broadly attributed to a shift in philosophical thought from the focus upon plan making via empirical methods associated with modernism, to a predilection on decision making process and the interpretive methods associated with postmodernism. Exacerbating this separation between theory and practice is the absence of a coherent analytical framework (Taylor 2003) to examine the relationship between planning theoretical concepts and planning as a practice.
While the separation between planning theory and planning practice inhibits the discourse of planning generally, the limited amount of research into the characterisation of remote area planning heightens the need to identify the underlying concepts and inherent meanings of planning for, and in remote areas. A range of terms have been used to describe those areas that lie outside of the main urbanised nodes, among these include peri urban, rural and countryside, which can and invariably are used interchangeably. However, the most commonly used term in the literature is that of the peripheries or the peripheral region (Friedmann 1966, Copus and Crabtree 1996, Slack et al 2003, Copus 2001, North and Smallbone 1996, Ball 1996, Hall CM 2008). This term originates from the centre periphery model that describes an economic relationship between two locations and assumes that a predictable relationship exists between the industry based economy of the urban centre, and the resource based economy of the periphery. Remote areas by contrast do not experience a consistent and predictable economic relationship with either the urban centre or the periphery regions to enable its inclusion within the core periphery development paradigm. However despite this, the core periphery paradigm is the dominant paradigm applied to regional or non urban development planning (Dredge 1999).

To enable an understanding of the manner in which a community plans for development, requires an examination of the context of the locational characteristics that shape planning outcomes. Remote areas typically possess low population densities and as such the cost of public infrastructure such as education, health, recreation and sport opportunities, energy generation and telecommunications is significantly greater per remote person, than for those residents who are located in urban and peripheral areas. As a consequence of limited access to infrastructure, both the lifestyle of the resident and the economy of remote areas are not dependent upon technology or infrastructure. It is perceived that it is not economically feasible for government entities or commercially viable for private enterprises, to construct and maintain highways, telecommunication towers and energy generation plants to such a low population base. Invariably a lack of infrastructure results in fewer mainstream development opportunities such as tertiary processing or manufacturing to base a remote local economy upon. These limited development opportunities result in a highly specialised resource economy that it turn operates within commodity market cycles, and places the remote community in highly unpredictable and therefore vulnerable economic circumstances.
The intent of this chapter is to identify the fundamental concepts that form the foundation of remote area normative planning theory. The distinguishing feature of this framework is the explicit acknowledgement of the specific location characteristics associated with remoteness, and the subsequent influence that these characteristics have upon planning practice. According to the literature (Markey et al 2006, McCall 2003) the quintessential attribute of normative planning theoretical concepts that should sustain planning practices conducted in remote areas, is the identification and creation of competitive advantage development strategies, as opposed to urban planning practices that seek to regulate development.

The chapter is organised in five sections to culminate in a model that describes the set of propositions, concepts and constructions related to the normative planning theoretical concepts for remote areas. Section 2.1 introduces the chapter, the notion of remoteness and provides the context for the chapter within the overall structure of the thesis. Section 2.2 introduces the notion of planning and includes a description of the activity and its evolution from the social anarchy movement of the mid nineteenth century. Section 2.3 describes planning in a contemporary context including the purpose of planning and theory, the academic and professional disagreement over planning for land uses or planning as a decision making process, and the utility of an analytical framework to create a coherent analysis of planning knowledge and action. Section 2.4 characterises remote areas to emphasise the consequences of a naïve and simplistic application of urban planning theories to non urban locations.

Section 2.5 establishes the normative planning theoretical concepts of planning generally, and remote areas specifically, in order to create the foundation of the analytical framework. The identification of these concepts enables the planning practice to be scrutinised for their application by the remotely located community. The chapter concludes in Section 2.6 that the normative planning theoretical concepts in combination with its philosophical orientation influence the selection and application of procedural theoretical concepts (discussed in Chapter 3), to guide the planning process.

2.2 Foundations of planning
Understanding the evolution of planning provides context to the dominant contemporary theories and practices as they are equally applied to both urban and non urban localities. It is this misapplication of urban orientated planning theories
that according to Markey et al (2006), exacerbate economic vulnerability and social isolation in remotely located communities. The word planning may be used in different ways and as a society we accept the term planning to describe a variety of activities such as financial planning, transport planning, social planning and business planning. These planning activities share some common themes irrespective of the subject matter. These include (Dredge and Jenkins 2007):

- Concerned with the future;
- About acquiring information;
- Anticipating or forecasting change under conditions that are often uncertain;
- The development of a strategic vision;
- The evaluation of different course of action;
- Facilitating political decision making; and
- Value laden and political.

The term planning is used in this thesis to refer to the decision and plan making processes that underpin change, or as Yiftachel (2006) suggests, planning describes the publicly guided transformation of space. Planning is the process of managing change within communities, and is a human activity undertaken by humans for humans. Planning, according to Chadwick (1971) is a process of human forethought, and the subsequent actions based upon that thought that are focused upon the future. Planning is therefore future orientated and simultaneously optimistic, because it assumes the ability of the humans within the system to control the forces that impact upon the future (Chadwick 1971).

The notion of planning land uses emerged from the anarchist movement that flourished in the late 19th century and early 20th century (Hall 1995). The anarchists within the planning movement were protesting against the impacts of the free market capitalist industrial society upon the people, and the built form within the city of London. The Victorian city trapped millions of labourers in slums with no or very limited access to clean drinking water, sewerage or rubbish removal, poor air quality, densely crowded living conditions and no access to education or health institutions. These appalling living conditions motivated the ‘fathers’ of the planning movement to address these through legislative reform. Ebenezer Howard led this reform arguing that the building of garden cities, that is new settlements, with a surrounding agricultural belt, would combine the best features of town and country through the elimination the worst (Town and Country Planning Association 1999). The vision of the planning movement was not merely of an alternate built form, but of an alternate
society, one that was based on voluntary co-operation between men and women and working and living within small self sufficient self governing locales (Hall 1995).

London was not the only city suffering the ill effects of overcrowding within its cities. Paris, Berlin and New York all suffered the same problems, the manner in which they dealt with these problems varied, but undoubtedly led to the same conclusion: to improve transport networks to outer areas. This then led to the proliferation of suburbs that were not planned or constructed to Howard’s vision, but nonetheless saw the birth of a housing development industry.

The first town planning schemes in Britain concentrated on providing an improved framework for the housing development industry to work within. The objective of this framework was to gain agreement between the public and private sector, and to provide them with the one plan to both work towards instead of ‘fighting each other to each others detriment’ (Hall 1995:55). Germany developed the process and concept of zoning land uses and building heights in cities (Hall 1995). The Americans quickly followed suite, justifying the application of zoning land uses on the premise that the state had the right to regulate private use of property so as to guarantee ‘the health, safety, morals, comfort, convenience and the welfare of the community’ (Bassett 1936 in Hall 1995). Zoning, whether by design or default, enabled the private sector to gain security on their current range of potential investments. Once the approval was granted, this guaranteed the use of the land for development purposes in perpetuity, irrespective of the perspectives of either the current or future community.

Planning within the public domain is based on utopian visions that provide frameworks within which private development may proceed. Public planning theory continues to focus on how to deliver plans and regulatory frameworks that provide for the overall public interest. Development planning on the other hand is based on the principles of economic rationalism. It is the reconciliation of these two at times seemingly mutually exclusive objectives that cause the wider community to question the true purpose of state intervened planning.

What started as an attempt to reform the process of land development under the guise of environmental determinism, evolved to economic determinism, whereby the physical environment influences the extent of economic development (Wadley and Smith 1998). This evolution in combination with global concerns regarding the impacts of development upon both environmental and social values are reflected in
the way in which planning and development is undertaken, and has resulted in the Planning Crisis. This crisis is attributed to a shift from modernism to postmodernism, in both planning theory and practice, that is from certainty to uncertainty, from objectivity to relativism and from unity to fragmentation (Harper and Stein 2006) and is described by Friedmann (1987 in Harper and Stein 2006) as a crisis of knowing.

### 2.3 Planning in a contemporary context

Planning is an intervention to alter the existing course of events (Campbell and Fainstein 2003), and has become the role of the government under the auspices of distributive justice (Wadley and Smith 1998). The alternative to planning is to have no government intervention, thereby allowing the free market to determine individual choice and the distribution of benefits. Accordingly, the logic behind a rational approach to planning is to replace the uncertainty of the market with a logical plan. Similarly others believe the reverse, i.e. that the logic of the market should replace the chaos left by planning (Hayek 1944 in Campbell and Fainstein 2003).

Planning according to Dror (1963:330 in Faludi 1973) is the process of preparing a set of decisions for actions in the future, directed at achieving goals by preferable means. Dredge and Jenkins (2007:22) define planning as a strategic activity comprising of a number of stages that lead to the determination of a course of action to meet predetermined goals. These two definitions describe what planning is, but does not justify its role in contemporary society. There is a duality between state intervention and the free market approach via planning. However, both approaches plan, but plan to meet different predetermined goals. The forces between the two result in both the generation of wealth and its subsequent distribution among members of a community. In theory, neither the free market nor state intervention should dominate the range of planning outcomes.

The state intervenes with the intent to equitably distribute the benefits of development throughout the affected community. The free market argues that social welfare, justice and equity are maximized by the pursuit of individual gain and that intervention stifles the attainment of this goal. Intervention based on the notion of equitable distribution of benefits from wealth has raised questions about authority and power. Typically each decision regarding an action to be taken is laid down in a document that states the intent and provides a justification. The aim is to demonstrate that the decision is the correct action to be followed. The decision making is guided by rules that are enshrined in law to describe what is, and is not,
Concerns regarding authority and power emerge because a decision is described as rational if it results from an evaluation of all alternatives in light of their consequences (Faludi 1986). To say a decision is rational, one must know all feasible alternatives and their expected consequences. A just outcome (decision) would therefore depend on a fair process that is transparent and predictable, (Wadley and Smith 1998) and assesses all feasible alternatives. The modernist method of planning saw the expert such as the planner, make a value free decision based on scientific data with no need for community involvement. This in reality did not happen, as the process associated with decision making could be and therefore invariably was, corrupted through political interference. Postmodernists such as Michael Foucault challenged the notion of both expert decision making and value free rationalism, as he believed that if the process of decision making was amended to limit empirical rationalisation and the misuse of power, then the outcomes would be derived by a socially rational process. Foucault’s perspective applied to planning was based on rational procedures, as opposed to a focus on the application of rational technical data inputs, and is highly normative in nature. Land use planning by nature involves the use of rational technical inputs. Terms such as ‘highest order use’ suggest that a rational comparative analysis has been undertaken in determining the use on a specific piece of land that delivers the greatest benefit to society. It is the normative nature of this benefit, and who accrues the benefit, that creates contention with planning and civil society.

2.3.1 Land use planning
Land use planning involves the arrangements of spatial patterns over time. According to Dredge (1999) state intervened land use planning refers to a statutory process which aims to identify a vision for the spatial development of an area, and to pursue this by designating a preferred pattern of land use. However, not all land uses are planned according to a process prescribed by written law. Spatial development occurs at varying scales independent of formal processes. For instance the layout of a farm is based on how the land owner/manager perceives the resources and subsequently frames the development pattern to make the best use of the resources.

A land use according to Malczewski (2004) is defined by various applications and the contents of its use. Accordingly, an urban planner and an agricultural expert would
have different perceptions of the term land use. To this end Malczewski (2004) proposed a distinction between the two notions of land use and land cover to permit a common basis of understanding of the terms. Land cover describes the physical state of the earths surface and immediate subsurface in terms of the natural environment (e.g. vegetation, soil and water), and the human built structures such as buildings or fences (Malczewski 2004:4).

A land use is the human perception and manipulation of a land cover type. Land use involves the manner in which the biophysical attributes of the land are perceived by humans, and the purpose for which the manipulation is subsequently used Malczewski (2004). The notion of land use is the implicit context of government intervened planning, and in this context the acceptable type of land use is described at a specific location, scale and intensity for a given area to ensure a just distribution of benefits from the land use. Making a decision about what is a proper, (acceptable) or improper (unacceptable), land use involves an understanding of the land cover and a manipulation of the elements of the land cover, to facilitate a particular land use. It is the confusion between whether planning is about land cover or about deciding what is a proper, and improper land use, that impedes the discourse of planning. This is further exacerbated when describing tourism as a land use. Tourism can take many forms and the nature of the land cover manipulation can create many different social, economic and ecological impacts. Notwithstanding this, tourism is but one of the many possible uses of land cover, and the manner in which the range of uses of the cover are identified and decided upon, creates the confusion between planning as a decision making process and the creation of a plan (Hall CM 2008). This confusion is particularly evident in the application of planning theory to planning practices.

2.3.2 Planning theory and planning practice
Campbell and Fainstein (2003) maintain that it is difficult to define planning because its theory overlaps in all social science disciplines, and therefore it becomes difficult to delineate where planning starts and ends. The authors maintain that there are four principal reasons for this difficulty:

1. The fundamental questions about planning belong to a broader inquiry concerning the role of the state in social and spatial transformations;
2. The boundary between planners and related professionals is not mutually exclusive for example planners don't just plan and non planners also plan;
3. The field of planning is divided between those who define it according to its object (land use patterns of the built and natural environments) and those who do so by its method (the process of decision making); and

4. The application of diverse methodologies from many different fields, consequently a theoretical base cannot be easily drawn from its tools of analysis.

There is no theory of planning in the same sense of the theories within natural sciences (Flyvberg 2001). Communities and their associated values, culture, history past experience, social networks, infrastructure and economic resource base differ from one space to another and therefore respond differently to given stimuli. Decision making by humans goes beyond science and technical knowledge, and involves judgements and decisions by society and politicians (Lyotard 1979, Nonaka 1994, Williams 2006). There is no consensus as to what constitutes planning theory (Friedmann 2003, Wadley and Smith 1998, Harper and Stein 2006), or its relevance to planning practice (Alexander 2003).

However, according to planning theoreticians such as Friedmann (2003:8) ‘there is no planning practice without a theory about how it ought to be practiced’. Alexander (2003) asserts that planning practice needs a theory of what (good/right) planning is or should be. Planning as a profession according to Harper and Stein (2006), that attempts to practice without reflective theory in the contemporary turbulent context may be doomed to irrelevance, decline and perhaps even extinction.

Planning theory is not a field that can be assembled in to neat typologies, and is a highly contested territory that seeks to make sense of what is happening in the world, the significance of these happenings and what to do about them (Richardson 2005). The result is a wide range of parallel, incompatible and competing sets of theories. Harper and Stein (2006) have segmented planning theory according to its philosophical orientations that are characterised as:

- Modernism: based on scientific, quantifiable and positivistic principles that is characterised in the development of the Rational Comprehensive Planning Model (RCPM). The RCPM is based on the premise that progress comes via a rational argument, planning is value free, technical (cost benefit) and the state is the agent of change.

- Postmodernism: A rejection of the RCPM whereby there is no direct experience from reality as each person sees the world through the filter of
their own paradigms, vocabularies and languages so society becomes fragmented because each person lives in a different world. Therefore there can be no net social benefit from planning processes because society is not homogeneous in its visions for the future.

However, modernism is criticised by many planning theoreticians including Friedmann (1993 in Campbell and Fainstein 2003:75) who maintains that:

The engineering model that served us during the modernist period, with its penchant for advance decision making and blue printing and its claims of superiority to other forms of decision making because of its scientific character, are thus no longer valid and must be abandoned. We are moving into a non Euclidean world of many space time geographies, and it is the recognition of this change that obliges us to think of new and more appropriate models.

The postmodern school of planning thought is characterised by its focus on the decision making within and by the society and a concentration on the notion of power and its influence on planning outcomes. The characterisation provided by Harper and Stein (2006) epitomises the major delineation made in the planning literature in that it represents the shift in thinking or ‘ways of knowing’. Postmodernism seeks to resolve problems associated with rationality under the auspices of the ‘communicative turn’. This ‘turn’ has been made in an attempt to resolve the problem of power by creating planning processes and practices that are grounded in free speech and rational argument (Richardson 2005). Table 2.1 (adapted from Harper and Stein 2006:18) illustrate the contrasting views associated with modernism and postmodernism.
Table 2.1
Contrasting approaches to planning (adapted from Harper and Stein 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of planning</th>
<th>Modernism</th>
<th>Postmodernism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Theory</td>
<td>Rational Comprehensive</td>
<td>Communicative Action and Social Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical basis</td>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td>Constructivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical focus</td>
<td>Determinism</td>
<td>Interpretivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical orientation</td>
<td>Planning is value free because it does not include community participation</td>
<td>Planning is value laden because it is focused on the involvement of the community in its decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent of Change</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Quantitative technique</td>
<td>Consensus building, communicative and dialogal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The postmodern planning theories related to the communicative approach have emerged from the work of Habermas and his theory of ‘communicative action’ in an attempt to remove the expert from the decision making process (Mazza 1995) in favour of a community-based approach. Foucault’s contribution to the processes applied to achieve Habermas’s communicative vision is to acknowledge and understand the relationship between knowledge and power (Flyvberg 2001). It is believed that power produces knowledge, and if the political power is removed through the introduction of free speech, the rational argument will be based in the social construction of the space by its inhabitants.

This shift from modernism to postmodernism has eventuated in the dilemma associated with defining planning as an outcome such as a Plan (modernism), that guides the spatial development pattern, or planning as a decision making process (postmodernism). The spatial plan however, represents the proper and improper relationship between the manipulations of land cover and a society. This in turn means that the outcome cannot, and indeed, should not be viewed in isolation to the decision making process (Lyotard 1979).

2.3.3 Decision making procedures and planning
The private net return from a given land use will differ from the social net return, and private land allocation decisions will not necessarily be socially efficient (Segerson et al 2006). This very notion of social efficiency is at the heart of state intervened postmodern planning practices. The regulation and control of land use and built form
by the state, is intended to be a reflection of the social values of the affected community. Land use in this respect is a social construct. Accordingly, while not explicitly stated by planning theoreticians, the normative theory of land use planning, is that the plan (represented as a spatial pattern of development) is the manifestation of the proper and improper relationships between the people who live in the locale, and the physical properties of the locale (Greider & Garkovich 1994, Campbell 2003).

In applying the social constructivism perspective to the decision making process, the people who live in the locale are seen as the makers of decisions. It is the decision making process that ultimately influences the type of permitted (i.e. proper) development, where it can be located and the associated scale and intensity of the said development. The Plan or spatial pattern and the decision making that underpins it, are inextricably linked, and cannot be seen nor analysed in isolation of each other. Planning in this context is less about the responses to the institutional contradictions of social formation, and more about the embodiment of the contradictions and ambivalence of the society (Perry 1995).

The most recent paradigmatic metaphor used to describe planning has been ‘development’ (Perry 1995). The term development much like planning can be used in many ways such as economic development, community development and sustainable development. The term is used to describe a change or improvement in the quality of life (Todaro 1997, Sharpley 2007). This improvement is reflected in increased standards of living through (but not limited to):

- Access to higher incomes;
- Diverse industry based;
- More equality of opportunity;
- Access to social infrastructure such as health and education;
- Protection of environmental values; and
- Infrastructure such as information and communication technologies, roads, sewerage, treated drinking water and electricity.

Development has been approached by some economists as being strictly within the realms of private industry. Accordingly, Lennon (2008) maintains that local government does not drive economic development, rather this is the role of industry. The role of state intervened planning in this instance is to influence the pre conditions for development such as (Lennon 2008):
• Infrastructure provision;
• A quality living environment;
• Appropriately skilled and flexible workforce;
• Building relationships between business, government, research and learning institutions to support innovation; and
• Support and responsive governance structures.

This perception of the relationship between those that drive development and those that regulate it is at the heart of the debate on the role of planning within society. State planners, according to Wadley and Smith (1998) no longer determine the type, location, scale and intensity of land uses within the given area upon the premise of development as an improvement in quality of life. The demand for developable land is such that the state cannot keep pace with industry demands and it has become the role of the developer (industry) to initiate site plans and construct whole new precincts (for example master planned communities). The state planner is less the maker of plans and now more the regulator who judges the plan according to the sets of outcomes (ends) that must be met (Perry 1995). Planning systems have evolved to be flexible and adaptive as to be otherwise may lead developers to migrate elsewhere (Wadley and Smith 1998).

This rationalist approach pervades, and as it continues to dominate the logic behind the planning outcomes, it continues to conflict with the purpose of planning and the practices undertaken by planners. Rationalism is seen as progress via a rational argument, and that scientific methods can serve human needs and wants through the substantiation of what is advocated, and what is opposed (Harper and Stein 2006). Planning is predicated upon the provision of rational technical value free data, and subsequent analysis, as a process of providing accountability to the residents of the locale in decision making.

Flyvberg (2001) summarised the role of rationalism in his study of the Aalborg Project, and determined that the fate of the project was not about what is rational and true in determining an appropriate development option. Instead, plan outcomes were driven by which party can put the greatest power behind the interpretation of what is rational and true. It is this form of truth that is actually realised in the physical, economic, ecological and social reality of a space.
2.3.4 Analytical framework for planning theory

The most critical issue related to defining planning is an inability to describe and define planning theory. This inability to define planning theory is described by Yiftachel (2006) as being attributed to a concentration on planners rather than on planning. This in turn has meant an emphasis on planners and decision processes, leaving a void for those working in diverse settings where decision making is less transparent and organised and where public participation is perceived as lip service or forms of co-optation in more uncompromising development environments that are characterised by creating facts from the ground (Yiftachel 2006).

To address this confusion and allow for a coherent analysis of the key concepts that describe planning as both a decision making process and as a plan, the distinction between planning theories that is inferred by Halpern (2006), Yiftachel (2006), Taylor (2003), Mazza (1995) and McConnell (1981) is applied. More specifically McConnell (1981) maintained that there are three types of planning theories, those being: theories in, of and for planning which in turn influence the planning practice. These three theories can be summarised as:

1. Theories for: are described as *normative* theories that describe the ends that planning might be directed at achieving. These theories describe ‘what ought to be done’.
2. Theories of: are described as *procedural* theories that serve to analyse the methods and focus on being as effective as possible. These theories describe ‘how to do it’.
3. Theories in: are described as *substantive* theories that describe the substance of the world. These theories describe ‘what to do’.

This chapter is concerned with establishing the concepts associated with normative planning theory. Taylor (2003) describes the key concepts employed in normative planning theory and practice as being:

- Planning to protect and enhance amenity and the aesthetic quality;
- Planning to encourage development or regeneration of certain localities;
- Planning to achieve a more just distribution of environmental goods;
- Planning that incorporates social equity and social inclusion;
- Planning for the public interest;
• Planning collaboratively; and
• Planning for sustainable development.

These concepts form the very foundation of planning within contemporary society. However, these are not given equal weighting when formulating the plan outcomes, or designing the decision making process which in turn influences the selection of procedural and substantive planning theories undertaken within the planning exercise.

Urban planning methods continue to follow in the footsteps of the utopian social anarchists by seeking to protect the marginalised (Wadley and Smith 1998), from the free market forces that threaten their existence. Development is consequently viewed with fear and trepidation, which in turn sees a shift in planning practices from the application of rationalism that favours technically rational outcomes, to one that favours Foucault’s emphasis on process to achieve a socially rational outcome. These influences in combination with a range of locational attributes that characterise a remote area, have had a profound and enduring impact upon identifying and securing development opportunities within these locations. These attributes are discussed in the following section to provide context to the creation of remote area normative planning theory.

2.4 Characterising remote locations

Spatial planning in post industrial society predominantly involves urban or metropolitan problems (Friedmann 1966). Spatial planning was formed and has evolved to address the issues facing urban centres and while the rural sector is important to the centre it does not possess its own school of planning thought that creates integrated development plans.

In Australia, only one edition of the planning journal ‘Australian Planner’ from a total of 180 has been dedicated to rural planning issues. Yet there is concern by planners (Wheeler 2003, Selman 1995) of how to manage the future of the countryside, and who to manage it for. The application of land use planning tools applied to urban areas are perceived by some to be far simpler than those required to address the more spatially complex rural context, where there is a sharper interface with cultural and land management issues, which do not fit so easily in to a urban based planning system (Wheeler 2003, Low Choy 2005).
There is a growing collection of literature on rural and environmental processes that includes regional development (Markey et al 2006, Richardson 2005); landscape planning (Forman 1995); and rural sociology (Waddell Jones 2008). However, these fields of study are tangential to the needs of a planning practice that applies to a remote location; in so much as they have not addressed planning at the depth of enquiry experienced by its urban and regional counterpart. Planning practice applied to remote areas, has borrowed models from urbanists and rural socio economists (Selman 1995) and applied these unsuccessfully to remote regions (Markey et al 2006).

In remote areas the quality of the natural resource may influence the economic base, which in turn contributes the cultural distinctiveness of its residents. This thinking is based upon the theory of environmental determinism that assumes a causal link between space and society (Frenkel 1994). Geographers according to Frenkel (1994) fear falling into a deterministic trap and remain wary of making strong statements about the causal links between the physical environment and culture.

The interpretive perspective however, suggests that whether the area is in a remote or an inner city, development reflects what people of that locale define to be the proper and improper relationships among themselves, and between themselves, and the physical environment (Greider & Garkovich 1994). All landscape in this sense reflect the residents definitions of themselves, and when the residents make decisions about the change in development (location, type, scale and intensity), the landscape is reconstructed in response to the residents changing definitions of themselves. Conversely, where there is little development such as changes in land use, the resident’s definition of their individual and collective selves, remain relatively unchanged.

While appearing to be mutually exclusive to one another the interpretive and the environmental determinism perspectives both provide plausible explanations for the ‘ways of knowing’ and planning. The following section summarises the characteristics of a remote location to provide context to the physical environment and the inhabitant’s interpretation of its corresponding ecological, social and economic values for development opportunities. The overview highlights the impact that the remote and isolated location, in combination with an economy dependent upon the
exploitation of the natural resources may have upon the identification and realisation of development opportunities.

From the literature reviewed four broad criteria that differentiate urban and remote areas emerged. Those criteria are accessibility, economic structures, socio economic characteristics, and land tenure and security. These are discussed separately in the following.

2.4.1 Accessibility

Inaccessibility is indicative of remoteness (Ball 1996), and remoteness is a major constraint on development opportunities in rural areas (Windle and Cramb 1997). Accessibility relates not only to how physically accessible an area is (Clarke and Stankey 1979), but also refers to the distance from a centre (Copus and Crabtree 1996), the quality of transport infrastructure (Windle and Cramb 1997), communication infrastructure such as access to information flows via the internet and telecommunications (Slack et al 2003), transport costs (Behrens et al 2006) and accessibility of the remote area population to a range of goods, services and opportunities for social interaction (ABS 2001, Farrington 2007).

In research conducted by Ball (1996) it was found that local authorities in the United Kingdom have constructed two perceptions of peripherality. The first of which relates to being disadvantaged and needing assistance on the grounds of inaccessibility through distances, limited transport networks and market reach, with costs imposed as a consequence. The other refers to a functional or institutional constraint as a lack of access to the wherewithal of the development process, such as accessing financial assistance.

The term peripheral does not take into account the spatial diversity of the rural and non rural world. Attempts by governments to conceptualise this diversity have been made by statisticians to identify different types of rural to address both the issue of physical inaccessibility (ABS 2001), and capacity to be self sustaining economic entities (Copus and Crabtree 1996).

Australia uses the Australian Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA), which is based purely upon the basis of road distance from any point to the nearest service centre (ABS 2001). There are five service centre classes each based upon a continuum of population size. These classes are used as a proxy of places where people can
access goods and services and opportunities for social interaction (ABS 2001). The road distance is used as a proxy for remoteness from those services. The ARIA system has been developed for use by the state and national governments in determining a range of services and funding allocations. Socio economic factors are specifically not included in the identification of the remote locations (ABS 2001).

The OECD (2006) has developed a ‘rural typology’ based upon two territorial levels (TL’s). TL2 consists of 300 macro regions and TL3 of more than 2300 micro regions (OECD 2006). These regions are classified as predominantly urban, predominantly rural and intermediate. The criteria for inclusion within these classifications is population density; regions by percentage of population in rural communities; and urban centre size. The OECD rural typology classification was developed to be consistent with the Eurostat classifications.

The OECD (2006) recognises that development patterns can differ within rural and intermediate regions, and proposed the following extensions of the OECD rural typology (2006:38):

- Dynamic remote rural regions: those regions that are distant from major centres possess sufficient natural resources, transport links or environmental attributes to attract tourists, new residents and enterprises.

- Lagging remote rural regions: those rural regions that exemplify the traditional image of rural in decline and face the most dramatic difficulties.

There is no classification of rural or remote locations within Canada to compare criteria. The term ‘rural and small town’ refers to those areas outside urban centres of 10 000 or more population, and where less than 50% of the workforce commutes to an urban centre for work (Stats Canada 2009). This system does not separate those who commute to an urban centre for work, to those that are beyond commuting and entirely dependent upon the local and immediately accessible economy. While attention has been paid to determining country specific rurality indicators, very little attention has been spent on identifying areas that are remote (Copus and Crabtree 1996), with the exception of Australia. The notion of remoteness in this sense is strictly related to distance from an urban centre, which again demonstrates a reliance upon the core periphery model for planning of government services.
2.4.2 Economic platforms

Remote areas have highly specialised economies, and are the least capable of responding and adapting to external economic shocks (Slack et al 2003). The specialised nature of the local economy means that there are fewer economic sectors to spread the impacts of a sudden decline in one sector or industry. Furthermore residents of remote areas cannot change jobs from a declining sector to another without moving to an entirely new locality. Urban centres by contrast have multiple sectors, and industries and a loss in one sector may not necessitate the relocation of employees out of the centre for the purposes of employment. The risk of economic dislocation in remote areas is therefore high. Copus and Crabtree (1996) maintained that remote areas tend to depend on declining and low income sectors, but were also dependent upon transfers i.e. financial assistance from the centre to the remote rural zone. This would further suggest that populations in remote areas are not necessarily economically self sustaining. This in turn, could lead to perceptions of marginality and a helpless population that perceives their control over economic situations to be externally driven, as opposed to internally controlled.

The centre periphery relationship is described as colonial, where the terms of trade favour the centre, and the prices of the essential foods sourced from the periphery are artificially held low through state controls and subsidies (Friedmann 1966). The centre is viewed as efficient in terms of the location of economic activities, capital investment, education, research, planning and control of government provided services. The peripherality is seen as a conduit for supporting the economic advancement of the centre (Selman 1995), and perceived to be unable to make rapid adjustments to constant socio economic change (Friedmann 1966).

Copus and Crabtree (1996) identified three rural zones in their study of remote rural Scotland (Table 2.1). They found that there was little evidence of any relationship between remoteness and economic activity. The authors did not investigate the whether the ownership structure of the resource base was locally or externally owned, but did add that the economic platform of remote areas in their study was based upon declining and low income sectors.
Table 2.2  
Development Continuum (Copus and Crabtree 1996:43)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban/Accessible Rural Areas</th>
<th>Intermediate Rural Area</th>
<th>Remote Rural Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Expanding population</td>
<td>• Recent or current rural-urban migration associated with technological change and structural adjustment in agriculture and urban industrial growth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agriculture prospers either part time hobby farming or serving urban needs such as horticulture/specialty crops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Above average incomes</td>
<td>• Continued structural problems/adjustment in agriculture, rural unemployment/underemployment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land use conflicts between agriculture, industry, residential use and recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Population and economic growth creates negative externalities such as pollution, congestion environmentally damaging development. Threatens rural amenities and puts pressure on public service provision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrated into global community through commuters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conflicts between incomers and original residents over preferences for development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sparsely populated, ageing and declining population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extreme physical environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor communications with urban centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High cost of services and infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Narrow economic base dependent on primary/extractive activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low incomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not closely integrated with other areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Valuable unspoilt environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minority peoples and culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While research has not specifically examined the perceptions of investors and planners of remote areas, Friedmann (1966) maintains that the preference for investment in the core may be due to a lack of objective knowledge about production opportunities on the peripheries. In studies conducted by Rolfe et al (2007) of the social and economic impacts of coal mining development in the Bowen Basin of central Queensland (Australia), it was found that despite the demand and the investment returns available to residential developers in the construction of employee housing within remote area communities, the housing industry perceived greater return on investments in the traditional centres that serviced the mining district.
Similarly, the affected remote area local governments were unable to rapidly respond to the demand for land availability for mine employee housing due to constraints in the planning and approval process. In this instance, the planning governance system was unable to keep pace with market demands. However, the nearby core centres within the Bowen basin of Mackay and Emerald, showed that in this same time their residential land values effectively tripled, accompanied by increases in both lot production and dwelling approvals. While sharing the same state planning governance system, the local government entities in the (relative) core were better equipped and experienced to rapidly respond to market demands.

2.4.3 Socio economic characteristics
There appears to be some diversity in respect to the socio economic characteristics of remote area populations. Some studies report disproportionate age structures tending towards an ageing population (Copus and Crabtree 1996, Slack et al 2003, OECD 2006) while others can experience in migration of working aged people (Rolfe et al 2007). It appears that population density is low by comparison to economic centres (OECD 2006, Copus and Crabtree 1996, Slack et al 2003). Employment figures will also vary dependent upon the age structure of the population and the nature of the economic activity for example the extent of seasonal employment (Copus and Crabtree 1996).

The OECD (2006) found that rural regions confront a number of challenges that contribute to weaker economic performance such as out migration, ageing, lower educational attainment, lower than average labour productivity and low levels of public services. However the OECD (2006) found that there is great variation both within and across countries with respect to socio economic characteristics.

Education levels of the rural population were lower overall (OECD 2006) than national averages, but this could be explained by young people leaving the area to pursue tertiary education. Moreover, as there is very little value adding of primary industries in rural and remote areas there, will be lowered levels of demand for specialised and skilled employees.

Copus and Crabtree (1996) found that some remote areas will have low GDP per head which can be attributed to dependence upon sectors that do not value add products and do not require skilled labour. With respect to levels of entrepreneurial activity Copus and Crabtree (1996), maintains that their study found no evidence to
suggest that remote areas are disadvantaged in this respect. The authors add caution that comparative data on rate of European new firm formation is ambiguous. Friedmann (1966) maintains that the heterogeneity (a large proportion of foreign nationals) of populations located in cities, by contrast to the peripheries, impacts upon entrepreneurial activity levels. Friedmann suggests that the heterogeneity of the population underpins a higher level of business, as the foreign nationals come with the intention to pioneer new enterprise. Conversely, this suggests that those populations with a relatively homogeneous cultural composition may not be innovative or inclined to risk taking.

The successful remote regions are those that have been able to valorise their public goods such as their attractive landscapes and cultural heritage. The success of these regions according to the OECD (2006) was related to improved transport links and growth tended towards those rural areas that are more accessible.

2.4.3.1 Indigenous people
While not well explored in research, there appears to be a higher proportion of indigenous people living in remote areas measured as a percentage of total population. For instance in Australia, of the total population in the Northern Territory described as ‘Very Remote Australia (Remoteness Areas)’ 72% were Indigenous persons, compared with the national proportion of 2.3% Indigenous persons in Australia (ABS 2008, census data 2006)

Culture as knowledge can also influence the level of economic activity (Cornell et al 2000), whereby indigenous people will select those activities that fit with the conceptions of self, and of appropriate intragroup relations. The choice of activities will be tribally specific, as each tribe will respond to particular sets of opportunities, constraints and cultural contexts (Cornell et al 2000) irrespective of the resources available.

2.4.4 Land tenure and security
De Soto (2000) maintains that access to a formal property system that secures the ownership of land in the form of a title and a planning process that secures property use rights, is fundamental to economic development. The formal property system enables a level of certainty of ownership of land in the form of implied capital equity. The capital value of the land use rights is able to be accessed i.e. borrowed against, to support growth in production. Furthermore De Soto maintains that the absence of
accessible equity reduces the opportunities for local communities to generate surplus value. Unlike labour that cannot be properly fixed and stored as a capital asset, land has the potential to be fixed and realised to initiate additional production, if the governance structures enable access to a formalised property system.

Cahill (2007) maintains that 50% of the world’s population live in urban areas, which account for 3% of the land surface of the planet. He maintains that the distribution of land (i.e. ownership), lies at the heart of solving poverty in the developing world, and securing future economic development in developed nations. White (2004) maintains that poverty experts recognise that the worlds poor is disproportionately located in rural areas, and that more than 100 million indigenous people live in the worlds forests. Governments have focused their attention on establishing private individual property rights in urban, agricultural and rural areas and have provided public infrastructure to support these areas, yet often continue to neglect remote communities (White 2004).

De Soto’s (2000) research found that most of the poor save, and already possess the assets they need to make a success of capitalism. However, these assets are in defective forms such as houses built on land whose ownership rights are not adequately recorded, and therefore are unable to access equity to increase production should they so wish. Without this equity, remote area populations will be dependent upon external capital flows to fund additional production and growth.

Slack et al (2003) found that the more remote and isolated the communities in their Canadian study performed poorly in terms of small business generation. Accordingly, Cahill (2007) reported that 9.7% of Canada’s total land mass is in private ownership and 90.3% is held by the national government on behalf of the English crown. Similarly in Australia nearly 67% of the country is held by the national government on behalf of the English crown, 13% is Aboriginal communal freehold and 15% is private freehold (Cahill 2007). Moreover, 91% of the population is urban and lives on less than 0.18% of Australia’s surface area (Cahill 2007).

The lack of access to a formal property system and secure ownership of property rights is a common characteristic to remote areas. This has the potential to restrict development opportunities and reinforce dependence upon external capital flows. The development opportunities available to a community in a remote area are dependent upon the exploitation of the natural resources. However, these
communities invariably do not own the property rights and are therefore at the whims of decision makers who live outside the community, and are therefore not personally affected by changes in the landscape.

2.5 Analytical framework: establishing the normative planning theoretical concepts

The proposed analytical framework adapts McConnell’s approach to categorising planning theory as it clearly illustrates the influence that the overarching normative theory has had upon the planning procedures undertaken, and the information that is applied in deciding the course of action to be selected and followed in the Plan. The philosophical foundation has a profound influence upon the interpretation of rationalism and the subsequent knowledge (substance) that is applied. A socially rational process would be strongly influenced by the methods applied to engage with the affected community such as communicative planning. Similarly, a technically rational process would be influenced by scientific (positivistic) principles.

When examined from a conceptual perspective, normative planning theory reads as a set of objectives that the procedures and applied substantive body of knowledge would strive to satisfy. Process and substance are intimately linked as they ceaselessly constitute one another (Yiftachel 2006). The ‘ways of knowing’ therefore become central to the production of knowledge. The contemporary knowledge production process associated with planning according to Yiftachel (2006:214), reflects the concerns and intellectual landscapes of prosperous, liberal societies where property relations are relatively stable and where most individuals including minorities have reasonable personal liberties, existential security and basic welfare provision. Moreover, Yiftachel maintains that the domination of these influences upon planning knowledge is due for a conceptual change and requires the creation of alternative bases of knowledge.

This section of the chapter assembles the concepts that have been identified as being central to the creation of an alternative base of knowledge that applies to a remote area. This base of knowledge is alternative to those applied in urban contexts, as the transformation of the spatial features associated with remote areas requires a fundamentally alternative approach to the knowledge production process.
The normative theoretical concepts that have been identified in this section have largely been drawn from the conclusions of Markey et al (2006) research. Markey et al research identified the planning framework and associated knowledge production processes as being the major impediments to creating self sustaining community based development strategies.

2.5.1 Place based planning framework

Place based planning explicitly acknowledges the relationship between the people and the attributes of the space that they inhabit. The notion of place identity, dependence and attachment is central to the literature on sense of place (Harwood 2007a). Place combines the elements of environmental determinism and social construction as it describes the values or meaning of the physical environment that shape the social rules and behaviour of a community (Harwood 2007a). Planning in remote locations as both a land use and decision making process, must consider the complex relationship between the physical environment, and the manner in which the affected community perceives both themselves as individuals and as a community.

People identify with a space, the parameters of which may transcend geopolitical boundaries and may be the result of an ongoing and enduring association with those geographical features. Associated with the place based approach, is a departure from the focus on industry sector development associated with economics, and a move towards the delineation of a place as a spatial unit, and the subsequently appropriate forms of development. The notion of a ‘commitment to place’ acknowledges the strength of social networks associated with the high levels of social capital that exists in remote areas (Markey et al 2006). While the term place was not explicitly acknowledged by Markey et al (2006), the authors made strong inferences to the notion in respect to how a community should identify development opportunities. The concept of place is associated with the relationship between individuals, the space that they inhabit and the subsequent value that individuals associate with the attributes of that space. Tuan (1977) maintains that what begins as a space when imbued with value becomes a place. The concept of place reinforces that decision making in planning for spatial transformation is value laden and reflects the values and beliefs of its inhabitants.

2.5.2 Pre conditions of development

Remote areas do not possess the range of development pre conditions that urban localities have access to. This in turn affects the range of business development
opportunities that support the growth and development of the resident population and their surrounds. The predevelopment conditions suggested by Lennon (2008) in section 2.3.3 describe the context within which development may occur. Their absence will only serve to exacerbate the perceptions of ‘remoteness’ held by residents, and leads to feelings of both spatial and social marginalisation (Garung and Kollmair 2005).

For while ever there is no resident local industry to drive economic development, there will be no need for the state provision of development preconditions. Moreover, the dependence upon the resource industry for development is plagued with uncertainty, as they are inextricably linked to the cyclical nature of the commodities markets, and technological innovations in production (e.g. steel fabrication) that determine demand for resource inputs. These are not proactively identified in the planning process as these occur on boom/bust cycles and are unpredictable at best. Therefore, planning of resource development is contingent upon and responsive to the cycles of the commodity markets, that invariably results in the transfer of long term land use rights to externally based companies. In these instances the property system operates outside the urban planning system like two parallel universes with the local community suspended in an abyss unable to influence either system.

Development planning in remote areas requires structural adjustments in both land tenure and planning, to enable the affected community to control the levers of demand, and enter partnerships with developers to provide infrastructure such as electricity, to underpin the diversification of local economies.

2.5.3 Community control
The conventional centre periphery approach to development planning in remote areas has seen the dependence upon external capital flows, to cover the high flows of resource development (Markey et al 2006). Decisions about capital expenditure for development preconditions are controlled by the centre and resource industry policy is controlled by the boardrooms of multinational corporations (Markey et al 2006). The fundamental question therefore becomes ‘who to plan for’? Does the plan preserve the landscape to relieve the urban based environmental guilt, respond to the survival needs of multinational resource companies, and ensure that national GDP and carbon emission targets are met, or address the aspirations of the affected remote area community?
Postmodern planning theory would suggest that the local affected community be empowered with the ability to make decisions regarding their future (Reid 2003, Markey et al 2006). This notion of community based decision making has been embraced by rural sociologists and in community economic development models (McCall 2003). These community based models have been developed in response to the failures of traditional top down approaches and the subsequent negative impact that these have had upon regional economies (Markey et al 2006 McCall 2003). Community based planning is comprised of three elements (McCall 2003 and Markey et al 2006):

- The capacity of the community is strengthened to enable them to identify opportunities;
- Communities initiate and generate solutions to bring the opportunity to fruition; and
- The community will create opportunities that integrate economic, social and environmental objectives.

To create the governance structures that enable the community to control the decision making process requires investment in development preconditions. Moreover, to enable the control over the decisions requires a command of the resources that they are the custodians of, which in turn requires tenure reform, secure and locally owned property rights and in many instances the recognition of traditional tenure systems.

**2.5.4 Competitive advantage strategies**

By nature, planning in remote areas has promoted the status quo via comparative advantage strategies, and reacts to industry demands as opposed to proactively identifying potential development opportunities (Markey et al 2006). There is no planning for internal community change, as change for remote areas is by and large externally driven and funded.

Accordingly, the planning process must place more emphasis on the demand side of development to embrace a new competitive mindset. Remote area communities need to engage with potential customers and industry to understand the nature of the demand for the regions assets. In doing this, the community gain a realistic assessment of development options, impacts and benefit distribution (B. Roberts 2008 pers comm.). To enable an understanding of the relative land uses of the land
cover requires a realistic assessment of the demand attributes for the land cover. This is rarely completed by the state as conventional approaches rely on private industry to undertake this role, which in turn reacts to the demand for commodities.

Most regional economic development planning has been associated with chasing smoke stacks and boosterism (Markey et al 2006). The aspirations of the community must move beyond the simplistic supply driven approach to development to enable the building of capacity, the ability to control the levers of development and eradicate false hopes and subsequent perceptions of social marginalisation. In addition, Markey et al (2006) warns that dialogue between regional communities and their competitors is essential, coupled with fine grain analysis of the development options to guard against the adoption of fads or ill suited interventions.

This chapter has identified the general concepts underpinning contemporary normative planning theory, and the specific concepts related to remote areas. The following model (Diagram 2.1) illustrates the relationship between the concepts that frame the knowledge production process, and the subsequent influence that these normative planning concepts ‘ought’ to have upon the procedural and substantive planning theories.

The model forms the basis of the analytical framework that is applied throughout the thesis. The following two chapters will address the procedural (Chapter 3), and substantive (Chapter 4) planning theoretical concepts associated with the land use of tourism in a remote location.
2.6 Chapter summary

Planning in a spatial context is the process of managing change through the manipulation of land cover to create a land use and incorporates decision making, and the considers the impacts of these decisions upon local values. Planning therefore involves:

- the application of technically and/or socially rational knowledge in making decisions about developed, natural or cultural spatial attributes;
- relies on institutional frameworks (i.e. rules) including law and policy for framing the decisions; and
- an affected community, its politicians and their subsequent application of power, emotion and conflict in determining the preferred spatial pattern of development.
Articulating a framework for planning in a remote location requires a coherent analysis of the concepts that describe the hierarchical nature of planning theory. These concepts provide the bases of knowledge that guide the procedural and substantive planning theories applied throughout the plan making process.

This chapter provided an overview of planning theory to highlight the shift or turn in thinking from the rationalist value free approach associated with modernism, to an approach that emphasises the value laden nature of consensual decision making, otherwise referred to as the communicative turn. This shift has had a significant impact upon the planning profession, and planning practices within an urban context, but has left a void for more diverse and non urban settings. This in turn, has resulted in planning practices that are performed in isolation to the key concepts inherent to planning theory, and are characterised by their dependence upon knowledge or facts created on the ground (Yiftachel 2006).

Section 2.4 provided a characterisation of remote areas to describe the unique attributes of the setting that influence the subsequent creation of specific planning theories related to remote areas. Section 2.5 described the normative planning concepts that Markey et al (2006) identified as being central to the creation of an alternative bases of knowledge that applies to a remote area. The literature reviewed on normative planning theory was summarised to create the foundations of the analytical framework. The model outlined in Figure 2.1 describes the concepts inherent to remote area normative planning theory, and the influence that these have upon the creation of procedural and substantive planning theory.
Chapter 3
Planning of Alternative Tourism in Remote Areas:
Procedural Planning Theoretical Concepts

3.1 Introduction
Chapter 2 provided an overview of urban related normative planning theory to illustrate the capacity of its application to remote locations, and the potential to inhibit the creation of locally based development in favour of externally driven and financed development strategies. Markey et al (2006) maintains that an alternative approach to regional development is required. This alternative was described as being place based, community controlled and focused on locally based development strategies that create competitive advantage rather than comparative advantage.

This chapter examines the role of location theory in relation to the tourism product and how this may subsequently affect the supply of the product. The purpose of the chapter is two fold. The first of which outlines the role of location theory in relation to the types of products produced by a locale, and the second of which investigates the notion of alternative tourism generally and specifically as this relates to identifying the procedural planning theoretical concepts associated with community based tourism. Tourism is identified as a place based product whereby the product is consumed at the same location as it is produced. Other products that compete on the basis of price rather than the characteristics of the product strive to gain comparative advantage, and are highly dependent upon lowered transport costs to achieve this type of advantage. The role of location is often overlooked, and as a consequence development strategies tend to focus more on gaining comparative advantage through the supply of similar products. Having a unique tourism product will invariably mean that the mass market will be less motivated to consume the product, favouring a mass produced and therefore price competitive product in its stead. The notion of alternative tourism is examined in the second part of the chapter to identify the procedural planning theoretical concepts associated with the supply of a community based tourism product. The notion of community is briefly explored to establish the context of the product supply, and is complimented with a description of the remote characteristics of the case study site to highlight the relationship between the normative and procedural planning concepts within the analytical framework.
The chapter is presented in four sections, the first of which includes this introduction. Section 3.2 establishes the context within which tourism is applied to: the term development; tourism within the phenomenon of leisure; and the relationship between the tourism product and the consumer as a tourist. The third section 3.3 provides an overview of tourism in non urban locations. Much of the literature attributes the location of a non urban tourism product as impairment to growth. This section suggests that demand for tourism products is place sensitive as opposed to location specific. Place sensitive products require an alternative application of conventional industrial location theory. The alternative approach focuses on the set of geographic characteristics as the basis of its competitive advantage strategy, to enable product differentiation within the market place.

The fourth Section (3.4) of the chapter examines the conceptual system of alternative tourism in greater depth to create the second model of the analytical framework. This second model describes the procedural theoretical concepts associated with product supply. It is suggested by Weaver (2007) that alternative tourism is the sustainable alternative to mass tourism. Therefore the alternative to non local corporate ownership and supply of the tourism product, is local community based tourism. Moreover, the alternative consumers of mass tourism are described as special interest tourists. In this section of the chapter the term community is explored to provide context to how this is alternative to the conventional market based approach to the supply of tourism products.

Section 3.5 describes the community examined in this research, and the extent to which they experience some of the specific remote characteristics that have been observed in the literature. The community is viewed as the basis for both the planning, and the provision of the setting characteristics that form the tourism product. The chapter concludes that the relationship between the normative and procedural planning concepts is unclear, and the forms of knowledge (if any), that community based tourism planning and development decisions are based upon, is limited to what is, or has been experienced, or is readily accessible.

3.2 Tourism as development
It is important to distinguish between tourism as a broad field of academic study and tourism that transpires as a form of development. The term tourism as it is generally applied in land use planning refers to the use of land for tourism purposes. Planning is inextricably linked with development and is about making decisions about change.
Development defines the type of change in land use. When the planning profession talks of development, they refer to the making of a material change in the use of a building or land (Greed 2000). In this respect a material change in the use of land includes starting a new use, or an increase in the scale and intensity of a current use. This perspective of planning for tourism development is about the decisions related to the appropriateness of making the material change of use, and the thresholds that describe the parameters of ‘appropriate’ development.

The procedural planning theories and practices applied in the decision making process determines the extent to which the spatial attributes of tourism development such as location, type, scale and intensity are considered. The focus of this chapter is on examining the procedural planning theories, and associated practices that relate to tourism development from a spatial perspective.

3.2.1 The phenomenon of leisure

The terms tourism and recreation are used interchangeably by some researchers (Carr 2002, Mercer 1991, Krippendorf 1982), to describe similar behaviour of people engaging in recreation and tourism activities. Manfredo et al (2002) describes a planning approach for wildlife viewing that addresses the use of public estates (national parks and forests) by wildlife viewers. This planning process does not stipulate that the management planning for either recreation or tourism activities should be conducted differently on public estate. However, Manfredo et al does make reference to a difference between the experience demands of domestic and international ecotourists.

For the purpose of this thesis, the terms recreation and tourism will be used to describe two separate land uses and as such require different theoretical approaches in the application of normative, substantive and procedural planning theory. Tourism development is undertaken in most instances by the private sector primarily for the purposes of deriving financial returns to the entity and where required, benefits to the affected community. The tourism development caters to the non local resident leisure needs. Recreation development is a form of state intervention to provide social and cultural benefits from the use of land to the local residents.

Both tourism and recreation describe leisure experiences as they both occur in unobligated time. The role of tourism within the phenomenon of leisure has been greatly debated within the literature (Colton 1987, Fedler 1987, Moore et al 1995,
McKercher 1996, Carr 2002). Leisure is objectively defined as time left over after work and subjectively as a state of mind (Iso-Ahola 1980). Work is therefore obligated time and leisure is unobligated time. Experiences associated with tourism are relatively rare leisure episodes in the lives of people (Mannell and Iso-Ahola 1987). Recreation experiences by contrast are embedded within the everyday activities that make up the lives of people. This in itself sets the tourist experience apart from recreation in that experiences associated with tourism are more ‘exceptional’ in their function and are a means of escape from everyday life (Mannell and Iso-Ahola 1987, Krippendorf 1982).

Therefore recreation is an activity undertaken within the home environment, and tourism is an activity undertaken in a separate location away from the place of origin (Mannell and Iso-Ahola 1987, Trauer 2006). To plan for recreation is to develop spaces and create places that cater to the leisure needs of local residents and to plan for tourism is to develop space in order to provide for the leisure experiences of non locals. Diagram 3.1 illustrates how this thesis delineates between recreation and tourism within planning practices for leisure on non protected tenures such as National Parks. The planning practices undertaken vary in their purpose, target market, development entity and process. While both practice planning a space for leisure the planning theory underlying the practice influences the process undertaken. Tourism is seen to operate in the market economy. Whereas recreation is about social justice, creating place and ensuring equal access to locally based leisure opportunities to a local public.

**Figure 3.1**

**Planning for leisure on non protected areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided by State as Community service obligation</td>
<td>Developed to maximise return to financial investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locals involved in the design phase ‘place based planning’</td>
<td>Locals react to development proposal in community engagement phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design to meet local leisure related benefits</td>
<td>Design to meet non local tourist demand for leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome is to maximise social benefits to local people</td>
<td>Outcome is to maximise the financial returns to investors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caters to leisure demands of locals (ie taxpayers) | Caters to leisure demands of non locals
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Tourism ventures may also provide to locals, however their primary form of financial survival is the commercial exchange between the non local consumer and the producer of the product. Tourism academics may argue that the two do not differ, however, the planning profession sees these two land use activities as entirely separate uses and processes. Moreover the Planning Institute of Australia (PIA) makes a specific delineation between these practices as two separate specialisations in their own right (PIA 2009). PIA for instance accepts tourism planners in the Economic Planning Chapter and recreation planners in the Social Planning Chapter.

3.2.2 Tourism and the tourist in the planning and development process

To describe tourism as a land use and the manner in which it is treated within the planning and development process requires an overarching definition of the term. Yet, despite being reputed as the world’s largest industry and possessing global economic significance (Hall and Page 2006), tourism is bereft of a universally accepted definition. Leiper (2004) reviewed a series of definitions related to the tourist and tourism. He concluded that there is no widely accepted definition of either terms, but offered the following as guidance (2004:45):

‘Tourism is best defined as the theories and distinctive practices of tourists, persons travelling away from their home region and visiting other regions or countries where they seek leisure related experiences’.

Weaver (2000:2) provides a more general definition based on some fundamental principles:

‘Tourism is the sum of the phenomena and relationships arising from the interaction among tourists business suppliers, host governments, host communities, origin governments, universities, community colleges and non government organisations in the process of attracting, transporting, hosting and managing these tourists and other visitors’.

To define tourism as a land use requires an understanding of the key elements necessary to support the use in an integrated and self sustaining manner. The definition of tourism as a land use varies significantly, and is dependent upon the
interpretation of the land use by the planner or those that assess and approve the land use.

Tourism requires a space or somewhere to occur. The local community are implicit providers of the tourism product, they set bounds and give form to the physical settings that frame the development. The extent to which they benefit, or are able to influence the land use decisions, is dependent upon the level of state intervention that governs planning and development decision making. What remains unclear is the role of the interaction between the tourist and the physical properties of the product sought such as the overall contribution of the physical setting characteristics to producing the desired experiences. Consumer demand theory is based on two information inputs those being information about the product and the people who consume the product. Lancaster (1971) maintains that demand theory makes no use of the information about the products, and provides no way of tracing the effects of changes in the physical properties of the product on demand.

The land use planning process makes no consideration of the importance of the physical properties to the tourist in making the purchase decision. Planning in this sense is concerned with how the developer envisages the product, and in some instances but by no means all, how appropriate the development is to the affected and wider community. It is essential that the provider of a remote area tourism product understand the demand characteristics associated with the people who consume the product, in this case the tourist, and the geographic characteristics that differentiate the product within the market place.

While there are many definitions for the term tourism, there are just as many for the term tourist, some relate to whether or not they are international or domestic by origin. Cohen’s (1974) definition of a tourist (1974:533):

A tourist is a voluntary, temporary traveller, travelling in the expectation of pleasure from the novelty and change experienced on a relatively long and non recurrent round trip.

Leiper (2004) provides another definition, but adds it should not be seen as the definition (2004:35)

Tourists can be defined as persons who travel away from their normal residential region for a temporary period of at
least one night, to the extent that their behaviour involves
the search for leisure experiences from interactions with
features or characteristics of places they choose to visit.

Both of the above definitions of a tourist incorporate a time and behaviour
component. Leiper however introduces two additional aspects of behaviour to the
definition. The first of which relates to a search, the second of which relates to the
interaction between the individual and the characteristics of a place chosen from the
search, thought to satisfy the desired experience.

The relationship between the provider of the tourism product, and the tourist as a
consumer, is one of a commercial exchange. The tourist enters the search of the
product market place with the desire to satisfy a range of experience expectations,
and the tourism provider designs a product to satisfy these demands. The
experience expectations of the tourist are influenced by many variables such as past
experience, knowledge, skill set, and time available (Brown 1988). The design of the
product however, is a result of the providers perceptions of these expectations, and
is therefore a construct of the provider. The design of the product is dependent upon
the provider’s knowledge of the tourist market, their expectations and how the
physical properties of the development site can be manipulated to satisfy the tourists.
Inherent in this decision making process, is the providers own desire to remain within
the market place (Wadley and Smith 1998).

Planning for tourism within a locale requires an understanding of what the tourist
expects from the consumption of the product and the characteristics of the physical
setting that they deliberately seek out to satisfy these expectations. The resultant
product is a physical representation of the interpretation of demand, the satisfaction
of the providers own goals and aspirations, and in some instances is modified as a
result of negotiations with the local community to ensure the appropriateness of
(amongst other things) the design and location.

3.3 Tourism in remote areas
Consumer demand theory suggests that tourists are motivated to choose particular
settings and activities to obtain certain experiential outcomes. Furthermore, few
people will participate in an activity to satisfy a single expectation, rather those
expectations that are most important to the individual will play the greatest role in
deciding which activity to participate in and in which setting (Schreyer & Roggenbuck
1978, Manfredo, et al (2002), Driver & Brown 1978). It is the level of setting development that is sought by the tourist that is the subject of this enquiry.

The tourism product is defined as involving a commercial exchange transaction (Trauer 2006, Scott 2003), and those types of tourism activities that do not involve a commercial exchange are not defined as tourism products for the purposes of this research. It is necessary to make this distinction as some activities are described as tourism that does not involve a commercial transaction such as visiting friends and relatives (Scott 2003). Therefore a tourism product in this sense describes the functional nature of the product, and the characteristics of the product that are included in the transaction. A remote area tourism product is produced and consumed in the one geographic location, and implies a commercial exchange process between the tourist and the provider of the product. The setting characteristics of the remote area, whether explicitly stated or not, are included in the transaction.

3.3.1 Tourism in the peripheries
Tourism planning in remote and rural areas, often described as peripheral areas in the tourism literature, lacks theory specific to tourism development (Marcoullier 1997). This has resulted in a range of planning methods being applied to either attract tourists to the region, or to encourage tourism orientated development. Most of the academic literature represents peripheral areas in a negative context (Blackman et al 2004), that is the failure of tourism ventures in peripheral areas and the features associated with these failures (Carson and Harwood 2007a). There is a perception that all peripheral regions face significant challenges with tourism development (Nash and Martin 2003). These challenges include access, infrastructure and market perceptions (Nash and Martin 2003); a dependence upon intermediaries such as tour operators and providers’ inability to make sufficient returns on the resources utilised for development (Buhalis 1999a); obsolete products, weather restrictions and limited market opportunities (Wanhill and Buhalis 1999); environmental degradation, information technology illiteracy and human resources management (Buhalis 1999b); and social impacts upon communities (Wanhill 1997). In these instances the failure of tourism is seen as a direct result of being peripheral that consequently creates the barrier to tourism development.

Despite these challenges tourism development is actively sought and encouraged in peripheral regions by both government agencies and communities as a way of
diversifying regional economies. Peripheral areas are by their nature dependent upon the available natural resources for their economic sustenance. Tourism is viewed as a means of sustaining life in peripheral areas as a form of income in the times that demand for resource commodities is low.

It is perceived that tourism is labour intensive, a low skill industry requiring little alteration to the existing workforce and more importantly that rural and remote areas possess features that are demanded by the tourism industry (Blomgren and Sorenson 1998). Tourism is viewed as a simple matter of “Build it and they will come”. However, Prideaux (2002) maintains that possession of an interesting landscape, old building, unique event or historic site is no guarantee that tourism will flourish. Research highlights the failures of tourism, and describes what would appear to constitute barriers for developing tourism, but fails to consider what makes a remote area attractive to tourists (Blomgren and Sorenson 1998). It has been suggested that tourists seek characteristics associated with remote areas to connect with what has been lost in their own lives as a result of modernity (McCannell 1999, Cohen 1974). Tourism in remote areas becomes a quest to regain a connection with unspoiled nature, societal coherence and simple lifestyle (Blomgren and Sorenson 1998). Moreover, some tourists who desire to travel to remote areas consider the distance less of a barrier and as an added value to the experience.

Researchers who portray peripheral tourism in a negative sense have failed to consider that tourists are attracted to a certain place in the hope that it lives up to their expectations. They do not visit or purchase a product in the hope that it is disappointing. Those ventures that fail to survive within the market place, may not have considered the role of the geographic characteristics in the experience expectations of the tourist market that travels to these areas.

Blackman et al (2004) provided an overview of the factors that contributed to the success of tourism development in peripheral areas. In their review they provided a conceptual and strategic framework for the planning and development of tourism in peripheral communities referred to as the Tourism Systems Framework. This framework (Figure 3.2) does not make reference to the expectations of the tourist and how tourism must meet these in order to be self sustaining entities. Moreover, if the market for the product is either: a) not of sufficient size to cover the costs of production; or b) does not exist, then the tourism development is doomed, with failure its only option. Similarly, Markey et al (2006) cautions that development strategies
should not confuse the development benefits associated with traditional comparative patterns of development onto a new competitive environment. This would result in 'if you build it they still might not come' outcome. The focus on tourism planning and development for these failed ventures has been based on the same model applied in conventional urban planning. This model has its procedural and substantive theoretical foundations firmly based in industrial location theory.

Figure 3.2
Attributes of a successful peripheral tourism development
(Blackman et al 2004: 61)
3.3.2 Location theory

Location is a very important feature in planning for development. Industry seeks to maximise returns from capital investments through minimising costs. Spatial externalities such as transport costs invariably mean different returns to different uses which are further exacerbated by remoteness. In this sense, the returns from a product sourced in a remote location and consumed in another will generate different profit zones for different uses depending on the costs associated with the distance travelled. Sites that possess low transport costs and access to large markets become preferred locations. In other words industry chooses a location to maximise their welfare given what other individuals are doing (Krugman 1998). The basic tenet of location theory is that there are important economies of scale enforcing the geographic concentration of some activities. Closely linked with location theory is the centre periphery conceptual model of development (Friedmann 1966) mentioned in Chapter 2. This model divides the space economy into to a rapidly growing central region and its periphery to explain why an industry may locate in a centre and not in a periphery. The rationale behind locating a business in a centre as opposed to a periphery can be partly explained by an entity seeking to maximise its advantage over others in terms of transport costs. Location theory and the centre periphery model are based on the assumptions that the origin (source) of the product and the place where it is consumed are separate locations. Neither paradigm considers a product that is produced and consumed at the same spatial location or the significance of geographic characteristics in tourism product differentiation.

Bull (1998) maintains that there are two types of products:
1. Place sensitive: those products that are produced, traded and consumed at the same physical location where its geographic location is a product differentiating characteristic (or set of characteristics); and
2. Location specific: those products that gain economic advantage over another based on transport costs and economies of scale.

Tourism in remote areas can be viewed from both perspectives, whereby the set of geographical attributes associated with the location permits product differentiation, or from the perspective of ‘distance decay’ where the greater the distance travelled from the originating source, the lower the number of consumers/visitors (Blomgren and Sorenson 1998, Clawson and Knetch 1966). However, the provision of location specific products by a remotely located supplier, applies a comparative advantage approach to a market that is highly price conscious.
The significance of the characteristics associated with the remote location of a tourism development can range from added value to crucial factor (Blomgren and Sorenson 1998). A development in a remote area would only attract tourists that seek peripherality related features. Similarly development in an urban area would attract tourists through non peripherality related features. Traditional location theory that has been applied in economic geography, urban development and studies of peripheral area tourism, does not apply to remote areas. Emphasis needs to be made on determining the characteristics that are sought from the location to satisfy experience expectations associated with tourism. Bull (1998) refers to characteristics theory (after Lancaster 1979) and maintains that consumers derive utility or benefit from features or characteristics that products may possess, rather than from the products themselves. A supplier of the product would need to understand:

1. The range of characteristics that are important to consumers; and
2. How the characteristics differentiate i.e. horizontal or vertical.

Bull’s study found that locational characteristics of place sensitive products (in his case hotel locations), are largely vertically differentiating and possess an interval or at least an ordinal scale of importance. The components of the location of place sensitive products include (Bull 1998):

- access from the originating source to the tourism development site or distance from particular places;
- intrinsic site characteristics: those that are physically intrinsic to distinguish a products siting; and
- neighbourhood characteristics: those elements that are likely to influence the utility gained from the product.

There is a broad continuum of development in the landscape, much like what Copus and Crabtree (1996) found in their study. Accordingly there is a tourism continuum of developed through to undeveloped settings that is characterised by setting appearance, infrastructure provision, access, interaction with locals, market characteristics, how risk averse the market is, the size of the travel party, information provision, role of the travel intermediary and the size of the market (Carson and Harwood 2007b). Table 3.1 is based on the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (Clarke and Stankey 1979) and Tourism Opportunity Spectrum (Butler and Boyd 1996) as it highlights a continuum of settings based upon the level of associated
development within the setting. Carson and Harwood (2007b) devised the tourism spectrum to assist in differentiating tourism products according to their settings, organisation of markets and the role of the tourist interest/activity in core, periphery and remote areas (after Briedenhann & Wickens (2004), Brotherton & Himmetoglu (1997), Boyd & Butler (1996), Buhalis (1999), Butler & Waldbrook (2003), Gyimothy & Mykleton (2004), Hunt et al (2005), Zurick (1992)).

According to Carson and Harwood (2007a) one reason why tourism in remote areas may provide an opportunity for economic development is that these remote locations often contain the ‘most authentic’ examples of setting characteristics such as landscape, wildlife, cultural practices and artefacts. The tourism literature abounds with assertions that authenticity (along with uniqueness) is a core value of many tourism markets (such as Boyd and Butler 1996, Cohen 1974, McCannell 1999).

Different markets (and different segments of the same markets), may respond to authenticity in different ways. Moreover, remote tourism destinations are likely to have more success building viable tourism industries if they have clear target markets, and are able to build and sustain relationships with those markets over time. They need to understand what those markets expect in terms of authentic representations of the tourism attributes of the destination. Accordingly, any hint of staged authenticity will break the expected link between the location and its attributes. Products that may successfully appeal to the same travellers in different settings (by being ‘authentic enough’) – aviaries, historical theme parks and zoos, theatre and exhibitions – may not fit market expectations in remote destinations.

Remote destinations have to continue to promote their uniqueness, and the authenticity of the nature-based and cultural experiences they can provide. They also need to recognise that uniqueness and authenticity are constructs of the provider, science, and most importantly the visitor. There is a need for a greater understanding of the nature and structure of the relationship between core tourism areas and their peripheries. The marketing practice of drawing tourists from the core areas to the peripheries may be better served by refocusing efforts on building relationships with special interest markets and developing products that meet their experiential demands.

An alternative approach to the planning and development of remote area tourism products that focuses on the market expectations is clearly required. The following
section describes planning for tourism in a remote area to provide an insight into the alternative tourism planning known as community-based tourism. The alternative to mass tourism is described in the literature as community-based, and as such the literature is scrutinised to conceptualise the notion of an alternative supply system within a remote area.

Table 3.1
Spectrum of tourism destinations and their market characteristics
(Carson and Harwood (2007b:20))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Periphery/Rural</th>
<th>Remote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting appearance</td>
<td>Structure dominated, land uses associated with urban development</td>
<td>Development restricted to towns and farm infrastructure within a landscape dominated by features of open space and agriculture</td>
<td>Entirely natural landscape far from suburbs and cleared farmlands. No built structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure provision</td>
<td>Full range provided – reticulated and treated drinking water, municipal sewerage system, full range of telecommunications available, rubbish and waste removal and treatment, full range of medical specialists and hospitals.</td>
<td>Infrastructure restricted to town centres. Significantly reduced level and reliability of provision by comparison to core areas.</td>
<td>Nil infrastructure provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Full range of accessibility to tourism related land uses eg. Freeways, international and domestic airports.</td>
<td>Access to town centres bitumen/formed gravel roads, regional airports catering to small aircraft, mobile phone coverage patchy</td>
<td>No motorised access, no formed tracks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with locals</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market characteristics Activity vs. destination</td>
<td>General interest</td>
<td>Mixed interest graduating to special interest Travellers tend to visit multiple locations</td>
<td>Special interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk adverse. Need to have personal safety issues addressed by travel company. No deviation from comfort zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of travel party</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate to small</td>
<td>Very small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information provision and channels</td>
<td>Mass media</td>
<td>Intermediaries</td>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of travel guide/company</td>
<td>Travel companies</td>
<td>Local tourism operators/providers</td>
<td>Dependence upon guide for facilitating experiential outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of market</td>
<td>Large Mass Market</td>
<td>Mid range</td>
<td>Minority of people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Planning for tourism in a remote area

Remote areas are difficult to access, tend to lack critical infrastructure, have relatively few product choices, experience low levels of visitation and repeat visitors, and are highly susceptible to shocks in the marketplace (Carson and Harwood 2007a). Planning must identify markets where the value attached to authenticity offsets the costs associated with purchase and consumption (Carson and Harwood 2007b). Success is likely to be greater among markets with highly specialised interests, where there is lower substitutability of both activities and their settings.

Planning for tourism development in remote areas must move away from ‘chasing smoke stacks’ (Markey et al 2006), and focus upon the deeper levels of the complicated relationship between the tourist demands and behaviours, the community and its aspirations for the future, and the development of a viable and differentiated tourism product.

3.4.1 Tourism development planning: an overview

A key constraint to achieving systematic and rational tourism planning is the inability to model the tourism development process, and thus enable accurate predictions to be made (Choy 1991). This according to Choy (1991), is one of the major reasons that government applied plans have little influence over market forces to achieve economic success.

The result of these failed plans has seen government planning move from a focus on economic development to one of creating the pre conditions of development. The burden of failure therein becomes a problem that industry must face. The tourism industry therefore creates plans for tourism development that is based on facilitating a viable business entity, with government taking a more regulatory approach in its response to industry driven development proposals. As a result tourism planning assumes a variety of modes, most of which do not integrate well (Hunter 1997) nor serve to develop a stable industry base for a locale (Ife 2002, Slack et al 2003). Communities respond to development on an ad hoc basis which in turn causes the role of planning to evolve to conflict resolution with neither industry nor community aspirations being satisfied (Brook 2000).

While industry pushes regulatory bodies to remove barriers to industry growth and construct the necessary preconditions essential to tourism development, tourism planning theory moves towards empowering citizens with decision making authority.
Practitioners however, work in the midst of what can be at times mutually exclusive groups such as industry versus community (Brook 2000). In an attempt to reconcile conflicting approaches the postmodernist planning procedure referred to as Community Based Tourism (CBT) has evolved upon the principles of community involvement in development planning outcomes.

Much like the term sustainable, community is a positive prefix used to describe a form of development (Kumar 2005) and much like sustainable development CBT has experienced a wide range of applications. However, to understand CBT requires an understanding of the paradigmatic shift within tourism theory from the mass ideology to the sustainable alternative. Tourism theory is heavily influenced by the shift from modernism (mass tourism) to postmodernism (alternative) in thought and to a lesser extent practice. This in turn has had a significant influence upon the planning procedures and practices associated with tourism which has seen the evolution of CBT.

3.4.2 Planning for alternative tourism

Weaver (2007) maintains that alternative tourism is an ideology which is to be aimed for. Table 3.2 has been adapted from the literature that contrasts the planning approaches associated with alternative and mass tourism. Applied to a planning theory alternative tourism combines normative, procedural and substantive theory into the one paradigm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Theory</th>
<th>Mass Tourism</th>
<th>Alternative Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical basis</td>
<td>Rationalism</td>
<td>Normative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td>Communicative Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Focus</td>
<td>Economic Determinism</td>
<td>Interpretivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of planning</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Incremental/Adaptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Orientation</td>
<td>Planning is value free</td>
<td>Planning is value laden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent of Change</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Technical, Quantitative analysis eg cost benefit</td>
<td>Less technical, Consensus building, communicative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CBT in a normative sense adopts communicative action theory to describe what ought to be achieved in planning for tourism. The procedural concepts adopt a
socially rational perspective (Healy 2006, Reid 2003). Whereby a decision that is made by a community is a socially just decision, in combination with the communicative action perspective that the affected community have the opportunity to have input in the decision making process, to the extent that they make a consensually agreed upon decision. Ultimately the knowledge inputs are based less upon rational technical data, and more upon how the community perceive and interpret the development, land use and subsequent impacts.

The planning approach that addresses alternative tourism swings the pendulum in the opposite direction to mass tourism. Table 3.3 highlights the contrasting perspectives of the two planning approaches applied to tourism. The scope of planning moves from comprehensive strategic plans to incremental planning based on the adaptive planning approach (Timothy and Tosun 2003, Simmons and Fairweather 2005). The incremental/adaptive turn in planning scope enables the community and the market to respond to situations as they occur, rather than plan for development in the unknown future and in unforseen circumstances. Examples of adaptive planning include the Limits of Acceptable Change (Stankey et al 1985) whereby the type of development is not prescribed, rather the conditions or impact thresholds are stipulated, and development must demonstrate how it does not exceed these thresholds.

The planning of alternative tourism explicitly recognises that the process is value laden, and accepts that decisions made by a civil society will not be based on scientifically rational or technical data.

CBT has been interpreted by tourism researchers from a variety of perspectives. The procedural theory associated with how, and substantive of what to include, requires further scrutiny of the literature in order to build upon the model associated with the planning knowledge production process. The following section discusses the evolution of the notion of community as it applies to planning generally, and specifically within tourism planning.
Table 3.3 Tourism typologies:
Adapted from Weaver (2007), Telfer (2007), Carson and Harwood (2007b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Mass Tourism</th>
<th>Alternate Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market Segments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of stay</td>
<td>Brief</td>
<td>Extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonality</td>
<td>Distinct high and low season</td>
<td>No distinct seasonality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origins</td>
<td>One or two dominant markets</td>
<td>No dominant market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation</td>
<td>Mass tourist</td>
<td>Special interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attractions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Generic purpose built ‘contrived’</td>
<td>Idiosyncratic, pre-existing authentic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>Highly commercialised</td>
<td>Moderately commercialised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Tourists only or primarily</td>
<td>Tourists and locals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accommodation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial pattern</td>
<td>Concentrated; obvious tourism districts</td>
<td>Dispersed no obvious tourism districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Obtrusive international style</td>
<td>Unobtrusive vernacular style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Non local, corporate</td>
<td>Local; community or small business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists receipts</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital inputs</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkages</td>
<td>With non local sectors</td>
<td>With local sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leakages</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier effect</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of tourism</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Non local corporate</td>
<td>Local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of government</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High-low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>Free market</td>
<td>Public intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>Economic growth, profits</td>
<td>Community well being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale and Intensity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Levels</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource use</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Large scale</td>
<td>Small scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local compatibility</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourist Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>Exploitative</td>
<td>Protective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local interaction</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of the natural environment to tourist experience</td>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport infrastructure</td>
<td>Highly developed, full range</td>
<td>Undeveloped, low maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding land uses</td>
<td>Urban and commercial</td>
<td>Rural and remote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.3 Planning theory for community based tourism

Tourism is dependent upon the goodwill and cooperation of the local community within a destination as they are an integral part of the tourism product (Murphy 1985). To achieve a community emphasis in tourism planning, Murphy suggests that an ecological approach be undertaken to enable the integration of tourism with the destination area’s physical and human capacities. The ecological approach, according to Murphy, considers the impacts and needs of tourism, integrates these with local and regional planning and therefore permits tourism to be considered alongside other land uses.

3.4.3.1 The concept of community within tourism

Singh et al (2003) proposed the term ‘destination community’ to refer to the locations, together with their natural and human elements, where tourists’ experiences take place and where the tourism product is produced (2003:10). This definition fails to recognise that a destination community may be a part of a larger community of which some areas may not be used for the production of tourism products yet are linked to, and affected by tourism (Harwood 2008a). The term destination community does not consider the impacts of the development upon the social networks or the local identity of the community. In other words the term destination community is tourocentric and does not view a community in a holistic sense.

There are many definitions of what constitutes a community. Kumar (2005) maintains that geographers emphasise spatial aspects in their definitions, economists examine work and markets and sociologists emphasise social interactions and networks in their definitions of community. The concept of community can also be referred to as a community of practice whereby the networks of people are geographically dispersed but are linked by a shared set of interests or experiences (Department of Industry Tourism and Resources 2006). In general terms the various definitions of a community all use some combination of space, people and social interactions (Kumar 2005).

3.4.3.2 Postmodernist view of community

The term community is significant to postmodernists as it represents a desire to regain what has been lost as a result of modernity. In this sense community offers an alternative to modernism, something that was lost when people were transformed from an agrarian community to that of an industrialised society. Social networks were lost, and with it a sense of belonging and self identity (Lalli 1992).
Traditional rural communities are seen as a guarantee for intact social relations, whereas modern cities expose the individual to a multitude of perils (Lalli 1992). There is a perception that the deeper cultural values that are developed through social networks are destroyed by civil society (Delanty 2003). Community and country represents a natural and harmonious state, whereas modern society is shaped by conflict, and sustained by mechanistic relations of exchange.

Finally the notion of community assumes that the individual places the benefit of the collective over their own (Delanty 2003), in the belief that those within the collective reciprocate the action in their decision making. Unlike those in modern society who operate under the premise of self interest or individualism.

3.4.3.3 Identifying with and defining community

Criticisms of ‘community’ abound in relation to social homogeneity, exclusion of minorities and that community represents a search for something that was never possessed in the first place (Delanty 2003, Young 1990). For the purposes of this research the term community will refer to people whom one identifies with in a specific locale (Young 1990). This enables a placed based perspective of the people and the spatial territory (locale) that they identify with. Place in this sense, refers to the relationship that the community or collection of people who live in a specific locale, have with both the social and spatial attributes associated with the territory.

Place according to Tuan (1977), is a space that is endowed with value. Place encompasses the physical setting as well as human experience and interpretation (Stedman 2002). It is the values or socio cultural meanings of the physical landscape that shape the broader set of social rules and behaviour expressed by members of a community (Harwood 2007). The physical attributes of the setting provide the basis to place meanings. Although social constructions are important, they hardly arise out of thin air: the local environment sets bounds and gives form to these constructions (Stedman 2003).

Markey et al (2006) maintained that both a community orientated and territorial based approach to development planning in remote areas will be more successful than a top down industry based, centre located approach. According to Harwood (2008a) there are two approaches to CBT undertaken by tourism researchers One focuses on community development through tourism (Blackstock 2005, Jones 2005,

### 3.4.4 Community based tourism as community development

According to Blackstock (2005) CBT centers on the involvement of the host community in the planning, construction, maintenance and management aspects of tourism development. This implies that the host community has involvement in, control over or ownership of the planning outcomes. According to Kumar (2005), the prefix of ‘community’ suggests that the type of tourism is positive, much like the terms ‘co operation and participation’ are never used in a negative manner. Community in this sense describes a ‘grass root’ approach to tourism or an alternative to the top down approach (de Beer and Marais 2005).

The primary purpose of CBT as a community development outcome is to provide development opportunities that distribute benefits that otherwise do not exist across a community. These benefits include economic returns, while also empowering a community with the skills and resources to develop a sustainable tourism enterprise. Also included in this type of CBT is a focus on removing constraints to participation in tourism related development such as gender equality (Scheyvens 2000), creating local employment (Kontogeorgopoulos 2005) entrepreneurial training and education for locals (Timothy 2000) and on devising and applying a comprehensive community development process to tourism planning (Reid 2003).

The community development approach to CBT views tourism as an economic driver within a local economy from which the benefits will be distributed in such a manner that every member will be able to have equal access to an improved quality of life. The premise behind tourism in this sense is that the industry will provide economic benefits that are not available from current economic strategies. The process that the community undergoes in deciding the types of tourism that it will be involved in is referred to as building the capacity of the community. The capacity building process enables the community to access information regarding tourism, be able to make informed decision on issues related to tourism, influence the decision making process and to have the skills to participate in tourism enterprises.
Kontogeorgopoulos (2005) maintains that CBT as a community development exercise is a long and complex process that has had lower than anticipated rates of success. Furthermore, his research on Thailand’s oldest ecotourism company found that there are tradeoffs to be made in CBT ventures namely (2005:613):

- Success and survival at the expense of spatial isolation and structural independences;
- Local employment and benefits at the expense of local initiation and control;
- Social status and mobility at the expense of social cohesion and harmony; and
- Incipient environmentalism at the expense of ecological sustainability.

Ife (2002) cautions communities considering tourism as a strategy for community development. Ife maintains that tourism may not provide a secure economic future because of insufficient demand, oversupply of tourism ventures and the impact of the global economy upon the ability of people to undertake tourism in times of recessions.

Blackstock (2005) views tourism as being exploitative in a slightly different manner and maintains that CBT processes do not allow a community to be empowered; rather it serves to ensure the long term survival of a profitable tourism industry. In this sense Blackstock maintains that the community is not empowered to reject tourism as a development option, and as such they have no real influence or power over the economic strategies that are undertaken. Blackstock highlights concerns that are equally shared by Hall CM (2003), related to the role of power and politics in tourism planning and the influence that these have upon empowering a community in the decision making process. Hall maintains that transparent decision making and planning processes are the most effective way to ensure community empowerment.

3.4.5 Community based tourism as community engagement

Land use planning refers to the process of identifying the sequence of actions necessary to achieve a predetermined goal or objective for sustainable land use on a specified portion of land. These planning activities according to Low Choy et al (2002:31) share seven common procedural attributes:

- The setting of the vision, goals and objectives;
- The collection and analyses of relevant data and information;
• A public involvement process;
• The evaluation of alternative future scenarios;
• The selection and implementation of a course of action and associated policies;
• The establishment of a monitoring and evaluation process; and
• A feedback mechanism to ensure adaptive management as a response to changing circumstances and new information.

Planning should precede development (Costa 2001), and the level of community engagement for each development is dependent upon a range of variables such as legislative requirements; nature of the development and associated impacts; and the commitment of the developers and regulators to empowering the community to make informed decisions (Development Assessment Forum 2005).

Engagement is the term used to describe the communication between the community and the planning agency and/or the developer i.e. public involvement process. The depth of communication and influence that the community can have upon the proposal can range along a spectrum of no involvement, to one of being empowered with the ability to make and control the decision regarding the land use or a proposed development (International Association for Public Participation 2007).

Tourism researchers generally agree that it is beneficial for the tourism project to have community involvement in the planning and development stages. Involving communities can:

• enhance local socio economic benefits (Mitchell and Eagles 2001),
• increase the limits of local tolerance through participation by locals in the tourism development process (Tosun 1999)
• assist communities to be more responsive to intensifying competition from the globalisation of trade, business and travel (Jamal and Getz 1995); and
• help secure the commitment of local people, without which the sustainable development of tourism is extremely difficult if not impossible (Sautter & Leisen 1999).

Interestingly, none of the above justifications for public engagement in tourism planning and development allowed the community the opportunity to feel empowered with the ability to reject tourism as an economic development strategy. The
community is involved, but not empowered. Reid (2003) combines the two approaches to tourism planning based upon the theory of communicative action. In Reid’s process the community have the ability to reject tourism by being empowered with the overall control in the decision making process, in addition to being in control over the gathering and interpretation of knowledge with which these decisions are based upon.

3.5 Community based tourism planning: procedural theoretical concepts

CBT focuses on the involvement of a community in the planning process to guide the intensity and location of tourism development (Reid 2003). Once the community have made these decisions they will then own, operate, manage and control tourism development within their community (Blackstock 2005).

Reid (2003) provides an overview of the planning process (Figure 3.3) to guide the procedural aspects of the CBT planning practice. Reid applied communicative action theory to develop the procedures for tourism development that is ‘community friendly and people centred’ (2003:121). Moreover Reid’s procedure is based on the premise that tourism will be sustainable when a community reaches a collective decision. This decision is reached through the identification of commonly held values and aspirations for development. The corresponding level of development will therefore be commensurate with the community circumstances.

The procedural planning theory that underpins Reid’s process is based on Friedmann’s (1987) characterisation of social learning and social mobilisation, and focuses on building the psychological and social growth capacity of the community. Reid (2003) maintains that this process differs from community economic development processes in that the project can be altered or even terminated if the community determines that the project is inconsistent with their vision for the future.
The process outlined in Figure 3.3 follows the classic procedure to planning outlined by Low Choy et al (2002) and is comprised of (Reid 2003:145):

- The creation of a vision to establish an overall framework for tourism development;
- The setting of goals and objectives to bring that vision about;
- The development of programs designed to accomplish the relevant objectives;
- An evaluation of the feasibility usually financial of the proposed project (if necessary and adaptation or refinement);
- The implementation and ongoing monitoring of the project established as a result of the planning and decision making process.

However, in Reid’s (2003) process, the role of data collection and analysis is taken from the analysts (experts) and given to the citizen and the local community to complete. The emphasis on economic rationality and the scientific approach in
determining goals and aspirations is replaced with the collective wisdom of those involved in the decision making.

Reid’s justification for this process is based upon his own account of communities that have lacked the necessary skills to create an overarching structure to control the direction of tourism. Reid is not anti-tourism, rather he stresses the importance of having a comprehensive community held vision of their desired future that is supported by a strategic plan. This vision and accompanying strategic plan describes the overall development direction. Reid further maintains that the plan formulation process should involve the local people in the day to day aspects including local groups to complete relevant research projects.

CBT is described in the literature as taking three forms. The first of which describes a relationship between the developer and the community (community engagement), the second of which describes tourism as a form of achieving community development, and the third describes a planning process. With the exception of Reid’s (2003) planning process, the other two forms make no explicit connection to normative planning theory or theoretical concepts.

The following section characterises the remote conditions that are experienced by the case study community and how these characteristics may affect the planning procedures undertaken in planning for development.

3.5.1 The case study area: remote characteristics

CBT is the provision of goods and services that are owned and controlled by a community. Similarly the level of development within a community is said to reflect the development aspirations of the residents (Reid 2003). The planning literature further suggests that development is contingent upon the existence of pre development conditions (Lennon 2008) such as infrastructure and governance structures. The CBT literature however, fails to address how an area lacking in pre development conditions makes decisions about development or the affect that the absence of pre development conditions has upon the creation of competitive advantage development strategies for the remote community.

Each remote location will possess its own unique set of setting characteristics and varying levels of predevelopment conditions. The community examined in this
research shares most of the characteristics identified in Chapter 2 that describe remoteness. These are briefly addressed in the following.

1. Accessibility:
   - The residents within the community do not have a school in the village and must walk 2km to the nearest school.
   - The village contains a health facility, but no medicine or trained health practitioner. The residents must travel to the City #1, pay to visit a doctor and the medicine. There is no publicly provided health care system in West Papua.
   - The road through the mountains is in the process of being upgraded to a single lane bitumen road. There are no bridges over the watercourses, so access is seasonal.
   - No one in the village owns a car. Trucks are unable to access the mountain region which limits the quantity of produce that can be transported to the City #1 region.
   - The cost to travel by private car service is RP60,000 return. The daily wage for a trainee bird guide is RP60,000, kitchen assistant is RP40,000 and cook is RP60,000. A farmer would need to sell 30 cabbages at the City #1 market to pay for a 120km round trip. The farmer receives a lower price for the produce at the local market as the range of produce is limited and the supply of the limited range is high.
   - As a result of limited infrastructure (pre development conditions) access to information via information communication technologies is non existent. Access to knowledge is limited to what the residents experience or has experienced in the past regarding development options.

2. Economic Platform:
   - The economy is highly specialised. Prior to tourism the main economic base of the village was subsistence agriculture. The residents grow sweet potato, cabbage, passionfruit and tamarillo’s.
   - The residents do not graze animals such as chickens, pigs or cattle for daily consumption or sale.
   - The farmers travel by foot and carry their produce to the local mountain markets (4km one way) and 60km one way to the City #1.
Tourism was introduced to the village in 2004. Approximately 80% of the 17 village households are 100% dependent upon tourism for their cash income. They all continue to farm for subsistence.

3. Socio Economics

- All of the 17 households are related to one another and more importantly are related to the land owner who is the head of the village.
- All residents are indigenous to the Mountain area. They all speak Hatam (mountain dialect) with some of the younger people who have attended school speaking both Bahasa Indonesia and Hatam.
- None of the residents speak fluent English.
- This remote area does not suffer from outmigration as a general rule. The only out migration that occurs is if the child receives a high school and university education. There is no demand for educated people in the Mountain region. Job opportunities are limited to the natural resources that the individual has access to farm.
- There are no telecommunication facilities, electricity, reticulated drinking water or waste water treatment infrastructure. Production of goods and services is dependent upon available resources, there are no opportunities to value add agricultural produce.
- Each household within the village is responsible for making their own living. In respect to entrepreneurial levels, this village is very high. Each of the households that contribute to tourism does so as individual enterprises. They are not employees of a particular company; rather they are all self employed.
- Each person within the household operates as an individual entity. If the husband works he retains the money, similarly if the wife works she retains her wages. The family work as a unit on their farming allotment and any income received from the sale of produce is used for family purposes such as the purchase of food. The community do not operate as a collective unit to provide for community infrastructure such as a school or medical facility.

4. Land Tenure and Security

- The land that the village is situated on is legally owned by the state (Indonesian national government). However the state has not yet exercised its ownership rights.
• In the absence of the state, the land is owned and occupied by the indigenous people of the Arfak Mountains. The indigenous people have a well developed system of land ownership that is dependent upon kinship ties i.e. Family networks. The land remains in the ownership of the landowner, and he allocates rights to use the land. In the case of the village studied in this research the traditional land use rights granted prior to tourism in 2004 were:
  1. House allotment in the village;
  2. Farm allocation on the perimeter of the village; and
  3. Restricted use rights within the forest resource.

This village does not possess the pre development conditions thought to support a diversified economic platform. However, despite its remoteness the village supplies a tourism product to bird watchers who come from all over the world (specifically from the USA, UK, Australia and Europe) to see the birds inhabiting the locale. The community does not possess telecommunication infrastructure, language skills used by the tourists or hold secure title to their land resource. The community does however own and control the tourism venture(s) that support the tourism product. Given the limitations imposed by being remote it is unknown how the decisions within this community are made about what product to supply, who makes these decisions and upon what knowledge inputs (internally or external) these decisions are based upon.

3.5.2 Planning for community based tourism in a remote area

The community examined in this research undertake planning, however, it is not a formalised process in the sense that the state intervenes through legislating a mandatory process that results in a statutory plan. The informal planning process undertaken by this community relates specifically to the physical territory that the residents identify with. The range of land uses typically reflect the specialised nature of the economy, and the types of knowledge applied and the process undertaken in decision making about the tourism product is not clear.

What remains unknown specifically as this relates to the application of normative concepts by the case study community is:
• Does the informal process consider the impact of development upon amenity?
• How are development opportunities identified and assessed?
• How is the substantive knowledge about development accessed and assessed?
• Is the public interest considered in the process?
• Does the community undertake collaborative decision making when assessing development alternatives?
• Are the principles of social justice and equity incorporated into decision making?
• Does the community identify the competitive advantage of its product within the global bird watching product range?
• How does a community plan for development in the absence of development pre conditions?
• To what extent does the community have control over the planning process and the knowledge production process?

The issues related to the procedural theoretical concepts applied by the case study community in the supply of the tourism product include:
• What is the relationship between the demand for geographical characteristics that underpin place sensitive products and the procedural planning concepts that inform the planning process?
• Is CBT operationalised as community engagement or community development?
• Does the community possess a vision for development?
• Has the community established a set of goals and objectives?
• Does the community establish a set of development programs to meet the established set of goals and objectives?
• How does the community evaluate the development programs to select the alternative the best meets their vision, goals and objectives?
• Does the community possess a strategic plan that describes how the programs are to be implemented and evaluated for their effectiveness?

The nature of these questions highlights a lack of coherence between the reasons for planning and the planning process. This in part may be due to an irreverent reference to normative theoretical concepts that bind reason and action. Figure 3.4 illustrates the procedural theoretical concepts inherent to community based tourism that form the basis of the analytical framework. The series of questions above highlight the gaps in the knowledge regarding ‘how planning’ for community based
tourism is conducted in a remote area. The research methods will address the knowledge gaps between the normative and procedural theoretical concepts to describe the behaviour of elements within the planning knowledge production process applied by the case study community. The following chapter examines the market characteristics of alternative tourism and provides detail on the substantive planning theoretical concepts to complete the analytical framework.

3.6 Chapter summary
This chapter provided an overview of tourism as a form of development in a spatial context. Remote area tourism products may be partly differentiated in the market by the specific characteristics associated with their location. It was established that traditional location theory applied to industries based on economies of scale may not apply to remote area tourism products.
The literature suggests that a community based approach to tourism development ought to be pursued as this incorporates the community aspirations for development within their locale and is therefore a more sustainable form of tourism. The notion of alternative tourism was reviewed to provide a theoretical context to the procedures associated with CBT. Reid’s (2003) approach to CBT was briefly discussed to highlight the procedural format of a contemporary postmodern planning process. Reid’s process described how tourism planning within a postmodern paradigm ought to be conducted. However, the structure is very process orientated and less concerned with the incorporation of substantive knowledge in the decision making. The fundamental flaw with the operationalisation of Reid’s planning process is that the community decides what opportunities to supply based on its set of values and understanding of the tourism resource within their community. Tourism is an industry that operates within a neo liberalistic global economy and as such should consider the how the product aligns with the tourist (consumer) demands and the industry that it will operate within. Furthermore, it was highlighted through an overview of the case study community that Reid’s process does not specifically consider remote areas. As a consequence, the procedure does not take account of:

- the impact of location and the demand for place sensitive tourism products;
- the effect of long term economic specialisation and how this in turn influences the way in which a community constructs and interprets its spatial development pattern; and
- the influence that a lack of pre development conditions has upon how a community identifies development opportunities and spatially transforms the associated territory to supply these opportunities.

The CBT literature focuses solely upon the process related to the decision making and very little on the relationship between the substantive matter and how this may affect the process. Understanding the substantive parameters of tourism requires the consideration of the potential consumers and the industry system that the tourism development operates within. The following chapter examines the alternative tourism market characteristics collectively described as special interest tourism. The village examined in the remote area of the Arfak Mountains in West Papua possesses remote and place sensitive characteristics that frame the bird watching tourism product provided by the community. Planning for special interest tourism in a remote area requires knowledge of the specific interest system (in this case bird watching) to
create competitive development strategies. Chapter 4 describes the alternative demand system and the place characteristics associated with bird watching for incorporation in the analytical framework.
Chapter 4
Special Interest Tourism in a Remote Area: Substantive Planning Theoretical Concepts

4.1 Introduction
Chapter three addressed the procedural theoretical concepts that delineate remote area location theory to those applied in urban planning, and described the notion of the alternative tourism supply system of CBT. This chapter examines the alternative demand system to mass tourism referred to as special interest tourism. In describing this alternative tourism system the substantive theoretical concepts that characterise bird watching consumer preferences is examined in relation to how these may influence the design of the bird watching tourism product range.

The purpose of this chapter is to complete the analytical framework to enable a holistic examination of the norms that structure the governance of planning, and the application of substantive planning knowledge in making the decisions about what products to supply. In the process of making these decisions an analysis of how the corresponding scale and intensity associated with tourism development is determined. Planning tends to focus on the process or a practice, rather than the social system that planning operates within. From the literature reviewed in this chapter it was established that the special interest tourism system is comprised of the community and its aspirations for development, the consumer demand preferences and the tour operator’s perceptions of consumer demand. In addition the relationship between CBT and the community as a place where tourism transpires is identified as a significant oversight in the planning and tourism literature. The chapter concludes with the identification of five research issues to guide the research process.

The chapter is presented in seven sections. The first of which includes this introduction. Section 4.2 provides an overview of Special Interest Tourism (SIT) from a simple systems perspective. The SIT system is comprised of the tourists, the tour operators as intermediaries and the community based suppliers of the tourism product. A deliberate delineation between the role of tourists and tourism suppliers is made to facilitate a coherent application of substantive and procedural theoretical concepts. Tourism is in essence a supply notion and is concerned with the planning and provision of tourism products. Tourist demand and their behaviour as
consumers however, form the basis of remote area substantive tourism planning theory.

Section 4.3 describes the special interest of bird watching and the creation of tourist typologies through the application of recreation specialisation theory. These typologies are believed to influence the motivations and experience expectations for participation and setting preferences. Section 4.4 describes the characteristics of the place sensitive bird watching tourism product. The application of characteristics theory (Lancaster 1979) is made to identify the tourism product specifications. The literature is examined to determine the specifiable characteristics that describe a bird watching tourism product. These characteristics were broadly identified as those that describe the intrinsic site characteristics of the place that differentiate the product’s location, the visitor facilities developed to support the activity and the neighbourhood setting characteristics that frame the product.

Section 4.5 provides an overview of a typology of the bird watching tourism within a spectrum of wildlife related products. The bird watching tour product is a separate typology within the spectrum and is described along a continuum that ranges from general to specialist products. The major research issue emerging from this review is the absence of a set of specifications that describe the bird watching product range. Product specifications (according to Lancaster 1979), are essential to describing how differentiated a product is within a product range.

Section 4.6 of the chapter summarises the SIT model as a system to describe the remote area substantive planning theoretical concepts in relation to the overall analytical framework. The SIT model describes the tourist preferences for product specifications as setting descriptors; the tour operator as an intermediary who interprets these preferences to create a product; and the remote community, who manipulate the land cover to satisfy the external demand preferences, tour operators and the community aspirations for development.

The chapter concludes that because of the knowledge gaps within the system, it is unknown how the relationship between external demand preferences for a tourism product manifests as development that is owned and controlled by a community in a remote location. The substantive model highlights these knowledge gaps as research issues that are later used to guide the research strategy undertaken in this thesis.
4.2 Special interest tourism and remote areas

Special Interest Tourism (SIT) is an ambiguous term. For the purpose of this section, the term SITism is used to differentiate the supply system from the demand system associated with Special Interest Tourists (SITists). SITism describes the decision making process made by the community and the suppliers in designing and providing the product. SITist refers to the tourist who purchases the special interest tourism product.

Some authors define SITism as the provision of customised leisure and recreation interests driven by the specific expressed interests of individuals and groups (Derrett 2001). Other definitions include:

Tourism undertaken for a distinct and specific reason (Brotherton and Himmetoglu 1997).

Characterised by the tourists search for novel, authentic and quality tourist experiences and by the industry’s provision of such experiences (Hall and Weiler 1992).

Travel for people who are going somewhere because they have a particular interest that can be pursued in a particular region or at a particular destination. It is the hub around which the total travel experience is planned and developed. (Read 1980 cited in Derrett 2001)

SITism has emerged from a perception within the industry that tourists are seeking authentic personal experiences (Macken 2009). These experiences are characterised by a desire to connect with locals, to participate (rather than just observe) in real experiences to satisfy mental, emotional and physical challenges and to avoid the standard tourist route (Macken 2009). Moreover these tourists are experienced travellers and are seeking meaningful life changing experiences (Brotherton and Himmetoglu 1997, Trauer 2006).

Derrett (2001) characterises SITism by the following:

- Flexible delivery;
• Market segmentation as opposed to mass marketing;
• Sensitive to advances in technology that impact upon management and distribution;
• Small scale in nature;
• Focus on yield as opposed to volume;
• Delivery of products and services based on ecologically sustainable development principles;
• Integration with local indigenous ownership and control; and
• Provision of authentic and real experiences as opposed to passive entertainment.

Trauer (2006) maintains that SiTism is part of an interdisciplinary system that is comprised of the environment (local to global), the tourist demand system and the tourism industry supply system. In her conceptualisation of the system (represented in Figure 4.1), the local industry supply system is comprised of places/destinations, the tour operators, travel agents, accommodation, businesses, transport, facilities and infrastructure. The demand system centres upon variables that influence the experience expectations of the tourist including their financial situation, possession of or access to specialist equipment, cognitive and activating determinants (e.g., perception, needs, motives and attitudes) and their personal characteristics such as perceived risk and values. The system according to Trauer is comprised of political, economical, ecological, technological and cultural concerns that are representative of tourism at the range of geographic scale from local levels through to the global scale.
SITism focuses on the interaction between tourists and local communities. However, Trauer’s conceptual interdisciplinary system does not explicitly acknowledge the role of a community within the system. For this purpose the following adaptation (Figure 4.2) of Trauer’s model has been made to illustrate the role that the community and the characteristics of the locale within the supply system. The literature related to tourism in peripheries suggested that tour operators play a major and at times detrimental role to tourism in non urban areas. The two significant differences between Trauer’s conceptual model and the adaptation made for the purposes of this research is related to the ownership and control over the supply features within the supply system and the relationship between the tourist, the tour operator and the community.
4.2.1 Special interest tourist demand system

Tourism occurs along a continuum that supplies products to a range of markets from general interest tourist to the special interest tourist and is based on the importance of both an activity (i.e. interest) and the role of the destination (Brotherton and Himmetoglu 1997). The Special Interest Tourist (SITist) has been described as a tourist whose motivation and decision making are primarily determined by a particular special interest (Hall and Weiler 1992). This special interest can be related to either an activity, destination or setting (Trauer 2006).

Brotherton and Himmetoglu (1997) maintain that the SITist has a specific interest based motivation for travel to a destination, which contrasts with the General Interest Tourist (GITist) where the destination characteristics such as accommodation facilities, that underpin the specifications of the tourism product sought and the overall motivation for travel. Brotherton and Himmetoglu (1997) maintain that special interest tourism both as a product and as distinct entity within the overall tourism spectrum has been largely ignored within tourism research. They characterised the tourist market according to how important the activity is to the individual in selecting a destination. The GITist is associated with mass tourist markets whereas the SITist is aligned with the market for alternative tourism products.
Table 4.1 illustrates the tourist continuum suggested by Brotherton and Himmetoglu (1997). The GITist does not pursue a particular activity per se, rather the perceptions and images of the destination pull the tourists to the locale. GI{T}ist's are seeking a fashionable destination that is consistent with their own home based social reference frames (e.g. behaviour and codes that are ‘normal’ or familiar), and they demand high quality accommodation, are relatively inexperienced travelers and are not seeking life changing experiences rather they seek life re-creating experiences (Cohen 1974).

**Table 4.1**

**Tourist continuum**

*(Brotherton and Himmetoglu 1997:18)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Interest Tourist</th>
<th>Mixed Interest Tourist</th>
<th>Special Interest Tourist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price sensitive</td>
<td>Have gained some experience in an interest and no longer enjoy GIT</td>
<td>Less price sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexperienced travellers</td>
<td>Experiment with a holiday choice, but not ready to go entirely different</td>
<td>Fanatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven’t developed a special interest or don’t want to pursue one</td>
<td>Period of transition</td>
<td>Experienced travellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit ‘fashionable’ destinations</td>
<td>Desire to be a bit more adventurous, but fashionable at the same time</td>
<td>High expectations of the setting and activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand high quality accommodation facilities</td>
<td>May have a special interest but not committed to pursuing while at destination</td>
<td>Accommodation is less of an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination choice based on the attributes of the area/resort</td>
<td>Demand quality accommodation</td>
<td>Don’t like to follow the majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHERE WOULD I LIKE TO GO</td>
<td>WHERE DO I WANT TO GO AND WHAT ACTIVITIES DO I WANT TO DO</td>
<td>Extension of leisure based pursuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WHAT DO I WANT TO DO AND WHERE CAN I DO IT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following stage in the tourist interest spectrum is characterised by a period of transition and change in the tourism product preferences of Mixed Interest Tourists (MITists). The tourist gains traveling experience and desires to be a bit more adventurous, but is not yet willing to give up the creature comforts or commit themselves to a particular interest such as bird watching or kayaking. The final stage in the spectrum is characterised by the decision to choose destinations based on how well these cater to specific interests. These SITists have high expectations in relation to the activity/interest but not necessarily in terms of accommodation facilities. SITist's are generally less price sensitive than the GIT/MIT’s and are more adventurous.

When the SITist has gained experience in a particular activity the search for the space to conduct the activity in, focuses on specific setting characteristics to support
the activity. Planning for SITism is based upon the notion that people are motivated to participate in a particular activity in a specific setting to satisfy their expectations.

4.2.2 Specialist tour operator
Essentially the tour operator identifies a particular market opportunity, establishes a relationship with the destination that is, or may be, demanded by the market, and designs a product to meet the market requirements. The tour operator survives within the market place by meeting the specific experiential requirements sought after by a market or segment of the market. The tour operator is a catalyst for demand in that they interpret the market needs and design products to meet these needs (Lumsden and Swift 1999, Trunjio et al 2006). Best described as an intermediary, tour operators seek destinations that satisfy market needs and design tour products that will motivate the market to purchase the product. In this sense the tour operator caters to the clients needs not to the destinations'.

The main tasks of the tour operator (Macintosh 1995 in Lumsden and Swift 1999) are:

- Planning, preparing and marketing of tour;
- Making reservations;
- Consolidating transport and ground services; and
- Assembling the above points into an itinerary for a departure on a particular date to a specific destination.

Research (Lumsden and Swift 1999) maintains that there are two types of tour operators, and that they differ based on their location:
1. The destination; and/or
2. In tourist generating countries.

The tour operator based in the tourist generating country controls the flow of tourists to a destination and according to Lumsden and Swift (1999), the destination based operator provides specialist services such as local knowledge to tourists. In addition to the two locations, tour operators are further distinguished by the size of the market and the type of product that is offered. Mass tour operators are described as developing a standardised tour package that has large economies of scale; possess enormous buying power; they control distributions; and possess a monopoly of the product within the market place (Curtain and Busby 1999).
Specialist tour operators by contrast, are small to medium sized enterprises that specialise in a particular geography or type of holiday (Curtain and Busby 1999). There are a large number of specialist companies within the greater tourism industry as these are thought to reflect the increasing fragmentation of tourist markets (Curtain and Busby 1999). However, the main distinguishing features between the mass and the specialist operator (Trunfio et al 2006, Curtain and Busby 1999, Evans and Stabler 1995, Tapper 2001) are:

- Product differentiation – the specialists provide a highly differentiated product range;
- Mass operators have large volumes and specialists attract low volumes;
- Small number of mass operators, large number of specialist companies;
- Price elasticity of demand – the specialist market is price inelastic as the product is thought to be both highly differentiated and to possess low substitutability;
- The specialist market has higher returns per unit, whereas the mass operators discount heavily to attract a large price conscious market; and
- The market for mass operators is generalists whereas the specialist operator market is special interest tourists.

In the context of alternative tourism in a remote area, a special interest tour operator is likely to be consistent with specialist tour operators that have low volumes of tourists. Whether the operator provides a differentiated product depends on the extent to which they apply traditional economies of scale (industrial location theory) to their business structure and compete with mass market providers. Evans and Stabler (1995) maintain that a specialist operator who sells standardised mass market products will be at the greatest competitive risk as the mass market is controlled by large vertically integrated competition that are able to undercut on prices. More importantly, Evans and Stabler (1995) contend that a specialist operator is destined to fail without a clear differentiation of the product on offer and a clearly defined market segment to consume the product.

The relationship between the product’s substitutability and market characteristics becomes more central to distinguishing between a mass and a specialist market, and creating a differentiated product within the overall range. The specialist supplier of tourism products must understand the context of the demand that the market has for the special interest and the corresponding local to global context of the product.
supply. Where a product is highly differentiated, provides the opportunity for extraordinary experiences including the physical setting, cultural attributes and service provision (Arnould and Price 1993) it is described as possessing low substitutability within the market place.

A tourist will be more willing to substitute one product for another where the array of alternatives is large (Brunson and Shelby 1993). Within a special interest context the role of the interest and how specialised the tourist is in the particular interest is paramount to how substitutable a product is within the market place. The tourist that possesses a high level of specialisation in the interest cannot substitute the interest with another to satisfy the experience expectations. Similarly the setting attributes that frame a highly differentiated tourism product cannot be substituted for another location, as this would entail a product shift not a substitution. Achieving competitive advantage for a remote area tourism product requires an understanding of context of the global tourism system and the opportunities it creates. This understanding, in combination to knowing the context of the territory’s assets and the community’s aspirations for the region itself, underpin the planning process associated with creating competitive development strategies (Markey et al 2006).

To create competitive advantage development strategies for special interest tourism in a remote location entails knowledge of the theories that describe how the special interest tourist gains a specialised interest. Understanding the specialisation process enables a supplier to understand which market to cater to. The following section provides an overview of the theory of recreation specialisation and how this relates to and has been used to create bird watching market and product typologies.

4.3 Theory of recreation specialisation applied to bird watching

In Trauer’s (2006) overview of SIT she maintained that the tourism product was based on an interest participated in one’s leisure time within the home environment. The interest progresses to the point that the individual purchases a general interest tourism product that is not located within the home environment. With time and skill acquisition, the individual goes on to search for SIT products that meet specific setting preferences and experience expectations. Figure 4.3 illustrates ‘Trauer’s Leisure Interest Cycle’ depicts the relationship between recreation and tourism within the leisure phenomenon. Trauer maintains that SIT is the commercialisation of leisure in that the tourism product is tailor made to the specific experiential demands made by the specific interest.
The concept of SIT is firmly based upon the application of the theory of recreation specialisation to provide an understanding of the diversity among recreationists engaged in the same activity. The concept was developed in 1977 by Hobson Bryan who maintained that specialisation is a developmental process whereby people progressed to higher stages of activity involvement the longer they participated in the leisure activity (Scott and Shafer 2001). Specialisation in this respect refers to a continuum of behaviour from the general to the specific, and is reflected by the equipment and skills used in the sport and activity setting preferences (Bryan 1977). It is believed that over time an individual will move along the continuum from low involvement and general interests, to high involvement and more specific interests (Bryan 2001).

The concept was first mooted by Bryan from his observations that the participants in an activity (namely fishing) did not display homogeneous characteristics, and as such proposed the continuum to explore the within activity variability. The continuum as illustrated in Figure 4.4 starts at the low end to describe the newcomers or infrequent participants that do not regard the activity as important, and do not show strong preferences for equipment and technique. The individual progresses over time to the high end of the continuum which describes the individuals who are extremely
committed to the activity and who use sophisticated techniques and equipment (Scott and Shafer 2001).

**Figure 4.4**

**Specialisation continuum**

![Specialisation continuum diagram](image)

There is an underlying assumption within recreation specialisation theory that there is a linear relationship between the times spent pursuing the activity, commitment, techniques and equipment applied in participation. Bryan maintained that there were participation typologies along the continuum (Figure 4.5). In his original research he maintained that there were four typologies of trout fishermen, those being:

**Figure 4.5**

**Trout fishermen typologies (after Bryan 1977)**

![Trout fishermen typologies diagram](image)

As the individual progresses through these stages they become more skilled in the activity to the point that the setting that frames the activity becomes central to involvement. Coupled with the setting requirements is an underlying assumption that the high end of the continuum is directed to an authentic level of involvement, and that the end product of the progression is an elite status within the activity social world (Scott and Shafer 2001).

Researchers in nature based recreation have applied this continuum to the development planning of sites. One such application is the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) by Clark and Stankey (1979) that is based upon the notion that quality is operationalised as the provision of a diverse range of settings to satisfy and equally diverse range of demands. With respect to tourism, Cohen (1979) proposed
a continuum to describe the level of authenticity sought from tourism experiences. His analogy was based on setting development (object authenticity) and the relationship between the object and how true to one’s self (existential authenticity) as the experiential outcome. While authenticism is not the focus of this study, Cohen’s analogy supports the application of a continuum to refer to experience typologies. This continuum analogy was also applied by Butler and Waldbrook (2003) in their Tourism Opportunity Spectrum (TOS) to illustrate a relationship between the setting, level of activity specialisation and the tourism activity. Figure 4.6 illustrates the application of the continuum concept to a range of recreation and tourism constructs.

**Figure 4.6**
Continuum concepts applied to specialisation, setting development and tourism experiences

![Continuum diagram](image)

While entirely conceptual, the TOS (Figure 4.7) provides an application of recreation constructs that are inherent to tourism generally, and the planning of tourism development specifically. This concept of a continuum has been widely applied to the research investigating the activity of bird watching and market typologies of bird watching tourists.

In a general sense bird watching is the observation and identification of birds. Birding as a form of tourism is receiving much publicity as an economic development strategy for remote locations. However, the publicity tends to portray all birders as a
group of highly committed and wealthy enthusiasts who are eager to add birds to their life lists (Scott and Thigpen 2003). These listers are described as those activity participants who have a list of species that they want to see in their life time and represent the high end of experts in the activity of bird watching.

Research efforts related to bird watching have focused on developing typologies of the bird watcher based on how specialised the individual is in the activity. Applying the specialisation continuum to an activity assists in understanding the within-activity differences among bird watchers and therefore provides a mechanism for describing the market for a tourism product range.

Information about these within activity segments provides an insight to the specific activity and setting demands of each segment in relation to the focus of the activity, and the behaviour that the individual displays.
### Figure 4.7
Adapted from Butler and Waldbrook’s TOS (2003)

#### Level of Adventure
---Hard---------Medium----------Soft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Access</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Access System</th>
<th>Marketplace</th>
<th>Information channels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>very difficult --------</td>
<td>rivers, game trails</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>word of mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>difficult -------</td>
<td>aircraft</td>
<td>retailers</td>
<td>social sources advisory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>moderately difficult</td>
<td>road (gravel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>advisory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very difficult</td>
<td>road paved</td>
<td></td>
<td>commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Other non adventure uses | incompatible | depends on nature and extent | compatible on a larger scale |

| 3. Tourism Plant |
|------------------|------------------|
| a) Extent | no development |
|           | isolated locations |
|           | moderate extent |
|           | very extensive |
| b) Visibility | none |
|             | primarily natural appearing |
| c) Complexity | not complex |
|               | somewhat complex |
| d) Facilities | no facilities |
|               | essential services |
|               | minimal comforts |
|               | some comforts |
|               | many comforts |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Social Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Hosts/guests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Guests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Acceptability of visitor impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Degree of impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1 Bird watchers as special interest tourists
It is believed that the level of specialisation exhibited by a bird watcher will effect the decisions made about the types of tourism products (Trauer 2006, Scott and Thigpen 2003) sought by each market segment. Inherent to the application of recreation specialisation to SIT is the notion that the individual gains experience in the activity in the home setting as a form of recreation. As these skills develop they gain confidence to visit other settings to enhance these skills. Moreover, as they gain travel experience and skills in the activity, they seek settings to further engage in the activity or challenge themselves. According to Bryan (2001) any activity has to be learned, and the learning proceeds from the relatively simple to the more complex and therefore constitutes a progression. It is the multi dimensional nature of this progression that is both unknown and highly contested within the specialisation literature (Scott and Shafer 2001). MacFarlane (2001) summarises the utility of specialisation as the basis of delineating the sub types of the activity and the different goals and behaviours of the participants within each sub type. Understanding these differences assists in designing products that meet the specific needs of specific activity sub types. Research efforts according to MacFarlane, should examine the underlying dimensions of the construct such as how to characterise and measure specialisation within the activity.


Kellert (1985) found in his study of North American households that the vast majority of bird watchers (60%) were categorised as generalists and could identify less than 10 species, over a quarter (27%) were causal birders and could identify up to 20 species, 10% could identify 21-40 species and 3.2% could identify more than 40 species. Kellert's findings concluded that the committed bird watchers required specific and specialised habitats for the activity and held a ‘personal fascination’ for
the birds as opposed to the casual birders who were less specific about the required habitats and were more concerned about the ‘aesthetic qualities of the birds’. Partridge and Mackay (1998) concluded from their study that birders select a destination for the purpose of bird watching and that all other reasons and activities are of tangential importance. For these people the quality of the natural setting was of paramount importance.

The world’s tropical rainforests are believed to contain up to 50% of the world’s biodiversity (number of different species). These settings provide the opportunity for seeing a large number of different and endemic species. Hvenegaard's (2002) research in a north Thailand National Park found that the majority of bird watching tourists were in the top two advanced categories (59.7%). These findings contrast with those conducted in North America, where the top two categories accounted for up to 20% of the sample. Hvenegaard attributed this to two possible reasons. First was the achievement orientated motivations of the advanced birders and their propensity to travel long distances to observe birds. Second, the advanced birders had relatively higher incomes. In addition, Hvenegaard also found that 70% of the sample was from foreign countries (Europe and North America).

Scott and Thigpen’s (2003) research found inverse relationships between the higher levels of specialisation of the birder and the level of importance of other activities (shopping and golf), comforts in built accommodation facilities, and demand for developed camping opportunities. However, the most significant finding of Scott and Thigpen’s research was that ‘escaping urban areas’ was an important motivation of bird watchers irrespective of their level of specialisation in the activity. Similarly their research also found that those bird watchers who were less experienced were far more likely to desire visiting quaint small towns, visiting historic sites, shopping and looking at local crafts and antiques.

The utility of the specialisation concept to SIT is in its ability to characterise market typologies. However studies of bird watchers have inadvertently served to confuse the development of typologies. Research has tended to concentrate on one location or one event to collect data (Hvenegaard 2002, Burr and Scott 2004, Scott and Thigpen 2003). Eubanks et al (2004) suggests that particular times and places attract particular types of birders and as such limits the understanding of the global range of participants in bird watching. Moreover, the research efforts originate from
North America and very little is known about bird watchers from other nations such as Australia or the United Kingdom.

Research efforts have applied both skill and investment in the activity as the independent variable to observe the variance in the range of characteristics under examination (eg setting descriptors) to characterise the typologies. However, the application of skill as the independent variable underpins the vast majority of research efforts in describing bird watching tourist typologies (MacFarlane 1994, Scott and Thigpen 2003, Lee and Scott 2006). Moreover skill and knowledge in the activity were found to be the most important dimension in determining bird watchers preferences for physical and social settings (Lee and Scott 2004, Martin 1997). Expressed in terms of the typologies of bird watching tourists the skill continuum is expressed in Figure 4.8 (after Scott and Thigpen 2003, MacFarlane 1994, Martin 1997) as:

**Figure 4.8**

Bird watcher tourist typologies (based on skill progression)

![Skill Continuum Diagram](image)

Applying skill as the independent variable to determine the characteristics of market typologies, especially as these relate to setting preferences enables a site suitability analysis to be performed by a community and/or planning agency. Markey et al (2006) maintained that is essential to understand the external demand preferences for the supply characteristics (in this case the place setting characteristics as setting descriptors), to enable an understanding of the potential development that may be offered. Tourism products located in a remote area are described as place sensitive products because they are produced and consumed in the one location. To create competitive advantage strategies requires information about the characteristics of the market preferences for a range of location attributes, and how these differentiate within a product range. The emphasis is therefore made on the interaction between the attributes of the place and the preferences of the market for these attributes. The product is sensitive to, and is only as good as, the suitability of the place according to the market preferences.
The following section outlines the characteristics of a bird watching setting that frames the tourism product and establishes the basis of product differentiation within the bird watching tourism product range.

4.4 Place sensitive product characteristics of bird watching tourism

It was previously established that the application of urban planning theory and planning practice to non metropolitan regions inhibits the creation of locally owned development, in favour of externally driven and financed development in remote locations. Development strategies emanating from urban planning theory and methods apply conventional location theory to create outcomes that are dependent upon lower transport costs to gain comparative advantage within the product range. Transport costs while not irrelevant, do not necessarily underpin how the product is differentiated in the market place. For some tourists the level of accessibility is adds value to the experiences associated with the product. Tourism, more specifically tourism in remote locations requires a fundamentally different approach that creates competitive advantage development strategies and considers the market preferences for the setting characteristics of the particular location.

The success of place sensitive products is dependent upon the level of importance that characteristics such as the setting attributes of the locale and its residents, assume as part of the overall product. If the important characteristics that define the demanded product are not present at the locale then it is unlikely that the product will survive within the market place. The literature has not explored the failures of tourism in remote or peripheral areas according to place sensitive product location theory. This in turn infers that failures of non urban tourism may be attributed to the inability of the location to provide the demanded setting preferences, as opposed to the relative distance from an urban centre.

4.4.1 Land use planning for bird watching as a place sensitive product

The activity market preferences for product characteristics vary across the tourism continuum. Accordingly, in the absence of information about these product characteristics no predictions can be made about how demand would be affected by a change in one or more of the characteristics of the product or how a new product would fit in to the existing product range (Lancaster 1971). The notion of product differentiation is inherent to creating competitive advantage development strategies in remote locations. Establishing a framework from which to analyse the relative position of the product within the range enables community based decisions to
possess market orientation. Fundamental to this framework are the following propositions (after Lancaster 1971):

1. It is the characteristics of the product not the product itself that consumers are interested in; and
2. All products possess objective characteristics relevant to the choices that people make among a different range of products.

These two propositions have a profound impact on understanding the affect that changes in characteristics of the physical environment have upon the substitutability of the product within the product range. Land use planning impacts upon the manipulation of the land cover in conversion of the physical environment to a range of land uses. There are a range of decisions undertaken in land use planning processes these include a description of: the type of land use; the preferred location for the land use; and a description of the corresponding scale and intensity at the preferred location. The order in which these decisions are made varies and the decision making processes that underpins the final set of decisions are entirely dependent upon the governance mechanisms that control land use planning within the locale. This section examines the characteristics that have been identified as important to conducting the activity of bird watching, and serve as the basis of the product specifications within the bird watching tourism product range.

4.4.1.1 Type of land use

Land use is typically defined in a local context as it refers to the use of land within a geopolitical boundary. By way of example, a definition of tourism contained within a local planning scheme, academic text and nationally significant destination (Gold Coast in Australia) were reviewed to demonstrate how these vary with each local interpretation of the uses of land associated with tourism.

1. Gold Coast City Council (predominantly urban shire and significant Australian tourism destination) tourism related land use definitions applied in the Gold Coast Planning Scheme (2003:14):
Tourist Cabins
Premises used or intended to be used for holiday accommodation that include an eco-tourism facility and are located in the Hinterland. The cabins are used only for accommodating persons away from their principal place of residence on a short-term basis. This term may include the provision of limited ancillary guest facilities. This term does not include cabins provided as part of the range of accommodation facilities in a caravan park or camping ground located within urban areas or adjacent to foreshore reserves.

Tourist Facility
Any premises used, or intended to be used, for providing entertainment, recreation or similar facilities for the general touring or holidaying public. This term does not include a Restaurant or Nightclub.

Tourist Shop
Any premises used, or intended to be used, for the sale, displaying or offering for sale of souvenirs, gifts, duty free goods or other tourist-oriented goods, mainly to the general touring or holidaying public and where such premises are ancillary to other tourist uses or tourist accommodation. This term does not include a Shop, Take-Away Food Premises or Restaurant.

2. Eacham Shire Planning Scheme (rural shire in Far North Queensland Australia): Tourism related land use definitions of the Eacham Shire Planning Scheme 2006:1-31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourist Accommodation</th>
<th>Premises comprising two (2) or more accommodation units either with or without a caretaker’s residence and ancillary facilities for the temporary accommodation of travellers. The term includes a food establishment principally for the use of house guests when conducted on the same lot.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Facility</td>
<td>Premises for an activity designed for the recreation entertainment or education of the tourist or holidaying public. The term includes ancillary amenities, souvenir stores and refreshments where for the primary use of tourists. The use may include the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Art gallery;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Historic building; rural produce showroom or display;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tea house;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Theme or fun park; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Historical village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The term refers to uses in the Rural Zone if the use is dependent on nature-based activities and the rural setting such as a farm stay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Academic Definition (Moskowitz and Lindbloom 2004:403) of tourism:
“The attracting and serving of people visiting an area for recreation and vacations”
Tourism as a land use therefore represents the interpretation of tourist demands by the community. This interpretation is subsequently represented as:

- A land use or series of land uses;
- Is arranged spatially within the community territory according to their judgements of the proper and improper relationships between and among the community; and
- The attributes of the physical environment within the territory that the community identifies with.

The bird watching literature does not describe the activity in terms of a land use. However a consistent theme to the abovementioned tourism definitions is the use of land for the accommodation of non residents that is either temporary or short term. The literature (Scott and Thigpen 2003, Curtain and Wilkes 2005) described three types of accommodation (Figure 4.9) utilised by bird watchers those being: hotel accommodation, huts and cottages; and camping.

The demand for these types of accommodation has been described along the specialisation continuum as:

![Continuum of bird watchers accommodation preferences](image)

**Figure 4.9**
Continuum of bird watchers accommodation preferences

4.4.1.2 Location
The defined land use establishes the parameters of the type of use relative to all other land uses within the geopolitical boundary. The preferred location of the use within an urban system is based on optimising the efficiency of infrastructure utilisation such as transport networks and waste water treatment. Generally, a preferred location within a locale is based on transport networks, considers the impacts of the proposed use on amenity of the surrounds, and the community's
preferences for development. How the decision is ultimately made varies considerably and is dependent upon the governance structures that frame power, rationality and the applied substantive knowledge.

With respect to tourism, the alternative paradigm describes the relative location of tourism development to be incorporated within the community locale, as opposed to creating separate tourism enclaves. Planning for tourism as a land use, particularly those uses that create competitive development strategies requires a greater depth and breadth of knowledge about the setting characteristics sought by the market. Tourism planning irrespective of it being mass or alternative, does not consider the setting characteristics sought by the target market, such as the site suitability (i.e. assessing the site against the important characteristics sought by the target market segment) and how these impact upon the development aspirations of the community.

4.4.1.3 Scale of development

The term scale as it is applied in planning practice refers to a spatial measure that defines the area of the development as both the size of the building envelope on the land and in terms of height (State of Queensland 2009). However, in recreation and tourism literature (Butler and Waldbrook 2003, Weaver 2000, Clark and Stankey 1979) scale also refers to a particular level of development that is measured along a continuum spanning from high level scale of development (urban) to low level scale (wilderness) as described in Figure 4.10. This notion underpinnings the Clark and Stankey’s (1979) Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS).

**Figure 4.10**

Continuum of tourism development scale

![Figure 4.10 Continuum of tourism development scale](image)

The ROS described the scale of development according to a set of characteristics. The class or level of development occurs along a continuum describing a typology of development type (urban through to wilderness). For the purpose of this research scale will refer to a combination of characteristics that are used in both tourism and urban planning to identify development typologies along a continuum. The following
outlines the characteristics derived from the bird watching and tourism literature to broadly describe scale (Jones and Buckley 2001, Scott and Thigpen 2003, Baloglu and Uysal 1996, Hvenegaard 2002, Tremblay & Pitterle 2007):

Standards in Accommodation:
- Self catering facilities
- Hot water for washing
- Space for privacy
- Local style meals
- Electricity to power appliances
- Safe drinking water
- Familiar food
- Sewerage (toilet/rest room system)
- Rubbish removal
- Internet connection
- Mobile phone reception
- Comfortable bed

Destination Infrastructure:
- Sealed roads
- Hospital within 2 hour drive
- Reliable telecommunications
- Airport within 2 hours drive

4.4.1.4 Planning for bird watching as a place sensitive product
The three characteristics that describe a place sensitive product Bull (1998) are: accessibility; inherent setting characteristics and the neighbourhood setting. Accessibility was addressed as an item that describes and is associated with the scale of development (Clark and Stankey 1979, Butler and Waldbrook 2003). However, with respect to the research undertaken on setting characteristics of bird watching tourism products (Scott and Thigpen 2003, Curtain and Wilkes 2005, Cole and Scott 1999, Jones and Buckley 2001) three criteria emerged that describe the characteristics of a bird watching setting those being:

a) Intrinsic setting characteristics:

Flora:
- Trees
- Orchids
• Palms

*Fauna:*
• Mammals
• Reptiles and amphibians
• Butterflies

*Rare and Endangered Birds*

*Landscape Features:*
• Mountainous landscape
• Pristine landscape and vistas
• Creeks and rivers

b) **Tourism facilities (to facilitate the activity)**

*Facilities:*
• Visitor Information centre that provides information about birds and wildlife
• Hides dispersed throughout the site
• You can take a driving tour
• The site has formed walking paths
• Eating facilities are nearby
• Guides or rangers are available on site
• The site contains signs identifying plants

*Other site activities:*
• Swimming
• Photography
• Museum
• Fishing
• Boating
• Golf
• Shopping

c) **Neighbourhood settings (other surrounding land uses)**

*Interaction with locals:*
• Able to attend cultural events and ceremonies
• To learn more about local traditions and belief system
• Able to buy local craft

*Acceptable land uses:*
• Farming is practised on site
• Logging and forestry is practised on site
• Hunting is permitted on site
• A local community is close by
• Preservation of the natural environment
• Industrial development is near the site yet can’t be seen

The product characteristics highlighted in this section provide context to how a product may be differentiated. Each of the characteristics serves as product specifications and can be assessed for the level of importance associated with the product. The following section of the chapter provides an overview of the product spectrum in wildlife tourism and the continuum of bird watching tourism products within this overall spectrum. Understanding how substitutable a product is within its product range defines how differentiated the product is within the market place.

4.5 Typology of bird watching tourism products
For the highly specialised bird watchers the activity is not substitutable (it cannot be replaced by another to produce the desired experience) (Lee and Scott 2006), and neither is the setting substitutable (replacement of one site by another without change in the activity) as rare birds have a limited range and endemic birds to a setting have a very specific range. For the more specialised birder, it is possible to change the location intended to be visited and hence the list of species to be observed, but this would involve a redefinition of the expectation which would then result in a product shift (Shelby, Bregenzer and Johnson 1988), not a substitution (Shelby and Vaske 1991).

This lack of substitutes in effect provides the context for the competitive advantage of one birding destination over another. Competition is dependent upon and derived from the choices tourists make between alternative destinations (Ritchie and Crouch 2000). The tourism industry provides a range of products to satisfy an equally diverse range of demands. Quantifying the characteristics of the product range provides a basis of describing the objective qualities of the product and enable the impact monitoring of the change in setting characteristics upon market demand i.e. does the change result in a product shift or a product substitution and if so for which market segment?
Curtain and Wilkes (2005) proposed a wildlife product/tourist spectrum to illustrate how the product meets the market demands. This spectrum (Figure 4.11) proposes six wildlife products of which bird watching is described as a product that focusing on the provision of a range of bird watching and photography tours. The continuum makes reference to some of the characteristics that differentiate the two extremes of the product continuum. The authors maintained that bird watching tour products are differentiated by itineraries, price and degree of focus on the activity or relaxation. More importantly they maintain that the complexity of the market prohibits the plotting of each product category along the tourist continuums, adding that with the exception of bird tours the other categories are more fluid.

Curtain and Wilkes also suggest that tourist expectations have increased in terms of the degree of comfort requirements and the desire for relaxation. This trend according to Curtain and Wilkes has marked a gradual shift from the highly specialised market to a more general market. The authors concede that a gulf exists between the specialised wildlife holiday and the mass market product, yet do not describe the underlying causes or reason why this may be. In terms of the product range very little research has described the product typologies in a cohesive manner to determine and how (if at all), these relate to the tourist market typologies. The relationship between the tourism product and its corresponding tourist market underpins the product differentiating characteristics that define a place sensitive product such as tourism in a remote location. This relationship is not known, nor have the market preferences for the characteristics of the product as opposed to the product per se been explored in the literature.

Creating competitive advantage development strategies for remote locations is contingent upon knowledge about the important characteristics for the market preferences across a product range. This knowledge enables an understanding of the impact that changes in the physical settings can have upon market demands for products, and how changes can affect product differentiation within the market place.
### Figure 4.11
**Wildlife Product/Tourist Spectrum**
(Curtain and Wilkes 2005:470)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPOLOGY</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>PREFERRED LOCATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expeditions</td>
<td>To be actively involved in research and conservation projects or to just lean about conservation issues and species. Ranges from wildlife conservation volunteering to adventure with a purpose working alongside scientists and researchers. Study tours included general wildlife, photography, ornithology, botany and ecology.</td>
<td>UK or overseas: Europe, Asia, Africa, Australasia, The Americas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated bird tours and</td>
<td>Main focus of tours is on bird watching and photography.</td>
<td>Any migratory routes and normal bird habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly birds</td>
<td>On a continuum from being highly focused and intensive to more relaxed and leisurely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General naturalist</td>
<td>To see birds, mammals, plants, butterflies, history and archaeology Product continuum from very expensive high quality tours to affordable holidays designed for wildlife watching, relaxation and general interest.</td>
<td>Any outstanding wildlife habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic tours</td>
<td>Can be similar to the general naturalist. Most operators also organise and promote tours in the UK. Or they can be highly specific, focused and intensive.</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safaris</td>
<td>To see the popular African game reserves Ranges from mass market tours based around seeing the big 5 (elephant, lion, rhino, buffalo and leopards) to more specialised and individual itineraries in the lesser known and visited parks.</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure/Exploration</td>
<td>Wildlife an added dimension of the adventure/experience and not the prima facie. But depends on the type of tour.</td>
<td>Worldwide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Substantive theoretical concepts and research issues

Figure 4.12 illustrates the supply and demand components of the alternative system. The analytical framework developed in chapter 3 is expanded upon to include the substantive theories and practices of SIT in a remote location. The substantive model proposes that the place characteristics associated with the SIT activity of bird watching are the basis of the exchange between those that demand and those that supply the product. The tour operator as the intermediary remains within the system as the facilitator of the experience expectations via their understanding of market demands for the product characteristics and their ability to seek and supply these to the target market. The community is represented as the entity that owns and has
Figure 4.12
Model 3 of the Analytical Framework:
System of Substantive Planning Theoretical Concepts

Procedural Theoretical Concepts
CBT: Collective decision making as community engagement &/or development operationalised as:

5 STEP PROCESS
1. Vision
2. Goals & objectives
3. Development Programs
4. Evaluation of Alternatives
5. Implementation & Evaluation

Substantive Theoretical Concepts:
Special Interest Tourism System

Special Interest Demand System
Special Interest Tourist (SITist) motivated to participate in specific activity in particular setting to satisfy experience expectations.

Search for product from product range

Alternative Tourism

COMMUNITY
- Locale inhabited by people
- Locale contains setting characteristics demanded by special interest tourists
- Community make decision about what to supply & where to develop

INTRA-SENSITIVE TOURISM PRODUCT

PLACE SENSITIVE TOURISM PRODUCT

INTERNATIONAL TOUR OPERATOR (ITO)
- Interprets consumer demand & designs tourism product
- Searches for destinations to meet activities & setting preferences of SITist

DESTINATION TOUR OPERATOR
- Local knowledge of setting features demanded by ITO & SITist
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control over both the access to and the manipulation of the land cover. The decision to change the land cover to a land use or set of uses is made by the community. The extent to which the process is consensual or collaborative is investigated to determine how the benefits are distributed within the community.

4.7 Research issues
Five major research issues have emerged from the literature reviewed in this chapter in the construction of the substantive model within the analytical framework. The research issues are related to the relationship between the demand for place characteristics by a SITist (bird watching tourist); the supply response made by tour operators; the role of the place characteristics associated with the location; and the community that owns and controls access to these characteristics. Each of the research issues is related to knowledge gaps within the literature that describe alternative tourism in a remote location. The research issues are briefly discussed in turn.

4.7.1 Place sensitive characteristics sought by bird watching tourists
The first research issue examines the level of importance that the tourist typology assigns to place sensitive characteristics of a potential tourism product. This thesis accepts the empirical findings of previous research that the skill level of the bird watcher is believed to be the most influential variable upon preferences for setting development. Skill level is also applied as the basis for delineating market typologies. What remains unknown are the important place characteristics associated that describe a tourist market typology.

4.7.2 Tour operator perceptions of place sensitive characteristics
The second research issue examines what bird watching tour operators perceive to be important place sensitive characteristics to their target market typology. The literature concluded that the bird watching market possesses a product typology within the tourism product range and that each market typology will have varying levels of importance attached to the different product characteristics. What is unknown is whether the tour operators identify product characteristics according to a specific market typology.
4.7.3 Relationship between market demand and tour operator perceptions

It was established that the role of the Tour Operator in the alternative system is to interpret the demand preferences of their target market and create a product that meets these preferences. The peripheral tourism literature also maintained that the peripheral locations were overly dependent upon the intermediary tour operator and that this dependence challenges their survival within the market place. What is unknown is the extent to which the Tour Operators influence development outcomes and how reliably do the Tour Operators represent the development preferences of the tourists. This research issue is critical to understanding the relationship between the community, the tourist and the tour operator within a remote area setting.

4.7.4 Community decision making

Reid (2003) maintained that the level of tourism development within a locale reflects the commonly held values and aspirations for tourism by a community. It is unclear whether the intermediary and the community as a provider of tourism products accurately reflect the demand for the place characteristics sought by tourists.

4.7.5 Spatial development pattern

The pattern and associated levels of development according to Reid (2003) represent the collective aspirations of the community. The spatial pattern describes the appropriate types and locations of development relative to the values of the community. The spatial development pattern provides a mechanism to describe the truth and knowledge applied in the decision making process and in this instance acts as a means of validating the relationship between knowledge and action as a planning practice.

4.8 Chapter summary

Chapter 1 provided the basis of the analytical framework for examining the actual planning knowledge production process that is applied by a remotely located community. This framework was advanced with the addition of the normative planning theoretical concepts for planning (Chapter 2) and procedural planning theoretical concepts (Chapter 3) related to the planning of community based tourism in a remote area. This chapter further expanded upon the framework through the examination of the substantive theories associated with special interest tourism in a remote area.
The purpose of this chapter was to examine the substantive planning theoretical concepts inherent to the special interest of bird watching tourism in a remote location. The chapter reviewed literature on recreation specialisation in relation to the creation of special interest tourist typologies. This approach has been widely used in describing bird watching tourist typologies within the literature. A product range exists within the market place that describes the activity in terms of the various combinations of product characteristics that are deemed to be important to each market typology. The relationship between the product range and the market typologies has not been explored in the literature, and as a consequence the relationship between the demand preferences for setting attributes as product characteristics is poorly understood.

The chapter culminated in a substantive model that described SIT from a systems perspective. The behaviour of the components within the system is largely unknown and as such the identification of a range of research issues from the model will be used to structure the research strategy and methods that form the basis of the following chapter.
Chapter 5
Research Strategy and Methods

5.1 Introduction
This chapter describes the ontological and epistemological orientation of the thesis and how these influence the research strategy and address the Research Aim and Objectives. The research strategy is best described as a pragmatic enquiry that seeks an understanding of how decisions about tourism are made by a remotely located community. The philosophy of pragmatism treats actions as beliefs (Rorty 1999) and as such the value and belief system are social constructions of the community. Spatial planning represents the relationship between development, the physical environment and human society. Planning outcomes are therefore the manifestations of what people in a community define to be the proper and improper relationship between themselves and the physical environment (Greider and Garkovich 1994). Planning as an action describes how a community socially constructs their landscape as reflections of themselves. The process itself influences the construction of an individual’s identity; the way in which a particular locale is described and defines a community’s collective reality.

The pragmatic approach to research focuses on the research problem as opposed to favouring a specific theoretical perspective to research methods (Rorty 1999). As a result the research strategy adopted in this thesis applies a combination of both positivistic and interpretive methods to address the Research Aim and Objectives established in Chapter 1. Figure 5.1 describes the design of the research process undertaken in this thesis. The purpose of this chapter is to describe how the theoretical concepts identified in the analytical framework are examined to describe the planning knowledge production process created and applied by the Arfakan community; and to determine the combined impact that the external demands expressed by the tourists and tour operators may have upon the current and future bird watching tourism product provided by the community.

A series of research questions and issues emerged from the preceding chapters and are treated as knowledge gaps in the creation of a coherent body of remote area tourism planning knowledge. The case study site assists in understanding the relationship between the components of the alternative tourism system and serves to inform the planning knowledge production process.
The chapter is presented in six sections, the first of which includes this introduction. Section 5.2 provides an overview of the research strategy undertaken in the procedure of examining the relationship between the components of the alternative tourism system as they relate to the demand for and subsequent supply of place sensitive characteristics in a remote location. Section 5.3 details the methods applied to address the research issues and questions and Section 5.4 discusses how the data was collected. Section 5.5 describes how the data is analysed and the final section of the chapter provides a concise summary of the research strategy applied in the thesis to give context to the structure of Chapters 6, 7 and 8.

Figure 5.1
Research Design
(Developed for this thesis)
5.2 Research strategy
Ontology is the study of being or the nature of existence (Gray 2004). This research adopts a social constructivist view that suggests that there are multiple realities rather than one true reality. Accordingly, truth and meaning are created by an individuals' interaction with the world (Gray 2004). Meaning is constructed and people construct their meanings in their own way, even if in relation to the same phenomenon.

Figure 5.2 illustrates the elements of this research process and identifies the overarching philosophy guiding this research as pragmatism. Pragmatism does not search for absolute truth and is about examining how people cope with their environment and how they have adapted to enable access to a life of greater pleasure and less pain (Rorty 1999). In essence pragmatism examines what is done and treats the actions as representations of beliefs. From this examination of habit, the inquiry makes normative statements about the ends to be achieved and the means to be used to achieve those ends (Rorty 1999). A pragmatic enquiry of a spatial planning project enables an understanding of how decisions are made by a community about their desired future. The spatial pattern of development is the physical representation of the truth and knowledge applied by the community as they respond to new conditions and knowledge. The truth and knowledge applied at the time of making changes such as planning decisions is temporal by nature and represents the beliefs of the community at specific times. A pragmatic orientation to planning suggests that a community spatially arranges development in a pattern that represents the socially acceptable identity of the locale and its residents.
Both knowledge and social reality are treated in the philosophy of pragmatism as beliefs and habits that have been socially constructed (Pansiri 2005). Pragmatists refute the idea that the truth can be determined ‘once and for all’ and maintain that truth is what works.

Society has been undergoing a profound change in how we see the world. This change has been variously described as a shift from modernism to postmodernism, from certainty to uncertainty and from objectivity to relativism (Harper and Stein 2006). This in turn has had an inscrutable impact upon how we know or understand the world such as the epistemological paradigms that guide the researcher’s investigation for knowledge. In the case of spatial planning the relationship between facts and values is uncertain and how the validity of either is assessed becomes a focus of contention within the planning process.

Pragmatism has been hailed as the foundation for mixed methods (Pansiri 2005) and views the relationship between truth and knowledge as relative to one another as
opposed to absolute. Pragmatism refutes the incompatible thesis and focuses on applying methods necessary to answer the research problem. The incompatibility thesis states that compatibility between positivism and interpretivism is impossible due to the incompatibility of paradigms that underlie the methods (Teddlie and Tashakorri 2003). Furthermore the incompatibility thesis suggests that positivism and interpretivism research paradigms are incompatible in terms of their ontology, epistemology and the ability to make generalisations and causal linkages (Lincoln and Guba 1985 in Teddlie and Tashakkori 2003). However not all research is suited to one paradigm or the other. An interpretive approach provides greater depth in understanding the phenomena, yet fails to offer greater breadth.

The research paradigms applied in this study apply a positivistic approach to describing the bird watcher preferences for place characteristics and seeks a large sample from which to make reliable conclusions about the impacts of change upon the target market typology for the place sensitive product. The interpretive approach is used to provide context to how the community responds to bird watchers preferences for specific place characteristics. The two approaches are used in combination to address the research aim and objectives. The interpretive approach provides an understanding of the decision making processes undertaken by the community regarding the arrangement of spatial patterns and the corresponding levels of development. The positivistic approach provides an insight to the consequences of these decisions upon achieving competitive advantage within the bird watching tourism product range.

Planning for CBT is the nexus between what a community wants for its future and what is demanded by a tourist market. A change in the development of the place characteristics could impact upon the market for the tourism product and its substitutability within the product range. However while this change may satisfy community aspirations for development it may also reduce product differentiation within the product range. Understanding the ramifications of planning decisions is integral to understanding how to gain competitive advantage within the tourism product range.

5.3 Research methods
This section provides an overview of the methods undertaken to address the Research Aim, Objectives and the questions and issues identified as knowledge
gaps in creating a coherent body of remote area planning knowledge. The **Research Aim** for this thesis is:

> To characterise the planning knowledge production process associated with alternative tourism in a remote area.

The analytical framework that has been created through the literature reviewed and summarised in Figure 4.12 is used to guide the investigation undertaken in the case study and is comprised of three types of planning theory and their underlying theoretical concepts. Three Research Objectives were identified to examine the extent of the application of planning theoretical concepts in describing the overall planning knowledge production process created and applied by the remote Arfakan community. Three Research Objectives were created to characterise the planning knowledge production process and as the basis of the analytical framework structure used to guide the literature review. These are:

**Research Objective 1:**

> To identify the normative planning theoretical concepts that underpins the planning knowledge production process applied by a remote community.

**Research Objective 2:**

> To describe how a remote area community makes decisions about the level of development associated with an alternative tourism product.

**Research Objective 3:**

> To identify the substantive planning theoretical concepts that were applied in the planning procedure and how these influenced the spatial transformation of the locale.

Knowledge gaps that describe the relationship between the types of planning theory were identified in chapters three and four. These were summarised as Research Questions and Issues, and are used to strategically guide the research strategy as shown in Figure 5.3. The spatial development pattern is included in the research strategy to describe the relationship between planning knowledge and its material consequences (action) within the case study site.
The research methods applied in the thesis separates external and internal sources of knowledge creation within the case study community. The external sources include the development preferences of bird watchers and the tour operator’s perceptions of the markets preferences. These are examined on the basis of the importance attached to the place characteristics associated with the bird watching tourism product. The internal knowledge applied by the community regarding tourism, land uses, tenure and benefit distribution are investigated to determine the influence of these and the external sources of knowledge upon the spatial development pattern within the remote community. The influence of the Regency government upon the planning knowledge production process was also investigated to determine how they influence the spatial development pattern through the provision of development pre conditions.

### 5.3.1 Knowledge gaps as research questions and issues

The research questions presented in the following Tables (5.1 and 5.2), identify the knowledge gaps that underpin a coherent body of remote area planning knowledge.
Table 5.1 outlines the gaps that describe the relationship between normative planning theoretical concepts and their application in the design of planning procedures. Table 5.2 seeks answers to a range of questions to provide context to how and why the planning procedure was adopted by the community. Table 5.3 describes the five research issues that arose from the remote area alternative tourism system and seeks answers that describe the behaviour of the components within the system in the production of a tourism product. Figure 5.4 describes the relationship between the Research Aim, Questions, Issues and Methods to provide context to the following three tables.

Figure 5.4
Relationship between the Research Aim, Questions, Issues and Methods

The tables have been designed to provide structure and purpose to the research process and enable the construction of a coherent body of planning knowledge on alternative tourism in remote areas.
Table 5.1
Normative knowledge gaps (developed for this thesis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Does the informal process consider the impact of development upon amenity?</td>
<td>Key community informants</td>
<td>Qualitative methods: Semi structured interviews</td>
<td>To examine the relationship between the normative and procedural planning theoretical concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How are development opportunities identified and assessed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How is the substantive knowledge about development accessed and assessed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is the public interest considered in the process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the community undertake collaborative decision making when assessing development alternatives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are the principles of social justice and equity incorporated into decision making?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the community identify the competitive advantage of its product within the global bird watching product range?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does a community plan for development in the absence of development pre conditions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent does the community have control over the planning process and the knowledge production process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Research Questions</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is the relationship between the demand for geographical characteristics that underpin place sensitive products and the procedural planning concepts that inform the planning process?</td>
<td>Key community informants</td>
<td>Qualitative methods: Semi structured interviews</td>
<td>To examine and describe the planning practices associated with community based tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is CBT operationalised as community engagement or community development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the community possess a vision for development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the community established a set of goals and objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the community establish a set of development programs to meet the established set of goals and objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does the community evaluate the development programs to select the alternative the best meets their vision, goals and objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the community posses a strategic plan that describes how the programs are to be implemented and evaluated for their effectiveness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Issue 1: Place Sensitive Characteristics sought by bird watching tourists</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine the level of importance that the tourist typology assigns to place sensitive characteristics</td>
<td>Bird watching tourist</td>
<td>Quantitative survey of bird watchers</td>
<td>To enable generalisations to be made about the market preferences for place sensitive characteristics of tourism products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Issue 2: Tour Operator Perceptions of Place Sensitive Characteristics</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine what the tour operators perceive to be important place sensitive characteristics to their target market typology</td>
<td>Global perspective of Tour Operators providing tours and services to the bird watchers</td>
<td>Quantitative survey of tour operators</td>
<td>To enable generalisations to be made about the Tour Operator perceptions of their target market demand for place sensitive characteristics of tourism products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Issue 3: Relationship between market demand and tour operator perceptions</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine the reliability of the tour operators interpretation of the demand preferences of their market typology</td>
<td>Tourist and Tour Operator</td>
<td>Quantitative comparison between bird watchers and tour operators</td>
<td>To identify the place characteristics that underpin the bird watching product range those that differentiate a product within that range.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Issue 4: Community Decision Making</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To describe how a remote area community makes decisions about the place characteristics associated with bird watching tourism.</td>
<td>The Community of the village providing bird watching tourism in the Arfak Mountains</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>To understand how a remote community plans for tourism development, including the incorporation of knowledge and the influence of the underlying governance structures upon the process. To determine if the level of tourism development is commensurate with a commonly held vision and strategic plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Issue 5 Spatial Development Pattern</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To describe the truth and knowledge applied by the community in making decisions about development.</td>
<td>Mapping spatial development pattern of the village and surrounds</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>To provide context to the decision making process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Data collection
This research applies mixed methods to the collection and analysis of data. In doing this quantitative methods were applied to the collection of data on bird watching tourists’ preferences for place characteristics and the tour operators’ perceptions of these preferences. The interpretive paradigm was applied to gain an understanding of how decisions are made by the community about what to supply and to whom. The spatial development pattern was mapped and used as an active representation of the truth and knowledge that was actually applied in making the decisions about the level of development associated with the land use of tourism.

5.4.1 The bird watchers
Two distinct samples were collected to examine consumer demand for place sensitive products. The first bird watcher sample was collected in the United Kingdom (UK) and the other within Australia. Unlike their United States counterparts very little is known about either the UK or Australian bird watching demand preferences for place characteristics or how this relates to the level of activity specialisation. Refer to Appendix 1 for a copy of the bird watcher survey.

UK Sample
The UK was identified by Phil Gregory (pers comm. 2006) of Sicklebill Safaris as the predominant market for his West Papua Tours. It was later confirmed that the UK and USA bird watchers were the predominant market source of the Destination Tour Operator (interviewed at the case study site). To collect data on the UK market required access to a large sample such as an association of bird watchers or a large gathering of a diverse range of people engaged in the activity. Due to time limitations associated with the research it was not feasible to travel to a range of bird watching sites in the UK to collect data. Two collection processes were considered:

1. insert the survey in a specialist magazine and have the surveys returned through the international mail system; or
2. to attend a festival or trade show that caters to the specific market.

The latter option was chosen due to both time and financial constraints.

Data were collected in August 2007 at the 19th annual UK Birdfair at Rutland Waters, in the English county of Rutland. The organisers of the Birdfair estimate that more than 12 000 people attended the 2007 Birdfair over the three days. The festival is sponsored by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) and provides the
opportunity for tour operating companies to maintain trade displays in addition to hosting guest speakers and lectures. The Birdfair caters to the interests of all bird watchers irrespective of their skill level.

Self administered questionnaires (Appendix 1) were randomly distributed to bird watchers in the dining area and in the events tent that hosted guest speakers. Potential respondents were provided with a verbal overview of the study and asked if they would like to participate. If the respondent agreed to participate they were given a pen to complete the survey and asked to deposit the completed survey in a centrally located collection box. Four hundred and sixty surveys (460) were distributed over the three days, and two hundred and ninety two (292) were returned. This method resulted in a response rate of 63%.

**Australian collection**

The Australian equivalent of the RSPB is Birds Australia (BA) who also organise an annual bird festival. However, at the time of the 2007 data collection phase the festival organisers were unable to predict with any certainty the expected visitor numbers as the festival was only in its second year of operation. Two alternative methods of accessing the Australian bird watchers were considered, those being:

1. Apply to use the BA member data base and send the survey to randomly selected members; or
2. Apply to BA to have the survey inserted in their quarterly publication Wingspan.

The second option was pursued as the first was found to contravene the association’s privacy policy. The survey was assessed by the association for its suitability and any potential legal implications. Once approved 1000 surveys (13% of the BA database) with an attached pre printed reply paid envelope were randomly distributed by BA to members in the states of New South Wales and Victoria in the September 2007 edition of Wingspan. After eight weeks 160 replies were received. A combined total of 452 (UK and Australia) fell short of the 780 total consumer surveys required to undertake a reliable factor analysis (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007) on the motivations for selecting a holiday site that is included in the survey. A second run of survey inserts was required to address this shortfall.

In the second run, 1700 surveys were inserted in the December 2007 edition of the magazine to members in Queensland (1100 members) and South Australia (600
members). The second mail out derived a further 262 samples, bringing the total Australian samples to 422. The response rate for the total Australian mail out was 16%. The research design did not follow Dillman’s (1991) Total Design Method (TDM) due mainly to financial constraints. Therefore reminders were not sent out which may have affected the overall response rate. The response rate is based entirely upon the motivation of the respondent to complete the survey. Dillman (1991) maintains that a response rate of 60 to 80% is typical to mail out surveys using the TDM approach for homogeneous groups where low education is not a characteristic of the population.

By comparison a recent (2008) two page survey inserted in a professional Geologist magazine investigating Australian Geotourist travel behaviours elicited a response rate of 7% (Robinson 2008).

5.4.2 Tour Operators

SIT is characterised by both the special interest tourist and the tour operator who provides customised services to meet the requirements of their clients in pursuit of the interest. The tour operator plays a critical role in both the provision of tour services as the intermediary between the originating source of the tourist and the locale providing the setting for tourism.

To develop a potential respondent list of tour operators, a Google search for tour operators was conducted using the following search descriptors:

- Bird watching tour operators
- Bird watching
- Bird watching tourism
- Bird watching West Papua

From this search each web page of the potential companies was reviewed to ensure that they fit the following criteria:

- Provided a service such as guiding, accommodation or tour design for the activity of bird watching; and
- Utilised natural areas (as opposed to zoos).

A web based survey (questionnaire) was constructed by Port Douglas Web Designs as a means to process the response without separate data entry. The design of the
survey was completed in accordance with Dillman, Tortora and Bowker (1999) principles for web based surveys (Appendix 2 for paper based version of web survey) and were constructed by a specialist web design firm. In August 2007 the first set of invitations was made to 183 firms. However, despite the testing completed prior to this distribution a terminal error occurred on the web page resulting in none of the data being retained.

Subsequent to this first attempt, the web survey was reconstructed. A covering letter was attached to explain the problem and to appeal to the firms to have a second attempt at completing the survey. In total 213 invitations to participate in the web based survey were sent (16th of October 2007) and 30 extra companies were sought to compensate for any losses as a result of the first attempt), 16 were returned with explanations including:

- Not interested or doesn’t apply to the company; and
- Returned via their server (full mailbox or no longer using email address)

To ensure anonymity the survey did not include response tracking cookies. A reminder was sent to all firms with the exception of the 16 abovementioned. At the conclusion of the data collection period (December 31st 2007), 51 surveys were received. The final response rate equates to 25%. The low response rate may have been attributed to the failure of the first survey. However, additional feedback received from non respondents included:

- We regret not being able to answer the survey sent to us. Our company was formed barely a year ago and we do not have all the required information.
- If you would like to receive responses from PNG tour operators for this survey it is very important that you e-mail the survey as an attachment and don't expect them / us to go crawling around your website - it won't happen. Many smaller tour operators in rural areas get their e-mail using other people's computers or limited-bandwidth HF or V-SAT internet connections and have very limited internet access. Plus we have frequent connection drop-outs so it is problematic trying to fill out on-line forms and surveys.
- MNA invested more than 10 minutes to your questionnaire. Your project is excellent but the questionnaire is very difficult. So don't be angry to him, he did not complete it. MNA is very busy but your project likes him very much.
- Thanks for your invitation, and sorry about the delay, but we are in the worst time to this thinks in the begin of the birding season here in Patagonia.
• It is unlikely that I will not have chance to complete the survey. I am going to be out of the office for a while and I’m afraid that at the moment their are other things that have priority.

5.4.3 Case study selection: remote area of Arfak Mountains

The focus of the research is on the community case study to gain an understanding of how the community plan for the adaptation of their local environment to incorporate development for bird watching tourism. The research applies the single case study method to address the research problem. Yin (2003) maintains that how and why questions are likely to favour case study research methods. The quantitative data on bird watcher preferences for development enables an understanding of the providers’ interpretation of the consumers’ preferences relative to the breadth of the bird watching tourism market.

How people arrange their spatial patterns of development to suit their own needs permits a more reflective perspective on the meaning of planning within society in general. The case study examined in this research allows a close proximity to the reality of how a community organises itself independent of state intervention and contributes to an understanding of the nature of community based planning in a remote area.

The case study approach permits an in depth understanding of the ‘little things’ (Nietzsche 1969 cited in Flyvberg 2006). These little things are often overlooked and lost when undertaking high level generalisations of theory. A case study according to Eisenhardt (1989) does not necessarily have to be randomly selected. Accordingly Eisenhardt maintains that random selection is not even preferable. Flyvberg (2006) maintains that the generalisability of case studies can be increased by the strategic selection of cases. He maintains that a typical case is often not richest in information and it is more important to clarify the deeper causes behind a problem and its consequences than to describe the symptoms of the problem and how frequently they occur. Table 5.4 summarises Flyvberg’s forms of case study sampling. The case study site examined in this research was chosen because it provides information on an extreme and yet simultaneously paradigmatic case (Flyvberg 2006). The site is extreme in that it provides information on how a community in a remote area plans for development. While also paradigmatic in that the case study allows an in depth understanding of the misunderstood, ideal and at times maligned notion of community based tourism.
Table 5.4
Strategies for the selection of samples and cases (Flyvberg 2006:230)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Selection</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Random selection</td>
<td>To avoid systematic biases in the sample. The sample's size is decisive for generalization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Random sample</td>
<td>To achieve a representative sample that allows for generalization for the entire population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stratified sample</td>
<td>To generalize for specially selected subgroups within the population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Information oriented selection</td>
<td>To maximize the utility of information from small samples and single cases. Cases are selected on the basis of expectations about their information content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Extreme/deviant cases</td>
<td>To obtain information on unusual cases, which can be especially problematic or especially good in a more closely defined sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maximum variation cases</td>
<td>To obtain information about the significance of various circumstances for case process and outcome (e.g., three to cases that are very different on one dimension: size, form of four organization, location, and budget).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Critical cases</td>
<td>To achieve information that permits logical deductions of the type, “If this is (not) valid for this case, then it applies to all (no) cases.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Paradigmatic cases</td>
<td>To develop a metaphor or establish a school for the domain that the case concerns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The case study site area possesses both remote and alternative tourism characteristics and provides a special interest tourism product. The key informants of the remotely located community provided a rich description of the planning practices associated with community based tourism, which in turn informs the remote area planning knowledge production process.

5.4.3.1 Identifying key informants
Informants from the village community were interviewed to address the issues and questions arising from Research Issues 4 and 5. Data collection was undertaken in two stages, the first of which sought information on the spatial development pattern of the village and the second to establish how decisions were made about tourism. As the area is an extreme case of remote, there were no maps or digital data publicly available on the locality to describe the location and associated spatial features such as topography, road networks, forest cover and human habitation. It was also not possible for a foreigner to gain access to information on future government planning initiatives without making application to the national government in Jakarta.

The spatial development pattern at the village was recorded using a Garmin 60CSx hand held GPS unit and mapped using MapInfo Professional Version 8. The location of the village was recorded to describe how the road infrastructure accesses the site. The location of the houses and land uses provided spatial relativity of the sites used.
for tourism. The purpose of the second visit was to determine how the decisions were made about:

- Providing for tourism;
- Where to locate tourism;
- The corresponding level of development including: service provision; information on how benefits are distributed; and the decision making process itself to establish whether its objective was to incorporate community engagement, deliver community development goals or to produce a strategic plan.

The data collection strategy was implemented to ensure the application of culturally appropriate methods. The key informants interviewed in the research were restricted to those who played a role in decision making regarding land use within the village area and owned the tourism related and services. However, it became evident at the conclusion of the community interviewing process that the Regency Government while not directly involved in the provision of tourism related services, exerted a significant impact upon tourism in the village. The key informants interviewed were:

**Destination Tour Operator**
Initial tour operator to village, based in City #1

**Tour Guide**
Village based field guide and tourism co-ordinator

**Land Owner**
Head of village responsible for all land use assessments and plot allocations

**Regency Government**
Bupati who has sole discretion over all development in Regency Area

**Regency Town Planner**
Responsible for planning in Regency Government boundary

The informants were interviewed to determine the role that they played in making decisions regarding tourism development within the village locality. The content of the interviews were structured according to the Research Issues and Questions outlined in the Research Strategy (Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3).
5.4.4 Human research ethic approvals
Data collection methods were approved by Charles Darwin University's Human Research Ethics Committee prior to commencement of data collection. Approvals were granted contingent upon a range of conditions, which were complied with in the data collection process.

1. Case study (CDU HREC Approval # H07071)
The participants were informed of the study and how the information was to be used. The plain language statement was converted to Hatam via a translation of both Indonesian Bahasa and English. The participants were able to withdraw at any time and their participation was entirely voluntary.

2. Tour Operators and Tourists Surveys (CDU HREC Approval #HO6089)
The approval relating to the surveys was conditional upon a plan language statement being provided for both the internet survey and the self administered survey form. These are included in Attachment 1 and 2. The respondents to both surveys were not required to be identified and their participation was voluntary.

5.5 Data analysis
This section of the chapter is presented as a series of tables that identify the study variables, the measurement scale, literature source, outcome sought and the statistics used in the data analysis chapters. Quantitative data was analysed using SPSS version 15 for Windows. Qualitative data collected from the informants was analysed using content analysis to structure the responses within the research strategy.

5.5.1 Place characteristics
The following section describes the place characteristics that define the demand preferences and the subsequent product description. These are used as the basis of exchange between the tourist, tour operator and the community. The importance scale was measured from 1 (Not at all Important) to 5 (Extremely Important). This also described the corresponding level of development. A low level of importance equates to preferences for low levels of development, similarly preferences for a highly developed setting would record a high score of between 3.5 to 5.
### Table 5.5
Variables describing the type of land use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Measurement Scale</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel, Hut/cottage camping</td>
<td>1 – 5 level of importance</td>
<td>Scott and Thigpen (2003), Hvenegaard (2002)</td>
<td>Average level of importance per skill level for type of accommodation</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.6
Variables describing Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Measurement Scale</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standards in accommodation</td>
<td>1 – 5 level of importance</td>
<td>Baloglu &amp; Uysal (1996), Hvenegaard (2002)</td>
<td>Average level of importance per skill level for Standards in accommodation</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Infrastructure</td>
<td>1 – 5 level of importance</td>
<td>Tremblay and Pitterle (2007)</td>
<td>Average level of importance per skill level for infrastructure requirements</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.7
Variables describing Intensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Measurement Scale</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of tours in group size categories</td>
<td>Open ended for each scale item</td>
<td></td>
<td>The preferred size of the tour groups and capacity of site</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.8
Variables describing intrinsic setting characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic setting characteristics</th>
<th>Measurement Scale</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of Flora</td>
<td>1 – 5 level of importance</td>
<td>Lindsay 1981, Jones and Buckley (2001)</td>
<td>Average level of importance per skill level for Diversity of Flora</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of Fauna</td>
<td>1 – 5 level of importance</td>
<td>Higginbottom, Waight and Faunsaugh (2004)</td>
<td>Average level of importance per skill level for Diversity of Fauna</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare and Endemic birds</td>
<td>1 – 5 level of importance</td>
<td>Jones and Buckley (2001)</td>
<td>Average level of importance per skill level for Rare and Endemic birds</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Features</td>
<td>1 – 5 level of importance</td>
<td>Higginbottom, Waight and Faunsaugh (2004)</td>
<td>Average level of importance per skill level for Landscape Features</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.9
Variables describing visitor facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitor Facilities</th>
<th>Measurement Scale</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Facilities</td>
<td>1 – 5 level of importance</td>
<td>Scott and Thigpen (2003), Hvenegaard (2002)</td>
<td>Average level of importance per skill level for visitor facilities</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.10
Variables describing neighbourhood setting characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood setting characteristics</th>
<th>Measurement Scale</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with locals</td>
<td>1 – 5 level of importance</td>
<td>Butler and Waldbrook (2003)</td>
<td>Average level of importance (per skill level) for interaction with locals</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities</td>
<td>1 – 5 level of importance</td>
<td>Scott and Thigpen (2003)</td>
<td>Average level of importance (per skill level) for other activities when participating in bird watching tourism</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable land uses</td>
<td>1 – 5 level of acceptance</td>
<td>Scott and Thigpen (2003)</td>
<td>Average level of acceptability (per skill level) of land uses occurring in the vicinity of the activity site</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.2 Bird watchers:
In addition to describing the demand preferences for place characteristics the data to describe the market typology by skill level (specialisation) was also obtained. To provide context to this typology, data on travel experience, motivations and demographics was also collected.

Specialisation variables
Specialisation was measured using a four item self reported scale. The respondents were asked to indicate how they would rate their skill level in bird watching. The four scale items were entitled: Beginner, Intermediate, Advanced and Expert. Section 1 of the survey sought information to provide context to the skill level. Additional questions were asked to provide information on the general leisure behaviour (number of years participated), commitment (relative level of leisure activity importance) and touristic behaviour (role of bird watching when on holidays).
Table 5.11
Variables describing bird watching skill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bird watching experience and skill</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of years</td>
<td>Open ended</td>
<td></td>
<td>Past experience</td>
<td>Correlate to spec level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Specialisation scale</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Scott, Ditton, Stoll &amp; Eubanks (2005)</td>
<td>Use as basis of identifying market typologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Level of relative importance</td>
<td>Scale of 1 - 5</td>
<td>Scott and Thigpen (2003)</td>
<td>Describe the centrality of the activity to all other leisure activities</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Incorporate bird watching in all holiday trips</td>
<td>Scale of never, sometimes, usually and always</td>
<td>Keuning (2005)</td>
<td>Describes the centrality of the activity to tourism behaviour</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Life list</td>
<td>Dichotomous</td>
<td>Scott and Thigpen (2003)</td>
<td>The proportion of the sample described as the elite bird watchers</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. number of species on list</td>
<td>Open ended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Papua Iconic species on that list</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2 sought information on the Travel Experience of the respondent and their preferences for the organisation and structure of their bird watching holidays.

Table 5.12
Variables describing bird watching holiday trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bird watching holiday trips</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of trips in past 5 years: a. how many where overseas</td>
<td>Open ended</td>
<td></td>
<td>Role of tour operators</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range, correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIT and Organised tour</td>
<td>Scale of never, sometimes, usually and always</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance level – for optimal experience</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable group size</td>
<td>5 categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of trips in 5 length categories</td>
<td>5 categories varying trip lengths</td>
<td></td>
<td>Length of trips</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motivation Scale
A motivation scale measured on a five point likert scale was developed to determine how important each of the scale items was in deciding where to take a bird watching holiday trip. The five point importance scale was measured from 1 Not at all important to 5 Extremely Important.

Table 5.13
Variables describing motivations to decide where to take bird watching holiday trip

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivations</th>
<th>Measurement Scale</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience sought</td>
<td>Scale of 1 to 5</td>
<td>Process based on REP scale (Manfredo, Driver &amp; Tarrant 1996)</td>
<td>Motivation sought for the trip/tour</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range, Factor analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td>MacFarlane (1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eubanks, Stoll &amp; Ditton (1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wang (2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics
This section of the survey described the demographics of the sample

Table 5.14
Variables describing demographic characteristics of typologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Year born</td>
<td>Jones and Buckley (2001)</td>
<td>Sample description</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin</td>
<td>Open ended</td>
<td>Hvengaard (2002)</td>
<td>Sample description</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male/female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sample description</td>
<td>Percentage of sample in each category and skill level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4 categories</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sample description</td>
<td>Mean, mode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.3 Tour Operators
In addition to the place characteristics described in Section 5.5.1 the tour operators were described in terms of their organisation, target market, product range and demographics.

Section 1 of the tour operator survey sought information about the respondent tour operating company to characterise the bird watching tour operators and its target market.
### Table 5.15
Variables describing company and product typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tour Operator Company</th>
<th>Measurement Scale</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill levels: Target market skill level</td>
<td>4 item scale of beginner to advanced</td>
<td>Scott and Thigpen (2003)</td>
<td>Correlate to specialisation (self reported) by bird watcher to see differences between intermediaries perceptions</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in operation</td>
<td>Open ended</td>
<td></td>
<td>The past experience of the respondent</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tours in last year</td>
<td>Open ended</td>
<td></td>
<td>The volume of tourists</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tours in length categories</td>
<td>Open ended for each scale item</td>
<td></td>
<td>Characterise the SIT industry in terms of how long the tours are</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tours in group size categories</td>
<td>Open ended for each scale item</td>
<td></td>
<td>Characterise the SIT industry What are the size of the tour groups</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the company certified (quality assurance)</td>
<td>Dichotomous</td>
<td>Derrett 2001</td>
<td>Characterise the SIT industry</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 Written policy on cultural sensitivity and protection of bird habitat</td>
<td>Dichotomous</td>
<td>Derrett 2001</td>
<td>Characterise the SIT industry</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of services</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>Derrett 2001</td>
<td>Bird watching industry description</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries visited</td>
<td>Open ended</td>
<td></td>
<td>Where the SIT bird watching industry visits</td>
<td>Mean, mode, range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2 sought information about the tour operators perceptions of their target market’s demand preferences for the place characteristics outlined in section 5.5.1, to describe how sensitive the typology is to changes in these characteristics.

Section 3 sought information (demographics) about the respondent to describe the sample.
Table 5.16  
Variables describing the Tour Operator demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Measurement Scale</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Year born</td>
<td>Tourism Qld 2006</td>
<td>Sample description</td>
<td>Determine average age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Open ended</td>
<td>Hvengaard (2002)</td>
<td>Source of intermediary</td>
<td>Role in the company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Open ended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Dichotomous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Open ended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addressing Research Issue 3, a comparison between the tourist preferences and the tour operator perceptions is quantified using ANOVA’s to determine whether there are statistically significant differences assigned to place characteristics (section 5.5.1) by these groups.

5.5.4 Community data
According to Yin (2003) the preferred approach to analysing the data obtained from case study research is to prepare an analytical strategy. The strategy used in analysing the data collected in this case study relies on theoretical and conceptual propositions to build an explanation of the phenomenon (Yin 2003). The theoretical and conceptual propositions were discussed in detail in Chapters 2, 3 and 4. These propositions form the basis of the semi structured questionnaire that was created to establish the relationships within the knowledge production process.

The initial content of the semi structured interviews included a range of questions that provided context to the decision making and the resultant spatial development pattern. Research Issue 5 examines the spatial development pattern. The pattern was analysed from two perspectives. The first of which established the pattern in the form of a series of maps, the second of which sought information that explained 'why and how' those decisions to locate and develop were made.

Economic Platform: (Land owner and Tour Guide)
- What is the main employment in Village #3?
- How do people make money?
- What proportion of each household income comes from tourism?
1 Tourist Preferences and planning outcomes (Land owner, Destination Tour Operator and Tour Guide)

• Why do tourists come to Village #3?
• What activities do the tourists do when they come to Village #3?
• How long have tourists been coming to Village #3?
• How do the tourists interact with the locals?

2 Tour Operators and planning outcomes: (Land owner, Destination Tour Operator and Tour Guide)

• How does tourism operate in Village #3?
• How many tour companies visit Village #3?
• How do the tour companies communicate that they want to come here?
• What is the worst aspect of tourism in your village?
• What can you tell me about your current market?

3 Governance: (Land owner and Tour Guide)

• Who in the village makes the decisions regarding what buildings can be built and where they are located?
• Why are the tourists situated outside of the village?
• Did you consider building the guest house in the village?
• Who owns the buildings that the tourists visit?
• Who has the authority over property rights and use of the village and forest?

4 Community Engagement: (Land owner and Tour Guide)

• How is community infrastructure provided eg schools, health facilities?
• What would happen if people in the village did not want tourists to come here anymore?
• What do the other people in the village think of the tourists?

5 Community Development:

• Do you propose to increase the number of tourists coming to Village #3 to enable the community to provide for a school, electricity or better medical supplies?
6 Vision and Strategic Plan:
Benefit Distribution:

- Do you think that every household in the village benefits from the tourists visiting Village #3?
- How do they benefit?
- What are your plans for the next 5 years in relation to tourism? Will you expand? Stay the same? Get smaller?
- What do you expect from your tourism business in the next 5 years?
- How does the government assist Village #3 in providing for tourism?
- What are the major threats to tourism in the village? Eg Neighbours, government policy, increase fuel prices, war, terrorism etc.
- Is life in your village better or worse since tourism came to your village?

Content of semi structured interview conducted with the Bupati of the Regional Government:

- What can you tell me about tourism in your province?
- How important is tourism in City 1?
- How economically significant is tourism by comparison to the agricultural industry in your province?
- Is there a plan for the future of the province?
- Is there a plan for tourism?
- Are infrastructure upgrades planned for the Arfak Mountains such as mobile phone towers, electricity, schools, sewerage treatment and waste management and roads?
- What is the planning assessment process for tourism development within the Province?
- What is his vision for tourism within the Arfak Mountains?
- In his opinion what are the best and worst aspects of tourism in your Province?

Subsequent to the interview with the Bupati, copies of the planning scheme and tourism plan were sought to add further context to the data collected. I was informed by the Town Planning Department that these were not publicly accessible documents and as a foreigner I was required to make an application to the national government in Jakarta to authorise the Bupati of the Province to release the information. This process could take up to 12 months to complete and the final determination would be
made by the Bupati anyway. Consequently these secondary forms of data were not used in the research strategy.

5.6 Chapter summary
This chapter provided an overview of the research strategy and methods applied in the study to address the Research Aim and Objectives. The research adopts a pragmatic orientation that incorporates mixed methods to establish how the components of the tourism system functions in a remote area and how this in turn may inform the remote area planning knowledge production process.

The positivistic approach is undertaken to provide reliable conclusions regarding both the tourist and the tour operator perspective on the level of importance attributed to specifiable place characteristics that frame a bird watching tourism product. The interpretive approach is applied to provide context to how and why the community manipulate and spatially arrange these characteristics in the supply of bird watching tourism. Bird watchers from the UK and Australia were sought to provide the basis of the sample so as to gain a broad representation of the market typologies. Tour operators based around the world were asked for their perceptions of their target markets’ preferences for place characteristics so as to describe the product range associated with bird watching. The data from these two samples is proposed to be compared and contrasted in the following chapters to examine the extent to which the suppliers interpret their market preferences.

The research strategy has been developed to address the Research Aim and Objectives and in doing so has identified a range of Research Questions and Issues fundamental to the creation of a coherent body of remote area planning knowledge. How the remote community in the Arfak Mountains makes decisions and plans for tourism is examined to establish causal links between the preferences of the tourist, perceptions of the tour operator and how the community responds to these. The case study is described as paradigmatic (Flyvberg 2006), as the knowledge gained from the community informs the planning knowledge production processes associated with community based tourism. Furthermore the case study is simultaneously extreme as it provides knowledge on a remote and therefore unusual case.

The following three chapters analyse the data collected and specifically addresses the Research Issues and Questions. Chapter 6 provides the quantitative analysis of
the place characteristics and Chapter 7 examines how the community make decisions about and plan for tourism. Chapter 8 addresses the Research Aim and Objectives in detail and culminates in a phenomenological model (after Burch 2003) that describes the planning knowledge production process applied by the case study community. Figure 5.4 describes how the data analysis chapters are organised and the research strategy is operationalised.

**Figure 5.5**

*Organisation of data analysis chapters*

![Diagram of data analysis chapters and research strategy](image-url)
Chapter 6
Tour Operator Perceptions and Tourist Preferences

6.1 Introduction
The data analysis is presented in two chapters. The first of which (Chapter 6) examines the substantive knowledge about bird watching tourism, and the second chapter places this knowledge in to the context of its application in the remote area planning knowledge production process. This chapter examines the demand preferences for development stated by bird watchers, and the perceptions that Tour Operators have of their client’s development preferences. The results of this analysis enable a description of the important place characteristics of the bird watching product and those that differentiate the product within its range. Chapter 7 examines the data from the case study interviews conducted with the principal stakeholders within the village and regional government.

This chapter addresses the first three Research Issues those being:

- **Research Issue 1:** Place Sensitive Characteristics sought by bird watching tourists
- **Research Issue 2:** Tour Operator Perceptions of Place Sensitive Characteristics
- **Research Issue 3:** Relationship between market demand and tour operator perceptions

Data from 714 bird watchers are analysed according to the self reported skill level to describe four market typologies. The responses made by the 51 Tour Operators to the web based survey are examined to describe their perceptions of the four market typologies and their associated demand preferences. Results from this chapter indicate that there are significant differences between bird watchers preferences for tourism development that facilitates the stay (e.g. scale and accommodation types), and the tour operators perceptions. However, the two groups are well matched in terms of the tourist preferences for, and the tour operator perceptions of, the important intrinsic site characteristics that form the basis of a bird watching tourism product. The chapter concludes that the place characteristics that identify the minimum requirement for a bird watching tourism product area able to be identified. In addition the chapter also identifies the product specifications that differentiate the product within the range based on the skill level and importance of the characteristic
to the typology, and those that are not important in making decisions about the bird watching holiday. These results suggest that there are two forms of product specifications. The first of which relates to the site characteristics that are essential to attract the bird watchers for the purpose of the activity and the other refers to those specifications that could serve to differentiate a product within the overall bird watching product range.

The chapter is presented in five sections including this introduction. Section 6.2 provides a description of the bird watcher sample, motivations for selecting a destination for a bird watching tour, the level of importance of the activity and other specialisation indicators, the travel behaviours of the tourist, the characteristics of the market who intend to visit West Papua in the coming 5 years and analyses the preferences for place characteristics at the bird watching destination. Section 6.3 provides a description of the special interest bird watching tourism industry in terms of the tour operation and examines their perceptions of important place characteristics of the bird watching tourism product range. Section 6.4 compares and contrasts the responses of the tourist and the tour operator to identify the important place characteristics that constitute a bird watching tourism product. The final section of the chapter summarises the main findings of the results derived from the first (and quantitative) data analysis chapter. The chapter concludes with the identification of those place characteristics that are inherent to a bird watching tourism product, and those characteristics (specifications) that differentiate a product within its range.

6.2 Bird Watchers
6.2.1 Sample description
The overall sample is comprised of 714 respondents of which 60% were gained from the Australian sample of bird watchers and 40% were gained from the UK Bird Fair. Table 6.1 illustrates the proportion of the sample in each of the skill levels by the corresponding nationality. The Intermediate and Advanced categories described 85% of the skill levels of the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Beginner</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall (N=714)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK (N=292)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia (N=422)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.2 provides a summary of bird watcher characteristics. Under two thirds of the sample was male (59%), with four fifths of the sample aged over 47 years of age (80%) and nearly three quarters had achieved a tertiary education (73%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Overall (%)</th>
<th>Beginner (%)</th>
<th>Intermediate (%)</th>
<th>Advanced (%)</th>
<th>Expert (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N=677</td>
<td>N=49</td>
<td>N=295</td>
<td>N=283</td>
<td>N=50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Overall (%)</th>
<th>Beginner (%)</th>
<th>Intermediate (%)</th>
<th>Advanced (%)</th>
<th>Expert (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-46</td>
<td>N=660</td>
<td>N=48</td>
<td>N=288</td>
<td>N=273</td>
<td>N=51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68+</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Overall (%)</th>
<th>Beginner (%)</th>
<th>Intermediate (%)</th>
<th>Advanced (%)</th>
<th>Expert (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>N=673</td>
<td>N=49</td>
<td>N=294</td>
<td>N=280</td>
<td>N=50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were more females in both the Beginner and Intermediate groups. However, there were disproportionately more men than women in both the Advanced and Expert groups. The demographics of bird watchers vary between studies. For instance in Burr and Scott’s (2004) sample more than 70% were female, over 40 years of age (80%) and possessed a college education (68%). Similarly Scott and Thigpen’s (2003) sample was comprised of nearly three quarters females (74%) and two thirds (66%) were over the age of 46. However Eubanks et al (2003) sample was comprised of slightly more than half females (51%), that were over 54 years of age and possessed nearly 17 years education. The greatest difference between studies is in the proportion of males and females in the samples. This variation is attributed to the data collection methods used (Eubanks et al 2003). Both the Burr and Scott (2004) and the Scott and Thigpen (2003) studies took place at birding festivals in the USA, whereas Eubanks et al (2004) research sample was derived from a combination of bird watching organisation mailing lists, festivals, bird observations and on site locations. Notwithstanding these differences, the sample examined in this study shares the basic characteristics of the activity participants those being an average age of more than 40 years old and the majority achieving tertiary education. The gender composition of the market varies throughout the studies, however the research suggests (Eubanks et al 2003, Burr and Scott 2004,
Scott and Thigpen 2003) that the more experienced activity participants are likely to be male.

6.2.2 Motivations for bird watching holiday destination
The 27 item scale measured the importance of the item to the respondent when deciding where to take their bird watching holiday trips. A five point Likert scale rating the level of importance of each scale item was applied and yielded a Cronbachs alpha coefficient of 0.85.

The 27 items of the motivations scale were subjected to principal component analysis (PCA). Prior to performing the PCA the data was assessed for factor analysis suitability. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy of .837 and Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant (p=.000) indicating that the scale was suitable for factor analysis. The PCA revealed 7 components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 21.7%, 11.5%, 7.4%, 6.4%, 4.7%, 3.9% and 3.8% respectively. The results of parallel analysis (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007) showed only 5 components with eigenvalues exceeding the corresponding criterion values for a randomly generated data matrix of the same size (27 variables x 715 respondents).

Both Oblique and orthogonal rotations were conducted. Results from the oblique rotations yielded low correlations (< 0.3). Orthogonal rotation was chosen as it was a more appropriate method than oblique rotation methods because orthogonal assumes low correlations.

Varimax rotation was performed (with values less than 0.4 being suppressed), revealing 5 components that accounted for 51.7% of the total variance in the scale (Table 6.3). Principal Component 1 emphasised that the greatest variation in the data was related to resting and tension release by escaping urban areas and daily routines to experience peace and quiet – this is referred to as Resting and Tension reduction.

Principal Component 2 emphasised the elements of the natural setting such as to be in a pristine and natural environment to experience the sights, sounds and smells of nature. This component is referred to as Natural Setting. Principal Component 3 (skill orientated) emphasised the desire to help others, and to improve and test individual bird watching skills and abilities. Principal Component 4 (Bird Species)
emphasised the addition of species to a list and to see birds that they had not seen before and in the most cost efficient manner.

The final component Social Recognition emphasised the desire of the bird watcher to have other people know that they had been to the destination, was the first bird watcher there and to chance a dangerous situation. Also included in this component was the desire to compete with others, avoid the unexpected and to gain respect from other bird watchers. This component had a low chronbach alpha coefficient, which would be expected due to the diverse motivations loading on this particular factor. All other components demonstrated good internal consistency with cronbach alpha coefficients above 0.7.

Further analysis of the motivations for each of the skill typology was not possible as the size of the sample in the Beginner and Expert categories did not permit a high ratio of respondents per scale item (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007).
Table 6.3 Factor analysis of bird watcher motivations: principal component analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Resting and tension reduction</th>
<th>Natural setting</th>
<th>Skill orientated</th>
<th>Bird Species</th>
<th>Social Recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To give mind a rest</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To release or reduce tension</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To escape daily routines</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To escape urban areas</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To experience peace and quiet</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To do something with the family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Photograph birds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be where things are pristine and natural</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To experience the sights, sounds and smells of nature</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To view the natural scenery</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be away from crowds of people</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote the conservation and preservation of birding habitats</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To learn more about the conservation of bird species</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be alone</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help others develop their bird watching skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve my birding skills and abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To test my birding skills and abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be with others who enjoy the same things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To see bird species I have not seen before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To see largest number of new and difference species in the most cost effective manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have others know I have been there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be the first bird watcher there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To chance dangerous situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To compete with other bird watchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid the unexpected</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain respect from other bird watchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>3.401</td>
<td>3.126</td>
<td>2.827</td>
<td>2.536</td>
<td>2.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance explained by component (%)</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach Alpha on component</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total variance explained – 51.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a Rotation converged in 13 iterations.
Table 6.4
Component transformation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.444</td>
<td>-.334</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>-.480</td>
<td>-.367</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>-.809</td>
<td>.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.509</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>-.425</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

The 5 components that were derived from this factor analysis (Table 6.4) suggest that overall, the bird watching tourists were motivated to choose a particular destination based on the abovementioned factors. Bird watching in this sense is not about the birds per se, but about the opportunity to derive a range of benefits from participation such as rest and relaxation in a natural setting.

6.2.3 Most important motivations for each skill level

As the size of each typology was uneven and the high and low end of the skill continuum contained a small proportion of the overall sample, a factor analysis was not completed for each skill typology.

For the entire sample the top two most important motivations in deciding where to take a bird watching holiday were related to the natural qualities of the setting. These results differ from Hvenegaard’s (2002) study whereby the most important motivations were related activity specific items (eg. birds), but is consistent with results from Eubanks et al (2004) research that found fewer statistically significant differences for the general items related to the activity. Table 6.5 illustrates the 5 most important motivations for each of the skill levels in choosing a particular destination for a bird watching holiday.
Table 6.5
Five most important motivations for bird watching destination choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginner</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To view the natural scenery (4.22)</td>
<td>To experience the sights, sounds and smells of nature (4.29)</td>
<td>To experience the sights, sounds and smells of nature (4.26)</td>
<td>To experience the sights, sounds and smells of nature (4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To experience the sights, sounds and smells of nature (4.21)</td>
<td>To view the natural scenery (4.15)</td>
<td>To view the natural scenery (4.06)</td>
<td>To view the natural scenery (4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To view the natural scenery (4.15)</td>
<td>To experience peace and quiet (3.74)</td>
<td>To be where things are pristine and natural (3.88)</td>
<td>To see bird species I have not seen before (3.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be where things are pristine and natural (3.71)</td>
<td>To experience peace and quiet (3.75)</td>
<td>To see bird species I have not seen before (3.75)</td>
<td>To promote the conservation and preservation of birding habitats (3.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be where things are pristine and natural (3.54)</td>
<td>To improve my birding skills and abilities (3.65)</td>
<td>To improve my birding skills and abilities (3.72)</td>
<td>To experience peace and quiet (3.76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean score of importance for each skill level shown in brackets

When the top five motivations across the skill levels are examined, there are no activity specific motivations included in Beginners column, the fifth most important motivation for the Intermediates is activity specific, for the Advanced the forth and fifth are activity related and for the Expert the third, forth and fifth are activity specific. These results infer that as the skill level of the individual increases, the importance of activity specific motivations also increases. Overall however, the quality of the natural setting is more important to all bird watchers irrespective of skill levels.

6.2.4 Activity importance and past experience

More than two thirds (71%) of the sample had participated in bird watching for more than 11 years (Table 6.6). Table 6.6 further suggests that the greater the past experience in the activity the higher the skill level. Spearman’s rho correlations (Table 6.7) between skill level and the number of years (raw score) was both positively and significantly correlated (0.47, p=.01). Similarly, the higher the level of importance of bird watching to the individual (in comparison to all other leisure activities), the higher the skill level (0.483, p=.01). However, the relationship between level of importance and years participated while significant, was low (0.216, p=.01), indicating that there is a relationship between the two, although not very strong.
Table 6.6
Activity importance and past experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of activity</td>
<td>Not at all (N=708)</td>
<td>Slightly (N=59)</td>
<td>Moderately (N=315)</td>
<td>Very (N=283)</td>
<td>Extremely (N=51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from Table 6.7 suggest that the greater the investment in time pursuing the activity, the greater the skill level and the higher the level of importance of bird watching to the individual in their overall leisure pursuits.

Table 6.7
Correlations between skill, years and importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho skill</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>importance</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>.470(**)</th>
<th>.483(**)</th>
<th>.000</th>
<th>.000</th>
<th>.000</th>
<th>.707</th>
<th>.216(**)</th>
<th>1.000</th>
<th>.000</th>
<th>.000</th>
<th>.695</th>
<th>.709</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho years</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

6.2.5 Travel behaviour

The majority of bird watchers, irrespective of skill levels incorporate bird watching into their holidays, the extent to which increases with skill (Table 6.8). Beginners were less likely to either holiday specifically to go bird watching (48% Never), or to travel to see a particular species (60% Never), than experienced bird watchers. In contrast only 2% of Experts never take holidays specifically to go bird watching, and only 22% never travel specifically to see a particular bird species.
Table 6.8
Travel behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall (%)</th>
<th>Beginner (%)</th>
<th>Intermediate (%)</th>
<th>Advanced (%)</th>
<th>Expert (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take holidays specifically to go bird watching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N=657</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=52</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=284</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=270</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=51</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate bird watching in holidays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N=674</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=57</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=301</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=273</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=43</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Specifically to see a particular bird species not seen before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N=621</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=50</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=265</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=260</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=46</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson correlations were conducted to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between skill level and the range of travel behaviours. All correlations (Table 6.9) were positive and significant (p=.01) the strongest relationship being between travelling specifically to see species not previously seen before and taking holidays specifically to go bird watching ($r= 0.542$).
Table 6.9
Correlations in travel behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>skill</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>skill</th>
<th>holspec</th>
<th>incorphol</th>
<th>travelspecbird</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.393(<strong>), .273(</strong>), .285(<strong>), .542(</strong>)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td>.273(<strong>), .302(</strong>), .293(<strong>), .285(</strong>), .542(**)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>.273(<strong>), .302(</strong>), .293(<strong>), .285(</strong>), .542(**)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>.273(<strong>), .302(</strong>), .293(<strong>), .285(</strong>), .542(**)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

holspec = Take holidays specifically to go bird watching
incorphol = Incorporate bird watching when on holidays
travelspecbird = Travel specifically to see a particular bird that you have not seen before

A one way analysis of variance was conducted (with post hoc tests) to explore the impact of travel behaviours to each of the skill levels. There were significant differences in the mean scores across the skill levels (p=<0.05), namely:

1. Take holidays specifically to go bird watching [F(df3, 653) = 40.021), p=0.000), in the skill levels.
2. Incorporate bird watching in holidays [F(df3, 670) = 24.435), p=0.000), in the skill levels.
3. Travel specifically to see a particular bird species not seen before [F(df3, 617) = 19.883), p=0.000), in the skill levels.

These results suggest that there were significant differences in travel behaviours in each of the skill typologies. The Experts were more likely than the Beginners to travel for the specific purpose of bird watching and placed a higher level of importance upon the activity relative to all other leisure activities.
Table 6.10
Effect of skill on travel behaviours (ANOVA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>holspec * skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>76.488</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.496</td>
<td>40.021</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>416.005</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>492.493</td>
<td>656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holspec * skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>28.227</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.409</td>
<td>24.345</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>258.938</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>287.165</td>
<td>673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holspec * skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>36.619</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.206</td>
<td>19.883</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>378.785</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>415.404</td>
<td>620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

holspec = Take holidays specifically to go bird watching
incorphol = Incorporate bird watching when on holidays
travelspecbird = Travel specifically to see a particular bird that you have not seen before

Table 6.11 describes the frequency and type of bird watching holidays taken in the past 5 years. Of the trips taken in the last 5 years, nearly half of the Beginners (48%), more than half of Intermediates (59%) and slightly under two thirds of Advanced (64%) and Experts (63%) were part of an organised tour group. Alternatively, when asked whether these trips were independent travel, i.e. ‘not with an organised tour group’ no Experts travelled independently, whereas slightly under one fifth of Beginners (18%) never travel independently.

These results (Table 6.11) suggest that as the skill level increases the tendency to travel in a group as opposed to independently also increases. However these results should be treated with caution as they do not describe the role of the tour operator in enough detail to make reliable conclusions regarding the type of group that bird watchers travel with, for instance a group of friends or as part of a tour group.
Table 6.11
Frequency and type of holidays in last 5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many bird watching holiday trips in last 5 years</th>
<th>Overall (%)</th>
<th>Beginner (%)</th>
<th>Intermediate (%)</th>
<th>Advanced (%)</th>
<th>Expert (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=609</td>
<td>N=31</td>
<td>N=257</td>
<td>N=271</td>
<td>N=50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many of these took place overseas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of all holiday trips taken were these:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organised tour group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent travel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.6 Demand for bird watching tourism in West Papua

The expressed demand for bird watching tourism in West Papua was identified to describe the sample characteristics of those who are intending to visit in the coming 5 years. Of the sample who responded to the question “Have you been to West Papua before”, 1% (n=666) indicated they had and ninety nine percent (99%) had not. When asked if they intend to visit West Papua within the coming 5 years, more than half of the sample (54%) were not intending to visit, forty three percent were not sure and 3% (22 respondents) of the sample were intending to visit in the coming 5 years.

Of those who were intending to visit West Papua in the coming 5 years, 9% had been previously and ninety one percent had not, indicating that the majority of the market would be first time visitors. The Australians accounted for more than half of the
market (59%) and the remainder of the market were described as originating from the UK. More than four fifths (85%) of the sample are described (respectively) as Intermediate (43%), and Advanced (42%), with Beginners comprising 7% and Experts 8%.

The intending visitors to West Papua are highly experienced travellers with sixty eight percent (68%) having undertaken more than 7 bird watching holiday trips in the past 5 years. More than eighty percent of the intending visitors possess considerable overseas bird watching tourism experience (Table 6.12), with the majority (61%) having undertaken greater than five trips in the past five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel experience of those intending to visit West Papua within 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bird watchers intending to visit WP in the coming 5 years who have taken an overseas bird watching holiday trip in the past five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4 trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 6 trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 7 trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, when the sample of who intend to visit West Papua is examined by its skill level (being the basis of identifying the market typologies), it became evident that the sample is not only small in size (i.e. 3%) but also very similar to the characteristics of the entire combined sample. Table 6.13 illustrates the skill levels according to travel experience, overseas travel experience, intention to visit West Papua and the combined sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill level of the entire sample according to travel experience; overseas travel experience; and intention to visit West Papua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These results suggest that the skill level of the bird watchers intending to visit West Papua in the coming 5 years is representative of the skill levels within the entire sample. For this reason the entire sample will be scrutinised to determine the important place characteristics that may define the bird watching tourism market for West Papua according to the skill levels.

6.2.7 Tourist demand preferences for place characteristics
Results of data analysis that described specialisation demonstrated that the travel motivations, past activity experience and travel behaviours are generally influenced by skill level in the activity. However, despite the literature maintaining that these skill typologies were able to describe market preferences for products, multiple regressions using skill level as the independent variable did not derive distinct products or typologies. The analysis then examined the extent to which skill level transpires into demand preferences for place characteristics (Tables 6.14). ANOVA's were conducted to determine the statistical significance of the differences across the skill levels on each of the items that measured the development criteria.
### Table 6.14 Important place characteristics by market typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Beg</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Inter</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Adv</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.258</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.255</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hut</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td><strong>3.06</strong></td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.223</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Beg</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Inter</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Adv</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standards in Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self catering facilities</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.274</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 663</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot water for washing</td>
<td><strong>3.31</strong></td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td><strong>3.64</strong></td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td><strong>3.4</strong></td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td><strong>3.22</strong></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 662</td>
<td>4.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for privacy</td>
<td><strong>3.55</strong></td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td><strong>3.81</strong></td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td><strong>3.58</strong></td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td><strong>3.51</strong></td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td><strong>3.37</strong></td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 652</td>
<td>1.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local style meals</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td><strong>3.11</strong></td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.151</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.362</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 656</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity to power appliances</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td><strong>3.27</strong></td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.345</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.365</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.309</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 656</td>
<td>1.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe drinking water</td>
<td><strong>4.33</strong></td>
<td>.944</td>
<td><strong>4.53</strong></td>
<td>.776</td>
<td><strong>4.35</strong></td>
<td>.936</td>
<td><strong>4.28</strong></td>
<td>.966</td>
<td><strong>4.2</strong></td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 67</td>
<td>1.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar food</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 654</td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage (toilet/rest room system)</td>
<td><strong>3.23</strong></td>
<td>1.292</td>
<td><strong>3.98</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>3.33</strong></td>
<td>1.262</td>
<td><strong>3.07</strong></td>
<td>1.305</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 666</td>
<td><strong>8.703</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish removal</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td><strong>3.46</strong></td>
<td>1.277</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.351</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 652</td>
<td>4.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet connection</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 653</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone reception</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 655</td>
<td><strong>4.36</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable bed</td>
<td><strong>3.52</strong></td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td><strong>3.81</strong></td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td><strong>3.58</strong></td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td><strong>3.46</strong></td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td><strong>3.24</strong></td>
<td>1.305</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 668</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealed roads</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 649</td>
<td>5.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital within 2 hour drive</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 655</td>
<td>2.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable telecommunications</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 651</td>
<td>3.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport within 2 hours drive</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.255</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 652</td>
<td><strong>2.164</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Beg</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Inter</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Intrinsic Site Characteristics</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Beg</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Inter</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Adv</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flora</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchids</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.251</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.471</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.212</td>
<td>3.649</td>
<td>1.201 .309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palms</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>3.646</td>
<td>.431 .731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fauna</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>3.661</td>
<td>3.969 .008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles and amphibians</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.171</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.513</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td>3.656</td>
<td>1.145 .330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterflies</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.316</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>3.666</td>
<td>1.476 .220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; E birds</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.479</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>3.651</td>
<td><strong>15.066</strong> .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountainous landscape</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>3.654</td>
<td>3.844 .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pristine landscape and vistas</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td>3.658</td>
<td>2.201 .087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creeks and Rivers</td>
<td><strong>3.58</strong></td>
<td>.994</td>
<td><strong>3.83</strong></td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td><strong>3.53</strong></td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td><strong>3.61</strong></td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td><strong>3.61</strong></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.661</td>
<td>1.316 .268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Visitor facilities</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Beg</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Inter</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor information centre</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>3,662</td>
<td>9.027</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hides</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>3,662</td>
<td>5.644</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving tour</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formed walking paths</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td>3,658</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating facilities nearby</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>3,658</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides/rangers on site</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.156</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.094</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>3,657</td>
<td>7.114</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs identifying plants</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>3,656</td>
<td>7.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.339</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>3,653</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.454</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.474</td>
<td>3,669</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.369</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>3,653</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>3,649</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>3,653</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>3,644</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.443</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>3,651</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Neighbourhood Setting</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Beg</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Inter</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to attend cultural events and ceremonies</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.314</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.094</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>3, 659</td>
<td>1.401</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn more about local traditions and belief system</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.265</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>3, 659</td>
<td>2.201</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to buy local craft</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.211</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.094</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>3, 656</td>
<td>3.589</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept land uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming is practised on site</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>3, 653</td>
<td>2.511</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logging and forestry is practised on site</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>3, 653</td>
<td>4.613</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting is permitted on site</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>3, 656</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A local community is close by</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.132</td>
<td>3, 653</td>
<td>1.858</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of the natural environment</td>
<td><strong>4.48</strong></td>
<td>.778</td>
<td><strong>4.53</strong></td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td><strong>4.41</strong></td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td><strong>4.52</strong></td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td><strong>4.63</strong></td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>3, 654</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial development is near the site yet can’t be seen</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>3, 652</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD – standard deviation
Beg – Beginner
Inter – Intermediate
Adv – Advanced

The level of importance is measured on a scale of 1 (not at all important) to 5 (extremely important). The scores of moderate (3) and above have been highlighted in bold to indicate the level of importance of the indicator (shown in italics).
6.2.7.1 Type
The type of accommodation development was not important to the bird watcher in the selection of their destination. The average level of importance for a Hotel for the Beginner was ‘moderately important’ and a hut of moderate importance to the Expert. These results would suggest that type of accommodation was not an important aspect of the holiday. Moreover, there were no significant differences across the skill levels, further suggesting that this is not an important product specification of a bird watching holiday to the respondents.

6.2.7.2 Scale
There were statistically significant differences attributed to skill level for criteria that measured the scale of accommodation development. These included the provision of hot water, sewerage, rubbish and sealed roads. This may be attributed to the decreasing level of importance of these items as skill increases. Respondents agreed that it was very important to have access to safe drinking water and a comfortable bed; and a space for privacy was of moderate importance to all skill levels. The remainder of the items were of tangential importance to the scale of development.

6.2.7.3 Intensity
The acceptable size of a bird watching tour group or party was between 5 and 8 for all skill levels. Small standard deviations were recorded for each of the skill levels further suggesting that each group held similar views on intensity. There were no statistically significant differences between groups.

6.2.7.4 Intrinsic site characteristics
With the exception of orchids and palms, all the items measuring intrinsic site characteristics were of moderate importance to the tourists. There were statistically significant differences between the skill levels on the importance of mammals, rare and endangered birds and mountainous landscapes. The differences related to the importance of Rare and Endangered birds is attributed to a greater importance being recorded by the Experts than the Beginners for this place characteristic. The presence of mammals and mountainous landscapes was of low importance to the Experts and greater importance to the Beginners.
6.2.7.5 Visitor facilities
Visitor information centres and Hides were moderately important to the Beginners, Intermediates and the Advanced levels. These were less so for the Experts, which resulted in a statistically significant difference attributed to skill levels. Other significant differences were recorded for guides and rangers on site, signs identifying plants and shopping.

6.2.7.6 Neighbourhood setting
The preservation of the environment was a very acceptable land use for the neighbourhood of the bird watching location in the selection of a bird watching tourism product. The remainder of neighbourhood setting items were of tangential importance to the holiday destination. There were statistically significant differences among the skill levels for the acceptability of forestry as a land use in the neighbourhood of the destination, and the purchase of craft differed in importance. However neither of these items were important in the selection of a tourism product.

6.2.7.7 Preferences summary
Of the total 53 items that measured place characteristics of a tourism product, less than one quarter (14 items) produced statistically significant differences that were attributed to skill, and a total of 9 could be described as more than moderately important. The items of significance were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Visitor facilities</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hot water</td>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td>Visitor Info Centre</td>
<td>Purchase craft*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage</td>
<td>R &amp; E Birds</td>
<td>Hides</td>
<td>Logging/forestry*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish collection</td>
<td>Mt Landscape</td>
<td>Guides*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealed Roads*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items had mean importance score less than 2.9

These results suggest that the demand for the important characteristics may form the basis of the differentiating features of a product within the product range. Similarly those characteristics that were described between moderately and extremely important (Table 6.14) and were not statistically different throughout the skill levels, would therefore describe the bird watching tourism product i.e. the features that are sought across the market irrespective of skill level.
6.3 Tour Operators

6.3.1 Sample description

The Tour Operator respondents to the web survey are described as being (Table 6.16) disproportionately male (71%), over 40 years of age (74%), tertiary educated (82%), and three quarters (75%) had personally led more than 8 tours in the past year. The demographic profile of the Tour Operators is similar to that of the bird watchers.

Table 6.16
Tour Operator respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender: (N=51)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Held (N=49)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tour leader</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner operator</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/director</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tours led in past year (N=48)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;41</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents came from a diverse range of nations (Table 6.17), with Australia comprising one fifth of the sample.

Table 6.17
Base location of tour operators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Africa (Kenya and South Africa)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Panama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.2 Description of the tour operation

The organisation that the respondent represented had been in operation for more than 5 years (75%), and had provided services to more than 50 clients in the past
year (Table 6.18). The main markets served by the respondents are bird watchers who are in the Intermediate and Advanced skill level groups (88%). Similarly, more than 80% of the bird watcher sample was comprised of Intermediate and Advanced bird watchers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Operation (N= 51 )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Clients (N=49)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-92</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-200</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-999</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Market (N=51)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the respondent firms provide guide services (94%) and develop, organise and guide tours (88%). Less than one third possess exclusive rights to a location, which invariably means that 70% of tour organisations frequent habitats that are used by a number of organisations. It would also appear that tour organisations facilitate bird watching tours, as opposed to providing a range of services to clients such as owning/operating accommodation, or providing booking services from the originating source to the destination.

Respondent organisations did not participate (Table 6.19), nor have they achieved certification for its tour products (71%). Alternatively though, the organisations have a formalised and written policy to manage the behaviour of tourists and employees to ensure cultural sustainability and the protection of birding habitats (71%). These results may indicate that the company is too small to gain value from certification and that a formal policy is the most affordable form of quality assurance.
Table 6.19  
Quality assurance of tour operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tour Product certification (N=51)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy to manage tourist behaviour (cultural sensitivity) and protection of habitat (N=51)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The core business of the tour organisations (Table 6.20), is to provide guide services including the development, organisation and guiding of tours to bird watchers. Secondary services such as booking for other tour organisations may serve to supplement income, likewise the provision of services such as organising flights and transfers within the destination may support the facilitation of tours.

Table 6.20  
Services provided by organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Service Provided by organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Guide Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Booking Services for other bird watching tour organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Own and/or operate accommodation for bird watchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Develop, organise and guide bird watching tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Flights to a bird watching destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Internal flights and transfers within a bird watching destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Own and/or possess exclusive rights to access a bird habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Planning assistance/advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bird lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Home stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bird Photographs and Photography training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.3 Tour Operator perceptions of demand preferences

Results of the respondents’ perceptions of the demand preferences for place characteristics by their clients is summarised in Table 6.21. Responses from the supplier of bird watching products to the Beginner typology were not used as there was only 1 supplier in the category.
Table 6.21 Tour Operator perceptions of their clients demand preferences place for characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Inter-</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hut</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.227</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale Standards in Accommodation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self catering facilities</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot water for washing</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for privacy</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local style meals</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity to power appliances</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe drinking water</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar food</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.372</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage (toilet/rest room system)</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish removal</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet connection</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.318</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone reception</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable bed</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Infrastructure</td>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Inter-SD</td>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealed roads</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.108</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital within 2 hour drive</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.484</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.232</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable telecommunications</td>
<td><strong>3.12</strong></td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td><strong>3.39</strong></td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td><strong>3.05</strong></td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport within 2 hours drive</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.339</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.344</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.403</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity Group Size</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 4</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>26.26</td>
<td>20.61</td>
<td>34.787</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>18.337</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.869</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>15.335</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>13.025</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>18.232</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.082</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>10.974</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>6.726</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.343</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.082</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-20</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5.456</td>
<td>20.61</td>
<td>34.787</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.441</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.577</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>13.025</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>18.337</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Trip (days)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>25.557</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>35.198</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>12.537</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.121</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-13</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>8.631</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>10.651</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.168</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-20</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>8.499</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.226</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.088</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>2.082</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>15.960</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.996</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>24.852</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.509</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Attributes</td>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Inter-</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Intrinsic Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchids</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.302</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.581</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palms</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.467</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.527</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauna:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.432</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles and amphibians</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterflies</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare and Endemic Birds</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountainous landscape</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pristine landscape and vistas</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.483</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creeks and Rivers</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.517</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Visitor Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Inter-SD</th>
<th>Ad SD</th>
<th>Expert SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitor information centre</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.391</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.789</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hides</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving tour</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.342</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formed walking paths</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating facilities nearby</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.335</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides/rangers on site</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.409</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs identifying plants</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other site activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.409</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.2113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 3. Neighbourhood Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction with Locals</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Inter-S</th>
<th>Ad</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Able to attend cultural events and ceremonies</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn more about local traditions and belief system</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to buy local craft</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Acceptable Land Uses

| Farming is practised on site | 2.57 | .922 | 2.74 | 0.915 | 2.36 | 0.902 | 2.6 | 1.14 | 3.47 | .686 | .565 |
| Logging and forestry is practised on site | 1.96 | 1.183 | 2.26 | 1.251 | 1.59 | 1.054 | 2.2 | 1.304 | 3.47 | 1.130 | .285 |
| Hunting is permitted on site | 1.49 | .834 | 1.7 | 1.02 | 1.36 | 0.658 | 1 | 0 | 3.47 | 1.365 | .265 |
| A local community is close by | 3.06 | 1.156 | 3 | 1.128 | 3.23 | 1.193 | 2.4 | 1.14 | 3.47 | .934 | .432 |
| Preservation of the natural environment | 4.75 | .659 | 4.83 | 0.388 | 4.82 | 0.395 | 4.2 | 1.789 | 3.47 | 1.867 | .148 |
| Industrial development is near the site yet can't be seen | 1.92 | .997 | 1.87 | 1.014 | 2.05 | 1.046 | 1.4 | 0.548 | 3.47 | .979 | .411 |

P<.05  

Note:  
- a) Beginner segment – not recorded.  
- b) The level of importance is measured on a scale of 1(not at all important) to 5 (extremely important). The scores of moderate (3) and above have been highlight to indicate the level of importance of the indicator (shown in italics).
6.3.3.1 Type
There were no significant relationships (correlations) between accommodation type and skill level. Tour Operators perceived that all tourists regardless of their skill levels preferred a hotel (mean=4.22), over huts/cottages (mean =3.43) and camping (mean =2.51). There were no significant differences in the means for the three skill level groups for accommodation.

6.3.3.2 Scale
Items that measured scale (standards of accommodation and destination infrastructure), reported high means (>3) and were highly correlated. These results would be expected given the high levels of importance placed on scale items by the Tour Operators. A one way analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of the importance of the standards in accommodation to each of the skill levels and found no significant differences in the means for the three skill level groups.

6.3.3.3 Destination infrastructure
According to the Tour Operators, reliable telecommunications was of moderate importance to the Intermediate and Advanced markets (mean =3.59 and 3.05 respectively). However none of the other scale items measuring destination infrastructure were perceived to be important to their market. This would indicate that areas do not have to be within two hours of a hospital or airport, nor is it important to have sealed roads to and from the destination. Correlations between the telecommunication related items (Table 6.22) showed a strong and significant relationships (p<.01) between mobile phone reception and internet connection (r=.513), and reliable telecommunications and mobile phone reception (r=.463), yet did not produce a similar relationship between reliable telecommunications and internet connection.
Table 6.22
Correlations between telecommunication variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mob ph reception</th>
<th>internet connection</th>
<th>telecomm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mob ph reception</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.513(**)</td>
<td>.463(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internet connection</td>
<td>.513(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telecom</td>
<td>.463(**)</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Mob ph reception – mobile phone reception
Telecomm – reliable telecommunications

The Tour Operators perceive that their clients prefer high standards in accommodation. All other destination infrastructure with the exception of telecommunications were not perceived to be important.

6.3.3.4 Intensity

The average frequency of trips (entire sample) by the group size of 1-4 people is approximately 20 trips per year and then steadily decreases to 11 for 5-8 people, 5 for 13-20 people and 1 for over 21 people. When the intensity is analysed according to skill level, the dispersion within each of the levels is too great to derive any meaningful result. Notwithstanding this, the overall average number of annual trips per company is 38, of which the vast majority (82%) are comprised of less than 8 people.

6.3.3.5 Intrinsic setting

All setting items that measured the attributes of the natural setting were perceived to be important to all markets. Overall orchids were Not Important to the Advanced market segment, but were more important to the Intermediate segment. Palms were Moderately Important to the Expert segment, yet Not Important to the Intermediate and Advanced segments. Rare and Endangered birds were perceived to be Very Important to each of the market segments.

6.3.3.6 Visitor facilities

The respondents were asked to indicate the importance of visitor facilities preferred by their markets. The only consistent preference for all segments was the provision
of Hides. The remainder of facility developments varied across the segments, with no specific pattern emerging as to the preferences for development to support the activity.

In relation to the importance of other site activities at a destination, photography was important to all of the market segments, and golf the least important. These results had with relatively small standard deviations that would indicate some agreement amongst the providers to the market segment.

6.3.3.7 Neighbourhood setting
Overall interaction with locals was not an important characteristic. However, learning about local traditions and the belief system, and the ability to buy local crafts was believed to be of moderate importance to the Intermediate market segment.

Acceptable land uses within the locale included having a local community nearby for all but the Expert market segment. Preservation of the natural environment was a very acceptable land use to bird watchers irrespective of the skill level.

6.3.3.8 Summary:
ANOVA’s were conducted to examine the impact of skill level upon the type, scale, intensity and location of setting descriptors, and found no statistically significant differences. This would suggest that there is relative agreement regarding the level of importance of product characteristics amongst Tour Operators.

6.4 The bird watching tourism product range
The important place characteristics preferred by the bird watchers in facilitating their bird watching holiday trip, and the Tour Operators perceptions of these, were compared to determine the specifications that constitute a bird watching product and those that differentiate. Table 6.23 has been created from the results of Table 6.14 and 6.21 to highlight the important place characteristics (with a mean >3.0) demanded by the bird watcher and those perceived by the Tour Operator. Table 6.23 identifies the place characteristics according to a match between the demand preferences and the Tour Operator perceptions on the importance of the characteristic; describes a bird watcher preference not matched by a tour operator perception and describes the Tour Operator perception that is not matched with a bird watcher preference.
Table 6.23 Place characteristics that describe the product

- ✓ Represents a match between what is demanded and the perceptions of demand
- ☺ Represents a bird watcher demand preference (not matched by Tour Operators perceptions)
- ✗ Represents a Tour Operator perception of demand preferences not matched with preferences
- Blank cell represents an unimportant attribute
- Coloured cell represents a differentiating specification
- Type in Bold: describes the inherent characteristics of the product range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Beginner (Tourist)</th>
<th>Intermediate (Tourist)</th>
<th>Intermediate (Tour Operators)</th>
<th>Advanced (Tourist)</th>
<th>Advanced (Tour Operators)</th>
<th>Expert (Tourists)</th>
<th>Expert (Tour Operators)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hut</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards in Accommodation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self catering facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot water for washing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for privacy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local style meals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity to power appliances</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe drinking water</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage (toilet/rest room system)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish removal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comfortable bed</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destination Infrastructure:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealed roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital within 2 hour drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport within 2 hours drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Beginner (Tourist)</td>
<td>Intermediate (Tourist)</td>
<td>Intermediate (Tour Operators)</td>
<td>Advanced (Tourist)</td>
<td>Advanced (Tour Operators)</td>
<td>Expert (Tourists)</td>
<td>Expert (Tour Operators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity and Setting Attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flora:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺☺</td>
<td>☺☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchids</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fauna:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺☺</td>
<td>☺☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles and amphibians</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterflies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare and Endemic Birds</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape Features:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountainous landscape</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>☺☺</td>
<td>☺☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pristine landscape and vistas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>☺☺</td>
<td>☺☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creeks and Rivers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>☺☺</td>
<td>☺☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Beginner (Tourist)</td>
<td>Intermediate (Tourist)</td>
<td>Intermediate (Tour Operators)</td>
<td>Advanced (Tourist)</td>
<td>Advanced (Tour Operators)</td>
<td>Expert (Tourists)</td>
<td>Expert (Tour Operators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Facilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor information centre</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hides</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving tour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formed walking paths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating facilities nearby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides/rangers on site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs identifying plants</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other site activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locale Setting Attributes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Locals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to attend cultural events and ceremonies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn more about local traditions and belief</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to buy local craft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable Land Uses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming is practised on site</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logging and forestry is practised on site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting is permitted on site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A local community is close by</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of the natural environment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial development is near the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.1 The bird watching tourism product and differentiating specifications

Results from Table 6.23 summarise the important place characteristics of a bird watching product, identify those characteristics that are not important to either the bird watcher or the Tour Operator and those that differentiate the product within the market place. The characteristics that form the bird watching tourism product are described in respect to a match between the perceptions and the preferences (Table 6.23) irrespective of the skill level. The characteristics that differentiate the product within the product range are described as those characteristics that vary in terms of importance according to either the bird watcher or the Tour Operator. The results from Table 6.23 suggest that there are some fundamental place characteristics that form the basis of all bird watching tourism products. The product differentiating specifications were largely related to the development of the site as opposed to the presence of activity and setting attributes. The following table (Table 6.24) illustrates the characteristics that describe the product range and the specifications that differentiate a product amongst the range.
These results suggest that there are two forms of substantive knowledge that emerge from the analysis. The first form of substantive knowledge relates to the characteristics that underpin the bird watching product irrespective of the market. These characteristics are capable of being assessed at a location and therefore provide an indication of the suitability of the site to supply the activity. This type of substantive knowledge could be used in land use planning exercises to identify the bird watching potential of the site. Similar types of research that investigate the
potential for other activity based tourism products would enable the identification of a range of tourism related land use alternatives.

The other form of substantive knowledge (product differentiating specifications) that emerged from the analysis could be used in a decision making process. These specifications describe the characteristics that require pre development conditions (electricity and other forms of infrastructure), and major injections of capital and therefore constitute material changes in the use of land. In addition, this second type of knowledge enables decisions to be made about the appropriateness of alternatives, and the target market that would be potentially interested in consuming the product if it was developed to meet these product preferences.

6.5 Chapter summary
This chapter investigated the demand preferences of 714 UK and Australian bird watchers, and the perceptions that 51 Tour Operators have of these preferences for bird watching as a special interest tourism product. The literature review established that planning decisions are based on externally and internally sourced forms of knowledge. This chapter examined the external demand preferences of bird watchers and the Tour Operators who supply these to the market. The results of the data analysis provided an insight into those characteristics that form the basis of the product. These included accommodation standards, activity and setting attributes and the preservation of the natural environment. Those characteristics that differentiate a product based on skill level include the type of accommodation and the range of services associated with the accommodation; visitor facilities and interaction with the local community.

From this analysis it was concluded that the information derived from the results provides two forms of substantive knowledge that can be used in planning exercises. One of which can be used to identify the site suitability of the land cover to supply the activity, and the other relates to identifying the varying spatial development patterns (including the scale and intensity) that can differentiate the product within the range.

The following chapter examines how the remote area case study community developed their product, the presence of place characteristics and how the community have incorporated, sourced and accessed substantive knowledge in the development of the locale for the purposes of tourism.
This chapter highlighted the important place characteristics that underpin external demand for a bird watching tourism product. The demand preferences of bird watchers and the tour operators’ perceptions of these form the basis of the external knowledge. The extent to which this knowledge is sourced and applied by a community in their internal decision making about what to supply, to whom and the corresponding level of development is the subject of the following chapter.
7.1 Introduction

Results from the previous chapter identified the characteristics of a bird watching tourism product that are inherent to the product range and those that differentiate a product within that range. The focus of the chapter is upon the knowledge production process that is created as a result of local tradition and information flows (Barnes et al 1996). This chapter examines the planning procedure undertaken by the remote Arfakan community in deciding the location, type, scale and intensity of development to give context to the application of the externally and internally sourced forms of knowledge. The spatial development pattern is examined to describe the material consequences of the planning process and the bird watching tourism product provided by the local community.

The results from this chapter suggest that the normative theoretical concept applied to the procedure is community control, whereby the individuals and the community are able to influence planning outcomes to redistribute benefits from development. The planning procedure undertaken does not focus on planning for the future. Decisions about location and type of development are made according to a kin based tenure system that cannot be reversed through community actions. However, decisions about scale (accommodation) and intensity, are made by the local guide in consultation (and funding) from tour operators, and are influenced by the social actions of the community. The bird watching tourism product provided possesses most place characteristics demanded by bird watchers (with the exception of a comfortable bed) and as such attracts a small number of bird watchers who possess a range of skills. The chapter concludes that due to a lack of infrastructure related development preconditions, the community are unable to differentiate the product in the marketplace. Moreover the Regency government does not have an integrated approach to infrastructure supply, despite the fact that they are improving access through the region.

There are seven sections of this chapter including this introduction. Section 7.2 provides an overview of how tourism evolved in the present community and the events that have shaped the tourism product. Section 7.3 provides a detailed
description and overview of the spatial development pattern of the Village locale and specifically analyses the site according to its location; type; scale; intensity; intrinsic site characteristics, visitor facilities and neighbourhood setting attributes. Section 7.4 describes how the product is provided to the tourist by the tour operator(s) and the community. Section 7.5 describes the governance structures that define and affect land use including the influence of the regional government upon predevelopment conditions and planning outcomes.

Section 7.6 describes the planning knowledge production process and in doing so examines the relationship between the normative and procedural concepts, the practice of CBT undertaken by Village #3 and offers a new conceptualisation of CBT based on the results of this research. The final section summarises the chapter and highlights the difference between planning as decision making, and planning to create a land use plan.

The following codes have been assigned to the key informants and are used for the remainder of the thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tour Operator</td>
<td>DTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial tour operator to Village, based in City #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour Guide</td>
<td>TG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village based field guide and tourism co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td>LO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Village responsible for all land use assessments and plot allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regency Government</td>
<td>RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burpati who has sole discretion over all development in Regency Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regency Town Planner</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for planning in Regency Government boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 Evolution of bird watching tourism in Arfak Mountains

Subsequent to the interviews and observations it became evident to the researcher that the current location, scale, and intensity of development with the associated levels of service provision are the outcome of a history of attempts to establish tourism within the Arfak Mountains. To understand the relationship between the
tourism product and the associated decision making process requires an understanding of all that went before, such as how tourism was initiated within the area and manifested in its current form in its current location. Table 7.1 details the significant events and the people who were involved in or were consulted with regarding the tourism product in the Arfak Mountains from the time of initiation in 1990 to May 2008. These events are discussed further in the following.

7.2.1 How did the community initiate Tourism?
The community did not initiate tourism, rather an outsider (DTO) saw the market potential of the forested land for bird watching tourism. The local residents did not identify the tourism potential of the area. To the local Arfakans the forest is a resource to enable subsistence, and a bank of resources for future generations. The local residents have no personal experience of the notion of tourism or bird watching tourism as they do not compartmentalise their life in terms of work and leisure as other cultures do.

The initiator (DTO) was a field guide accompanying a scientific expedition to the area in 1990. The initiator met the local guide (TG) and asked if he would be interested in hosting bird watching tourists at his home and providing guide services to bird watching tour groups. The initiator would source the groups if the guide would host them (accommodate) in the Village and guide the tourists to see the birds.

At that stage the TG lived in Village #1. However, over the years other people within this community wanted access to the cash income that the TG had. But these people (according to the DTO and TG) did not want the responsibility of servicing the client’s needs to the level that the TG and DTO deemed appropriate. The price for porters increased and according to DTO the level of service was not equal to the price. The TG and DTO refused to pay the increase, and conflict erupted between the disgruntled individuals and DTO /TG. The DTO and TG decided not to use any of the people from the Village to assist in supplying services and continued to bring bird watchers to Village #1. The people of the Village retaliated to the exclusion by the DTO and TG, by informing the Indonesian Army that the bird watchers were trespassing on their land. The Indonesian Army came to the Village and held an International tour leader in custody, leaving the DTO and the TG to negotiate and secure the release of the tour leader.
Table 7.1 Significant events and people which shaped the Tourism Product at Village #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Tour operator Original (DTO)</th>
<th>Tour operators subsequent</th>
<th>Tour Guide</th>
<th>Village Land owner</th>
<th>Individual Farmers</th>
<th>Affected Community</th>
<th>Regency Gov’t</th>
<th>Nat Gov’t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>DTO approached TG to provide guide services and accommodation in his family home within the Village #1.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/3</td>
<td>Village #1 community dissatisfied with tourism arrangement. Tour Guide leaves Village #1 and moves to Village #2.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>TG asks permission to live in Village #2 and continues to host tourists at his new home and provide guide services throughout Arfak Mountains. On an extended tour through Arfak Mountains female porter from Village #2 has sexual relations with porter from distant Village. Community in Village #2 hold TG responsible because they believed it would not have occurred if all porters came from same Village.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>TG approached Village #3 LO for permission to live in Village and to host bird watching tourists. The guide moved into his brother’s house.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>TG asked other land owners for permission to use farm huts for overnight accommodation and to traverse farms to access bird watching sites. Prices negotiated.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Tour guide asked people within Village to be porters, provide vegetables and firewood, also commenced training of cooks and guides.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Tour operator initiates access fees to be paid to land owner for the Village #3 territory to increase good will.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Local government commence road construction through the Arfak Mountains - single lane bitumen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 July</td>
<td>Three other tour companies make arrangements with tour guide to visit and utilise accommodation and guide services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Tour operator Original (DTO)</td>
<td>Tour operators subsequent</td>
<td>Tour Guide</td>
<td>Village Land owner</td>
<td>Individual Farmers</td>
<td>Affected Community</td>
<td>Regency Gov’t</td>
<td>Nat Gov’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 August TG Asks for permission to construct guest house on his house allocation. Tour guide continues to live in brother’s house.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2007 New guest house constructed to accommodate up to 8 people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 April Tour guide constructs 2 x 2 person huts and one kitchen in response to bookings from 3 tour operators to visit in July, Aug, Sept and Oct 2008 for a max of 12 people.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 May Members of community (not involved in tourism) make complaints to land owner that they want increased wages, more employment opportunities, and that tour operators are to purchase food from locals. Negotiated outcome: 1. Code of Conduct; 2. Forest Soldiers; and 3. Higher wages for services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After the resolution of this conflict, the DTO and TG came to the conclusion that if tourism in the Arfaks was to continue then the TG would have to leave Village #1 and find another place to base himself out of. The TG moved to Village #2 in about 2003. He lived within the Village and continued to accept tourists accompanying the DTO. The residents of Village #2 provided porter services. On this particular occasion the DTO brought a group for an extended trip through the Mountain region and TG accompanied the porters from Village #2. It was the habit of the DTO to employ porters from Villages where the tour utilised their community owned forested land for bird watching. On this particular trip, unbeknown to DTO and TG a married female porter from Village #2 allegedly had sexual relations with a male porter from one of the other Villages in the region. When the tour concluded the TG returned to Village #2 with the resident porters. News of the affair become known within Village #2 and conflict between residents and the TG ensued. The residents believed that the affair was inappropriate and as it occurred on a tourism related trip it became the responsibility of the TG to accept the consequences.

Death threats were subsequently made to the DTO and TG. The TG decided to leave Village #2. In 2004 the TG sought permission from the land owner of Village #3 to reside in the Village and to be able to conduct tourism in the adjacent forested lands. The TG’s brother had a house in Village #3 and he offered to raise his brother’s child while his brother and wife worked as teachers in other Villages. The LO granted him permission to live in his brothers house. It should be noted at this point that the TG and the LO identify each other as kin. The TG guided bird watching groups in the forested land and hosted tourists in his brothers’ home. In 2004 the DTO initiated a system whereby every time the TG brought a group to visit the Village and forested lands they made a land owner payment referred to as ‘landowner fees’. In addition, the landowners’ youngest son was provided with a scholarship by the DTO to attend high school in City #1.

It appears that the DTO and TG understood the precarious nature of tourism and the impact that this could have upon both the social and economic values within a community. Since 2004 the DTO makes regular donations to the Village church as the church is the central place of the Village (spatially and spiritually), and provides the opportunity for interaction with other members the community to share common spiritual beliefs. These donations are used to provide resources for Sunday school,
and contribute to the maintenance of the church vegetable garden which is used to supply food at church gatherings.

The previous experience of the DTO and TG appear to have influenced the way that they interacted with the community in Village #3. In addition the TG devised a rotating roster system so that all members of the Village could have equal access to the alternate cash income stream provided by tourism. Village residents are able to supply vegetables, firewood and porter services. A training system has also been established by the TG in the areas of bird watching guide services and cooking. Three young men are being trained in bird identification by the TG and several young women are being trained by the cook (wife of TG) in kitchen duties such as cooking and food preparation.

Approximately 80% of the 17 households within the Village participate in tourism and access cash incomes (TG). Even the young children assist in porterage at the arrival of the tour group to earn money and develop a work ethic (DTO). All employees are residents of the Village. The tours utilise the land associated with the Village territory and no outsiders are employed by the TG or the DTO.

7.3 Spatial development pattern

The spatial development pattern of the immediate Village area was mapped (Map 7.1) as the basis with which to analyse tourism in relation to all other land uses within the Village. This section of the chapter provides a description of Village #3 and the level of development (May 2008) catering for bird watching tourists.
7.3.1 Location
The tourists are accommodated in huts outside the central Village area and are separated from the Village. This is interpreted as a form of zoning and as a means of separating incompatible uses. The tourists use the guest house for accommodation which then becomes the central point for dispersion throughout the sites used for the activity of bird watching (Map 7.2).
There are three unformed foot tracks that traverse the habitat of the four iconic species of the Mountain area. These are:

1. Magnificent Bird of Paradise track (59 known species to be seen)
2. Western Parotia and Vogelkop bowerbird (in excess of 50 known species)
3. Sicklebill (87 known species)

The traversal of each track incorporates the known habitat of the four endemic and iconic species of the Arfak Mountain. Each track is value added for the activity by the number of other lesser iconic species.

Map 7.2
Bird watching tracks and hides
The typical itinerary for a stay at the Village is:
Day 1: Leave City #1 bird watch along the drive in. Arrive at the guest house, bird watch around guest house.
Day 2: Up at 05.00hrs to Western Parotia and Vogelkop bowerbird hides. Walk to Garden cottage, bird watch in vicinity of cottage and stay overnight at the cottage.
Day 3: Depart garden cottage at 04.00hrs to walk up to the ‘top camp’ to view the Sicklebill and then return to the guest house by sunset.
Day 4: Depart for Magnificent Bird of Paradise hide 06.30hrs, leave for City #1 in afternoon.

7.3.2 Land use type
There are no Hotels in the Village. However, the TG offers both hut style accommodation and camping facilities. The hut style accommodation provided is in the form of a Guest House (Plate 1) and a Garden Cottage (Plate 2). The Guest House is located on the outer perimeter of the Village. The Garden Cottage is located in between the Guest House and the top camp of the Sicklebill track. This location allows the tourists to get up early in the morning (4.00am) to walk up to the top of the sicklebill track to see the Sicklebills around sunrise.
Camping: Tours can chose to camp at either the top camp at the end of the Sicklebill track or at the Garden Cottage. Plates 2 and 3 illustrate the camping infrastructure provided.

Guest House
The tourist numbers from 1990 up to about 2005 have been sporadic. The DTO reported that ‘months would go by with no tours’. In about 2006 the frequency increased in both the number and size of groups to a point where it was felt necessary by the DTO and the TG to construct a separate accommodation facility within the Village.
The guest house was designed by the TG and built in October 2007 from timber sourced from the adjacent forested land. All other materials and labour were paid for from the TG savings, grants provided by the DTO and a donation from a benevolent tourist. The internal fit out is comprised of four guest rooms each with two wooden bed platforms, a dining room and store room. When asked why the capacity of 8 persons the DTO replied ‘this is the maximum number that we like on a tour. Any more than 8 become difficult to manage’.

Subsequent to the 2007 season, an increase in demand to access the site was experienced. The TG decided to build extra accommodation facilities adjacent to the guest house which included two huts each with a capacity of 2 people. The kitchen was planned to be upgraded from the current location to a separate building.

The range of hospitality services provided to support the accommodation included food preparation and porter services. The tourist must provide their own bedding and equipment (including binoculars and sound recording devices). The visit to the Village according to the DTO and TG was for the express purpose of bird watching. *The guests can watch birds for up to 16 hours a day* (DTO) so all services are focused on ensuring the tourists can see as many birds as possible while they are there. According to the DTO *the type of food and accommodation and levels of comfort are not as important as the activity itself*. 

Plate 1

The Guest House with kitchen (under tarpaulin) in the background
7.3.3 Scale
The scale of the activity is on the lower end of the development continuum. At the time of the first data collection field trip, the kitchen was comprised of two tables and
two fire places under a tarpaulin and one table to prepare food and wash dishes and utensils (refer to Plate 4).

### Table 7.2

**Scale of Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards in Accommodation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self catering facilities</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot water for washing</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for privacy</td>
<td>Twin rooms, enough space to lie down and for back pack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local style meals</td>
<td>The cook has learnt to cook meals that are familiar to western tastes e.g. doughnuts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity to power appliances</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe drinking water</td>
<td>Tour Operator brings in bottled water for the trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar food</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage (toilet/rest room system)</td>
<td>Drop toilet (refer Plate 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish removal</td>
<td>Nil municipal service, all rubbish is burnt or recycled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet connection</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone reception</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable bed</td>
<td>Bed structure is wooden platform. Client brings own bedding including mattress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Destination Infrastructure

| Sealed roads                         | Single lane bitumen road from City #1 under construction (May 2008) |
| Hospital within 2 hour drive         | Closest hospital is 3 hours drive               |
| Reliable telecommunications           | No accessible telecommunication infrastructure with satellite phone reception only. |
| Airport within 2 hours drive         | Closest airport is more than 3 hours drive     |
Plate 4
Kitchen facilities

Plate 5
Drop Toilet Amenities (hole in the ground)
Bathing was done in the nearby creek for the first trip (Plate 6) and on the second trip a tub of cold water was provided to wash on the back veranda (Plate 7).

Plate 6
Washing facilities
**Destination infrastructure**

The Village is an activity based destination. It does not provide for a broad range of non bird watching tourist markets. The DTO and TG do not carry satellite phones and there is no postal service or public transport between City #1 and the Village.

City #1 has a hospital and airport. These are both located more than two hours from Village #3, despite the separating distance of slightly more than 60km. The road from City 1 to Village #3 commences as a two lane road until the road gets to the foot of the mountains. From this point it had been a seasonal dirt road to Village #2. Plate 8 illustrates the state of construction from Village #2 to Village #3. Plate 9 illustrates the internal road construction. In mid 2007 the Regency government commenced road construction to upgrade the road surface throughout the mountains. Neither the DTO nor the TG knew why the road was being upgraded and had not been consulted prior to construction commencing.
7.3.4 Intensity:
In May 2008 the provided accommodation was comprised of one guest house with a capacity of 8 persons, however two huts each having the capacity of 2 persons were
under construction (see Plate 10). This will increase the capacity to 12 persons at any one time.

**Plate 10**

Hut 2 under construction

---

**Summary: tourism development within the village locality**

On the first data collection field visit the construction of the guest house had been completed and operational for two months. The location and intensity of the structure complimented the local vernacular architecture in terms of form. The function of the structure was to accommodate bird watchers and consisted of 4 rooms each with two wooden bed platforms. The drop toilet was located outside and to the rear of the structure and the kitchen was offset to the front. It was purpose built and on a greenfield site removed from the Village at the extreme edge of the Village boundary.

**7.3.5 Intrinsic site characteristics**

Specially built hides have been constructed to view the Magnificent Bird of Paradise, the Western Parotia and the Vogelkop Bowerbird as these are known to perform at ground level. The Sicklebill is more likely to be viewed at higher altitudes in the canopy and is more difficult to see.

The village area is home to 10 endemic bird species, and 15 species with a restricted range (Papua Expeditions 2008). More than half of the 679 Indonesia Papua bird species can be seen at this one location. Its competitive advantage over all other

---
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bird West Papua watching locations is that *bird watching is not restricted to early morning and late afternoon activity* (Interview: DTO). Rather there are birds to be seen throughout the day and each track offers unique opportunities for species not available on other tracks within the locale.

The surrounding landscape is dominated by steep terrain and provides the opportunity to look over pristine rainforest vistas and views of traditional farming practices on hill sides. No inventory of other flora and fauna has been undertaken. According to the DTO and the TG the tourists are not interested in knowing the names of tree species, mammals, reptiles, amphibians and insects. The tracks utilised for the purposes of the tours are those used by the locals in accessing forest areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic Site Characteristics</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flora:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Orchids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Palms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large diversity of species, however precise number is unknown as no inventory has been compiled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fauna:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mammals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reptiles and amphibians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Butterflies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large diversity of species however, precise number is unknown as no inventory has been compiled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rare and Endemic Birds</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 320 species reside in Village locale (Papua Expeditions 2008).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mountainous landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pristine landscape and vistas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creeks and Rivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the highly variable topography and steep terrain the landscape contains all three of these features (refer to Plate’s 12 and 13 for details of landscape)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.6 Visitor Facilities

The TG provides all guiding services throughout the Village locale. The DTO accompanies all trips, provides assistance and interpretive services to the TG and meets the needs and comfort of the bird watcher. The TG concentrates solely on locating birds and naming the species seen by tourists. The DTO and TG do not provide information on flora and fauna as part of the guide services. The DTO provides interpretative services for the tourists as the TG is not fluent in English. The
trainee guides do not speak English and are able to communicate with DTO in Bahasa Indonesia. The trainees also participate in trips as porters to the tourists.

**Table 7.4**

**Visitor Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitor Facilities</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitor information centre</td>
<td>Nil all information is provided to the tourist via the TG and the DTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hides</td>
<td>At the Magnificent Bird of Paradise and Western Parotia/Vogelkop bowerbird tracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving tour</td>
<td>Nil – no roads all access at site is non motorised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formed walking paths</td>
<td>Nil – all paths are foot tracks approximately 30cm wide (refer Plate 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating facilities nearby</td>
<td>All food is eaten at the accommodation facilities or taken with groups by porters when on tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides or rangers on site</td>
<td>A guide is present with a group at all times when in the Village locale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs identifying plants</td>
<td>Nil – no inventory completed to identify species.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other site activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Nil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>Of birds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3.7 Neighbourhood setting
The Village is located in a mountain valley. It has creeks running either side of the Village, its mid ground views are predominantly the result of farming land uses (Plate 12 and 13) and the background views are forest covered mountains.

There are few opportunities to interact with the locals such as attending church. All conversations with the older members of the Village require two interpreters – one to convert English to Indonesian and another to convert Indonesian to Hatam. The younger people within the Village speak both Indonesian and Hatam. The only person who speaks English and Indonesian is the DTO.

If the tourist requests the opportunity to go to church or to meet with residents, the DTO will check with the TG to see if this is permitted. According to the DTO this is not something that is asked very often as most visitors just want to see the birds. There are no opportunities to purchase local crafts as the local residents do not produce any item other than agricultural produce in surplus quantities.
Plate 12
Mid ground view from garden cottage

Plate 13
Mid ground view from Highway
Table 7.5  
Neighbourhood setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Setting</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Locals</td>
<td>Tourists are able to attend events at the church upon request and subject to the approval of the Landowner and Tour Guide. The people of the community are happy to interact with tourists and inform them of their local traditions and belief system – however the conversation is heavily dependent upon a translator. There are no opportunities to buy local craft as the local people to do produce surplus to their own needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable Land Uses</th>
<th>Acceptable Land Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farming is practised on site</td>
<td>At the home garden and the farming plot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logging and forestry is practised on site</td>
<td>Within the forest for self sufficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting is permitted on site</td>
<td>Within the forest – for self sufficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A local community is close by</td>
<td>The community is central to all sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of the natural environment</td>
<td>Of the forest lands adjacent to the farms and Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial development is near the site yet can’t be seen</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4 Decision making
This section highlights how tourism operates from the originating source of the tourist to the community to provide an insight in to the substantive theoretical concepts associated with facilitating tourists at Village #3.

7.4.1 Tourist to Tour Operator
The relationship between the entities provides an overview of the level of planning and co-ordination that is undertaken in the formulation of the tourism product.

According to DTO the majority of the market that they service comes from the United States and United Kingdom and describes Australia as an emerging market. The groups range from 1 to 8 people in size and the average duration of West Papua tour is three to four weeks. The visit to the Arfak Mountains is one of 6 possible sites that the DTO visit in West Papua, and the only Village that operates as a ‘community based’ provider of services. The itinerary and sites actually visited ‘depend upon the
The target species sought by the bird watcher' (DTO). The DTO develops a trip itinerary based upon the target species and time limits (i.e., dates) set by the tourist or the ITO.

The tourist either contacts the DTO directly or responds to an established itinerary set by an ITO.

The DTO is integral to the product as it is very difficult to organise trips in Indonesia generally. Specifically booking domestic flights, guiding services, accommodation and transport services between sites on the internet is very difficult as there are no reliable schedules provided. It is impossible for a tourist to make contact with the TG to book a trip directly as there is no telecommunication infrastructure at the Village. In addition, the DTO acts as an interpreter, which is essential because very few people speak English in West Papua, and no one in the Village speaks fluent English.

**7.4.2 Destination Tour Operator - Tour Guide**

The Tour Operator contacts the TG via a note written in Bahasa Indonesia and is sent via a private transport vehicle that travels to the Arfak Mountains from City #1. The communication can take up to 2 days to reach the TG. Included in this note from the TO, is a description of expected date of arrival, the number of tourists expected and the schedule/itinerary while at the Village.
7.4.3 Tour Guide – Community
The TG responds to the note by contacting the appropriate service providers listed on the roster to work for next rotation. This includes porters, cooks, firewood providers and trainees.

The relationship between the providers of the product has been established so that each entity has its own level of responsibility in the provision of services. Each entity therefore plans in response to the level of information provided to them by the preceding business/entity. The DTO and the ITO’s respond to the tourists. The TG responds to the DTO and the community respond to the TG.

**Figure 7.1**
Relationship between tourism providers

The community do not respond directly to the tourists or the TO’s. They rely solely upon the direction provided to them by the TG. The community does not have access to a telephone or satellite service to communicate with people and businesses outside of the Village boundary. The businesses have evolved and formed around these limitations, and therefore have clearly delineated boundaries of interaction and decision making.

The DTO does not plan trip itineraries in advance. Rather they respond to the demand of the tourists and ITO’s for guide services. The schedules are developed on a first in first served basis and depend upon the target species sought and the time available to the client. Pricing schedules are entirely dependent upon what the client needs eg flights, hotel accommodation between sites and available transport.
The DTO is highly flexible and entirely responsive to the market demands. They sought no particular market segment and did not specialise in any form or manner other than to provide for bird watching tours. Moreover, the operation of the business was highly dependent upon staff skills and numbers. The DTO was a two person operation comprised of one dedicated field guide and the other part time business manager and part time field guide.

The DTO business was unable to operate more than 1 tour at a time. They had no formal business plan and no specific plans for the future other than to remain within the market place in the immediate future.

**TG**
The TG provides all field guiding services, liaison with community providers and accommodation at the Guest House. The TG does not liaise directly with the tourists as he is responsible for service provision within his Village. The TG speaks little English (other than the English names of birds) and does not have access to information and communication technology to communicate with the rest of the world.

The TG responds directly to the TO’s. Up until 2007, the TG responded to only 1 TO (DTO). Since then two other West Papua based TO’s established contacts with the TG. The TG as of 2008 responded to three operators and as a consequence in May 2008 was in the midst of increasing the intensity of development at the site. The TG responded directly to the 2008 season (May to December) peak demand by increasing capacity the accommodation capacity from 8 to 12 at any one time.

When asked if the TG had a 5 year plan for tourism in Village #3 he responded:

‘*He does not have a five year plan other than to be better every year*’

When asked if he will build more guest houses

‘*No more three is enough*’.

When asked what the break even point was for the current guest house the TG replied:
‘It (Guest House) cost RP14 800 000 to build and I charge RP25 000 per person each night. You work it out. He did not expect to break even, he just built it for the tourists and does not have to think about breaking even.

The DTO explained that the TG did not view the guest house in terms of economic returns or profit, as he received over half of the capital in the form of grants from the DTO and a tourist.

Community
No interviews were conducted with members of the service provision community. The researcher relied upon participant observations of the actual service provision. The DTO and TG provided payment to the service providers on behalf of the tourists. All liaisons for quantities and schedules were undertaken by the TG. The major obstacle to the community for greater interaction with the tourists was language. As a consequence there were few opportunities provided by the DTO for interaction unless specifically required by the tourist. The DTO would invariably be required to assist in translation.

Summary
The communication process that has adapted to the absence of telecommunication infrastructure and knowledge of a common language has meant that decisions regarding tourism are centred on those individuals able to exchange information. Tourists therefore must utilise the communication channels that are able to make these connections possible on their behalf. This invariably means that the TG is dependent upon his interaction with the DTO’s to connect with the wider world of bird watchers, similarly the ITO’s are dependent upon the DTO’s to organise tours on behalf of their clients.

7.5 Governance structures
The governance structures provide the framework for decision making and the parameters that regulate land use, development assessment and property rights. This section addresses how decisions are made at the community level about land use and development assessment and the influence that the state (Regency government) has upon the property rights, pre development conditions and development generally.
7.5.1 Land use assessment system

There is no available literature that outlines how decisions are made within Arfak Mountain communities with respect to land use. The Indonesian Adat system does not apply to the people of this locality as the residents do not identify with the Indonesian system. The people of the Arfak Mountains broadly identify themselves as Hatam, yet identify specifically with a Village locale within the Hatam speaking Arfak Mountains. The Hatam speakers are the indigenous people of the Arfak Mountains who identify themselves as Papuans not as Indonesians. Papuans are indigenous to the island of New Guinea and are known as Melanesians. Accordingly, one of the few things that characterise nearly all Melanesians is their relationship with their land (Sillitoe 2000), to which they all possess rights.

According to the rules of the traditional customary land tenure systems, Melanesians cannot permanently alienate land to strangers ie people not related by kinship ties (Sillitoe 2000). Land tenure depends upon kin relationships and while an individual does not hold ‘freehold title’ to a particular parcel of land, they do possess use rights to defined plots. Among the Hatam, the land owner (the original settler or descendent thereof) defines the land plots to be used by his kin. The land owner has sole discretion over who is given an allocation, and where the allocation is to be located.

There is very little information available on the Hatam tribes of the Arfak Mountain. There are no digital or paper based data freely available to the public that describes the spatial patterns of Villages and localities. The Indonesian government has restricted the release of all spatial information to reduce the likelihood of an insurgence by the indigenous people for example the Free Papua Movement.

The Village governance structure that frames the decision making process and outcomes is related to the customary land tenure system. The land owner of Village #3 was born in the Village and inherited the land area from his father when he died. To gauge his age he was asked how old he is:

*When Japan was here [Second World War 1942] he was the same age as Zachary (boy in the Village who is 11).*
The landowner is approximately 77 years old, has never attended school, only speaks Hatam and has not left the Village since he was ‘young and followed his parents to City 1, Marmere and Warkipi’. This could be at least 70 years ago.

The land owner is self sufficient and does not produce surplus food from his farm. His only form of cash income is from tourism in the form of land owner fees and if there is an emergency and he needs money he asks his sister to sell his vegetables in town, but this is very rare (LO).

The land owner is able to give any of his land to his kin. The dominant land uses granted by the LO have been a plot for farming in the mountain sides and a plot within the Village for a house. As all the land belongs to the LO, and he has sole discretion to determine the location, type, scale and intensity of development. Once granted, these use rights belong to the kin member and can be passed down to following three generations. After three generations the next must move to another Village (DTO). Areas can be traded, however all changes in the use of the land must be approved by the landowner.

There are no opportunities provided to the community to have input into decisions relating to changes in land use. There are four types of land uses within the Village those being religion (church), farming, residential and tourism. There are two types of tenures within the Village locale (Figure 7.2). One type may be developed for housing, tourism and farming. The other type relates to the forested mountain lands (public estate/commons) that are not to be developed for commercial gain, but are able to be used by all of the Villagers (with permission from the land owner) for subsistence. This would include forest products for housing, hunting for food such as possum and gathering of mushrooms and other food sources.

The area that immediately surrounds the Village is used and managed for agricultural purposes. This is surrounded by the forest or public conservation area. The public conservation area is only able to be used by those living within the Village. No commercial removal of forest products is permitted and these rules are strictly adhered to even by the land owner (LO):

> I think of the future, my children, grandchildren and my grand grand children. Nothing is to be taken. For example a butterfly collector offered me 9 million rupiahs to collect
butterflies. I said no because nothing is to come out of the forest except by the Village.

Figure 7.2
Description of Predominant Hatam Tenure Types

Land is inherited by land owner. Land owner makes decision to allocate land for his kin and makes decisions about the use of the public land.

**Land type**
- Private land
- Public Land for conservation

**Ownership**
- Member of family requests portion of land from land owner. This includes members of extended family such as nephews, cousins. Can occupy but not own.
- No ownership transfer – vested in the landowner and future generations

**Permitted uses**
- Land owner considers requests and determines location. The pattern (Map 7.1) to date has been a Village block to live on and farming portion.
- Managed for conservation only. Permitted to take for subsistence eg wood and protein. No commercial extraction.

**Tourism**
- Occupier of land can build any structure upon the allocation as long as they gain land owner approval. Prior to 2007 only three land uses: Village, church and farm.
- Bird watching tourism permitted as they use existing tracks and do not take from forest.
7.5.2 Regency Government

Unbeknown to the Village #3 land owner, tour guide or the tour operator (DTO), the Regency Government have a 5 year plan to construct and surface a circuit road from City #1 through the Arfak Mountains to the coast and back to City #1. In addition the Regency government have also developed a tourism plan. The details of which are not able to be accessed by members of the public – local or otherwise.

Despite the lack of information about the number of tourists coming to City #1, the Regency Bupati (Mayor) said

‘that he knows more and more tourists are coming to City #1 and that he is planning to promote the area’.

He also said that tourism was:

‘one of the reasons that they built the road through the Arfak Mountains – to open the remote area by both airports and the road so that tourists will see the culture in Arfak as they are the original people here’.

It is neither a statutory requirement, nor a practice, to involve members of the public in infrastructure planning specifically or planning generally. Planners and government officials are not required to consult with the wider community.

‘Because the government planners think this [town plan outcomes] is good for a reason. So the citizens cannot say no’. (TP).

Transport infrastructure upgrades permit enhanced and timely access between producers and markets. Typically, a preferred settlement pattern in the form of a land use plan is developed prior to investment in transport infrastructure upgrades. Infrastructure upgrades increase development opportunities. In the absence of a regional plan and an opportunity by the affected community to have access to or knowledge about the outcomes of the decision making process, there are limited opportunities for development to fairly distribute benefits within and amongst the affected community.

Village #3 operates under a customary land tenure system. The customary land tenure system and the formal (state) property system are two separate processes governing land ownership and title over the same area. Accordingly, the state is the legal owner of the land and all rights to its use are vested in the state. Consequently the state (Regency Government) became a key informant in the research. The Regency Government is the legal owner of the land and use rights, in addition to
managing the planning system that underpins the upgrades in transport infrastructure and other forms of development pre conditions. Furthermore, the plan and maps for tourism have been completed by the Regency Government tourism office. However, the Tourism Office had no copies of the plan to be analysed for this research.

The Regency therefore plans for tourism development through infrastructure – notably transport upgrades. When asked about the provision of other forms of infrastructure such as hospitals and schools the Burpati answered:

‘Not now step by step’.

Electricity?:

‘No plan for the coming 5 years’.

Telecommunications?:

‘This is not government business this is decided by phone companies. They will build towers when demand is sufficient’.

The Burpati alleged that there is a plan for both tourism and for the development of the Arfak Mountains, however these plans were neither publicly assessable nor created with community input. Furthermore, with the exception of transport infrastructure upgrades, the Regency government does not provide other forms of pre development conditions such as medical facilities, telecommunications, electricity or skill development in the form of training. Only those industries that are price sensitive to transport costs will benefit from these upgrades. This would further suggest that those industries that are sensitive to transport costs and are located in the core/centre, stand to gain the most from the improved transport infrastructure.

In sum, the core owns the land (state), controls the plan, its outcomes and the property system. The local community do not have the opportunity to control or influence their long term future as they have do not have access to planning decisions or a property system that recognises traditional land tenure. Therefore the manner in which the core controls the decision making, use rights and land, exacerbates the community’s vulnerability to external influences.
7.6 Planning knowledge production process

The chapter has so far examined how the decisions are made with respect to planning generally and specifically for tourism development in Village #3. The results from this investigation are summarised in the following to describe the relationship between the theoretical concepts and how this relationship in turn describes the planning knowledge production process applied by Village #3.

A series of knowledge gaps were identified in the literature and these formed the basis of the research questions (Chapter 3) that were subsequently used to guide the interviews with key informants. The first set of research questions focused on identifying the relevant normative concepts to the planning knowledge production process and how these were in turn applied. The second set, sought to gain an understanding of the relationship between the normative and procedural concepts, and how these influenced the type of CBT operating in Village #3.

7.6.1 Normative planning theoretical concepts

This section refers to the research questions specifically used to identify the application of normative concepts used in the planning process. The answers to these research questions are summarised in the following (Table 7.6).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Village #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the informal process consider the impact of development upon amenity?</td>
<td>Not with respect to scenic amenity. However tourism was separated from the village to permit the village life to function unimpeded by development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are development opportunities identified and assessed?</td>
<td>They are not proactively assessed by the community, and are identified by external entities that see the tourism value in the place characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the substantive knowledge about development accessed and assessed?</td>
<td>In the case of tourism, the Tour Operators provide the substantive knowledge on tourist demand preferences. This is assessed by the TG for incorporation into the current product. No further consideration or assessment is required prior to establishing the development on the land allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the public interest considered in the process?</td>
<td>Not until there is a conflict with social values. As the activity is new to the community, the impacts are unknown until they occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community undertake collaborative decision making when assessing development alternatives?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the principles of social justice and equity incorporated into decision making?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the community achieve competitive advantage within the global bird watching product range?</td>
<td>The community does not achieve competitive advantage. This is the responsibility of the tour operators to gain this for their own product. This in turn means that they gain a place in the market for the Arfakan product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does a community plan for development in the absence of development pre conditions?</td>
<td>As there has been no development prior to tourism, the absence of development pre conditions has not been recognised as a limitation. The Arfakans provide what they can within the bounds of their knowledge and infrastructure. In this instance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the product provided by the community met the minimum characteristics required to attract a broad spectrum of the activity market. The product had not been designed to attract a specific tourist target market.

To what extent does the community have control over the planning process and the knowledge production process?

The community influence the planning knowledge production process by reacting to the development when it does not meet individual needs. The TG then amends the delivery of the service to incorporate the ‘community’ requirements. The community have no direct control over the process in relation to development assessment, but are able to exert influence after the approval has been granted.

The normative concepts that describe the overarching principles of the planning system used by the community reflect the role that planning and intervention plays within the community. In this sense, there is no consideration of the future, and no recognised need for a formal planning process to direct this future. In other words the future will take care of itself. In addition, the level of intervention required through the planning process is indicative of the high level of trust within the community. By trust, it is implied that the system is not designed in law to describe the rights and responsibilities of developers and the community alike. This system is such that the community can exert sufficient force to cause the cessation of development if it is deemed inappropriate.

The normative concepts applied by the Regency Government were not directly assessed as it proved too difficult to gain access to the documents and the staff, to make this assessment possible. However, from the interview conducted with the Bupati and the conversation that took place with the Town Planner, it was evident that a command and control approach to planning was generally taken. There was no opportunity for community engagement and the system that did exist essentially serves the interests of the core. As a provider of pre development conditions, the Regency Government looked to the private sector to provide telecommunication infrastructure, and had no plans to provide any other form of infrastructure other than transport. No assessment of development opportunities and their associated infrastructure requirements had been conducted, and as a consequence there was
no preferred settlement pattern to guide future investments, or budgets for capital items such as hospitals etc.

In sum the notion of future had various conceptualisations and temporal scales applied by both the Arfak village and the Regency government. The notion of creating a strategic plan that guides the future, addresses impacting forces and identifies a preferred settlement pattern was not considered at either the community or Regency scale. Without a plan for the future the Arfak community and the Regency are able to adapt rapidly to development opportunities as they present themselves. Conversely rather than actively identifying these opportunities both fail to consider how to secure the local and long term control of development.

7.6.2 The practice of CBT by Village #3
The literature identified three conceptualisations of CBT as being community engagement, community development or a planning procedure. The study specifically sought to determine how CBT was operationalised within Village #3 to determine which conceptualisation it fell within. The following research questions were used to focus the investigation into the application of procedural planning concepts and are briefly addressed in Table 7.7.

Table 7.7
Application of procedural planning theoretical concepts by Village #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Village #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Is there a relationship between the demand for geographical characteristics that underpin place sensitive products and the procedural planning concepts that inform the planning process?</td>
<td>No explicit relationship between the two whereby the site is assessed for its potential to supply a demanded range of place characteristics. The community respond to externally stimulated interest as opposed proactively identifying development opportunities. The planning procedure does not have a mechanism to link the theoretical concepts that underpin a particular type of development. The decision making process is limited to the LO regarding the use of the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is CBT operationalised as community engagement or community development?</td>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community possess a vision for development?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the community established a set of goals and objectives?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community establish a set of development programs to meet the established set of goals and objectives?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the community evaluate the development programs to select the alternative the best meets their vision, goals and objectives?</td>
<td>No proactive community evaluation. The highly specialised nature of their economy has not required the creation of a decision making process that identifies development, a range of options or assesses its appropriateness according to set criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community possess a strategic plan that describes how the programs are to be implemented and evaluated for their effectiveness?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The community development perspective of CBT (Blackstock 2005) maintained that tourism is owned, operated and controlled by the local community. In this instance of this case study, the rules that govern the property rights and ownership of the land, determine the ownership structure of enterprises. Therefore, only people who are related to the LO are able to use the land within the Village locale, while the LO retains overall ownership of the land. All use rights and development is assessed and approved by the LO, and the community accept and function within these local governance structures.

However, the control is limited to the territory that is associated with the Village. The community of Village #3 neither legally own nor control the planning outcomes created by the Regency government. Moreover, within the community, individuals do not own the land as this is retained by the LO, but they may own the use rights. The control of land use decision making and ownership is retained by the LO.

Being remote invariably means that there is a standard range of land uses that reflect the highly specialised economic platform. Until tourism arrived, the process that had evolved for decision making by the LO, was limited to decisions about residential,
church and farming. The impacts of tourism had not been previously experienced by
the case study community. As a consequence, the planning and decision making
system had not evolved to include this land use. Where there is no change in the
economic platform of the locale, the identity of the individual and the physical
environment remains the same, and people are comfortable in their knowledge of
how things work. However, when change occurs like it did in Village #1 and #2, the
residents respond in ways that cause the use to be modified, or in the case of Village
#2, resort to extreme measures to cause the cessation of the use.

Tourism in Village #3 is community based in the sense that a person can participate
in the roster to access a cash income. It is not community based in the sense that
the arrangement was made to put the needs of the community above those of the
individual. Each person in Village #3 behaves to satisfy their individual needs, and
for as long as these individual needs are met then the enterprise will continue to
operate within the Village. Moreover the theoretical concepts of social equity, public
interest, collaborative decision making, proactively identifying development
opportunities, planning for and constructing development pre conditions, identifying
the competitive advantage of their product were not incorporated in the planning
process undertaken by Village #3. The definition of planning as described in Chapter
2 incorporated the notion of planning for future change, but change can only be
planned in instances where there is experience about consequences.

The magnitude of income generated by tourism in Village #3 is far greater than any
member had experienced from the traditional farming economic base. When the LO
received complaints from community members about not having enough access to
the cash income generated by tourism, he was therefore obliged to ensure that
everyone was happy. The greatest issue for the TG, was ensuring that each
household who wanted to be involved was provided equal opportunity. Furthermore
the LO developed a ‘buy local’ decree to ensure that each household could provide
farming produce, and therefore had greater opportunity to access a cash income
from tourism. These actions indicate that public interest is considered in the practice
of community based tourism, but not in assigning conditions to development in the
assessment phase.

7.6.3 CBT: A New Conceptualisation
Table 7.8 describes the results of the research in relation to the alternative tourism
paradigm and found several of the descriptors to be inadequate in its description of
the supply of the product and the market for the product. These are discussed briefly in turn.

a) Market Segments: In general terms the size of the market does little to describe the demand for the place characteristics. The segmentation of the market within the alternative tourism paradigm broadly describes the market as SITism, but in doing so fails to see the interactivity diversity for development preferences by SITists. Chapter 6 highlighted this diversity in respect to those skill based typologies who demanded greater scale, and less activity focus as a contrast to those who care less for accommodation and more for birds.

b) Economic Status: The returns from tourism are far greater than the residents had previously experienced from their traditional agricultural pursuits. This suggests that change was undertaken to gain greater economic benefits from the available resources as opposed to lower or equivalent benefits from current land uses. In addition, the capital inputs are high initially and due to low number of tourists have a long payback period.

c) Regulation: The alternative to a system that recognises ownership rights and plans for development (i.e. mass tourism), is a remote location that has no or little planning intervention. This intervention (if present) applies industrial location theory to serve the core based industries, rather than a place based approach, that serves to utilise the values of the land cover to gain greatest return to the local people.

d) Tourist Experience: The results from Chapter 6 indicated that the bird watchers did not demand interaction with locals at a bird watching destination, and similarly, results from this chapter demonstrated that the community did not want interaction with the tourists either. This was further evidenced in the layout of the spatial development pattern, whereby the uses of residential and tourism were separated so that the community could conduct their lives in the absence of the tourists.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Alternate Tourism</th>
<th>Community Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market Segments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Up to 12 persons at any one time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of stay</td>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>3 to 7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonality</td>
<td>No distinct seasonality</td>
<td>All year round – access dependent – road gets cut off in wet season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origins</td>
<td>No dominant market</td>
<td>USA, UK and Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation</td>
<td>Special interest</td>
<td>Bird watching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attractions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Idiosyncratic, pre-existing authentic</td>
<td>Remote Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>Moderately commercialised</td>
<td>Very little commercialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Tourists and locals</td>
<td>Locals (85) and tourists (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accommodation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial pattern</td>
<td>Dispersed no obvious tourism districts</td>
<td>Very distinct location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Unobtrusive vernacular style</td>
<td>Unobtrusive, stylised version of local vernacular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Local; community or small business</td>
<td>All buildings, services and land Locally controlled. State owns the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists receipts</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High by comparison to agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital inputs</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High by comparison to returns. Subsidised by grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkages</td>
<td>With local sectors</td>
<td>Dependent upon theDTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leakages</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier effect</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very high within the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of tourism</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
<td>Provides 80% of community’s cash income, but supplementary to low yield agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Local community</td>
<td>LO and Regency Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of government</td>
<td>High-low</td>
<td>Nil planning intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Informal, reactive to events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>Public intervention</td>
<td>Individualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>Community well being</td>
<td>Kinship ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>No time horizon, reactive to situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale and Intensity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Levels</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource use</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Small scale</td>
<td>Low levels of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local compatibility</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourist Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>Separated to protect Village integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local interaction</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of the natural environment to tourist experience</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Dependent upon the quality of the habitat for bird watching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport infrastructure</td>
<td>Undeveloped, low maintenance</td>
<td>Formed dirt road, single lane bitumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding land uses</td>
<td>Rural and remote</td>
<td>Rural and remote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.8 Characteristics of Alternative Tourism displayed at Village #3
CBT in this Village shares some of the characteristics of the community development and community engagement perspectives. However, it was not deliberately based on communicative action philosophy and associated planning practices, rather upon ensuring the satisfaction of individual aspirations. When each person has their aspirations met, there is no outward conflict between its members and the land use. The postmodern approach to CBT based on the communicative action philosophy reduces society to a moral totality. The totality is over and above the individual, and the social groups whose diversity or opposition to a proposal must be denied in favour of wholeness (Delanty 2003). The normative stance suggested in the literature by Reid (2003), maintains that the aspirations of an individual and community must be satisfied. Reid’s process was based upon the premise that tourism is sustainable when it reaches a collective decision, and that the decision is reached through the identification of commonly held views and aspirations for development. However, the community of Village #3 while not able to have input into the land use assessment phase, is able to influence the business operation within the community and locale. The attempts to establish tourism in Village #1 and #2 were unsuccessful as the operation of the development conflicted with the aspirations of the more influential members of the Village community. The development was approved, but this is seen as separate to the operation of the business.

Postmodern planning theory attempts to consider the flow on effects and negative impacts of development to social, environment and economic values of the locale at the time of assessment. This approach ensures that mitigation strategies are in place to address impacts upon the affected community. The governance strategies applied by Village #3 sees the role of the LO as an assessor of land use and the appropriate location (based on kinship relations). The ability of the business to sustain itself both within the community and in the market place is the responsibility of the developer (TG and DTO), irrespective of the benefits that the community derive from the use. The developers were unsuccessful in building the necessary relationship between the business operation and the community in Villages #1 and #2, and were therefore unable to sustain the business in these locales. On the third attempt, the developers realised how integral the community is in relation to the ability of the business to remain in its location, and to sustaining its place in the market. The international demand responded to the security of location, and the provision of accommodation facilities, through increasing the demand for the bird
watching tourism product. As the demand for the product increases does the demand for greater inclusion in the benefits, and increased wages by community members.

These results suggest that establishing opportunities for a community to benefit from tourism underpins the success of the tourism product within a community. Harrill (2004) maintains that resident attitudes towards tourism will be positive where they are the recipients of benefits derived from the enterprise. Interestingly, the LO did not have to intervene at the time of assessment by conditioning the development in Village #3 to provide benefits to the community. Rather, the developers had learnt from previous attempts that the business was contingent upon community support for its survival.

The process that has evolved within this Village further suggests that planning for tourism development is comprised of two separate, yet inextricably connected processes. On the one hand a land use planning process that identifies the suitable and appropriate location, and type of development. On the other hand a planning process for a tourism product includes consideration of the scale and intensity of development, commensurate with community support and involvement.

Finally, and perhaps more importantly, the community and the TG did not consider the impact of proposed development on the market preferences. In fact, at no time was the market considered in either the planning involving the use or the business. The TG does not (and cannot) connect with the tourist to ascertain their preferences. The DTO becomes the focal point for survival within the market place. The DTO is responsible for all marketing and the logistics of getting the tourists to the Village. The community therefore do not (and cannot) control the levers of demand, for reasons attributed to the absence of infrastructure, capacity (human resource) and language barriers.

CBT in Village #3 is not operationalised according to any of the conceptualisations identified in the literature. In this instance CBT has evolved as a response to earlier experiences in other villages. This form of CBT offers an entirely new conceptualisation that focuses on:

a. A territorially bound location;

b. The people who live within the territory identify with each other on the basis of kin relationships and as a distinct entity within the Mountain region;
c. Employment within the tourism enterprise is restricted to the people who live within the territory;
d. All decisions about tourism are restricted to and bounded by the territory;
e. Decisions about tourism development are limited to the developer and the regulator;
f. Community input in decision making is not sought;
g. There is no temporal scale associated with planning
h. Products are not proactively identified or assessed by the community;
i. Decisions about what to supply are made as a response to knowledge provided by an externally based entity;
j. Tourists do not demand social interaction with community; and
k. The community do not want social interaction with the tourists.

7.7 Chapter summary

This chapter examined how a remote community plans for the special interest activity of bird watching tourism, and how this transpired as spatial development within the locale. The analysis specifically focused on addressing research issues 4 and 5 established in Chapter 4.

The results suggest that CBT is multifaceted, in that it is not necessary to create a commonly agreed upon plan, develop a commonly held vision, engage with its members or be owned and controlled by all members of the community to be described as CBT. Rather, CBT in the Arfak context can be described as tourism that creates accessible benefits to those who seek them, and compensates those who are affected by tourism (such as the LO in the form of access fees). The significant features of CBT found from the case studied in this research include:

1. application of imperfect knowledge gained from the Tour Operators when undertaking product design decision making;
2. planning for development that occurs in isolation to the ramifications of external influences including state government and resource sectors;
3. an egocentric orientation to satisfying the community or individual aspirations with no consideration of the impacts to demand structures associated with particular market typologies; and
4. a focus on social control rather than certainty of development rights.
The analysis of the spatial development pattern indicated that the village provided the basic components of a bird watching tourism product. However, the village would not be able to differentiate the product by targeting the larger and lesser skilled segments of the market, due to a lack of pre development conditions such as electricity and telecommunications infrastructure. This invariably means that the decision to purchase the Village #3 product by bird watchers, would be based on the qualities of the intrinsic site characteristics, rather than on the accommodation features or other non bird watching related characteristics.

The planning process undertaken by Village #3 has adapted and evolved in response to its economic past, considers development as being less important than social harmony and highlights the notion of tradeoffs that are based less on economic efficiency and more on social efficacy. The theoretical literature on tourism marketing, planning and development tend to focus on strategies to ensure the survival of the product within the marketplace, rather than how the community will survive subsequent to tourism. This finding in itself suggests that the planning knowledge production process that is represented in the planning and tourism literature and undertaken by neo liberalist societies, cannot be assumed to be applicable to all societies. There are other conceptualisations of planning and tourism, but in the absence of a reflective theoretical framework that explicitly acknowledges that these differences exist, planning knowledge and theory will continue to be irrelevant to practitioners.

The following chapter consolidates the results from the two data analysis chapters to address the research objectives, and in doing so creates a phenomenological model of community based bird watching tourism practiced by Village #3.
Chapter 8
The Planning Knowledge Production Process

8.1 Introduction
The purpose of this chapter is to synthesise the data collected and analysed according to the models that were established in the analytical framework, and the thesis outcomes reflected in the Research Objectives and Research Aim. The intent of this chapter is to provide an insight into how tourism planning knowledge is produced, sourced and applied by a community in making tourism planning decisions for a remote area.

Chapter 1 described the contemporary practices associated with planning as lacking a connection between the key concepts inherent in planning theory, and the planning practice itself. The ramification of this disconnected relationship is believed by theoreticians to impair the effectiveness of the applied practice. The planning knowledge production process outlined in Chapter 1, described the relationship between the three types of planning theory, and provided the structure for the analytical framework from which a coherent analysis of planning theoretical concepts and practice could be made.

Chapter 2 introduced the notion of planning as a form of policy intervention aimed at promoting development and protecting community values. The purpose of planning is described in terms of a range of normative theoretical concepts that apply to planning in a general sense. The chapter also reviewed the characteristics of remote locations to describe the purpose of planning relative to a non urban location. These two reviews extracted the normative planning theoretical concepts that form the foundations of planning for remote areas.

The purpose of Chapter 3 was to establish the range of procedural planning theoretical concepts that describe the supply of alternative tourism otherwise known as CBT. The chapter examined the role of location theory in relation to a tourism product, and the utility of this theory in describing alternative tourism as a system within a remote locale. The review identified three types or purposes of CBT those being engagement, development and as a planning practice (after Reid 2003). The literature (Moscardo 2005), described the notion of CBT as possessing a substantial body of literature on the topic of the planning practice. The review conducted in
Chapter 3 found that the CBT literature is limited to the purposes of achieving engagement or development (Harwood 2008a). This suggests that there is a concentration of academic thought upon procedural planning theory in isolation to the influences of both normative and substantive theoretical concepts.

Chapter 4 examined the demand for the alternative tourism product (bird watching) in respect to the market preferences for development. The chapter reviewed the literature on SIT, recreation specialisation and how this transpires to market typologies and the tourism product range for bird watching. The substantive theoretical concepts related to alternative tourism as CBT and SIT, and the demand for bird watching place characteristics, were combined to form a remote area SIT system.

Chapter 5 described the research strategy that was applied to make the coherent analysis of the relationship between planning theory and planning practice in a remote area. The research strategy employed mixed methods, and in doing so sought quantitative data from a sample of bird watchers and Tour Operators to describe the tourism product, and identify the differentiating specifications of the product within that range. The qualitative investigation of an extreme and paradigmatic single case study, explored the product that was provided by the community, how decisions were made about the product and the knowledge that was used to design the product.

The preceding two chapters (6 & 7) analysed the data that described the bird watcher development preferences, the tour operators perceptions of these preferences and the decision making process undertaken by the community in the supply of a bird watching tourism product. The results from Chapter 6 indicated that a bird watching tourism product can be described in terms of the product range and the differentiating features that can create competitive advantage in attracting particular segments of the activity market. Village #3 provided all of the features that are inherent to a bird watching tourism product, but due to the absence of pre development conditions are unable to target specific market segments, and therefore do not differentiate their product within the range. As a consequence, the village attracted tourists of all skill levels and tailor made each itinerary to fit the activity orientated demands. The results from this analysis found that tourists are not able to contact the community directly, due to the lack of telecommunications infrastructure, nor can they communicate their development preferences to the community because of language
barriers. The community are therefore unable to control the levers of demand. The destination Tour Operators and their international contractors act on behalf of the tourists by describing their interpretation of the tourist’s development preferences to the community. These perceptions are in turn used as the knowledge bases for development within the community locale. A challenge is presented by the Tour Operators’ imperfect knowledge of tourist preferences.

The final section of Chapter 7 provided a new conceptualisation of CBT. However, this description does not represent all remote areas, rather demonstrates that each remote area community will respond to planning and development in their own unique way. This response will depend on several factors, namely: the extent of specialisation within the local economy; the features associated with the land cover and territory that the community identify with; the design of land use governance structures to assess appropriateness and deal with changes in land use; the extent of accessible pre development conditions (as infrastructure and property governance) and how the affected community determine the appropriateness of development; and expected benefits (including the distribution thereof).

It was at this stage of the study that I discovered that the planning process created by the case study community does not source or apply market data, nor is it designed to incorporate market based sources of knowledge. The decision makers within the case study community rely solely upon the imperfect market knowledge of the Tour Operators. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the Research Objectives and Research Aim in relation to the planning practice undertaken by the case study community. The results of the market data are used to highlight the implications of decision making in the absence of such data, in addition to commenting on the notions of uncertainty and vulnerability in planning.

This chapter is comprised of five sections the first of which includes this introduction. Section 8.2 discusses the normative planning theoretical concepts applied by the community and how these influenced the process and the application of knowledge. Section 8.3 describes the planning procedure associated with alternative tourism in relation to the application of procedural theoretical concepts, and how these in turn affect the supply of the alternative tourism product.

Section 8.4 examines the relationship between the spatial development pattern and substantive theoretical concepts. This section of the chapter focuses on the types
and sources of knowledge used by the community to base their planning and development decisions upon. This section specifically addresses making decisions about development in isolation to the system that it operates within. Pertinent results from the analysis of the bird watcher and Tour Operator surveys highlight the importance of practicing market realism to reduce their economic vulnerability.

Section 8.5 addresses the Research Aim to characterise the planning knowledge production process associated with alternative tourism in remote areas. This section of the chapter describes the relationship between planning knowledge and planning practice as an action.

Section 8.6 summarises the chapter, and concludes that the planning knowledge production process applied by Village #3 is best described as adaptive and flexible. The identified weaknesses of the adopted planning system include: an inability to address external threats; irreverence to other development opportunities; and an inaccessible formal property system.

8.2 Research Objective 1: application of normative planning theoretical concepts

To identify the normative planning theoretical concepts that underpins the planning knowledge production process applied by a remote community.

The postmodernist approach to planning maintains that if the process is just, then the outcome will be as well (Harper and Stein 2006). This approach exemplifies contemporary planning theory, and as such the normative planning theoretical that dominate the literature, the procedures and the profession. The analytical framework used in this thesis identified a series of normative planning theoretical concepts that underpin planning generally (Taylor 2003), and a range of concepts that may specifically apply to remote area planning (Markey et al 2006). These are outlined in Table 8.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Normative</th>
<th>Remote Area Normative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Sustainable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Equity</td>
<td>Place based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative decision making</td>
<td>Community Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public interest</td>
<td>Pre conditions of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity</td>
<td>Competitive Advantage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.2.1 General normative concepts

#### Identifying development opportunities

Village #3 does not proactively create development opportunities. As a consequence, the community do not identify opportunities to secure the competitive advantage of a product, nor have these reflected in development strategies. Therefore they do not plan per se, as they are not trying to control the future, rather they adapt to situations as they present themselves. This means that while they are adaptive, they also become vulnerable to external demands and shocks within the global market place. In this particular instance, the absence of telecommunications infrastructure, and English language skills means that they are dependent upon external entities (Tour Operators) to create products and connect with the tourists market on their behalf. It was found from the results of the Tour Operator survey that the information that the Operators supply the community with represents their own interpretation of market preferences, and does not necessarily provide information on the entire product spectrum demanded by the bird watching tourist market typologies.

#### Social equity

Planning in a typical urban system is about providing certainty to developers and the affected community (Hall 1995). The formalised Anglo American state intervened approach to planning is characterised by its dependence upon written and decreed laws. The role of law in land use planning ‘controls the powerful equally with the powerless’ (Cotterrell 1995:259), that is, whatever the law stipulates should stipulate for all concerned. A community is based on the notion of the social networks, communal interest and a sense of belonging. Applying a law to a rule or protocol implies that there is no trust in the community to act in the interest of the collective over the individual. A law is decreed to ensure that each person is treated equally. The law protects the relatively powerless from the effects of economic, political or other power by insisting that the legal rights of the powerless are no less than those
of the powerful (Cotterrel 1995). The consequence of law deliberately creates a situation of certainty of rights.

Where there is no law governing a particular right as being either inappropriate or appropriate, then the social relations within the community determine the responsive actions to be undertaken. In the instance of Village #3, there were no rules or protocol governing the certainty in development rights associated with the tourism product, and as such the tourism product was subject to the powers of the social relations to determine the distribution of economic benefits (Village #1 and #3), or behaviour (Village #2). There was no evidence of the principles associated with social equity having been applied in the decision making process at Village #3.

**Collaborative decision making**
Planning is the process of managing change in communities and assumes that the people within the system are able to control the forces that impact upon the future. In the example of Village #3 it was evident that disaffected people could change the future. Whether these people acted to satisfy themselves, or acted in the public interest is unknown. However there were no opportunities for proactive collaborative decision making, rather a focus on negotiating decisions about the enterprise subsequent to a social action.

**Public interest**
At no time throughout the process was the public interest considered or a public benefit test undertaken to determine the generation of benefits from tourism, or the distribution amongst members of the community. The LO is charged with the responsibility of making decisions in the public interest after the complaint has been received, and intervenes where necessary to realign the distribution of benefits subsequent to a perception that the balance is deemed to be inequitable. The public land that is set aside and staunchly protected by the LO, is the only explicit indicator of land use assessment in the public interest.

**Amenity**
Amenity did not appear to be a great concern in assigning development conditions on tourism. The TG felt that it was better to separate the uses so that there was no threat to the everyday function of village life from tourism. In this respect the amenity of the village was considered less from a scenic perspective, and more from a functional perspective. However, the results from the bird watchers and Tour
Operators survey demonstrated that the attributes that describe scenic amenity, and more particularly the quality of the natural setting underpinned both the experiential demand for the tourism product, and the place characteristics that describe a bird watching tourism product.

8.2.2 Remote area normative concepts

**Sustainable development**

This concept was not considered in the decision making process other than with reference to the protection of the public land estate from commercial extraction. There was no impact assessment conducted (formal or otherwise) to determine whether the development was sustainable, nor was this notion considered from any particular disciplinary perspective i.e. environmental, social or economic impacts of the development upon the functioning of the community. Results from the Tour Operator and bird watcher surveys both indicated that the ‘preservation of the natural environment’ was a very acceptable use of the land within the destination used for bird watching. Possessing access to information about these types of preferences would enable the LO and TG to make decisions about development that ensures that these areas are continued to be protected from threatening extractive uses.

**Place based**

The planning system adopted by Village #3 is well described as place based as it considers both the relationship of the people to the territory and to each other. In this respect there is both recognition of the social networks and the functional value of the land. More specifically, the decision making process and the way that development is assessed and managed, reflect the local idiosyncrasies that describe the unique qualities of Village #3. Every decision was bound to the spatial extent of the territory, and the developer (TG) recognised the importance of maintaining the support of the people who lived in the village to ensure the survival of the business.

**Community control**

A community based planning system requires local ownership of the land and its use rights to enable community control. While ever an external entity owns the land and use rights, the community are vulnerable to the whims and aspirations of external others for their future. The major failing of contemporary planning theory in this respect is that it presupposes that a formal property system exists in every situation. In urban areas this system may exist, however for many remote areas including
Village #3 a formal property system does not exist and therefore creates uncertainty of rights.

The fundamental differences between the process applied by Village #3 and a typical development assessment process conducted by Anglo Americans, is that individuals or groups of individuals in Village #3 are able to exert sufficient force or action to change the development subsequent to its commencement. The system that operates within this particular region has demonstrated its scope to achieve community control through the expulsion of tourism from Village #1 and #2. In essence, a member of the community within Village #3 is able to exercise control to stop the activity irrespective of the approval granted to the land use. The control is not provided for in the procedural design such as via community engagement, rather this occurs subsequent to a situation being assessed as inappropriate.

Village #3 whether by design or default, allows for the development to be amended to address negative impacts upon the community (or group of individuals), as and when they are perceived. The land use assessment process is limited to assigning a use to an allotment of land with a narrow range of conditions that apply to every allotment, such as the transfer of certain, but not all use rights. However, if the impacts of a particular use conflict with what the community deem to be appropriate, then the proposed use will be forced to cease. The developer does not have the control in Village #3, rather the community possess this control.

While the community is in control over development in a very local context, this does not mean that they posses the ultimate control over their future. They do not legally own the land that they inhabit, nor can they legally stop the state or national government from taking the resources that they see as theirs, as these are legally owned, controlled, planned and sold by external entities. Village #3 operates in two systems, one legal and the other subject to the social relations. The legal system does not recognise the traditional property system, or the planning mechanisms applied within the community, nor does the legal system create certainty of rights or equality in decision making through community engagement.

**Pre conditions of development**

There were no preconditions of development provided by the Regency government other than transport infrastructure upgrades, nor were there any plans to provide any other conditions. This limits the size and scope of the market that the village could
attract. In addition the communications and language differences were two other significantly lacking pre development conditions that impair the ability of the community to connect with, and then subsequently control the levers of demand. However, to look at these pre conditions in isolation fails to recognise the interdependency between each condition and the contribution that they could make to an overall strategy, which is lacking in any case. The people within Village #3 do not pool their resources to supply these, and as they do not have access to a formal property system cannot access the implicit capital value to lever funds to create these pre development conditions. The results from the bird watcher survey suggest that if the community had a more intimate understanding of the bird watcher preferences (in particular the market that is most suited to the product they are limited to supplying), then they would be able to create a product that forms the base for a viable tourism economy. This in turn would enable the community to set up the infrastructure that can allow expansion into new markets (Carson and Harwood 2007a).

**Competitive advantage**

The competitive advantage of the tourism product was not considered by the Village or the TG. This is in part due to the lack of pre development conditions that enable a target market to be identified and catered to. Therefore, the product provided meets the minimum product range characteristics, but possesses no differentiating characteristics such as hotel, electricity and other services that are important to specific segments of the market. The DTO maintained that the competitive advantage of Village #3 over all other sites in West Papua is its value for money in respect to the number and type of bird species seen at one location. This implies that the market for the product provided by the DTO is price conscious, as opposed to seeking place based products. The results from the bird watcher survey indicate that the highly specialised end of the market was seeking a place sensitive product. Had the community or the TG possessed this knowledge, they would have been able to emphasise the characteristics that the locale possess in order to gain competitive advantage for their product.

The results from this research found that none of the general normative concepts were relevant to or were applied by Village #3. Yiftachel (2006) maintains that the production of planning knowledge has been dominated by Anglo American gatekeepers (including Canada and Australia), and as such reflects a different reality for those societies where liberalism is not a stable constitutional order; where
property systems are fluid and intergroup conflicts over territory inform daily practices. This has resulted in conflicting and irreconcilable rationalities, and hence the practices and possibilities of planning are vastly different in diverse and remote regions of the world. Those societies that possess different norms to the gatekeepers are unable to adopt the typical CBT planning practice (after Reid 2003) and outlined in Chapter 3, as the normative theoretical concepts that shape the planning procedures, determine the practice, and influence the selection and incorporation of substantive knowledge vary, and are responsive to entirely different stimuli.

These normative planning theoretical concepts are therefore relative to the society that applies them. This example demonstrated that the application of normative concepts derived from contemporary planning literature and protected by the knowledge gatekeepers do not apply to Village #3. This in turn means that the planning procedures applied by Village #3 reflect the norms of the society that the procedure applies to. According to Watson (2002) and Yiftachel (2006), planners and therefore planning should only proceed on the basis of a thorough understanding of the socio spatial and political processes that shape the context of the locale. However the notion of community control did resonate with the approach that was undertaken by Village #3, but was again limited to the spatial extent of the village territory.

In summary the most enduring normative planning theoretical concept that was applied by this remote area community in their planning knowledge production process was that of community control. This is entirely different to collaborative decision making, public interest and social equity. It should also be noted that the general theoretical concepts outlined by Taylor (2003), did not consider that a community could control development or planning outcomes as a normative theoretical concept. This would further indicate that planning in the Anglo American systems views development as means for maintaining the established order.

8.3 Research Objective 2: procedural theoretical concepts and alternative tourism development

To describe how a remote area community makes decisions about the level of development associated with the alternative tourism product.
This results from this study found that the planning process that is created and applied by Village #3 is shaped by tradition. This tradition includes a land use planning process that addressed land uses according to an allocation for farming, and an allocation in town. If the person in possession of the allocation does not want to use it for the purposes originally intended, then they must apply to the land owner for permission to change the use, and if he approves then it may occur. There is no legal system established to create certainty for developers, or to protect the powerless from the effects of development. Moreover, the state system applied by the Regency government does not incorporate the principles of social justice or collaborative theoretical concepts in their decision making, or their statutory planning process, and therefore offers limited opportunities within the procedure to consider the views of the affected community.

Tourism is not assessed for impacts at the time of making the assessment to change the land use, and conditions are not attached to the approval that require the developer to mitigate potential impacts. The LO does not have access to alternative sources of knowledge (e.g. communication infrastructure, language and communication barriers) to evaluate options or impacts, and as such the process has not evolved to incorporate these forms of knowledge.

Planning for CBT in the sense that was described by Reid (2003), does not occur in Village #3 (refer to Figure 8.1). Nor was the planning process designed to engage the community in decision making to enhance the benefits of the development for either the community, in terms of capacity building, or the tourism enterprise. Figure 8.1 describes the planning procedure undertaken by Village #3 in the supply of the bird watching tourism product by comparison to that described by Reid (2003).
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The process of decision making undertaken by Village #3 and described in Figure 8.2, separates the decisions about land use from the provision of ancillary services (food, guide services, etc). As a consequence, the impacts of the use upon community or environmental values in establishing the land use, or how the product would be provided beyond the use of the land, were not considered. All subsequent decisions regarding the involvement of the community in the access of benefits were made after the approval to use the land was granted. In a typical and formalised land use assessment phase (conducted in countries such as the UK, Australia and the USA), the land use would be assessed for its impacts prior to approval being granted. This typical Anglo American approach assumes that the assessment is made with full knowledge impacting forces upon the community and environmental values, and an ability to predict the future.

It is difficult for a remote community to make comment on specific forms of development if they have no experience of it, or are not able to access independent knowledge about development. The process applied by Village #3 has evolved to enable those that may be disaffected to have influence subsequent to their experience with development. The most noteworthy attribute of the process adopted by the community in making decisions, is that it does not have a particular strategy.
that it follows. In this instance the governance structure assesses the development according to the rules that apply to land use and lot allocations and reflects the highly specialised nature of the economy. This would further indicate that where there is infrequent change in the economic platforms, the ideas for wealth creation can be stifled (Wadley and Smith 1999). External stimulation would become necessary to create change. For this Arfakan community, an external entity identified the potential for bird watching tourism. The TG depended entirely upon the knowledge from the DTO about the activity, the level of development required to facilitate the activity and the tourist’s activity preferences.
Figure 8.2 Planning Procedure undertaken by Village #3
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The results from the data analysis in Chapter 6 concluded that two forms of substantive knowledge about bird watching can be applied in the planning process. Information about what makes a site suitable for a type of tourism activity (in this case bird watching) enables the identification of important land cover attributes and the identification of a potential development opportunity. The plan decision making can then focus on how much manipulation of these land cover attributes can be undertaken before the activity becomes inappropriate. Comparisons can be made to determine which segment of the market would consume their development, which in turn enables the community to make informed and market realistic decisions about development. These types of knowledge have not been coherently developed, and as such the DTO and the TG have made their decisions based on their own experiences. The community had even less experience with tourism, and in turn followed on from the directions of the TG and DTO.

8.3.1 Supply of the Alternative Tourism Product

Alternative tourism is described from a supply perspective as CBT, whereby the tourists are able to gain an authentic experience from a cultural exchange with locals. This is an idealised version to provide contrast to the mass forms of tourism that occur in enclaves and focus on accommodation facilities such as resorts that provide for the bulk of tourist numbers. CBT in this instance described a unit of people who provide tourism services within a bounded territory. The bounds of the territory in turn describe the spatial extent of the people affected by and involved in tourism and therefore the extent of decision making. The TG had learnt from previous experiences that it would not be appropriate to employ people from other localities in the mountain to supply services. He realised that if he limited the employment and supply of services to a territorially bound unit of individuals then the benefits would be realised by these people alone. The benefit to the TG is that they would not hinder the ongoing function of the business for while ever they were satisfied, and able to access benefits. This was his form of gaining development certainty through social rather than legal means.

While CBT is described in the literature as the ideal way of bringing about benefits to a locale, it is quite limited in its ability to look beyond its territory. So in this sense the limitation of CBT and indeed any form of community based development, is that it has a tendency to focus on the needs of the community at the expense of the development, and lacks the ability to monitor and adapt to the global and regional
influences. Irrespective of the organisational type that supplies the product, the product is sold in a global marketplace and to address the market survival risk must be abreast of changes in the market place that may affect future development opportunities. The Tour Operators will look after themselves first and foremost (Trunfio et al 2006), and if the destination no longer fits the particular market requirements that they cater to, then the Tour Operator will simply stop using it (Curtain and Wilkes 2005). In this instance the community are left with capital investments that have no ability to make a return on investment. While the community do not have to worry about connecting with the tourists at the generating regions, spend money on marketing or product development research they place all of their aspirations upon one form of development and do not effectively manage risk. Having said this, another of the enduring features of this remote community planning system is that it reacts to development rather than proactively identifies opportunities, possesses irreverence to the notion of temporal bounds to development and therefore an ignorance of the future or a vision and methods to attain it. This is in part due to the culture of the Arfak Mountains in that they have not had to adapt their planning process to incorporate development outside of residential, church and farming. Moreover, they are unaware of what the global nature of tourism is, and they view this level of information as being the Tour Operator’s responsibility to understand.

In sum, the remote area community make decisions about the level of development associated with the alternative tourism product in response to the knowledge provided by the Tour Operator and according to the governance structure that is in place to guide the process. Moreover, the results from Chapter 6 indicated the Tour Operators have imperfect knowledge of the market preferences, which in turns skews the product provided to the Tour Operators interpretation of their own market preferences for development.

8.4 Research Objective 3: Substantive Planning Theoretical Concepts and the Spatial Development Pattern

To examine the range of substantive theoretical planning concepts that were applied in the planning process, and how these influenced the spatial transformation of the locale.
The previous section of this chapter described the supply of alternative tourism according to the application of procedural theoretical concepts. It was established that there is no Meta narrative (community engagement or community development) that underpinned the planning procedure. The substantive model established in Chapter 4 (Figure 4.12) described the demand for special interest tourism products from a systems perspective. Four main components of the system were identified as being the tourists as a stimulator of demand; and a combination of the place characteristics, the community, and the Tour Operator(s) as the basis of a product that responds to the tourist demand. These are discussed in turn.

The Tourists
The results in Chapter 6 identified 5 experiential (factor) components to describe the motivating force underpinning the decision about where to take bird watching holiday trips. The first two experiential components described one third of the total variance in the motivation scale items and were respectively termed Resting and Tension Reduction (accounted for 21.7% of variance) and the Natural Setting (11.5% of variance). The results from this analysis suggest that bird watching is not necessarily about the birds per se, but about the opportunity to derive a range of benefits from participation in the activity. Further analysis of these motivations (by skill) did suggest that the items related to the quality of the natural setting were Very Important when making decisions about bird watching destinations (Table 6.5). Moreover, results that described the important place characteristics sought at a bird watching destination, further indicated that the quality of the natural setting (measured as intrinsic site characteristics) also described the basis of the bird watching tourism product range. Those characteristics that differentiated the tourist product within the market were based on the development of the site, rather than on the quality of the natural setting.

Place Characteristics
The five broad categories of place characteristics were analysed according to the preferences of the bird watcher, the Tour Operators perception of these preferences and the actual supply of these at the case study site. The Tour Operators play a very significant role in the supply of substantive knowledge about bird watcher preferences. It was found from the analysis in Chapter 6 (Section 6.4), that Tour Operators perceive that their clients demand high levels of development to facilitate their stay (scale of development, accommodation type and tourism facilities) at a destination. It was also found that these categories of place characteristics enable
the product to be differentiated within the bird watching tourism market place. The category of place characteristics that were essential to gain entry to the market place were described as the intrinsic site characteristics (trees, reptiles, butterflies, rare and endemic birds, mountainous landscape, pristine landscape and creeks/river), scale of development (space for privacy, safe drinking water and comfortable bed) and the preservation of the natural environment.

The Community
The case study community provided all of the necessary place characteristics to enable entry to the market place. However, due to a lack of predevelopment conditions are unable to differentiate the product within the product range. The community made planning decisions about the level of development in isolation to other components within the special interest system. Decisions about what to supply were made based on the substantive knowledge gained from Tour Operators, but then amended by the TG/LO if these were thought to be socially inappropriate, or if an opportunity to gain greater community participation in the venture could be made (e.g. porters, trainee guides and vegetable supply). At no time did the community or the TG seek feedback from the visiting tourists about the product supplied, and the extent to which this could be enhanced to better meet their preferences; nor was there consideration that the manipulation of the land cover attributes may influence the market for the product.

The Tour Operator
The Tour Operators were central to the supply and creation of substantive knowledge to the community about the development preferences of the market. It was generally perceived by the community that the Tour Operator understood their client’s development preferences, and therefore acted in direct response to these. The results from the analysis in Chapter 6 (Section 6.3) demonstrated that the Tour Operators cater to a range of markets, and in general terms perceive that their target markets prefer more intense levels of development that are invariably infrastructure dependent.

This research has highlighted that substantive knowledge is not limited to information about the tourist or special interest tourism. Rather substantive knowledge was:

1. Influenced and created by traditions and past experience within the community that reflect their unique and collective interpretation of tourism.
2. In the form of information about site suitability for the special interest as an activity, and about segments of the special interest market as product/market typologies; and
3. Influenced by Tour Operator perceptions of tourist demand preferences.

Tourism planning knowledge production process applied by Village #3
Figure 8.3 illustrates the phenomenological model of alternative tourism in Village #3. This model describes the relationship between the substantive knowledge of the place characteristics and the procedural elements of the process. The process highlighted in Figure 8.3 illustrates the iterative nature of the relationship between practice and theory. The nature of this relationship would serve to support Rorty’s (1999) assertion that arguing about what should be done [in planning], or how we should use the tools at our disposal to make progress, does not achieve a coordination of behaviour. Societies use the knowledge that they have available to them including their sets of norms to make the decisions they feel necessary, which is further evidenced in the actions that they undertake. Yiftachel (2006) warned that forcing theory condoned by the planning knowledge gatekeepers upon a non Anglo American society in the guise of a planning practice, would not derive the outcome sought. Much like forcing a square peg into a round hole, the two entities were not designed with strategic intent to fit and therefore simply exist in isolation to each other.
The analytical framework that has guided the thesis positioned substantive planning theoretical concepts subsequent to the procedural design. The relationship between substantive knowledge and how it is applied throughout the planning process by Village #3 suggests a more central role than the planning and tourism literature currently postulates. These types and sources of substantive knowledge are discussed in turn.

8.4.1 Knowledge informed by traditions and past experience
The spatial development pattern is largely the result of the source and type of substantive knowledge that is accessible to the community. The knowledge that is accessed to identify the development opportunities is filtered through the social value system to determine how the land cover attributes can be manipulated. This in turn informs the creation of appropriate development within the spatial extent of the
The iterative nature of the planning process subsequent to approval has a profound impact on the relationship between procedural and substantive theoretical concepts. This became evident in the analysis of the spatial development pattern. Both the planning process undertaken and the application of substantive knowledge regarding how to make decisions about tourism, where to locate tourist development, ownership of tourism development and the style of architecture is influenced by traditions and past experience gained and created within the community. The location of tourist development such as the siting of the guest accommodation, is influenced by the traditions governing land allocation and the past experience of the TG with tourism in previous villages. The tourists are separated from the village, whereas the literature on alternative tourism suggests that to be community based they are to be dispersed within the community (Weaver 2007, Telfer 2007). However, at Village #3 there is an area set aside for tourism that allows the village to function in every day life without interference from the tourists. The land that the guest house is on has been allocated to the TG as his town portion. When questioned about the obvious separation the TG attributes this not to an allocation process, but to separate what is in his mind, a potentially conflicting use (tourism) with the ongoing every day function of the village.

The vernacular style of accommodation (architectural design) was an interpretation of client requirements by the TG. The design was based on what could be locally sourced, and a form of development that enabled the maximisation of employment opportunities for local people. The huts were not built to permit self catering. Rather a separate kitchen was established that employed people as cooks, who in turn purchased food supplies and firewood from the local people. In essence the design of the hut(s) was such that they maximised the benefits of tourism to the locals in terms of creating increased opportunities to derive cash incomes.

8.4.2 Substantive knowledge, land use planning, and decision making
The results from the analysis of the two surveys indicate that there are two forms of substantive knowledge necessary to identify and create SIT in a remote location:
• knowledge that identifies the activity potential and describes the site suitability of the locale in respect to the land cover attributes necessary to facilitate the activity and
• knowledge about the market typologies that enables the product to be differentiated within the tourism product range.

Tourism planning in remote areas requires both forms of knowledge to identify development opportunities and to enable informed decisions about what is an appropriate level of development. Chapter 2 (Section 2.3.2) identified four principal reasons why it is difficult to define planning, and describe where planning starts and ends (after Campbell and Farnstein 2003). The results gained from the application of mixed methods to this study suggest that planning for development in remote areas is about the object (land use), the method (decision making), and the socio-spatial transformation of the locale. The knowledge about the site suitability of the locale for the land use of bird watching tourism enables decisions to be made about the market typology, the level of development required to support the particular typology, and the extent to which the land use and the associated level of development is assessed by the affected community as appropriate. If the combination of the activity and the level of development necessary to support the typology are not appropriate, then the spatial transformation of the locale can either be amended to make it appropriate, or can be refused on the basis of inappropriateness.

The case study community did not have the benefit of knowledge on the market typology for the place sensitive product that they provided, so was therefore unable to make informed decisions about the land use before the spatial transformation occurred. This in turn necessitated social action to make amendments to the development subsequent to the land use decision being made.

The differentiating specifications of the bird watching tourism product are mostly dependent upon predevelopment conditions such as infrastructure. The results from the two surveys suggest that the product provided by Village #3 does not target a specific tourist market segment, and as such provides a product that is related solely to the activity of bird watching. Substantive knowledge on how to differentiate the product is not currently considered, nor is it sought by either the TG or the DTO. The current product provided at Village #3 caters to the entire market in the respect that it supplies the suitable land cover attributes to facilitate the activity of bird watching. This approach has resulted in a broad range of bird watchers irrespective
of skill levels purchasing the product on offer, and a range of destination Tour Operators connecting with the TG. In addition Village #3 is dependent upon the Tour Operators to sell their product within the market place on their behalf. A lack of access to substantive knowledge on both the activity and the market makes the community and its product vulnerable to the actions and decisions of external others. If the community had access to the substantive knowledge, they would understand what triggers demand and be able to control the levers of demand within the special interest tourism system.

8.4.3 Substantive knowledge and the Tour Operator

The potential of the region to supply bird watching tourism was identified by the DTO. The local people had no experience of tourism in the sense of a use of their land or within their own lifestyle and culture. The community relied on the DTO to provide them with information about tourism and the level of development that would meet the demand preferences of bird watching tourists.

Once it was established that tourism could be provided within the village, the experiences that both the DTO and TG shared in Village #1 and #2 shaped the way in which they provided tourism in Village #3. However, a separate accommodation facility was provided in Village #3 to cater to increased visitation which in turn influenced the need for access to, and utilisation of, substantive knowledge on the scale of development necessary for the supply of accommodation. This knowledge was incorporated into the decision making process made by the TG and LO. Given the limitations imposed by a lack of pre development conditions, the guest house was developed to supply the basic services such as sleeping space, water for washing, local style food and toilet. The knowledge about the range of ancillary services that should be supplied was provided to the TG by the Tour Operators visiting the village, and was limited to food (including firewood) porter services and guides. The range of ancillary services while narrow, is highly contested in the community as it is the only source of cash income, and therefore forms the focus of social action.

The community originally worked with one destination Tour Operator (DTO) and this has increased since 2007 to three operators. As the popularity for this product increases the number of Tour Operators that the community is influenced by will also increase. The results from Chapter 6 demonstrated that Tour Operators demand more intensive levels of development and as the community attracts more Tour Operators to the Village, the knowledge that the Tour Operators supply will serve to
reinforce that these higher levels of development are essential to satisfy market preferences. Research conducted by Curtain and Wilkes (2005) who surveyed Tour Operators to determine their perspectives on the bird watching tourism product range, concluded that the overall market was changing its focus from specialised products to those that provide ‘a pleasant relaxing holiday based around a general interest in nature and the environment’ (2005:475). This suggests that Tour Operators apply industrial location theory to gain comparative advantage of their product range, whereas the remotely located community must gain competitive advantage for their product to overcome the costs associated with remoteness. The crucial point to be made is that a price conscious market does not consume remotely located place sensitive products, and is able to substitute one price sensitive product for another, and still gain the sought after benefits.

Remotely located communities cannot survive in a price conscious marketplace, nor is there scope to provide community or locally owned development when the intensive levels of development demanded by a larger less specialised market, require equally intensive injections of capital. It was established in Chapter 2, that remote areas are dependent upon external capital flows to support development for a range of reasons including an inability to lever funds from their land assets, and their history of economic specialisation. The remote community must access and apply substantive knowledge that identifies the competitive advantage of their product and connect with the Tour Operators, who in turn connect with a segment of the market that demands the type of remote product on offer.

The Tour Operators are seeking to satisfy a broader and more general interest type of market that requires comfort in the form of intensely developed sites. Remote locations cannot support these markets in the absence of pre development conditions, and therefore a conflict between what the Tour Operators seek and the remote locales can provide, while also maintaining ownership and control will ensue. This remotely located case study community could retain control over the product by understanding its position within the market place and linking with Tour Operators who in turn target tourists seeking bird watching tourism products in a less developed setting. The results from this research highlighted the centrality of substantive knowledge about special interest tourism. The remotely located community cannot be a passive component within the system, and at the same time possess control and ownership of their product. Similarly, the Tour Operators are in existence to satisfy a large segment of a broad activity market, and do not have an allegiance to a
destination. Tour Operators decide which market segments to focus their products on in order to achieve their own company objectives, and cater to their potential client’s needs, rather than the needs of the destination (Trunfio 2006 et al).

Carson and Harwood (2007a) suggested that success for remotely located products is likely to be greater among markets with highly specialised interests, where there is lower substitutability of both activities and their settings. Creating a product to meet these market expectations can form a base for a viable tourism economy, which can then set up the infrastructure that can allow expansion into new markets (Carson and Harwood 2007a). The results from the bird watching survey further indicated that the highly specialised market were more likely than beginners to travel for the specific purpose of bird watching, and place a much higher level of importance on the activity relative to all other leisure activities. These highly specialised bird watchers also demanded less intensive forms of site development to facilitate their activity, and with slightly under two thirds of the market (63%) taking their bird watching holiday trips with an organised tour group, the Tour Operator remains fundamental to the survival of remotely located bird watching tourism products.

The relationship between the components of the Special Interest Tourism System i.e. the tourist, place characteristics, Tour Operator and the remotely located providers, becomes central to the survival of the product within the market place. The model presented in Chapter 4 (Figure 4.12) describes the components of the SIT system, but not the behaviour between the components, or the ability to predict how the components respond to changes in the behaviour of one of the system components. This case study found that the Tour Operators controlled the levers of demand as opposed to the local community, and that this in turn meant that the community were both vulnerable to, and highly dependent on, the Tour Operators for their ongoing survival in the market place.

8.5 Research Aim

To characterise the planning knowledge production process associated with alternative tourism in a remote area.

The planning knowledge production process is best described as adaptive. The governance structures respond and adapt to incorporate new types of development. The spatial development pattern adapts to incorporate tourism in the forms of
accommodation and the use of the land for bird watching. The community maintain control of the entity in respect to ensuring that the activity and any changes to the intensity of development are within the realms of appropriateness, and where inappropriate the product adapts to meet the norms. The product that is provided has been created to adapt to the predevelopment conditions (or lack thereof), and in doing so the meets the general requirements of bird watching tourism, but does not specifically target a particular skill based typology.

Unlike land use planning that is conducted in the UK, Canada, USA and Australia, this particular planning knowledge production process does not provide certainty to the developers, instead it provides the opportunity to incorporate new knowledge into the design of the tourism development and its product specifications. Similarly, this form of planning does not provide certainty to the community as the legal property system operates externally to the locale, and does not formally recognise or protect the planning and development decisions made by the community. The theoretical concepts of the analytical framework are discussed in turn.

Normative concepts:

Figure 8.4 illustrates the relationship between the three types of planning theory applied by the remote Arfakan community relative to the practice and an appropriateness evaluation. It was found that the normative theoretical concepts influenced every aspect of the planning knowledge production process as the norms represent the beliefs and values held by the community that are affected by the tourism development. None of the concepts applied by Taylor (2003) were applied by the Arfakan community. Of the remote area concepts identified by Markey et al (2006) community control and Lennon’s (2008) notion that development could not occur without pre development conditions rang true and loud for this community. Sustainable Development was important in so much as protecting a resource, but did not drive the process. Competitive advantage was not considered by the community or even the DTO, rather this was the responsibility of the ITO as they had the relationship with the bird watchers at the tourist generating regions. The process was place based from a spatial perspective and the governance structures reflected what it means to belong to this community.
**Procedural concepts:**

The process did not occur according to Reid’s conceptualisation of CBT, or for the purposes of community engagement or development. The process reflected the governance structures traditionally applied by the village when considering the development of land. The practice was heavily influenced by the past experience of the TG, and the evaluation of ‘appropriateness’ by members of the community (acting as either individuals or as a collective). Moreover, the practice was also influenced by the substantive knowledge provided by the Tour Operators such as bookings for the following season, which again triggered responses from the community after these changes were implemented.

**Substantive concepts:**

Figure 8.4 describes the relationship between the planning practice as an action, the evaluation of the practice and substantive knowledge. The source of substantive knowledge about bird watching tourism and tourists was gained from externally based entities i.e. the Tour Operators. The TG applied this knowledge in the creation
of the product which in turn influenced the spatial transformation of the locale. As there was no provision within the planning system to seek the responses of the community about an appropriate level of tourism development prior to the development materialising, an iterative and unpredictable relationship between practice, knowledge and social values ensued.

8.5.1 Summary of the applied planning knowledge production process
The analytical framework was used in this study to gain an insight into how a remote area community plans for alternative tourism within their locale, and the types of knowledge that they base their planning decisions upon. The framework permitted a coherent analysis of the application of theoretical concepts within the planning practice, which in turn described how knowledge was created, sourced and implemented in remote area alternative tourism planning. The results of the mixed methods research strategy concluded that planning decisions are based on the interpretation of the Tour Operators perceptions of market demands, and that the substantive knowledge about the type of bird watching tourism product to provide is generated within the community with little consideration of consumer preferences. Due to a lack of pre development conditions namely telecommunications, the community were unable to access independent substantive knowledge about bird watching tourism products in their decision making, and therefore relied heavily upon the Tour Operators in this respect. The bird watcher and Tour Operator surveys were used to examine the extent to which the community were able to predict and respond to demand issues. The results from these two surveys indicate that by accessing knowledge about place sensitive tourism products and how they can be differentiated within the market place, can assist remote area communities in making decisions about how to achieve competitive advantage for their product. This particular case study community were more concerned with how they would survive with tourism in the locale, than how the product would survive within the market place. The search for knowledge and its subsequent incorporation in the planning procedures, reflect the role of values in planning rather than economic rationalism. The case study community therefore did not consider the notion of competitive advantage or planning for the future beyond next years accommodation bookings. This invariably means that the results from the two surveys are largely irrelevant to how the community made decisions about their tourism product, and its survival in the market place.
8.6 Chapter Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to address the Research Aim and Research Objectives which in turn described the overall Planning Knowledge Production Process applied by the case study community. The research concluded that the normative theoretical concepts outlined in Chapter 2 were with the exception of community control, largely irrelevant to the process applied by Village #3. The planning procedure undertaken reflected the governance structure that allocates land uses, and is evaluated and amended according to the responses of individuals (or collectives) to decisions made by the TG to changes in product design.

CBT was described as a by product of spatial isolation, in that the focus of decision making is concentrated to the extent of the spatial territory that Village #3 identify with. CBT is limited in its ability to control the levers of demand because the habit of the community is to make decisions within its territorially bound unit, coupled with a dependence upon externally based Tour Operators for substantive knowledge about the market and to attract bird watchers to their locale. Planning as a form of CBT practice applied by Village #3 lacks a temporal perspective beyond the immediate, and as such created further vulnerabilities to external forces.

The range of substantive theoretical concepts applied in the process was influenced by traditions and past experiences; and the Tour Operators interpretation of tourist development preferences. The theoretical relationship between practice, knowledge and theory suggests that practice informs knowledge that in turn creates theory. However, the planning knowledge production process applied by Village #3 did not inform either the procedural or normative theoretical concepts (Figure 8.4). This may be attributed to the temporal horizon of the planning process (i.e. immediate focus) and the dependence upon external initiators of development.

The chapter concluded that the planning knowledge production process applied by Village #3 is best described as adaptive, flexible and place based. Whilst this has many benefits such as the ability to adapt the product to new knowledge, this approach does not address the long term and external threats to its ongoing survival within the market place.
Chapter 9
Conclusions with Implications for Planning and Tourism in Remote Areas

9.1 Introduction
The central purpose of this research has been to determine the theoretical concepts inherent to tourism planning in a remote area. The relationship between McConnell’s three types of planning theory and their conceptual bases was established from a review of planning and tourism literature and arranged to create a models based view of theory (Burch 2003). The models were used to guide the analysis of a remote area planning knowledge production process. The combination of models formed the analytical framework that provided the theoretical structure of the thesis with the intent to create a coherent body of planning knowledge for community based tourism in a remote area.

The normative theoretical planning concepts that underpin planning as a human activity in a general sense, and more specifically for remote areas, were identified to form the philosophical bases of the planning knowledge production process. The framework is predicated upon the notion that remoteness is a key determinant of planning theory and practice. The second stage of the framework established the procedural theoretical concepts related to a product that is consumed and produced in the same location, and the significance of geographical (place) characteristics in determining how a product may differentiate within a product range. The tourism literature was scrutinised for the planning procedures and theoretical concepts associated with the community based alternative to the supply of mass tourism products. The alternative tourism literature postulates that the market for these community based products is based upon the pursuit of a special interest. The centrality of the interest to the tourist, in addition to the role that specifiable setting attributes (described as place characteristics), play in relation to a bird watching tourism product and its associated range, was assembled to form the substantive knowledge bases of alternative tourism. The final stage of the analytical framework constructed a special interest tourism system that brought together the place characteristics associated with bird watching, the community, the industry and the tourist. The analytical framework was used to guide the analysis into how a real life remote area community in the Arfak Mountains of West Papua planned for and provided a bird watching tourism product.
The results of a survey of 714 bird watchers and 51 Tour Operators were analysed to conclude that there are a variety of place characteristics that are inherent to a bird watching tourism product and a variety that differentiate the product within the product range and its market place. The results further indicated that the differentiating characteristics of bird watching tourism such as hotel accommodation, reliable telecommunications and electricity to power appliances, are dependent upon the presence of pre development conditions such as electricity and communications infrastructure.

The results from Chapter 7 confirmed that the inherent place characteristics that describe a bird watching tourism product were present at Village #3, and that the bird watching tourism product differentiating characteristics were not. This in turn means that the Village are not differentiating their product within the global product range, and that the survival of the product is dependent upon the suitability of the site (intrinsic site characteristics) to facilitate the activity; and the actions of the Tour Operator(s) in attracting bird watchers to their site. The community were entirely dependent upon Tour operators as a source of knowledge about external demand preferences. At no time did the community seek feedback from the tourists to access a more direct understanding of their product relative to the demand preferences. This dependence upon the Tour Operators as an intermediary placed the Tour operator, as opposed to the community in control of the levers of demand.

The planning process applied by the Arfakan community was examined to describe how the community made the decisions about tourism development and what knowledge they based these decisions upon. The results from Chapter 7 identified the dominant normative theoretical planning concept as community control, described the planning process as adaptive with a concentration on the spatial territory as the bounds of its decision making; a dependence upon Tour Operators for market knowledge to base decisions upon and no consideration of the factors that contribute to its vulnerability to external forces.

The purpose of this chapter is to summarise the research findings and discuss the implications for planning for remote areas, alternative tourism as both the community based supply of and the special interest demand for products, and to make recommendations for future research.
The chapter is organised in six sections, the first of which includes this introduction. Section 9.2 reflects on the research method applied in this thesis, and how the design of the research strategy was influenced by my own Anglo American planning background. Section 9.3 discusses the need for a body of knowledge to be created that addresses the specific theory and practice requirements of planning in remote areas, and highlights the implications of applying generic normative planning theoretical concepts, as opposed to considering that spatial change can be guided by the norms specific to a locale. The most significant implication of a one size fits all approach to planning, is a mismatch between planning theory and the material consequences of planning (Yiftachel 2006). This mismatch highlights the need to accept and create new conceptualisations of planning that are not based on the material and political setting of urban based Anglo Americans, from which most planning theories emerge. This is in itself requires a new conceptualisation of location theories, and embracing as opposed to disparaging development, within planning to create planning models for remote areas.

Section 9.4 highlights the implications that postmodernism has had upon planning for tourism in a general sense, and specifically addresses the ideological notion of alternative tourism. This section specifically addresses CBT as alternative supply system and SIT as an alternative demand system. The results from this research indicate that community based tourism can occur as a by product of an informal property system (i.e. not statutory) that allows for community control, however this may occur at the expense of creating certainty for industry development. The market for alternative tourism was described in the literature as seeking special interest products. This research provided an insight to the special interest tourism system as it operates within a remote context, and concluded that the ability of the SIT product to differentiate within the market place is dependent upon the supply of predevelopment conditions such as governance and infrastructure. In the absence of these conditions, the presence and quality of the intrinsic site characteristics to supply the activity enables the product to remain within the product range, but only for as long as this product is not replicated within the locality. This in turn means that to posses some semblance of competitive advantage there can be only one provider that offers a specific product in the one remote location.

Section 9.5 provides recommendations for future research based on the findings from this thesis. Section 9.6 provides a concluding statement from the researcher
9.2 Reflections on the research method

The two surveys were initially designed to provide context to the decisions that the community made regarding the spatial transformation of their locale and to gain an understanding of the particular bird watching target market the locale was designed to cater to. However, the results did not produce the clear cut delineations that I was after. Upon reflection this desire for perfectly reliable information demonstrates a predilection of planners in justifying why a particular development option is preferred. In those instances where the preferred option cannot be rationally defended (particularly in a court of law), public confidence in decision making is lowered and the ability of the government or the private planning firm to make empirically sound decisions is questioned. I may have addressed the ‘planner’s fear of empiricism’ by seeking a rational justification of why a decision was made relative to a target market, but in doing so confirmed to myself that planning is about multiple realities. The empirical knowledge of demand preferences is one reality, the Tour Operators is another and planning for development involves the multiple realities of individuals within a community, which is rarely if ever, in harmony.

The knowledge gained from the two surveys was essentially irrelevant to the community in making decisions about development, as they depended entirely upon the few tour operators that came to the village as knowledge sources. There is no right or wrong in how the village make their decisions, it is just a different way to that applied in a typical Anglo American system. The process that the village applied reflects their reality and immediate needs. Just as the Anglo American system reflects a different set of realities.

The knowledge gained from the surveys used in combination with the analysis of how the activity transpires in a spatial sense served to reinforce that tourism planning is not about satisfying the visitors, but about satisfying the affected community and the providers (the tour operators and guide). In this particular instance, the results from the surveys confirmed Malczewsi’s (2004) assertion that there is a distinction between land cover and land use. Understanding the land cover attributes as place characteristics enables the identification of development potential. However the data about the level of development (land use) to facilitate the stay then becomes the focus of tourism planning as a decision making process. At present the Anglo
American approach to tourism planning does not focus on land use planning methods to identify the suitable land cover attributes for a leisure activity. Instead the system focuses on land use as a form of accommodation to regulate development. This enquiry into a very different planning system enabled me the opportunity to reflect on the notion of planning. My conclusion is that planning has evolved in the Anglo American system to regulate and protect the established order, whereas the adaptive system that the Arfakan village used, provided the opportunity for the community to stop a development from operating irrespective of the planning approvals that had been granted.

In sum the research methods applied reflected my own professional biases that have been formed through working in a highly regulated planning system, and are confirmed through a certification process that the planning professional body requires of practicing planners in Australia. While the data collected was of no relevance to the Arfakan village it did possess utility in advancing the discourse of tourism planning generally, and remote areas specifically. The following sections highlight the nature of these advances.

9.3 Planning for Remote Areas: Theory and Practice

This research demonstrated that improved transport infrastructure in the absence of a property system and future settlement pattern did not improve development opportunities for a remote community. However this improved accessibility will improve the opportunities for externally based resource industries that are dependent upon lower transport costs as the basis of their comparative strategies.

For while ever the property system serves the interests of the urban based state or the resources sector, remote localities will remain underdeveloped and the core periphery model for development will apply. A fundamentally new conceptualisation of planning in remote areas is essential. This new conceptualisation should be:

- based on theoretical concepts that are inherent to a remote location and the socio political norms of the society inhabiting the remote locale;
- capable of proactively identifying development opportunities and the associated competitive advantage of a product within a globalised market;
- place based; and
- described in terms of a planning system and temporal horizon that is able to predict and adapt to knowledge and technology as it becomes available.
The following observations regarding remote area planning theory and planning practices are discussed briefly in turn.

9.3.1 Planning Theoretical Concepts
This thesis demonstrated that remoteness is a complex phenomenon. Remoteness is exacerbated by physical accessibility, but not dependent upon transport infrastructure to gain access to the global market place. To understand the notion of remoteness requires a coherent body of knowledge that systematically creates theories about how and why places are remote to distinguish how these differ from urban locations. These types of theories would be described as substantive in so much as they would describe ‘what’ a remote area is, the opportunities that they posses, and development opportunities that can be created or denied through policy intervention.

The planning system applied in a locale whether formal or informal represents a belief system that is a complex interplay between normative and procedural theoretical concepts that are specific to a region or geopolitical locale. This research demonstrated that the normative and procedural theoretical concepts that emerged from the literature reviewed in Chapters 2, 3 and 4 does not bear significance for Village #3. The normative concepts that referred to how a community ought to participate in decision making are relevant to Anglo American societies, and the legal systems that protect the established order within these societies. Other societies and localities will have entirely different realities and more pressing issues to contend with, which will invariably invoke and apply different sets of norms to guide their planning processes.

9.3.2 Proactively identifying development opportunities
The relationship between secure property rights and social control is not specifically addressed in the literature. According to Wadley and Smith (1998) this is attributed to postmodernist planning theory that typically disparages development. Planning for remote areas requires a planning knowledge production process that creates planning theory to enable a wide range of development opportunities to be identified. These types of theories would involve the analysis of the physical attributes associated with the land cover and matching these with the external demand. At present external entities identify development opportunities in a haphazard manner
that is contingent upon commodity cycles, with development approved as a reaction to external pressures, rather than in accordance with a place based strategic plan.

Identifying development opportunities requires substantive knowledge of a broad range of development types. This research demonstrated that to gain the level of detail necessary to make decisions about the manipulation of the land cover requires an in depth knowledge of the activity. Describing tourism as an accommodation type provides a regulatory planning mechanism to control the established order, rather than proactively identifying what type of tourism (i.e. which activity at what intensity) the territory can gain competitive advantage for. Urban planning systems focus on regulating development, and planning theory has been created to deal with these regulatory processes as practice. Remote areas require development opportunities to be identified, and therefore require theory and practice to guide the identification of opportunities and decision making procedures that enable the information from which to select the option that best suits the people of the development affected territory.

However the fundamental pre development condition to enabling a place based approach to the identification of development is access to a formal property system, and local ownership of the land cover and its attributes. Planning is predicated upon controlling the forces that impact upon the future and in the absence of local ownership there is no ability to control the future. The future for remote areas is thereby owned, controlled and planned by external entities in the absence of a formal property system.

9.3.3 Planning is value laden
Planning in the formal and legal sense clarifies land use rights. These rights are protected and enshrined in law (McConnell 1981). Accordingly, the invocation of rights tends to be part of a conservative form of justice to protect the established order within society as opposed to reformative justice that aims to change the social order (McConnell 1981). The property system within the Arfak Mountains does not aim to protect an established order or predetermined future, and in doing so allows societal control over the rights associated with land when the rights infringe upon the social values of the affected community.

Planning requires knowledge about the community value system to delineate the boundaries between appropriate and inappropriate development. It was the value system that possessed the greatest influence in securing the long term prospects of
the tourism development within the Arfak village. Due to an absence of accessible substantive knowledge on the use of land for tourism, the decision making process had not evolved to pre-empt impacts of the use on the value system. As a result, the development has no certainty for growth in to the future, nor was there an ability to identify and plan for future tourism development opportunities.

9.3.4 Identifying competitive advantage and controlling the levers of demand
The results from this research suggested that gaining competitive advantage for a special interest tourism product is dependent upon pre development conditions to differentiate the product within its range. In the absence of these pre development conditions, gaining competitive advantage would be dependent upon being the sole supplier of access to a unique set of intrinsic site characteristics that provide for the special interest. Moreover, having the control over or ownership of access to these intrinsic site characteristics requires a formalised property system that recognises traditional land tenure systems.

9.3.5 The Analytical Framework
This research investigated the application of characteristics theory which was well suited to special interest tourism. Other types of development will require the conceptualisation of theories that enable the identification and quantification of the attributes of the locality to supply remotely located products, or components of products. Identifying development opportunities requires the creation of substantive knowledge on the identification and quantification of demanded attributes within an industry based system. In making the examination of bird watching tourism products, this thesis undertook to gain an understanding of the special interest product by positioning the product within a system that considered the place characteristics, the consumer, the tour operator and the community to understand the product relative to all other components within the SIT system.

The revised remote area planning knowledge production process outlined in Figure 9.1 suggests that substantive knowledge is essential to inform normative and procedural theories, in addition to supporting the planning practice that is actually undertaken. Substantive planning theories are created both within and external to a planning knowledge production process. Yet the normative and procedural planning theories are inextricably bound to each other and the planning system that they operate within. The relationship between all types of planning theories and the planning practice could be greatly enhanced through an integration of practice with
theoretical refinement. This integration can only occur where practice is explicitly established to apply theory, and where the theory is robust enough to withstand scrutiny in a planning practice. While Friedmann talks of the planning crisis as a crisis of knowing (Friedmann 1987:312, in Harper and Stein 2006) that reflects a deeper underlying crisis within society, the analysis of the relationship between the theoretical concepts and the practice undertaken by Village #3 suggests that the planning crisis may be in part due to the existence of an incoherent body of planning knowledge. This crisis can only be exacerbated where the normative and procedural theories associated with postmodernism fail to incorporate substantive knowledge that can at times appear to have rational and empirical undertones. When applied to a remote area the mismatch between theory and practice is inevitable not only because the remote area lacks predevelopment conditions with which to create development opportunities, but because postmodern planning disparages development generally and the substantive knowledge about specific forms of development.

Figure 9.1
Revised Remote Area Planning Knowledge Production Process

9.4 Alternative Tourism
The concepts that have been used in the literature to describe alternative tourism were examined for their application in the Arfak Mountain case study. The results from this research suggest that alternative tourism is a postmodernist notion that contrasts a type of development to the least desired forms of mass or industrial
tourism. The major failing of the notion of alternative tourism is that it lacks a coherent body of knowledge that links theory to practice.

The concepts inherent to CBT in the form of a planning practice, community engagement or as community development were not applied by the case study community. These theoretical notions reflect an entirely different reality from that experienced by Village #3. Moreover, the limitations posed by a lack of predevelopment conditions caused the scale and intensity of development to be described as alternative. If the village had access to infrastructure and governance structures they may have created a ‘mass’ product that was capable of differentiating and attracting a larger size market.

The body of knowledge that currently describes alternative tourism is not capable of explaining tourism in remote areas, or in regions of the world that do not experience liberalism as a constitutional order. Therefore alternative tourism has limited applications, and in its current form is not capable of rigorous examination outside of the urban Anglo American context. Planning for alternative tourism could in the first instance benefit from a conceptualisation of tourism as a land use. This would entail a shift of focus upon describing tourism as a type of accommodation, to one that examines the suitability of a locale for activity based tourism e.g. bird watching, four wheel driving, fishing etc.

9.4.1 Alternative tourism as CBT
This research expanded upon the procedural and substantive planning knowledge of the concepts of community based tourism and special interest tourism. Village #3 demonstrated an entirely different conceptualisation of community based tourism from that described in the literature. While Village #3 possessed the control over the operation of the enterprise, they did so because the planning system had not evolved to a point where the ‘rights’ associated with land became statutory and therefore more enduring than the society’s value system. The community retained social control over development that occurs within the territorial bounds of their locale. However they remained vulnerable to the interpretation of consumer preferences by tour operators and to the legal owners of the land.

Simpson (2008) questioned the necessity of community participation, ownership and control in the delivery of benefits from tourism. The results from this research suggest that there would be limited benefits or distribution thereof without social
control. Moreover, in this case study land can only be allocated to a kin of the LO and therefore ownership is contingent upon being a community member. In this instance local ownership is a prerequisite of development. With regards to participation, Village #1 and #2 demonstrated that while they were not able to participate in decision making about land use, they retained the control in determining whether the development continued its operation within the village locale. This control was entirely dependent on the perceptions of the benefit distribution within the community.

It would therefore appear from this example that it is essential to have community participation, ownership and control in the delivery of benefits to a community from tourism. However, this statement is made with the following preface ‘that the community can make decisions about what to supply, the expected benefits and subsequent distribution once they understand what it is that the consumer is seeking from the tourism product’. The community can own, control and participate in tourism till their hearts content, but this does not deliver a product that is any more competitive than another within a marketplace. Achieving competitive advantage requires substantive knowledge from which to base commercial decisions upon.

CBT as a theoretical planning procedure is associated with postmodernism, favours aspects of social control at the expense of substantive knowledge regarding tourism development, and as a consequence its procedures fail to address how to create viable development opportunities. Tourism is a form of development that generates wealth, and planning is about the distribution of wealth. Planning for tourism alternative or otherwise, is therefore concerned with the generation of wealth and the subsequent distribution of benefits.

9.4.2 Alternative tourism as SIT
The tourism market for remote areas is based on tourists pursuing a special interest. Despite the literature maintaining that these skill typologies differentiated the market and thus the product, multiple regressions using skill level as the independent variable did not derive distinct products or typologies.

The research found that there were very few significant statistical differences across all four skill based market typologies in terms of its land cover requirements. This indicates that a range of skill levels visit remote areas to participate in the activity, but does not explain the purchase decision making process that is associated with a
remote located product. Brotherton and Himmetoglu (1997) mention in their SIT characterisation that ‘travel experience’ may influence the selection of a destination. This infers that the more experienced traveller possess skills to travel to places that are not specifically designed for tourism. The application of recreation specialisation theory describes the activity setting preferences, but not the purchase decisions associated with remotely located tourism products. This finding highlights the need for tourism theories to be developed within the field of leisure that focus on the commercial aspects of consumer demand for leisure products. Trauer’s leisure Tourism Interest Cycle (Figure 4.3) could form the basis of the theoretical progression from recreationalist to special interest tourist, if it were capable of explaining the different purchase decisions associated with a specific activity.

9.5 Directions for Further Research

This research focused on planning for community based tourism in a remote area and provided an insight in to the remote area planning knowledge production process that a remote community applied in spatially transforming their locale. However, several concepts have been examined in this thesis that are worthy of further investigation. These are discussed in turn.

9.5.1 Planning for development in Remote Areas

Markey et al (2006) maintained that the misapplication of urban strategies to remote areas is an impediment to development in remote areas. This research supports this observation and found that this misapplication is attributed to a mismatch of normative and procedural planning theoretical concepts which in turn influenced the application of substantive theoretical concepts. Remote locales are different to urban areas, and as such require the creation of a distinct body of knowledge that reflects these unique qualities.

9.5.2 Community Based Tourism

As a planning procedure, community based tourism fails to acknowledge the importance of market data in making decisions about development in a community. The community are not the consumers of the product, and as such the process needs to reflect the global nature of tourism. Further case study research that examines the relationship between planning theoretical concepts and its consequences, may assist in understanding the relationship between knowledge and action.
9.5.3 Special Interest Tourism
This research found that the application of recreation specialisation theory did not identify distinct and statistically reliable products or typologies. These may be identified from an application of consumer demand theory to special interests. This research showed that for the purpose of planning for bird watching, the application of characteristics theory allowed the identification of important place characteristics, but did not identify the variables underpinning development preferences for accommodation. In the absence of this data, communities and developers will make decisions to suit their own condition and needs; however it would be of a commercial benefit to add value to these decisions based on substantive knowledge of market preferences.

9.6 Concluding Statement
As a planner I found that the investigation of the planning practices undertaken by Village #3 within the analytical framework assisted in developing my understanding of planning. I have been trained as a planner according do the Anglo American system and while I intuitively felt that the planning system is unsuitable for application to remote areas, I was unable to identify precisely why it was unsuitable. Deconstructing a planning system according to theory and practice provided an insight to the purpose of planning, but more importantly an insight in to planning as an evolutionary process, that reflects the complexity or in this case the simplicity of highly specialised economic platforms associated with the plan area.

A pragmatic inquiry in to a planning practice allows for the reflective integration and synthesis of knowledge that enables an understanding of how to successfully translate knowledge into action. The analytical framework created for this research permitted a pragmatic inquiry into a planning practice. From this specific inquiry the mismatch between planning theoretical concepts and the material consequences of planning was identified as it related to a remote area. In sum, this research highlighted the failings of the Anglo American urban based planning system to be overly insular, disparaging of development and emphasises procedure at the expense of substantive knowledge about development. This fear of substantive theory is attributed to a fear of modernism or empiricism (Harper and Stein 2006). Yet planning irrespective of whether formal or informal is about wealth creation and benefit distribution (Wadley and Smith 1999), and as such requires substantive knowledge about development and its impacts. The revised planning knowledge
production process (Figure 9.1) clearly demonstrates the critical and fundamental role that substantive knowledge plays in the creation of a coherent body of planning knowledge. More importantly this research also found that remotely located communities do not have access to a range of predevelopment conditions, and as such face significant impediments to making informed decisions about achieving competitive advantage in the absence of substantive knowledge about development, and as a consequence the ability to control the levers of demand also decreases.

Finally, the creation of place based planning strategies whereby the land cover and emotional attachment that the inhabitants have to the land, appears to me to offer the starting point for the remote area planning framework. This approach would explicitly acknowledge the norms of the residents and the procedures currently in place for making decisions. However, the fundamental step in improving development opportunities for remote locations is about making informed decisions about what to supply. These decisions are dependent upon the creation of substantive planning theories that enable the identification of development potential and an understanding of market demand for the range of goods and services available at a remote locale.
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APPENDIX 1
Bird Watcher Survey
This research is being led by Sharon Harwood, a Doctorate student at Charles Darwin University, Northern Territory, Australia. The study aims to increase knowledge about bird watching tourism generally, and to see if a model can be developed to identify and measure the markets for community based tourism in West Papua.

This PhD project is funded by a CSC/NT Government IT Enabled Environmental Post Graduate Scholarship.

This research is a PhD project part funded by the Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre, established by the Australian Commonwealth Government.
RESEARCH PROTOCOL: Planning for bird watching tourism

You have been invited to participate in a study on bird watching tourism. This research is being led by Sharon Harwood, a Doctorate student from Charles Darwin University, in the Northern Territory Australia. The study aims to increase knowledge about bird watching tourism generally, and to see if a model can be developed to identify and measure the potential markets for West Papua. The bird watching destination that I am most interested in for my research is West Papua.

Procedures to be followed:
In undertaking this research I am required to follow a research protocol. The attached survey contains questions covering topics such as those listed below. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. No names or identification will be required. Your responses to the survey will be anonymous.

Participant selection:
You have been randomly selected to participate in this survey as a subscriber to the Wingspan magazine. Birds Australia has considered this survey and finds it to comply with its Privacy Policy.

Your right to the privacy and the security of records:
The original completed surveys will be kept in a locked and secure place at Charles Darwin University. The digital information will be kept under locked and secure conditions at the researchers place of residence. At no times will your identity be revealed as no names or identification are required as part of this study.

Responsibilities of the Researcher:
Any information that is obtained from this study will be used in aggregate form to describe bird watching tourism.

Responsibilities of the Participant:
It would be appreciated if your answers reflect your own opinion and not those of any one else.

Information Sought:
The survey will be seeking information about:
- Your bird watching experience and skills
- Information about your bird watching trips
- What motivates you to undertake bird watching holiday trips
- Preferred bird watching site characteristics
- Your perceptions of West Papua
- Some information about you such as age, education, gender, occupation and where you live.

Inquiries: If you have any questions regarding this research please contact:
Researcher Details
Sharon Harwood
PhD Student
PO Box 44
Mareeba Queensland 4880
Australia
Ph: + 61 7 4092 375
sharon.harwood@cdu.edu.au

If you have any concerns before commencing, during or after the completion of the survey, you are invited to contact the Executive Officer of the Charles Darwin University, Human Research Ethics Committee on + 61 8 8946 6708 or by email fiona.steel@cdu.edu.au. The Executive Officer can pass on any concerns to appropriate officers within the University. The principal supervisor of the research student is Dr Richard Noske, you can contact him on + 61 8 8946 6359 or by email richard.noske@cdu.edu.au.
Section 1. Your bird watching experience

1. How many years have you been participating in bird watching? ________ years

2. Please circle the response that best describes how you would rate your skill level in bird watching?

Beginner Intermediate Advanced Expert

3. In comparison to all activities that you participate in your leisure time, how important is bird watching to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. When you take holidays, do you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Take holidays specifically to go bird watching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Incorporate bird watching when on holidays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Travel specifically to see a particular bird that you have not seen before</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Do you have a list of birds that you intend to view over your lifetime?

No

Yes 5. (a) How many species are included in this list? __________(number of birds)

5. (b) Are any of the following birds included in this list?

- Buff tailed sicklebill
- Magnificent bird of paradise
- Red bird of paradise
- Wilsons bird of paradise
- Vogelkop bowerbird
- Biak paradise kingfisher
- Biak red lorry
- Long tailed paradigalla
- Biak monarch
- Waigeo brush turkey
- Arfak astrapia
- Western parotia

Section 2. The remainder of this survey asks you to refer to bird watching holiday trips, by this I mean those trips that are away from your home for at least one night, and are undertaken specifically for the purposes of bird watching.

1. How many bird watching holiday trips have you taken in the last 5 years? _______ trips

1a. How many of these took place overseas?______________

2. What types of bird watching habitats have you or would you like to take a bird watching holiday in? Please tick the response that applies to the habitat type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat Type</th>
<th>I have taken a bird watching holiday trip in this habitat type</th>
<th>I would like to go to this type of habitat for a bird watching holiday trip</th>
<th>I am not interested in going to this habitat type for a bird watching holiday trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beach/coastal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote Rainforest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savanna/woodlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deserts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangroves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Thinking back to all of the bird watching holiday trips that you have undertaken in the past 5 years, were these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of an organised tour group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent travel that is, not with an organised tour group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. What do you think is an acceptable size for a bird watching tour group or travel party, when you take your bird watching holiday trips?

1 – 4  5 – 8  9 – 12  13 – 20  21 + people

5. In the last 12 months how many bird watching holiday trips in each of the following length categories have you taken?

____ trips of 1 - 2 nights   ____ trips of 3 - 6 nights   ____ trips of 7 - 13 nights

____ trips of 14 - 20 nights   ____ trips of 21 + nights

6. Tick the box that best describes the type of landscape where you experienced your most recent bird watching holiday:

☐ City/Urban: Built and developed landscape, highly accessible by airports and freeways. Wide range of facilities available.

☐ Countryside/Rural: A rural landscape with built structures and facilities restricted to towns and farms.

☐ Remote and Rugged: Entirely natural landscape far from suburbs and cleared farmlands. No built structures or facilities.

Section 3 Reasons for taking bird watching holidays

How important are each of the following reasons for deciding where to take your bird watching holiday trips.

1  2  3  4  5
Not at all Important  Slightly Important  Moderately Important  Very Important  Extremely Important

To see birds that I have not seen before .................. 1  2  3  4  5
To avoid the unexpected........................................ 1  2  3  4  5
To have others know that I have been there............... 1  2  3  4  5
To chance dangerous situations............................. 1  2  3  4  5
To be alone.......................................................... 1  2  3  4  5
To learn about the conservation of bird species......... 1  2  3  4  5
To do something with the family........................... 1  2  3  4  5
To compete with other bird watchers..................... 1  2  3  4  5
To be away from crowds of people........................ 1  2  3  4  5
To be with others who enjoy the same things........... 1  2  3  4  5
To experience the sights, sounds and smells of nature.............................. 1  2  3  4  5
To improve my birding skills and abilities.............. 1  2  3  4  5
To be where things are pristine and natural.............. 1  2  3  4  5
To escape daily routines........................................ 1  2  3  4  5
To be the first bird watcher there........................ 1  2  3  4  5
To release or reduce tension.................................. 1  2  3  4  5
To promote the conservation and preservation of birding habitats.............................. 1  2  3  4  5
To view the natural scenery.................................. 1  2  3  4  5
To test my birding skills and abilities.................... 1  2  3  4  5
To help others develop their bird watching skills..... 1  2  3  4  5
To add a bird species to my list............................ 1  2  3  4  5
To experience peace and quiet.............................. 1  2  3  4  5
To gain respect from other bird watchers............... 1  2  3  4  5
To escape urban areas......................................... 1  2  3  4  5
To photograph birds.......................................... 1  2  3  4  5
To give my mind a rest........................................ 1  2  3  4  5
To see the largest number of new and different bird species in the most cost effective manner........... 1  2  3  4  5
Other (Please specify).......................................... 1  2  3  4  5
Section 4. Site Characteristics

Please use the following Importance scale in Section 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. When you go on a bird watching holiday trip, **how important** are the following technologies to your holiday experience?

- Mobile phone: 
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Video recorder/Video Camcorder to film birds:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Digital Camera to photograph birds:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Personal Digital Assistant to access emails, phone calls and SMS:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Satellite phone:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Portable computer (tablet/laptop):
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Global Positioning System to record location of sightings:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Personal Digital Assistant (e.g. palm pilot) interactive field guide:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- iPod loaded with bird songs:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Video capable iPod to play audio visual field guide:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Digiscope for close up viewing and photography:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Other sources (please specify):
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

2. When you go on bird watching holiday trips, **how important is it to participate** in the following:

- Swimming:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Photography:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Museum:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Fishing:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Boating:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Golf:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Shopping:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

3. When you make your decision about **where to stay** while on your bird watching holiday trips, how important are the following **standards in accommodation**:

- Self catering facilities:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Hot water for washing:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Space for privacy:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Local style meals:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Electricity to power appliances:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Safe drinking water:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Familiar food:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Sewerage (toilet/rest room) system:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Rubbish removal:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Internet connection:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Mobile phone reception:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important

- Comfortable bed:
  - 1: Not at all important
  - 2: Slightly important
  - 3: Moderately important
  - 4: Very important
  - 5: Extremely important
Section 4. Site Characteristics (continued)

4. When you make your decision about where to go for a bird watching holiday, **how important** are the following:

**Diversity of Flora:**
- Trees... 1 2 3 4 5
- Orchids... 1 2 3 4 5
- Palms... 1 2 3 4 5

**Diversity of Fauna:**
- Mammals... 1 2 3 4 5
- Reptiles and Amphibians... 1 2 3 4 5
- Butterflies and other insects... 1 2 3 4 5

**Rare and Endemic birds:** 1 2 3 4 5

**Landscape features:**
- Mountainous landscapes... 1 2 3 4 5
- Pristine landscape and vistas... 1 2 3 4 5
- Creeks and rivers... 1 2 3 4 5

**Interaction with Locals:**
- Able to attend cultural events and ceremonies... 1 2 3 4 5
- To learn more about the local traditions and belief system... 1 2 3 4 5
- Able to buy local crafts... 1 2 3 4 5

**Visitor Facilities:**
- A visitor centre that provides information about birds and wildlife... 1 2 3 4 5
- Hides dispersed throughout the site... 1 2 3 4 5
- Hotel accommodation to stay overnight... 1 2 3 4 5
- You can take a driving tour... 1 2 3 4 5
- The site has formed walking paths... 1 2 3 4 5
- Camp grounds and picnic facilities... 1 2 3 4 5
- Eating facilities are nearby... 1 2 3 4 5
- Guides or rangers are available on site... 1 2 3 4 5
- The site contains signs identifying plants... 1 2 3 4 5
- Huts/cottages style accommodation... 1 2 3 4 5

**Destination Infrastructure:**
- The site has sealed roads... 1 2 3 4 5
- Hospital is within 2 hours drive... 1 2 3 4 5
- Reliable telecommunications... 1 2 3 4 5
- Airport is within 2 hours drive... 1 2 3 4 5

---

How **acceptable** are the following **other site land uses** to you when you chose a destination to go bird watching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Acceptable</th>
<th>Slightly Acceptable</th>
<th>Moderately Acceptable</th>
<th>Very Acceptable</th>
<th>Extremely Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farming is practised on site</strong>...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logging and forestry is practised on site</strong>...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hunting is permitted on site</strong>...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A local community is close by</strong>...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preservation of the natural environment</strong>...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial development is near the site yet can't be seen</strong>...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Show which of the following ten site characteristics (refer to previous 2 pages) you feel are the most and least important in deciding where to go on your bird watching holiday trip, by putting a '10' in the box for the most important, '9' for the second most important and so on until you have ranked all 10 site characteristics down to 1 being the least important site characteristic.

**USE EACH NUMBER within the range of 10 down to 1 ONCE ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Site characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other non bird watching activities near by or at site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards of accommodation at destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity of flora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity of fauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rare and endemic birds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction with locals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visitor facilities on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Destination infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other on site land uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 5. What about West Papua?**
West Papua is located on the Western half of the island of New Guinea and is a province of Indonesia. The province has recently been renamed West Papua, and was previously known as Irian Jaya. It is a relatively undeveloped region of the world and contains a large number of rare and unique bird species.

1. Have you been to West Papua for the purpose of bird watching?
   - No
   - Yes

2. What are your perceptions of the Indonesian province of West Papua as a bird watching holiday destination:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   - Tourists are welcomed by residents. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - High standards of accommodation available. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - Limited range of non birding tourist attractions. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - Province provides for authentic cultural experiences. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - Bird watching sites are easily accessed by transport networks. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - The province is not safe for tourists. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - Quick and efficient tourist visa application procedures. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - Transport to the province is poorly connected to the rest of the world. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - High value for money bird watching experiences. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - There are better places to see higher numbers of endemic bird species. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - Adequate medical facilities are available. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - Low levels of flora and fauna biodiversity. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - Pristine landscapes. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - Able to see large number of birds in short period of time. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - Limited telecommunications network. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - Bird watching experiences in West Papua are extraordinary and unique. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - Big distances separate bird watching sites. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - Politically stable. NA 1 2 3 4 5
   - Residents do not speak English. NA 1 2 3 4 5

3. Do you intend to visit West Papua for bird watching in the coming 5 years?
   - No
   - Not sure
   - Yes
4. Do you intend to visit other remote rainforests for bird watching within the coming 5 years?
   □ No
   □ Not sure
   □ Yes specifically which country and where________________________________________________________

Section 6 Questions about You

Finally, in this last section I am seeking some information about you

1. What **year were you born?** __________

2. What **country** do you normally live in? ____________________

3. What is your **occupation**? If retired what was your occupation **prior to retirement**?
   ________________

4. What is your **gender**?
   Male       Female

5. What is your highest level of **schooling**?
   Primary
   Secondary
   Tertiary
   Other ____________________

Thank you for sharing your impressions on bird watching. Your assistance is greatly appreciated. The following space is provided for any additional comments that you may wish to make.

_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________

Please return your completed questionnaire in the reply paid envelope attached on the front page of the form. If the envelope has been mislaid, please forward to:

Survey Response
Reply Paid 44
Mareeba Qld 4880
Australia
APPENDIX 2
Web based version of
Tour Operator Survey
Section 1. Your Organisation

1. The following scale describes bird watching skill levels from beginner to advanced. Please circle the skill level that best describes your company’s target market.

- Beginner
- Intermediate
- Advanced
- Expert

2. How many years has your company been in operation?

3. Approximately how many bird watching tourists did your company have in the last year?

4. Approximately how many tours did you conduct last year?

5. In the last 12 months how many bird watching trips has your company taken in each of the following length categories?

- 0 trips of 1-2 nights
- 0a trips of 3-6 nights
- 0 trips of 7-13 nights
- 0 trips of 14-20 nights
- 0 trips of 21+ nights

6. In the last 12 months how many bird watching holiday trips has your company taken in each of the group size categories?

- 0a 1 - 4
- 0 5 - 8
- 0 9 - 12
- 0 13 – 20
- 0 21 + people

7. Has your company participated in or achieved certification for its tour products eg. quality assurance, tourism/eco-tourism certification?

- No
- Yes, if yes which program

8. Does your company have a formalised and written policy to manage the behaviour of tourists and employees to ensure cultural sensitivity and the protection of birding habitats?

- No
- Yes
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9. What services does your company provide bird watchers?

Please tick the boxes that apply:

- [ ] Guide services
- [ ] Booking services for other bird watching tour organisations
- [ ] Own and/or operate accommodation for bird watchers
- [ ] Develop, organise and guide bird watching tours
- [ ] Flights to a bird watching destination
- [ ] Internal flights and transfers within a bird watching destination
- [ ] Own and/or possess exclusive rights to access a bird habitat
- [ ] Other, please specify

10. Which countries do you provide these services in

11. Using the following scale, how important are the following information and communication methods and technologies to your business operations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Personal contact
- Web page/internet
- Word of mouth
- Mobile phone
- Land line telephone
- Fax
- Written letters via the postal service
- On line banking and payment services
- Email
- Other
12. How important are the following technologies to your clients while on bird watching trips?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video recorder/Video Camcorder to film birds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Camera to photograph birds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Digital Assistant to access emails, phone calls and SMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable computer (tablet/laptop)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Positioning System to record location of sightings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Digital Assistant (eg. palm pilot) interactive field guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPod loaded with bird songs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video capable iPod to play audio visual field guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digiscope for close up viewing and photography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sources (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 2. Site Characteristics

Please indicate by circling the appropriate number, how Important each of the following site characteristics are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How important is it to your clients to participate in the following activities while on your tours?

- **Swimming**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Photography**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Museum**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Fishing**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Boating**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Golf**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Shopping**: 1 2 3 4 5

2. When you make your decision about where to stay for your bird watching tours, how important are the following standards in accommodation?

- **Self catering facilities**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Hot water for washing**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Space for privacy**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Local style meals**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Electricity to power appliances**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Safe drinking water**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Familiar food**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Sewerage (toilet/rest room) system**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Rubbish removal**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Internet connection**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Mobile phone reception**: 1 2 3 4 5
- **Comfortable bed**: 1 2 3 4 5
3. When you make the decision about which place to use as your birding destination, how important are the following?

**Diversity of flora:**
- Trees: 1 2 3 4 5
- Orchids: 1 2 3 4 5
- Palms: 1 2 3 4 5

**Diversity of Fauna:**
- Mammals: 1 2 3 4 5
- Reptiles and Amphibians: 1 2 3 4 5
- Butterflies and other insects: 1 2 3 4 5

**Rare and/or endemic birds:**
- 1 2 3 4 5

**Landscape features:**
- Mountainous landscapes: 1 2 3 4 5
- Pristine landscape and vistas: 1 2 3 4 5
- Creeks and rivers: 1 2 3 4 5

**Interaction with locals:**
- Opportunity to attend cultural events and ceremonies: 1 2 3 4 5
- Opportunity to learn more about the local traditions and belief system: 1 2 3 4 5
- Opportunity to buy local crafts: 1 2 3 4 5

**Visitor Facilities:**
- A visitor centre that provides information about birds and wildlife: 1 2 3 4 5
- Bird hides: 1 2 3 4 5
- Hotel accommodation to stay overnight: 1 2 3 4 5
- You can take a driving tour: 1 2 3 4 5
- The site has formed walking paths: 1 2 3 4 5
- Camp grounds and picnic facilities: 1 2 3 4 5
- Eating facilities are nearby: 1 2 3 4 5
- Guides or rangers are available on site: 1 2 3 4 5
- The site contains signs identifying plants: 1 2 3 4 5
- Huts/cottages style accommodation: 1 2 3 4 5

**Destination Infrastructure:**
- The site has sealed roads: 1 2 3 4 5
- Hospital is within 2 hours drive: 1 2 3 4 5
- Reliable telecommunications: 1 2 3 4 5
- Airport is within 2 hours drive: 1 2 3 4 5
4. How acceptable are the following other site land uses to your company when it chooses a destination to go bird watching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farming is practised on site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logging and forestry is practised on site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting is permitted on site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A local community is close by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of the natural environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial development is near the site yet can't be seen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Show which of the following ten site characteristics you feel are the most and least important in deciding where your company will go for its bird watching tours. Place a ‘10’ in the box for the most important, ‘9’ for the second most important and so on until you have ranked all 10 site characteristics down to 1 being the least important site characteristic.

**Use Each Number (1-10) Once Only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Site Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>Other non bird watching activities near by or at site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Standards of accommodation at destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>Diversity of flora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Diversity of fauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>Rare and/or endemic birds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>Landscape features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>Interaction with locals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>Visitor facilities on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>Destination Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>Other on site land uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3. What about West Papua?  

West Papua is located on the Western half of the island of New Guinea and is a province of Indonesia. The province has recently been renamed West Papua, and was previously known as Irian Jaya. It is a relatively undeveloped region of the world and contains a large number of rare and unique bird species.

1. Has your company been to West Papua for the purpose of bird watching?
   - Yes
   - No

2. What are your perceptions of the Indonesian province of West Papua as a bird watching tourism destination:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   - Tourists are welcomed by residents
   - High standards of accommodation available
   - Limited range of non birding tourist attractions
   - Province provides for authentic cultural experiences
   - Bird watching sites are easily accessed by transport networks
   - The province is not safe for tourists
   - Quick and efficient tourist visa application procedures
   - Transport to the province is poorly connected to the rest of the world
   - High value for money bird watching experiences
   - There are better places to see higher numbers of endemic bird species
   - Adequate medical facilities are available
   - Low levels of flora and fauna biodiversity
   - Pristine landscapes
   - Able to see large number of birds in short period of time
   - Limited telecommunications network
   - Bird watching experiences in West Papua are extraordinary and unique
   - Big distances separate bird watching sites
   - Politically stable
   - Residents do not speak English

3. Do you intend to visit West Papua for bird watching in the coming 5 years?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not Sure
4. Do you intend to visit other remote rainforests for bird watching within the coming 5 years?

☐ Yes, If yes which Country ☐ No ☐ Not Sure

Section 4. Questions About You

Finally, in this last section I am seeking some information about you

1. What year were you born?

2. What country do you normally live in?

3. What is your position within the organisation?

4. What is your gender? ☐ Male ☐ Female

5. What is your highest level of schooling?

☐ Primary ☐ Secondary ☐ Tertiary ☐ Other:

Thank you for sharing your time and impressions on bird watching. Your assistance is greatly appreciated. The following space is provided for any additional comments that you may wish to make.