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By Chrys Horn

This thesis analyses research into the evolution and adaptation of the communities in Rotorua and Kaikoura by using a complex systems perspective. This perspective requires that the analyst look beyond the obvious impacts of tourism such as employment, crowding, and congestion, to the processes that underlie the experiences of local people in relation to tourism.

The configuration of the destination, the flows of people in the area, the visitor types and the ratio of hosts to guests all influence a community’s interactions with tourists. In small destinations, the effect of host interactions with guests is potentially much greater than is the case in larger destinations.

However, in using a complex systems perspective to analyse the effects of tourism on these two destinations, it becomes clear that the impacts of tourism are more than just the impacts of tourists. The impacts of tourism are intertwined with the processes of trust, leadership and decision making occurring both within the community and within the wider regional and national socio-economic systems. As such, local perceptions of tourism are associated with history, geography, local politics and local social processes.

As concepts, the meanings of both ‘tourism’ and ‘community’ emerge from the experiences people have, and the associations that they make with the two terms. Thus, the meaning of both ‘tourism’ and ‘community’ are idiosyncratic and locally defined. Each term means different things to residents in Rotorua and Kaikoura, and each affects how residents perceive tourism in their respective towns. For example, the associations that people make between historical events and processes such as restructuring are quite different in each of the two communities. In Rotorua, tourism is seen as a source of stability, as a phenomenon that confers a higher level of perceived control on the community. In Kaikoura, tourism is seen as a source of change and it confers a lesser sense of perceived control on the community overall.

Likewise, the relationship between the local council and the community underlies the sense of security people feel about local decision making processes. This relationship is mediated by a range of processes including the effort that the council put into communicating with community members, the leadership shown by the council, the
way in which they facilitate community visioning processes, which then provide a basis for both leadership and decision making.

Underlying these processes are community processes of rivalry, competition, cooperation, labelling and stereotyping that all affect the levels of trust that the community have in those around them. Community cohesion (which is not the same as community agreement) underlies a community’s ability to work together to manage tourism.

Thus using a complex systems approach to analyse the impacts of tourism in two destinations has shown that there is much more to tourism than the impacts of tourists and their activities. Instead, the way the community system interacts with the tourism system gives rise to the impacts of tourism. Tourism can be usefully conceptualised as a process that is inextricably interwoven with history, politics and community interaction processes at the destination level. Perceptions of tourism reflect these processes and the understanding that local people have of them, and the level of control that they feel they have over tourism development.

With little trust in local decision making processes, people have a low sense of control over how tourism development affects them. In tourism planning, therefore, it may be more effective to focus primarily on the processes by which tourism development and management occurs in the local area and to look at mitigating the effects of tourists only after building community capacity to adaptively manage tourism in their area. Communities need a sense of control over their world, and this is only undermined when experts and institutions try to advise courses of action without involving a range of community players in the process of managing tourism.

Thus, government and other organisations and institutions at local level must focus on working with communities to build local capacity to manage tourism, without imposing on those communities to convince them to ‘treat tourists well’ or to manage their environment better, so they become more attractive as a destination.

**Keywords:** qualitative methods, complexity theory, chaos theory, systems, tourism, community, perceptions, social impacts, community development, reflexivity, perceptions of control, adaptation.
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### Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iwi</td>
<td>Put somewhat simplistically, ‘Iwi’ is similar to tribe. Each Iwi grouping relates to a particular part of New Zealand, thus Ngai Tahu are an Iwi grouping who lay claim to much of the South Island, and Te Arawa have their land around the Rotorua Lakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hapu</td>
<td>Sub-tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runanga</td>
<td>A <em>runanga</em> is akin to a management committee. They occur at both Hapu level and at Iwi level. For example the Te Arawa <em>runanga</em> has representatives on it from the sub tribal <em>runanga</em> around Rotorua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae</td>
<td>Meeting ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>New Zealanders of European descent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treaty of Waitangi</td>
<td>Considered to be New Zealand’s founding document, the Treaty of Waitangi was signed by representatives of the British Crown and most Iwi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taonga</td>
<td>Property or treasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kati Kuri</td>
<td>The Hapu Grouping with Manawhenua in Kaikoura; a sub-tribe of Ngai Tahu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Arawa</td>
<td>The Iwi group with Manawhenua in Rotorua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawhenua</td>
<td>Authority over the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The Maori words in this glossary are in common usage in New Zealand English and so are not italicised throughout this thesis.
Chapter 1
Author’s Preface/Introduction

The literature on tourism is full of different explanations and interpretations. The truth will probably not lie in one or the other of these theories, but in a mixture of different interpretations. Which does not make the thing any simpler (Krippendorf, 1987: 67).

In 1997-98, I spent six months in the community of Kaikoura, New Zealand, as part of a study looking at the impacts of tourism on the local community. Following this, in 1999-2000 I spent six months doing the same thing in Rotorua. This thesis compares my research experiences in those two places and reflects on the research process and some different ways in which I came to understand the impacts of tourism on these two destinations. As might be expected, most studies of tourism impacts have focused on the impacts that tourists have in the local area. This thesis takes a different approach, using and conceptualising the two communities in question as complex adaptive systems. Using this approach it is possible to see that tourism impacts emerge from the complex interactions of tourism systems with the community systems in Rotorua and Kaikoura.

Understanding the world from a complex systems perspective requires what is an essentially ‘pragmatic’ epistemology (Deising, 1991; Johnston, 1986; Smith, 1984). Researchers are actors within the systems they research, so they can never really understand the whole of that system. They can only ever understand the part that they inhabit. However, it is possible to learn more about a system by being open to learning
from others, by testing one’s knowledge to see what ‘works.’ Thus pragmatists can search for the truth and develop useful understanding of the system by trying to see the system as if from the outside, while at the same time being mindful that what they have set themselves is an impossible task (Deising, 1991). An important part of this approach then, is an openness to learning about all levels of the system, including learning about doing research and being a researcher. Thus, a pragmatic researcher must also try to see herself as an outsider might, and work on learning about herself, her methods, and the processes by which she interprets her results.

Another aspect of this thesis, in its pragmatic approach to research, is that it is interdisciplinary and eclectic in nature. This may be disconcerting to some readers, because they may feel that I have not covered the subject in the way to which they are accustomed when using any particular disciplinary focus. At times, my approach is geographical, at other times, my approach is social psychological or anthropological. Each discipline has something to offer the study of tourism and the study of complex systems, and like any individual within the system, I have a limited view of the system as a whole. However, the strengths of the approach I have chosen are that: one, it is grounded in the experiences of both myself and the people who helped me understand their communities; and two, that thinking about the systems in question from the different perspectives offered here, allows more options for improving the outcomes of the planning and management of tourism (in this case).

As a result, this thesis reflects on a number of different aspects of this study of the two communities. Perhaps, most obviously, I discuss tourism and its impact in Rotorua and Kaikoura, New Zealand. I do this to ground the research in a way that is perhaps most familiar to readers of this thesis. Following this, I discuss how the two communities have interacted with tourism to produce the impacts that manifest in each place. Underlying this analysis is a reflection of how my understanding of tourism and community changed over the period in which I participated in the research process and the different standpoints that I found useful to understand the processes that underpin the impacts of tourism. Another important strand that exists throughout the thesis is a discussion of the utility of a systems perspective in social research and a consideration

---

1 I choose to use the female pronoun here and in a few other places in this thesis. Much of the thesis reflects some aspect of my own experiences, so I phrase my writing in this way, not to exclude males, but make the reader aware that I speak from a female perspective.
of how such a perspective helped me manage the ‘dance’ of research.

I discuss how a complex systems perspective might facilitate new ways of thinking about tourism planning and management, that might help destinations adapt better to the pressures of tourism. Lastly, as a part of using a complex systems perspective in a social science setting, I reflect on my own experiences of conducting research, and consider the ways in which reflecting on that experience increased my understanding of those who worked with me to help me understand the places that they called home. Overall then, using a complex systems perspective has required much more of me than might have been the case if I had chosen to focus purely on the impacts of tourism.

This thesis does not stand alone as a research project. I could not have written it without reflecting on the work that has already gone into studying tourism, communities, social change, ecology, psychology and complex systems. My ideas have emerged from reading, talking, and thinking over the years it has taken to complete this process (and I include here more than just the years I have been enrolled at the university in formal study). In other words, research itself is usefully conceptualised as a complex, self-evolving system.

Furthermore, there is another sense in which this thesis does not stand alone as a research project. It emerges from a longer and ongoing research programme, funded by the Foundation for Science, Research and Technology from the Public Good Science Fund, and led by Professor David Simmons and Dr John Fairweather. Initially, researchers in this programme had looked at the movement of tourists around New Zealand and at the facilities that were provided for tourists. It became clear early in the research that, to plan for sustainable tourism in New Zealand, it is essential to understand how tourism changes communities and places over time. Much research has been conducted on this question over the years but little has been completed in New Zealand, and even less uses qualitative methods as the primary form of data collection and analysis. Without this kind of information, it is difficult to explain in detail how tourism affects New Zealand communities and what factors help people to adapt to the changes that tourism brings to destinations.

This programme, therefore, was designed to fill that research gap. Two reports for which I was primary author – one written about tourism in Kaikoura, and one written about tourism in Rotorua – preceded this thesis. Using the same raw data from which
the two reports were produced, the thesis differs from the reports in several ways. First, it compares the effects of tourism on the two destinations by comparing the experiences that I had as a researcher living in each community. Conducting a comparison of the two case studies by going back to the raw data has allowed me to test the idea that complex systems theory is useful for understanding how communities interact with tourism and evolve through time. Writing the thesis has also provided an opportunity to look in some depth at the role of research within complex systems and at the epistemological basis of what I have done. The thesis, therefore, contains a small amount of information that can be found in the reports, but uses much of that information to develop some new ideas about tourism and its interactions with destination communities.

The Tourist Area Lifecycle

The research design was initially based on the tourist area cycle of evolution (also commonly referred to as the tourism area lifecycle), illustrated in Figure 1. Butler (1980) developed this model after observing a range of tourism resorts in the Mediterranean. In the destinations that he studied, a similar pattern of growth occurred in the numbers of tourists visiting destinations over time.

![Figure 1: The tourism area cycle of evolution (Butler, 1980: 7).](image-url)
Tourists visit an area in increasing numbers until their effects on the social, economic and physical environments mean that increasing numbers can no longer be supported. The level at which tourist numbers start to level off is called the ‘carrying capacity’ of the resort. The outdoor recreation literature (in which Butler’s work also features considerably) has developed the concept of carrying capacity further – dividing it into environmental carrying capacity, physical carrying capacity and social carrying capacity (Shelby & Heberlein, 1986). All apply similarly in tourism settings, but the carrying capacity concept has been less useful than might be imagined, because it depends on factors such as expectations, social norms, site hardening, and the way people move around a place. In addition, residents’ attitudes toward tourism will affect the carrying capacity of a destination. As tourist numbers reach their limit, residents become more disenfranchised and, therefore, less welcoming to visitors. These ‘social’ changes are hypothesised to accompany changes in the natural and built environments making the destination less attractive to tourists who will then move on to visiting other more attractive destinations.

Butler’s framework focuses on structural change and on the pressures to which tourism subjects destinations (Milne, 1998). It underlies much tourism research so it strongly affected the way in which I began researching the effect of tourism on the two communities in question. On entering the field, my focus was on how tourism affects local communities and how those effects, in turn, influenced tourist numbers. In accord with these ideas, I focused on the ‘concrete’ effects that tourism has at local level such as crowding or problems with water supply/sewerage, etc. The concrete effects of tourism in both towns differed, but I could not explain the differences between the two places adequately in those terms. This left me feeling that I was missing something important. A useful aspect of complex systems is that sometimes what can appear as random events can be explained much better when one focuses on a different part of the system. An important part of this research, therefore, has involved paying attention to that feeling and trying to understand what processes underlie the perceptions of the residents in Kaikoura and Rotorua. To do this, I had to think hard about the research process itself, to understand how intuition and feeling might reflect something that I was learning in talking with local people. This process was fruitful for understanding the processes that communities use to construct and reflect on their experiences of tourism.
The Research Process

The main purpose of this section is to show how my understanding went through sudden shifts as I learned more from the people I was talking with. Several times in this process, I realised that, while I understood a relationship or process at an intellectual level, I was still interpreting my experiences from the viewpoint of my 'old' perspective.

As an example, my initial focus on 'concrete' tourism impacts led me to realise that I could not explain the tension that I felt within the community when I lived in Kaikoura and talked to people about tourism. My interest increased when I realised tourism could, in turn, be seen as an impact of economic restructuring of the 1980s and 90s. While this may sound obvious, putting it into these terms represented an important shift in my thinking. Such a perspective conceptualises tourism as part of an ongoing historical process, transforming the 'impacts of tourism' approach, in which tourism is central to the enquiry, into a perspective focused on the relationship between tourism and community. Intellectually, I liked this idea even before I entered the field, but I had continued to focus my attention on tourism. The interpretations I was putting on the conversations I had with locals were 'held' in place by the discursive patterns outlined by the objectives of the research, by the way people in the industry talk, and by the literature on tourism impacts. Each of these influences places tourism as central, seeing it as the cause of positive or negative outcomes. If, instead, tourism is conceptualised as part of community history and processes, it opens up the possibility that communities may be part of the cause of those impacts. In other words, communities might influence tourism and its outcomes as much as tourism influences communities. This shift in perspective allowed me new ways of discussing and interpreting the relationship between community and tourism, even in the face of a discourse that did not always support such a perspective.

Furthermore, some of the patterns of interaction in the Kaikoura community, such as the comments that people made about Catholics controlling the Council, or the role of the different churches in differentiating groups within the community, and a surprising lack of communication between the dairy farmers on Suburban Flat and the sheep farmers south of the Kowhai River, were rooted in the patterns created around the time of Pakeha settlement in the area, nearly 150 years ago (Boyd, 1992). These findings suggested that one could not understand the Kaikoura community, nor tourism's effect
on it, without first understanding its history and geography. In other words, the changes associated with tourism could be usefully construed as part of an ongoing process of community evolution.

The impacts of tourism emerge from the interaction of tourism and the local community. Therefore tourism development is not a one-way process in which tourism imposes itself on the community, but is, instead, a two-way process in which impacts emerge from the interaction of tourism and tourists with the community. Effectively, then, communities have their own impacts on tourism and tourism can be seen as just one of many influences on the trajectory of community change. This idea was initially difficult to apply in the research process, because I was focusing on how the community had reacted to tourism development. This, again, directed my attention to the 'concrete' effects of tourism and to how the community had dealt with them. But this still misses the point, because probably the greatest impact that the community has is on their own perceptions of tourism, which come from the meaning that they give tourism and the processes by which they engage with it.

Moving to study Rotorua, more emerged as I compared the two communities. In comparing the two places, it was possible to understand how the wider social and historical contexts underlie the way tourism impacts are interpreted by communities. Thus, my understanding of what was happening focused more on the processes that contribute to local perceptions of tourism. Local perceptions are affected by the historical, social and ecological contexts of which tourism is just one part.

Another important question in understanding the social impacts of tourism is the effect of tourism on Maori. The impacts of tourism on Maori are likely to differ from those on non-Maori given that Maori culture is an important facet of tourism in Rotorua. These differences are acknowledged, but are not a central theme in this thesis, partly because research specifically on Maori was completed by another member of the research team. My interest was more on the relationships between Maori and Pakeha, and the effects that those relationships have on tourism and vice versa. Looking at the general fortunes of the two Maori communities as separate entities also adds some insights into understanding the impacts of tourism and the processes of adaptable communities.
Self reflection in research

The previous section outlined some of the shifts in understanding that I experienced during the process of reflecting on my research data. This section considers how reflecting on my own experience has been directly important in understanding communities and tourism. This process of self reflection has been an important part of reaching my conclusions, and must be part of working within a complex systems perspective. This section begins by discussing my own thoughts on the shifts in understanding outlined above. It then reflects on the implications of these experiences for understanding the worlds of the people with whom I was talking during the research process.

I can best describe these shifts in understanding as changing from knowing something from the outside (from the place of my intellect) and seeing it in some kind of two-dimensional form, to ‘getting alongside’ that knowledge, being able to see its depth and other dimensions. A yoga teacher that I recently met suggested that one works with a subject (in his case a physical body; in my case in this thesis, a community) by meshing both intellectual and experiential knowledge to ‘build conviction’ or true ‘understanding’. In a very real way, one must work with one’s subject matter rather than working on it (‘over-standing’) and this requires a continual process of learning how to work with that subject without imposing on it too much. To ‘work with’ one must also contribute to the work and help shape it, thus, it is not enough just to observe and record. To ‘work with,’ one must participate. ‘Working with’ therefore, is a complex balancing act – or maybe even a ‘dance’ during which one sometimes follows the steps of others, and sometimes leads.

‘Understanding’, then, comes from a continuous ‘dance’ between personal experience, reflection on that experience and reflecting on the spoken experiences and ideas of others. I use the metaphor of ‘dance’ throughout this thesis, because dance requires engagement with other people in a way that is both patterned and also creative. It has rhythm and rules, and yet, like team sports, there are unlimited ways to work within those rules. Through reflecting on my own experiences, I came to see that we are all engaged in a kind of dance from which new patterns can evolve and the unexpected can happen, and yet there remains a sense of coherence in the activity. This is a metaphor for any relationship – but perhaps is accentuated in the research context, because the researcher, more than the researched, participates in a range of dances both with other
researchers and with people inside the research setting.

The difficulty in research, as in any other of our relationships, is in achieving the balance of a constructive, interdependent relationship in which studied and studier can learn from each other. The relationship of researched and researcher is, therefore, like any other relationship: it can benefit from mindful reflection on the part of all actors about what is going on and why. Hence, my focus during the research has been how to understand the dynamic processes before me, while trying to understand the role of both research and researchers in those processes.

I as researcher and the object of my study – the two communities – reflected each other in an iterative process. This is not a new idea in tourism. Boorstin (1961: 117) wrote that in the act of being tourists 'we look into a mirror instead of out of a window and we see only ourselves.' Similarly Bhattacharya (1997: 387) argued that 'A guidebook presents India as a sign in Western discourse and as such it communicates more about Western discourse than about India.' One might apply these ideas to research in the sense that the researcher can only really see herself. However, I argue for a more moderate interpretation than Bhattacharyya – that meaning and understanding emerge from the interaction of researcher and researched as the actions of one feed back to affect the actions of the other.

These are not new ideas in the social sciences. Writers who identify themselves as human geographers, social psychologists, psychologists and sociologists have all written about the problem of reflexivity and what it means for individuals or groups participating in the activities associated with research (Berger & Luckmann, 1985; Cromby & Nightingale, 1999; Deising, 1991; Johnston, 1986; King, 1994; Moore, 2000; Rosenberg, 1988). Labels such as pragmatism, phenomenology, existentialism, and constructivism have been applied to epistemological stances that deal with the problem of subjectivity and the role of human perception in the development of knowledge.

My own treatment of reflexivity and subjectivity arises from my understanding and experience of what it means to work within a complex system while trying to understand that system as a whole. My use of the ideas is based on whether they were helpful for understanding and questioning my research methods and processes. Understanding complex systems this way, thus requires a pragmatic epistemological approach based on the experience that working from the inside of a system is more often
effective and constructive if one is reflexive or mindful (cf. Langer 1989, 1997). Truth, then, is useful in some way, for moving forward to where I want to go. Of course, this makes truth contextual and dependent on my objectives at the time, which, in turn requires me to be mindful of how my objectives and methods affect my interpretation of what is happening.

Another important part of this learning process was to articulate my understanding and the process by which I reached it. To write about others, a researcher must reinterpret another’s knowledge in terms of her own experiences and understanding. That experience and understanding continuously emerges and changes, both as a result of personal experiences and from the act of conducting research. To interpret and understand other perspectives, I had to learn new ways of thinking and to understand my own thinking as just one perspective.

This process was not always comfortable or easy. This learning reflected the process that I went through during the shifts in understanding that I outlined earlier. I would feel something at a ‘gut’ level and have to reach for the words to articulate this feeling, so it could become a thought. Once articulated, I would then have to ascertain whether there was evidence for my feelings or whether I had misinterpreted my observations. The most difficult kind of learning required me to question my current beliefs and frameworks and to reshape them. These processes often took considerable engagement with the world I was researching. However, the process of questioning my own perspective was also exciting and interesting at times. It is a process that becomes easier and more fun with practice.

This process is important on two levels. First, I realised the importance of staying with the discomfort of working through the process of changing my understanding of the world. If I had dismissed my feelings impatiently, preferring to avoid the discomfort, I could not have learnt as much as I did. Second, how this process occurs in other people has important methodological implications. I have made a feeling explicit because as a researcher I must mindfully reflect, think and articulate these processes. What of the people with whom I am working? What does this process mean for research into the worlds and meanings and knowledge of others? How do people deal with knowledge that affects behaviour and emotions, but is not usually accessible to consciousness, that is, tacit knowledge (Barbiero, n.d.). Is tacit knowledge important for others, and if so,
how does one begin to access it? How does one work with people to reach understanding of such tacit knowledge without imposing one’s own knowledge?

These questions point to the existence of different kinds of knowledge within a social system. The most obvious kind of knowledge is the knowledge that we can articulate and that is concrete. They might be rules like my parents taught me such as ‘stay seated at the table until everyone has finished eating.’ It may be about concrete things in the environment, it may be things taught in stories. It may be how annoyed people feel when they get behind slow tourist traffic or the fact that they cannot get a park in town during the tourist season. This knowledge is relatively easy to discover by talking to people and asking directly about those things. Much of this knowledge could be explored using quantitative methods.

However, one cannot ask directly about knowledge that is unspoken – in fact neither the questions nor the answers exist. Interestingly, much cultural knowledge is tacit and is most easily uncovered by comparing one’s own culture with other cultures. Thus, it is possible that some community tacit knowledge might be uncovered by comparing across communities; and some family tacit knowledge might be uncovered by comparing across families.

Tacit knowledge is arguably more important for understanding a social system than is articulated knowledge. Tacit knowledge often underpins behaviour and affects outcomes. It can be disproportionately powerful in its effects, because there is no way to question it and think about it. If it is not articulated, people cannot easily think about it and manage it. This appears to be related to Freud’s idea of the unconscious, and, indeed, Goleman (1996) uses these ideas to discuss some of the ways in which human beings can distort information because of tacit knowledge which prohibits the discussion of particular issues. Others speak of tacit knowledge in terms of knowledge cultures (Tsouvalis et al., 2000). In a group, organisational or community setting, this kind of knowledge is what helps us know ‘how things go around here,’ what counts as important, what is to be dismissed and what is to be avoided.

Drawing out tacit knowledge can be a difficult and subtle process – at least in the beginning. It has never been articulated and so people can and do deny that there is more to something if questioned. For example, in the course of this research I realised that there was something important in the meaning that people implied when they spoke
of tourism. Twice I asked respondents what tourism was and what it meant to them, at which point, both (separately) looked at me very strangely and gave me well-memorised definitions from some text or document or other.

I got a little further when I was challenged by the Rotorua Tourism Advisory Board for calling visitors ‘tourists.’ Asking what the difference was between visitors and tourists elicited some thoughtful answers, but even this was limited in its extent. The only way for me to understand the meanings implicit in tourism was to talk ‘around’ the topic, listen closely to the associations that people made with tourism when they spoke about it, to listen to the ways in which they used the word and what they implied by what they were saying. This process took some time, because these meanings had to emerge from many different interactions with people and required a lot of mindful reflection on whether I was imagining these meanings or whether they were ‘real’ and grounded.

Thus, the denotative meanings of ‘tourism’ in Rotorua were similar to those in Kaikoura, but the connotative meanings of ‘tourism’ in the two places were often different. To ignore these differences was to miss out on understanding many of the factors that affect local perceptions of tourism. As Brule (1985) notes, language is full of these fuzzy concepts that cannot be translated into something more precise without losing some of their meaning. When trying to understand people’s perceptions and feelings, these connotative, imprecise meanings are, arguably, the more important.

**Defining Tourism and Community**

The definition of both ‘tourism’ and ‘community’ are central to this thesis, but I do not address the academic arguments about the meanings of these terms. For my purposes, it seems unnecessary to dissect them in detail, since meaning depends on the context in which terms are used. My experience in the two communities indicates that meaning emerges from the ways in which people in any particular context use words or expressions. At the same time, the meanings of the words influence their use. Thus, words and their meaning co-evolve dialectically, but there is much that is not definite in the relationship of a word and its meaning. It was more important to understand that both of these words were used differently within the same context and both were used differently even by the same person, depending on the focus of the conversation at the time.
The central argument of this thesis is that communities build their own meanings into the word ‘tourism.’ These meanings depend on that community’s history, local and national politics, and by the state of the community itself. The terms ‘community’ and ‘tourism’ are, therefore, inextricably linked, as will become clear when I develop the arguments in this thesis.

In summary, the research took place in a confusion of shifting viewpoints and meanings. There were times when I was thrown into situations and environments in which I felt uncomfortable. There were times when I was unsure how to interpret what was happening and there were times when I thought I had got ‘it’, only to find that I had not. Out of the confusion, emerged the order that you see here in this thesis. My conclusions reflect my own history of working in tourism, and studying ecology, outdoor recreation, tourism and, most recently, environmental management. There are also aspects of my leisure interests and experiences in this analysis. A result of this process is that while tourism provided the basis of this research, this thesis is not primarily about tourism. Instead, ‘community’ provides the central organising theme and complex systems provides the main basis of the theoretical analysis of the communities in question.

A Complex Systems Perspective

To achieve the goals that I have set in writing this thesis, I have chosen to use a complex systems perspective. This allows discussion of relationships and linkages not just between players in tourism, players in the communities under study or between those communities and tourism, but also between researcher and community and between researchers and between community and local geography. This perspective allows me to discuss psychological concepts such as mindfulness (Langer, 1989) at the same time as discussing local spatial features, history, conflict, power, globalisation and evolution.

Alongside my own development as a researcher was the development of the research project of which I was a part. The research project was designed partly in response to calls for more integrated approaches to the study of tourism. Researchers have called for an approach to the study of tourism that recognises the value of seeing tourism from different disciplinary perspectives (Pearce, 1995; Przeclawski, 1993). This team of researchers contained people trained in economics, psychology, sociology, ecology and geography.
Thus, I show here something of the evolution of myself as researcher, the research process, the communities under study and a way in which a complex systems perspective might be used in the interpretation and understanding of these processes. I find it helpful to see my own intellectual development in terms of adaptation, emergence, coevolution and history. In other words, I see myself as an evolving, complex, adaptive system.

My understanding has emerged through a process of oscillating between trying to make sense of data, having intuitive ‘tip of the tongue’ flashes of insight that were difficult to put into words, reading and talking with other researchers and then going back to the data to try to support and construct the ideas logically. This process is outlined in Figure 2.
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**Figure 2: The research process**

Therefore, time is a tool that I have used only occasionally as an organising feature of this thesis. Themes offer a better way to put it all together to show how I have come to see the application of ideas associated with complex systems in this research process.

**A Complex Systems Perspective and Thesis Structure**

As I reflected on my research and watched communities and groups, I felt that a
complex systems perspective might provide the framework to discuss the very wide range of processes of which I became a part. To see the world as a whole, complex, open system comprised of many smaller, overlapping and nested, complex, open subsystems appeared to offer a way forward through the 'dynamic confusion' mentioned above. In particular, it allows:

- a discussion of positive feedback and its effect on change processes within a system.
- a discussion of the concept of emergence. Emergence is important in understanding local patterns of interaction, relationships between different community groups along with the use of language and the development of perceptions and attitudes.
- the use of concepts such as fractal patterns in which one can see similar patterns across different system levels and, therefore, make use of insights gained at one level to understand phenomena at another.
- an understanding of the world as a dynamic, complex, evolving set of systems in which a ‘normal’ or ‘stable’ state is really only a short-term aspect of the system, which is subject to change and evolution.
- an understanding of the place and process of research within a system and a framework for understanding its limitations.

Each of these is a core component of systems thinking (Cilliers, 1998). As outlined above, my understanding of complex, adaptive systems was something that developed over the course of the research in question. It was not a theoretical perspective that underlay my research prior to my entering the field. I had an interest in the perspective at this stage, but I was uncertain about how to use it in my research. However, it has proven useful as one of the tools for completing this thesis.

This thesis is not written chronologically, or in the standard format of literature review, methods, results, and discussion. Neither is this thesis primarily about tourism. Instead, the understanding that I reached is bestorganised using themes, which centre around the complex systems which were the focus of my particular piece of research – the social/community systems in Kaikoura and Rotorua. Seeing communities as complex systems implies that one must look at the community as part of a greater national and global
socio-economic system, tracing its history, discussing how the surrounding physical and political environments affect community processes and how tourism has developed within those systems. It is also important to look at the interactions of people and groups within the communities in question and see how they adapt to changes from outside the system. These are the major themes that order this thesis and they are outlined in more depth below.

**Chapter 2: Theoretical Background.** This chapter outlines the complex systems perspective on which the thesis is based. This chapter explores the linkages between more mainstream theoretical perspectives used in the social sciences and shows the similarities and differences of the different perspectives.

**Chapter 3: Methodology.** This chapter discusses the implications of using a complex systems perspective to interpret and discuss social settings such as those in Rotorua and Kaikoura. This discussion includes some thoughts on the methods that are most appropriate, as well as some implications for using this perspective to analyse the data once they are collected. After this, I describe the methods used to collect data in the communities of Rotorua and Kaikoura. A similar approach was used in both communities, although differences in method occurred in response to the differences between the two communities.

**Chapter 4: Community and Environment** provides an introduction to the two places that were studied: Rotorua and Kaikoura. In particular, this chapter looks at the geography and demography of the two towns under study and describes the natural resources on which tourism is based in the two places and the relationship that local residents have with their physical environments.

The basis of tourism in both Rotorua and Kaikoura are the natural assets of the two places. These natural assets also give the community some of its character and patterns. The environment influences the communities that live in them, although this is not to argue from a position of environmental determinism. The natural environment can shape communities by isolating them from other communities (as in the case of Kaikoura) and it can impact substantially on a community in the form of natural disasters – as it has in the case of Rotorua and the Tarawera Eruption. Of course it also affects local interaction patterns, because of its impact on the way people lead their daily lives.
Chapter 5: Community and History describes some of the recent history of Rotorua and Kaikoura. History is pivotal to understanding how a community has reached the point that it has reached today, and is as important in understanding tourism as it is in understanding any other aspect of community life. Perhaps one of the most important historical processes of recent times has been economic restructuring, which has occurred worldwide and had profound impacts in the regions of many different nations including New Zealand. Economic restructuring was coined as Reaganism in the USA; Thatcherism in the UK and Rogernomics in the New Zealand context. The changes that swept the world during the 80s and 90s represent a ‘catastrophic’ event in which the global system settled into a new set of economic and social patterns. This chapter has a particular focus on how global and national economic change affected the fortunes and development of these two towns. There are other aspects of history that are also important in understanding Rotorua and Kaikoura, but which are not included in this chapter. For example, history is important for understanding community interactions in both communities, but I have included this at the time I have discussed community interactions. The same goes for history relating to local government, which is included in the community and politics chapter. The fact that history underlies most of the chapters in this thesis only serves to highlight its importance.

Chapter 6: Community and Tourists provides the kind of analysis that might be expected in a traditional thesis about resident perceptions of tourism. This chapter discusses some of the literature on resident perceptions of tourism and some of the findings of the telephone surveys of residents in the two communities. The focus of this chapter is primarily on the tourist-related factors that appear to have influenced the perceptions of residents in both towns in relation to tourists and their impacts on the local area. The chapter ends by noting that although these factors are obviously important, there is more influencing local perceptions than just tourists and tourism infrastructure. I reiterate here that the quantitative work found in this chapter provides a small and relatively insignificant part of the study as a whole.

Chapter 7: Community and Politics. This chapter outlines the major changes that have affected local government in New Zealand and shows how the different histories and resources of the two councils have resulted in a different quality of relationship with their respective communities. The relationship of the council with the local community is central to how a community adapts to tourism. Local government manages and
regulates tourism development and the planning processes associated with it. Many New Zealand councils have also developed a role in local economic development which makes them potential advocates for tourism. At the same time inbound tourism has increased significantly in New Zealand. Another important factor to affect the relationship between councils and their communities is the high level of change to which local government has been subject over the last decade. These factors have been played out differently in Rotorua and Kaikoura, which has led to very different levels of local trust in council between the two communities.

Chapter 8: Community Interactions The relationships and divisions within the local community strongly influence how local residents feel about their community. Local interactions also contribute to the maintenance of social patterns such as racism and poverty. Thus, community relationships underlie the ability of local people to adapt to change. This chapter discusses these patterns within the two communities. It shows that a small community such as Kaikoura has characteristics that can make it more difficult to change local patterns of interaction. The divisions in Kaikoura appear more rigid, longer lasting and greater in number than anything that I recorded in Rotorua. In addition, Kaikoura's small size means that it has access to fewer resources for managing the impacts of tourism and the impacts of community division.

Chapter 9: Discussion and Conclusions. This chapter highlights the connection between perceptions of tourism and the ways in which locals perceive and trust their own community processes. In addition, in this chapter, I reflect on the ways in which the ideas espoused in an adaptive management approach might have considerable utility in managing tourism. This kind of approach is likely to have greatest effect where people from all over the community can learn to work together well to pool their knowledge, and reflect on their actions and results of those actions. To do this, people must find ways to work from a position of some mutual respect while, at the same time, being able to debate and argue – a balance which takes considerable skill (and echoes the ideas expressed about the dance of relationships discussed earlier in this chapter).

This of course implies that cohesive communities are the ones which are most likely to manage tourism successfully, to feel in control of tourism and, therefore, to feel most positive about it.
Final Note

A central premise on which this thesis is built is that understanding is best gleaned by using several different standpoints or lenses to understand a system. I have no ‘magic bullets’ for fixing the problems of tourism. I have learned, however, that it is important to keep looking for new ways to understand the things that we take for granted, and that those new ways of looking can lead to better ways to manage old problems. The more that we take this kind of mindful approach to learning about the world we live in, the higher the chance that we will learn to adapt more positively in it.

All through the process of both research and writing I have learned to see new things or to see things that I thought of as ‘old hat’ in new ways. These shifts in perception and understanding (which do not replace the old ways of seeing but which sometimes offer new possibilities for action) are exciting and probably are my main reason for actually completing this PhD and my main reason for doing social research. I believe that a complex systems perspective offers a way of incorporating a range of perspectives into a narrative and, therefore, offers some useful ways of understanding both research and research findings, which then offer some potential ways forward into adaptively managing phenomena such as tourism.
Chapter 2

Complex Systems: A Tool for ‘Under-Standing’ Community?

Introduction

Much tourism research deals with the impacts of tourism on host communities. However, some authors are now commenting on the lack of theoretical development and on the inconclusive nature of the findings across different settings (for example, Ap, 1990, 1992; Faulkner & Tideswell, 1997; Wall, 1996). There are many perspectives from which to study the social world of tourism destinations and, therefore, many ways to study how communities adapt to tourism. The research discussed throughout this thesis was primarily interdisciplinary and qualitative, focusing on the way in which research subjects construct tourism and its impacts on their community. As such, my reading has come from a range of disciplines, including economics, sociology, anthropology, geography and psychology. Each discipline has something to offer the study of tourism, and the study of community adaptation to tourism, hence, the many calls in the literature for a more integrated approach to tourism planning and research (see for example, Hall, Jenkins & Kearsley, 1997; Getz, 1987, Pearce, 1995), and to the conceptualisation of sustainable tourism (Milne, 1998).
To achieve such integration, a theoretical framework must be flexible enough to encompass research from a wide range of disciplines and methods, to allow for these findings to be conceptually connected. A complex systems approach (also known as complexity theory) may offer these possibilities (Faulkner & Russell, 1997; McKercher, 1999; Russell & Faulkner, 1999).

The concept of ‘systems’ is not new in the tourism literature. Most notably, Leiper (1990; 1995), borrowing from the ideas of von Bertalanffy, a biologist who helped develop the study of ecology, suggested that tourism is best conceptualised as a system arising from the behaviour of people acting as tourists. Elsewhere, a complex systems framework (also called a dynamical systems framework) has been adopted in areas such as management (Senge, 1990), social psychology (Vallacher & Novak, 1994a, b), economics (Allen, 1994), and sociology (Byrne, 1998; Cilliers, 1998; Hanson, 1995).

Furthermore, theoretical perspectives currently used to inform social research have elements in common with a complex systems approach. These include symbolic interactionism, structuration theory, actor-network theory, political economy and political ecology. A complex systems approach offers opportunities to integrate findings from disciplines as disparate as ecology, economics, psychology and sociology. In comparison, perspectives such as political economy, political ecology and symbolic interactionism are mainly confined to the disciplines of social geography and sociology.

This chapter introduces and outlines complexity theory and the characteristics of complex systems and their patterns. In doing this I use examples from a range of different subject areas in which a complex systems framework seems to offer some useful interpretations. I then compare this theoretical framework with others used in the social sciences, such as structuration theory, symbolic interactionism, political economy and actor-network theory. These are all theoretical frameworks used extensively in the social sciences at the current time, and all offer some useful insights into the working of social systems. My goal in making these comparisons is to show that conceptualising social systems as complex systems adds value to these theories. My personal preference in doing social research is eclectic. I prefer to look at a system from several different perspectives – a strategy that is supported by the tenets of complexity theory. This provides some background for discussing the implications of using a complex systems perspective to inform research.
Chaos versus complexity

Authors writing about complex systems use a range of terms to describe them. 'Chaotic,' 'self-evolving,' 'dynamical,' 'dynamic' and 'complex' are all used in very similar contexts in the literature. Some authors use them interchangeably (e.g. Byrne, 1998). At times, however, 'chaos' is taken to mean something beyond complexity. When used in this context, a chaotic system is so dynamic that it never settles into a pattern, so the behaviour of the system is random. In this context, complex systems lie somewhere between simple\(^1\) and chaotic/random systems: they are more dynamic and unpredictable than a simple system, but out of that dynamism come patterns and regularities. In contrast, I use the term 'chaos' in the former sense – as part of the theoretical understanding of complex systems.

Complexity and chaos theories have emerged from theoretical work on systems as well as from the development of powerful computers that can manage the large volume of calculations involved in modelling such systems. Gleick (1988) argued that chaos theory emerged from the study of meteorology, but chaos and the associated complexity theory are being used in other disciplines. In the natural sciences, the ideas have been used to model a range of systems in areas such as artificial life, physics, economics, and artificial intelligence (Casti, 1994; Mainzer, 1996).

History of Systems Thinking

Systems theory emerged in the mid 20\(^{th}\) century as scientists tried to understand 'real world' phenomena that required the integration of a range of disciplinary approaches. Because the approach arose in the space between disciplines, as Kramer and de Smit (1977: 3) note in their foreword 'there is no generally accepted, clearly delineated body of knowledge concerning systems thinking.' This may partly explain the range of approaches in the systems literature, including general systems, hard systems, soft systems, and complex systems. These different approaches are also a reflection of the history and development of systems perspectives. As Figure 3 shows, Allen (2000: 16) has conceptualised the development of soft systems as the result of changing questions,

\(^1\) A 'simple' system is one which can be described entirely in terms of its parts – as in the case of an engine or a machine. Simple systems are unable to learn or adapt to changing external conditions in a way that allows them to go on functioning.
a greater understanding of the complex nature of many questions and a move toward more integrated, holistic approaches to research and analysis.

Figure 3: The relationship of systems research with basic and applied research (Allen, 2000: 16)

Kramer and de Smit (1977: 3-4) suggested that the earliest reference to the idea of whole systems came from Köhler in 1924. Köhler discussed ‘Gestalten’ or wholes in physics, but ‘did not succeed in working out [a systems approach] in general terms.’ Lotka (1925), cited in Kramer and de Smit (1977) was the first person to question how systems interact with their environment and, therefore, to suggest the concept of ‘open systems’. The idea of open systems was further developed by von Bertalanffy, a biologist, in 1932, which then led to general systems theory. General systems theory aimed to draw the findings and knowledge of different scientific disciplines together (Strijbos, 1995). Since that time, the idea of trying to look at whole systems has gained in popularity in many fields. For example, in ecology, ecosystems are conceptualised as coherent wholes, consisting of a network of interacting plant and animal species. Similarly, in geography, Simmons and Leiper (1998) discuss the concept of a tourism system. Central to all these approaches is a concern with ‘wholeness.’ At the same time,
systems researchers consider that a system is made up of many interdependent elements (see Gleick, 1988; Kramer & de Smit, 1977; Leiper, 1990).

Over time, the underlying assumptions of systems approaches have changed. Early systems approaches were predicated on the idea that if researchers could learn enough about the system, the future of that system would be entirely predictable. Hard systems approaches, as they have been named, emerged from the study of engineering and defence. They were positivistic in nature, and their general aim was to integrate large amounts of information to predict the workings of the system in question. The underlying assumption was that a small change in one part of the system would change the overall system in an equally small way. Therefore, scientists assumed that they needed only to determine the elements of the system, and they would then be able to accurately predict the future trajectory of the system. As Gleick (1988: 15) put it:

*Scientists marching under Newton's banner actually waved another flag that said something like this: Given an approximate knowledge of a system's initial conditions and an understanding of natural law, one can calculate the approximate behaviour of the system. This assumption lay at the philosophical heart of science . . . very small influences can be neglected. There's a convergence in the way things work and arbitrarily small influences don't blow up to have arbitrarily large effects.* (Emphasis in original)

In a sense then, this hard systems perspective conceptualised the world as a complicated machine, rather like the working of a watch mechanism.

Using computers to model real-world systems, a meteorologist, Lorenz, found that this underlying assumption did not always hold (Gleick, 1988). Lorenz was modelling weather systems. He found that he could run a weather system model on a computer once, and get a set of weather predictions that looked realistic. However, one day he set his model to restart some way back in a particular sequence of events. He restarted the model using figures rounded to only two decimal places, but when he checked he found that the system diverged from its original path after only a few iterations. This meant that what were termed chaotic systems, were unpredictable in the long term (Gleick, 1988; Waldrop, 1992). This was particularly surprising since the interactions between individual components of the system could be described quite simply. Since that time, systems models have found very similar patterns in fields such as ecology, artificial life, and economics (Mainzer, 1996; Waldrop, 1992)
As Stewart (1989: 2) explained:

*We are beginning to discover that systems obeying immutable and precise laws do not always act in predictable and regular ways. Simple laws may not produce simple behaviour. Deterministic laws can produce behaviour that appears random. Order can breed its own kind of chaos.*

These characteristics mean that in chaotic systems, very small variations in initial conditions can sometimes lead to large differences in system outcomes. This implies that systems that appear to be complex and random in their behaviour may have developed from relatively simple sets of interactions. Complexity is conceptualised very similarly. Instead of thinking in terms only of complexity arising from relatively simple sets of interactions, it is also clear that relatively complex sets of interactions may actually exhibit quite simple overall system patterns. In short then, the system as a whole differs from the sum of its parts. Understanding the parts does not allow one to predict the path of the system as a whole.

**What are Complex Systems?**

While complex systems are difficult to define, they do exhibit a range of characteristics that make them useful for thinking about social science research. Complex systems:

- are not merely complicated systems but instead are able to adapt or change without breaking down;
- have a large number of interacting components which each have a relatively small range of influence;
- have system components that interact in non-linear ways;
- are subject to feedback or recursivity;
- can absorb change but over time the cumulative effect of change can put a system into a state of 'self-organised criticality';
- have new forms or attractors that emerge from the interactions of individuals within the system that then affect the behaviour of those same individuals;
- contain individuals that have only limited 'knowledge' of that system;
- are open;
• have a current state that depends on past or historical states; and
• show repeating patterns throughout different levels of the system. These are known as fractals (Byrne, 1999; Casti, 1994; Cilliers, 1998; Gleick, 1988; Gregersen & Sailer, 1993; Mainzer, 1996; Waldrop, 1992).

Complex versus complicated

Complex systems are not the same as complicated systems. A system may be very complicated, with many interconnecting parts, and yet not able to change or adapt in the way that complex systems do. A watch mechanism, or a car engine, are both complicated, but neither are complex. Conversely, a system may look very simple, and yet be surprisingly complex, as in the case of a leaf. Complicated systems are closed and cannot adapt to outside influences, whereas complex systems can. Complicated systems generally break down rather than adapt (for example, when water gets into a watch mechanism). Also, in a complicated system, changes in one part of the system are in proportion to changes in other parts of the system. Complicated systems fit the hard systems model outlined above, and are usually human inventions. Complex systems are able to adapt and can recreate themselves (Combs, 1995).

Another difference is that each element in a complex system reciprocally affects the way in which others around it operate. In a complicated system, the effect of one system component on another tends to be unidirectional, so the pistons in an engine move the cam shafts, but not the other way round (when the engine is operational at least).

Large number of interacting components

Complex systems usually consist of many constantly interacting elements. The interactions may be physical, or they may involve an exchange of information. They are crucial to the development of complexity in a system (Cilliers, 1998). Leiper (1990) and Hanson (1995) argue, however, that the number of components in a system does not always have to be large. At its simplest, a system can be defined as any two or more parts that are related such that change in any one part changes all the other parts. Nevertheless, the number of interacting components in actual complex systems is usually large, as is the case in social or economic systems, for example.
Non-linear interactions

The interactions between system components are mathematically non-linear and asymmetrical (Cilliers, 1998). Thus, a change in A might not effect a proportional change in B. In addition, A and B may have different-sized effects on each other. These aspects of complexity mean that very small changes can have large effects on the future functioning of a system. Conversely, what appear to be large changes within a system may actually have only small effects on the overall system. Linearity, in comparison, would ensure that small perturbations would only have small effects and large perturbations would have large effects.

Feedback/ recursivity

The interactions between system components feed back on themselves. Thus, in a system consisting of only two components A and B, a change in A will cause a change in B which then changes A again, and so on, *ad infinitum*. In this case, the feedback is direct. Alternatively, feedback may occur through a network of interactions, and so is more indirect in its effect. Feedback may be positive, increasing the effect of a change, or it may be negative, and decrease the original signal. Hanson (1995) calls this process 'recursivity'. Cilliers (1998) calls it 'recurrency'. Allen (1994) calls it 'lock-in.'

Positive feedback, in particular, is an important feature of complex systems and is the feedback pattern most often discussed in the social sciences since these tend to be the patterns that lead to change. Allen (1994: 6) sees the lock-in effect as an intrinsic part of the development of culture and society:

> In human systems, such positive feedback systems abound. Much of culture may well be behaviour which is fixed in this way. In most situations, imitative strategies cannot be eliminated by the evolutionary process, and so fashions, styles and indeed cultures rise and decline without necessarily expressing any clear functional advantages. Indeed culture should perhaps be viewed not so much as being the best way for doing things somewhere, but more as resulting from ignorance of other ways of doing things. . . Cities are extreme examples of positive feedback traps. They can grow far beyond the point at which they function well, trapping capital investment, infrastructure and human enterprise in what may be a congested and inferior environment.

Thus, positive feedback may not always have positive results. Recursivity may also make it difficult to change systems' patterns. Negative feedback can work to maintain an established system structure by discouraging actions that could change a pattern of
interaction. The complexity of the feedback loop may also mean that changing what seems obvious may not change the underlying patterns of interaction that maintain a problem. Therefore, feedback mechanisms must be understood before any interventions are tried (Hanson, 1995; Senge, 1990). Poverty is a good example of a phenomenon that is difficult to fix because there are many feedback mechanisms that operate to keep people in poverty, even if the obvious problem (a lack of money or jobs) is addressed (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986).

**Self-organised criticality, the ‘butterfly effect’ and ‘catastrophe’**

Conversely, positive feedback mechanisms, along with the potential effects of change in a single system component, mean that systems may change quite suddenly and relatively unpredictably. In social systems, for example, individuals can alter their own behaviour. If a change in behaviour ‘catches on’ perhaps through a new reaction from other individuals within the system, then these processes of positive feedback can very quickly change the pattern of the whole system. The collapse of the Berlin Wall in the early 1990s and the reunification of Germany over a remarkably short period of time is a case in point. These sudden changes, however, do not happen in isolation. A change in the structure of the system, as a whole, may be quite unpredictable. However, in hindsight, it is possible to see that there were a series of changes in the system components that led it to a state of ‘self-organised criticality.’

Once a system reaches this critical state, it may ‘jump’ to a new state relatively easily. This is the basis of catastrophe theory – a mathematical concept, which often appears alongside discussions of complex systems (Casti, 1994: 43) provides discussion of this). It is the ability of a complex system to change its structure suddenly in response to a relatively small perturbation that is referred to as the ‘butterfly effect’. This term arose from the observations of meteorologists that the flapping of the wings of a butterfly in one part of the world could conceivably trigger a tornado in quite another place. This example illustrates that very small events can be linked with much bigger events and changes. However, as the study of history shows, there are many factors in the history of a system that might be chosen as ‘butterflies.’ Really the butterfly effect is just a reference to the fact that very big differences can arise from very small initial changes. In comparison ‘catastrophes’ are a more important concept, but they also must be seen as a form of discontinuous pattern in the ongoing evolution of a complex system.
'Catastrophes' occur only after much, apparently insignificant change, which has brought the system to a point of self-organised criticality or instability.

It is this kind of catastrophe pattern that ecologists worry about in relation to the health of ecosystems. Complex systems can absorb considerable internal change with little apparent ill-effect. However, when structural change does come, it tends to be relatively large and, to some extent, unstoppable. Thus, something like increasing carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere may appear to have little effect for some time. Lovelock (1979), however, has predicted that when change occurs around the planet, it is likely to be large, relatively fast, unpredictable in its timing, and once it begins it will have to run its course as the system (the planet) settles back into a new equilibrium. My point is that if you consider the earth as a whole to be a complex system, then if and when major changes occur, it will not be the last few molecules of carbon dioxide that cause the problem – it is those along with all the others that came before. This means that it is very important to consider cumulative change in managing complex systems, because, as the changes build, the system comes closer to a point of criticality. It also makes cumulative change very difficult to manage, because the effects of it can be both sizeable and difficult to predict.

**Emergence and Attractors**

A feature of complex systems is that new forms emerge from the interactions of individuals within the system through the processes of positive feedback. These emergent forms, in turn, affect interactions within the system, and may then be seen as parts of the system in their own right. For example, some neurophysiologists see consciousness as evolving from the complex interactions of neurons, each of which affects the others (Combs, 1995; McCrone, 1997). Consciousness thus emerges from the interactions of neurons many of which may begin to operate as clusters. It does not exist at the level of individual neurons; it develops only when they interact and begin to work in concert. In turn, consciousness itself affects the future operation of individual neurons, thus consciousness, an emergent feature of the interactions of neurons itself, influences the neurons' interactions.

Similar emergent phenomena are apparent in the social world where, for example, the development of group norms may be conceptualised in a similar way. As a group of
people interact with each other, they continually adjust their own behaviour in the light of the behaviour of other members of the group (see Figure 4). As this process of ongoing adjustment and tacit negotiation goes on, social norms evolve. Effectively, these norms are attractors around which behaviour organises. Once emerged, norms then reinforce those behaviours within the group, which is why norms can be difficult to change (Svantek & DeShon, 1993).
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Figure 4: The ongoing process of norm emergence and influence

Of course, it is also why they *can* change, since a change in behaviour of even one group member can, if the system is primed, change group norms. The idea that structures and norms emerge from the positively reinforced interactions of many individuals within society is something that appears as the basis of social theories such as social interactionism, structuration theory, and actor-network theory, which are discussed later in this chapter.

Law (1992: 6) puts a slightly different, but helpful, slant on this idea of social structure and emergence. He framed social structure as processes and relationships, rather than concrete, objective 'things.'

*Actor-network theory assumes that social structure is not a noun but a verb. Structure is not freestanding, like scaffolding on a building site, but a site of struggle, a relational effect that recursively generates and reproduces itself. The insistence on process has a number of implications. It means, for instance, that no version of the social order, no organisation and no agent is ever complete, autonomous and final. ... there is no such thing as 'the social order' with a single*
centre, or a single set of stable relations. Rather, there are orders, in the plural. And, of course, there are resistances.

Understanding the concept of emergence, then, is vital for understanding the meaning of concepts such as community. To paraphrase Law, there is no such thing as 'community' with a single centre and a single set of stable relations. One might also note the same for 'tourism'. Instead, there are only the 'language games' and 'forms of life' that revolve around these words (Moore, 2000 discussing the philosophy of Wittgenstein, 1967). Social structures are processes rather than concrete entities. Our language use, and the activities associated with that, reifies them, helping us to forget that they are really only ideas and not concrete 'things'.

Emergent features of social systems are sometimes called the 'unintended consequences' of action (Hanson, 1995). Thus, an individual in a social system may be acting so as to keep everyone feeling comfortable, or in a manner which helps her/him achieve goals. Acting this way, however, helps to reproduce social norms and social structures, some of which may even turn out to affect the individual negatively. Some social norms may make an individual feel trapped, but her/his behaviour may actually maintain a trapped position. Rebellious teenagers, or people who act out the role of victim, exemplify this problem.

Another aspect to emergence in social systems is that, contrary to concepts such as community, some social structures (and indeed psychological structures) may not be named or recognised consciously. Nevertheless, they affect our behaviour. Without reflection, many social norms are understood tacitly, and people act them out without recognising that they have some choice in what they do.

Tacit knowledge is knowledge that usually is not within conscious awareness but which affects behaviour and mental states (Barbiera, n.d.). It is arguably a more powerful influence on behaviour than articulated knowledge, because its lack of existence in general discourse makes it difficult to question. Naming such knowledge, bringing it into some kind of linguistic or conscious form, loosens its 'hold' on people's behaviour. Once they can think about it, they can change it or question it. For example, individuals respond emotionally to events that reflect experiences they had in infancy. In some cases, this causes an over-reaction to relatively small events and can affect that individual's current relationships negatively. Individuals who learn to understand these emotional responses and their origins (that is, come to name them) can then understand
their influence. This then offers them more options for future action and a greater level of control over their responses (Goleman, 1996; Lerner, 1992).

One of the possible results of social research is to name those tacitly understood patterns. This, then, offers people more opportunities to choose their actions, allowing them a greater sense of control. For example, as we become more aware of our own cultural assumptions, and the fact that this understanding of the world is not as self-evident as we had once thought, we are then more able to interact successfully with those who see the world differently from ourselves (Dodd, 1998).

**Range of influence**

Cilliers (1998) has argued that, in any given system, each system component has a relatively small range of influence, thus, information is exchanged only through a relatively small number of close neighbours and, therefore, an individual system component cannot fully know the state of the whole system. This effect can be seen in systems where the interactions between individuals are localised, for example, in a flock of flying birds. In computer simulations of bird flocks, each simulated bird is programmed to keep a distance from the ‘birds’ immediately surrounding it. Each bird knows about its neighbours, but it does not know about the flock as a whole. In spite of consisting of many individuals focusing only on their immediate surroundings, from the outside the simulated flock appears to move coherently as one organism in the same way that real bird flocks do.

Although a system can operate this way, this state of affairs is not so clear in a social system. Individuals in a social system can gain considerable information about the system as a whole, and can interact with individuals in different parts of the system. For example, researchers looking into ‘small world theory’ suggest that, in social systems, people are not randomly linked and, therefore, information, theoretically, ought to stay within local clusters and not spread widely through the human social system, as is the case with the birds. This, however, is not always the case.

Linkages between clusters can increase the likelihood of linkages between any two individuals in the system, so they greatly increase the system’s ability to adapt to change. Cilliers (1998) refers to these inter-cluster linkages as long-range influences, and they can be seen as a way to allow information into a system from outside. These
Inter-cluster links are important in economics, neurology and physiology, where there are clusters of networks. What is of interest is that each cluster could, conceivably, be seen as a system in its own right. Thus, a system may be conceptualised as a set of interacting sub-systems, and may, itself, be seen as part of a bigger system in a nested arrangement. This arrangement turns out to be a very efficient mechanism for the spread of information.

The randomness of links between clusters means that the number of links between any two actors in any two clusters plummets, making the world a very small place (Matthews, 1999). Communications technologies can, therefore, change the way information would normally travel through a system by increasing informational links across the system. Even something as simple as writing can have this effect and, in fact, it may be worth considering that linkages across time (that is, memory) in a system might have as much effect as linkages across space.

The role of social research might be conceptualised as individuals within a social system trying to get a more holistic or overall picture of the system under study. In short, if elements in a system are capable of reflexive thought, and have the technology to communicate across a wide range of system components, some understanding of the system as a whole is possible and, therefore, this may offer individuals in a system more opportunities for adapting and learning.

Complex systems are open

The components of complex systems are influenced by factors external to the system, making the system 'open.' A system may get energy or information from outside. Complex systems require energy to maintain the organisation of the system. Human beings, for example, have to eat and drink in order to survive. Weather requires the constant input of solar energy to drive it. Thus, energy must be able to enter the system from outside for the system to survive.

Cilliers (1998) notes that incoming information may cause large changes across the system as conditions outside the system change. The dynamic nature of complex systems means that they are adaptable. The information that comes from outside affects the operation and interaction of components right across the system, which then affect
each other. The way that a system adapts to change depends on the state of the system when new information comes in (Gregersen & Sailer, 1993).

The open nature of complex systems makes it difficult to define the borders of a system. In a sense, the world can be conceptualised as a seamless, whole system. A systems framework allows one to understand this, while at the same time focusing in on particular aspects of the world. The definition of a system under study generally comes from the purpose for which the system is being described (Willig, 1999) rather than any absolute form of system existence. As Willig (1999: 40) puts it, ‘...objects or systems are not composed of fixed natural units. Parts have no independent existence as parts...’ The parts that we see, therefore, can be seen as figments of our imaginations, in the sense that they are not really whole and separate entities in themselves. King (1994) alluded to something similar when he suggested that what researchers see depends, to some extent, on the tools that they use for research, and the ways in which they break the system up for study. Thinking of the world as a complex system within which research is conducted means that, to get a good understanding of the system, one must use a range of standpoints.

In some ways, this leads us to some insights about the arguments between realists and constructivists. Using a systems framework does not deny the existence of a ‘real world out there,’ which we can study. It does, however, allow that different constructions of the world might arise (paradoxically) from the ways in which we break it up to understand it. Also, understanding might be best achieved by working from shifting standpoints, which divide the world up in different ways to see how it works, even while it is understood as a seamless whole (another standpoint). Good theories, then, come not from negating the standpoint of others, but in trying to understand how other standpoints divide the world and, therefore, how they differ from one’s own. In short, ideas about the world are most productive and useful when they are seen only as tools that allow us to work from a particular standpoint. They are also most useful, therefore, when they can be used collaboratively alongside, rather than competitively against other standpoints. This is essentially the basis of a pragmatic view of research. Pragmatists see science as ‘learning to learn,’ by reflecting on the processes they use to know about a world that will always be impossible to understand in its entirety (Deising, 1991).
In summary, I am arguing that a complex systems approach offers a framework for using a range of levels and types of analysis. It potentially accommodates a range of standpoints. For example, using a systems approach to understanding community and tourism allows one to look at influences at local, regional, national and global levels. As well, we may look at individual psychology, community structures, politics, economics, ecology, culture and history.

The trick is to use this framework in a way that is not naively relativistic, a point that I will develop in the next chapter. Neither does a complex systems approach offer any prescriptions for ordering data, or any way of predicting, with certainty, how a system will evolve. Using a complex systems approach requires that we give up the need to ‘over-stand’ the system in some kind of ‘god-like’ role, and that, instead, we learn to work within it, as part of it.

The strength of this approach is that it offers opportunities for an understanding, which then allows us more options for future action. In short, it facilitates an understanding of our own ability to adapt constructively, and to see how the changes that we impose on a system might have different consequences than we first expected. By the end of this thesis, I will show how this approach can actually lead to better long-term management than more prescriptive approaches that presume to predict the future.

History

History is important in a complex system. This is because complex systems are iterative, that is, the future state of the system depends on the current state of the system (Gregersen & Sailer, 1993). Therefore, to understand how a system currently operates, it is necessary to understand what occurred in the system in the past. For example, Greenwood (1977), studying Fuenterrabia, suggested that commodifying the Alarde, a 350-year-old festival, for tourists, devalued it for local people, so the event stopped. In fact, further analysis incorporating a historical perspective argued that strong Basque nationalism and the nature of local politics had more to do with stopping the Alarde than did tourism (Wilson, 1993).
Fractals

Another aspect of complex systems that might have implications for research is the notion of fractal patterns. Fractal patterns are most easily shown by looking at the structure of a cauliflower, which shows a similar branching arrangement throughout a series of levels. Fractals are patterns that repeat through a system but at different scales. In the social sciences it means that the patterns and processes that occur at the level of the individual might have much in common with the patterns that happen at the level of groups or communities. This should not be a surprising assertion given that complex systems consist of nested arrangements of smaller complex subsystems. The interactions of neurons may well have some similar patterns to the interactions of individuals. These patterns do not mean that one can automatically transpose explanation at one level to explanation at a different level within the system. It might, however, mean that there is something to be learned from comparing processes and patterns at the different levels, since these may reflect each other. Therefore, fractals might be useful as another point of reflection in an analysis of social-psychological processes.

Section summary

Complex systems are learning systems comprised of many different interacting parts, all of which can potentially influence each other. They are open, and can adapt to changes occurring in their external environments. Patterns emerge from the interaction of these parts, which then influence the behaviour of those same parts in a positive reinforcement pattern. This positive reinforcement means that new patterns can become established quickly, and remain stable for long periods. Under some circumstances, then, a complex system may appear to be quite stable. However, complex systems are dynamic entities, so many changes can occur without changing the overall structure of the system. After a period of stability, during which changes have been accommodated without any structural change, a system can reach a point of imbalance, disequilibrium, or self-organised criticality. At this point, a seemingly small perturbation will suddenly tip the system into major ‘catastrophe’ or structural change (Casti, 1994; Cilliers, 1998: 96). Complex system states also depend on past system configurations and patterns, and potentially may be seen as a series of reflections in which patterns at one level of the system contain similarities to patterns at higher or lower levels of the system.
Linkages Between Systems and Other Theoretical Perspectives

Just as there is much to be learned from understanding different standpoints within a system, there is much to be learned by working at the interfaces between disciplinary approaches. Many other authors have called for the integration of different disciplinary and theoretical perspectives to help in understanding real-world phenomena such as tourism. For example, Hall, Jenkins and Kearsley (1997) suggest that integrated strategic planning is critical in the development and management of sustainable forms of tourism. Similarly, Echtner and Jamal (1998) note the need for a way to integrate different disciplinary perspectives. Illustrating this point, Michael (1999: 59) argued that a 'jumbled' approach to research is useful in understanding the social world in what he calls a 'new paradigm.' He wrote:

[The new paradigm] is by no means a coherent endeavour: there are serious divides and divisions, there are divergent accounts of what sort of politics is being offered in these heterogeneous accounts and there are troublesome differences in the analytic resources that are brought to bear (concrete and situated, or abstract and universal?). Having noted these (healthy) difficulties, what holds this range of efforts together is what we might call a 'studied indifference to epistemology'. The purification of knowledge is not the aim. The real and the constructed (and their accompanying epistemologies) are not transgressed – they are jumbled.

In other words, explanation and understanding might come from parallel, but perhaps occasionally interlinked, accounts of what is being researched. This sits comfortably with the observation made earlier, that there are many ways in which one may look at a system, many different standpoints from which it can be viewed. If there is a way for the analyst to look at the system from several points simultaneously, then this offers a more coherent view of the system as a whole. The best view of the system might be from a meta level 'above' or outside the system, but researchers are part of the system and, therefore, affect the behaviour of the system. This means that theory cannot correspond to reality, since such an assertion implies that there is a stable unchanging reality from which researchers are separate. The only possible way of getting a better view of the system is to look at it from the many different standpoints on the inside.

After analysing the world of a 'couch potato', Michael (1999: 63) continued:

...layers of narratives, metaphors and ironies... weave in and out of the real and the constructed. ... more or less likely linkages have been drawn that explore the complexity of a seemingly simple figure: the couch potato. We have unsystematically traversed the borders of, and juxtaposed a number of disciplines: medicine, sociology, cultural studies, technological design...
In this case, Michael is looking at a couch potato from a range of standpoints, or a range of places within the social system, of which the 'couch potato' and the researcher, alike, are a part. Each of these different ways of seeing the system offered something to Michael’s analysis. Similarly, Law (1994) found that, used together, symbolic interactionism, actor-network theory and Foucault’s ideas about how power is developed and maintained in social systems, allowed his research data to be analysed more usefully than using just one perspective. A systems framework, therefore, offers insights into why it is worth using a research process that weaves together many different strands of knowledge.

The following sections outline some of the theoretical perspectives that I have found useful during the course of my research into the two communities of Rotorua and Kaikoura. My major focus during the course of this research has been on the local perceptions of tourism, and the ways in which locals have adapted to deal with the development of tourism in their area. People act and create meaning locally, based on their knowledge and feelings of control over what happens to them. This has been variously referred to as sense making (Mills, 2000), perceived control (Lefcourt, 1992) or ontological security (Giddens, 1984). In addition, the two communities under study have experienced profound impacts from the economic restructuring that has taken place across the globe during the last 30 years, indicating that understanding local events and practices involves looking at events and practices at regional, national and international levels. The history of both the local areas and of the wider political/social and economic environments also proved to be important in understanding present attitudes and behaviours associated with tourism. Likewise, the physical and technological environments influence social practices and behaviour within the two communities. There is, therefore, no single perspective that covers all these different levels of analysis. This thesis utilises a number of theoretical perspectives. What I aim to show is that all the perspectives presented here are compatible, or perhaps overlap, with the ideas inherent in a complex systems approach.

**Symbolic interactionism and social constructionism**

Becker and McCall (1990:3), adapting the work of Becker and Blumer, describe symbolic interactionism in the following terms:
Any human event can be understood as the result of the people involved (keeping in mind that that might be a very large number) continually adjusting what they do in the light of what others do, so that each individual's line of action 'fits' into what the others do. That can only happen if human beings typically act in non-automatic fashion and instead construct a line of action by taking account of the meaning of what others do in response to their earlier actions. Human beings can only act this way if they can incorporate the responses of others into their own act and thus anticipate what will probably happen, in the process creating a 'self' in the Meadian sense. (This emphasis on the way people construct the meaning of others' acts is where the 'symbolic' in 'symbolic interaction' comes from). If everyone can and does do that, complex joint acts can occur.

Thus, symbolic interactionists see society as a collection of (many) interacting people, all of whom continually affect the actions of the others, while at the same time, adjusting their own behaviour to fit in with the behaviour of others. From this dynamic set of interactions emerge complex joint acts and meanings. Arguably, they see society as a complex system.

Plummer (1996) suggests that symbolic interactionism was significantly influenced by pragmatism – a North American philosophy having several variants which:

[j]ejects the quest for fundamental, foundational truths and shuns the building of abstract philosophical systems. Instead, it suggests a plurality of shifting truths grounded in concrete experiences and language, in which a truth is appraised in terms of its consequences or use value. It is a down-to-earth philosophy, born of a period of rapid social change...

Littlejohn (1996) suggested that the ideas in social interactionism and social constructionism are the same. In both perspectives, knowledge is seen as contextual and relative. The meanings that people ascribe to the world, and the structures they 'see' in it depend on their experiences and interactions with that world and the other actors in it. This means that both symbolic interactionists and social constructionists focus more on agency than structure, and are concerned with looking at how people communicate through the use of language, gesture, meaning and symbol and how these patterns emerge from social interaction. Law (1994) suggests that symbolic interactionists observe the actions and reactions of the 'little' people in the system. These ideas all fit well as part of a complex systems perspective. Complexity theory takes into account more than just the local, and more than just human actors.
Social representations

Building on the work of Moscovici (1981), Pearce, Moscardo and Ross (1996) use the concept of social representations to analyse the relationship between communities and tourism. They postulate that individuals build up representations, or ways of thinking about tourism through actions and interactions with others. Groups within the community also develop shared representations of tourism or, for that matter, any other local issue. Shared (or group) social representations, individual social representations and the actions of people in the system all affect each other in a process of co-evolution (see Figure 5).
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Figure 5: Model linking individual and social representations (Pearce et al., 1996: 49)

This means that, in the case of tourism, communities will have a common set of ideas about tourism, that is, what it is and what it does, but at the same time, individuals’ ideas about tourism will differ slightly from those of other community members. Some will be very positive about it; others will be negative; many will be neutral, and these attitudes will be based on differing assessments of tourism and how it fits into their individual lives.

The line between group social representations and individual social representations is fuzzy and open. Both can change in relation to each other because of the recursive nature of representations as a whole. Similarly, the actions and reactions of people
within the system will influence these two types of representations. For example, local people may form some of their representations of tourism from interactions with tourists. This approach focuses on communities, and allows for the fact that individuals develop perceptions of tourism within the context of interactions with tourists, other community members, the media, etc..

The theories of social representations and symbolic interactionism, therefore, have some commonalities. Both frameworks require researchers to focus on interactions at local level, and the influence that people and groups have on each other’s actions through the co-evolution of meaning or social representations.

**Actor-network theory**

Actor-network theory also has similarities to symbolic interactionism, social constructionism and social representations, but, in actor-network theory, the actors are not exclusively human. Technology and the environment are conceptualised as participants in interactions, so, for example, in debates about dolphins and the effects of tourism on them, actor-network theorists would conceptualise the dolphins as actors as much as human beings. Similarly, whales are important actors in tourism in Kaikoura. Another aspect of this is that physical props such as furniture might be seen as actors also since the arrangement of such props can contribute to the maintenance and development of power (e.g., Law, 1994; Dugdale, 1999).

In comparing actor-network theory with symbolic interactionism, Law (1994: 18) has argued that symbolic interactionists tell their stories looking from the ‘bottom up,’ whereas actor-network theory looks from the ‘top down.’ Actor-network theory focuses on power and how it is maintained through both social and material networks. The inclusion of environment and technology as players in the social process opens the door for researchers to see people as embodied, physical beings rather than simply disembodied minds.

**Structuration theory**

Giddens’ (1984: 2) aim in formulating structuration theory was to ‘put an end to the... empire-building endeavours’ of both those who argue that the actor has primacy over social structure (interpretive sociologists) and those who argue that social structures and
institutions have primacy over action (functionalists and structuralists). Structuration theory then posits that social structures and institutions both constitute and are constituted by the actions of individuals in their everyday lives. Giddens (1984: 2) then sees that what is important in understanding the social world are the ‘social practices ordered across space and time.’

A fundamental part of the process of structuration is routinisation. The routinisation of everyday life involves the establishment of familiar patterns of interaction that are repeated over space and time. As Giddens (1984: xxii) wrote;

*The repetitiveness of activities which are undertaken in a like manner day after day is the material grounding of what I call the recursive nature of social life. (By its recursive nature I mean that the structured properties of social activity – via the duality of structure – are constantly recreated out of the very resources which constitute them (emphasis added).*

Thus, routinisation bears a close resemblance to Allen’s (1994) description of lock-in effects in systems. Routine, normal ways of behaving and interacting emerge from the interactions of human actors. As previously explained, these normal patterns of interaction then influence future interactions in a reinforcement loop. Such routines or recursive patterns do not prescribe behaviour. Rather, they make it more likely to happen and they make it more comfortable or familiar to the social actors involved. Thus, individual actors do not have to act in any particular way, but in general they find it easier to do so, and behaving ‘appropriately’ allows all actors in the situation a greater sense of familiarity, perceived control or ontological security. Thus, much of everyday life becomes predictable, patterned and secure.

This also resembles Moscovici’s (1981,1984,1988, cited in Pearce et al., 1996: 40) observation that ‘the core function of social representations is to make the unfamiliar familiar...’ and ‘... the need to understand the unfamiliar is presented ... as the major force driving the development and use of social representations.’ This theme is also reflected in the psychological concepts of schemas and scripts that describe individuals’ expectations of the routine of a range of previously experienced situations. It resonates with the idea of family patterns that are used at the microsocial level, as units of analysis in family systems theory (Lerner, 1992). It also explains the development of culture at a larger level of analysis. All of these ideas may be thought of in terms of lock-in or emergence from a range of levels in complex systems.
According to Giddens (1984), actors act with intention (and intelligence) in their day-to-day time-space, but they do not necessarily understand all the consequences of their actions, or the ways in which their actions reinforce the structures that exist and limit their action. This discussion echoes some of the ideas outlined earlier about the unintended consequences of the action of an individual in a system. To use Giddens’ (1984: 8) example, when authors write correctly in English, they reproduce the correct way to use the English language. Generally an author’s intention is only to achieve the former. The reproduction of the language is just an unintended consequence of her/his writing.

Echoing this, Senge (1990: 94) suggests that people within a system can be ‘held prisoner’ by the unintended consequences of actions that may have specifically been designed to mitigate a problem. Without an understanding of the linkages and patterns in the system, it is easy for a person’s actions to reinforce a particular problem, even though the action was intended to fix the problem. Senge (1990) gives as an example the actions of beer retailers who, in ordering beer, created an even greater shortage of beer in the short term, and a glut in the long term. Neither consequence was an intended outcome of the retailers’ actions of increasing beer orders. A classic ecological example of unintended consequences was the use of DDT as an insecticide to kill insects on agricultural crops. The DDT also had long-term effects on local bird populations because it decreased the thickness of their eggshells. As the bird population declined, the insect population increased (Pim, 1981 cited in Hanson, 1995). Similarly, increasing the capacity of roads around Auckland City, New Zealand, might appear to be a good way to reduce traffic congestion at rush hours, but increasing the capacity of the motorway might well increase the use of cars, increasing the original problems of congestion and parking in the inner city (Rankin, 2002).

What appears to be the obvious cause of the problem is not necessarily so. Rather, the problem may be the effect of a network of recursive or routinised patterns. Structuration theory, therefore, offers another way of thinking about recursivity, and the emergence of system structures. It resonates with ideas which exist at a range of levels of analysis, and in doing this also resonates with some aspects of a systems understanding of society.
Political Economy

As demonstrated, a complex systems approach can be used to incorporate some of the well-established theoretical perspectives developed in the social sciences. However, these theoretical perspectives underemphasise the larger-scale influences that may act from outside the system of interest. In particular, global and national level influences can be vital in understanding the impacts of tourism. Giddens (1991:1) noted that:

One of the distinctive features of modernity . . . is an increasing interconnection between the two ‘extremes’ of extensionality and intentionality: globalising influences on the one hand and personal dispositions on the other.

Schöllmann (1997), for example, discusses the images used to market Christchurch, New Zealand, to tourists and prospective residents and investors, focusing on the tension between global and local influences on the image-building project. Similarly, Horn, Simmons and Fairweather (1998) note the effect of national and international restructuring processes on tourism development in Kaikoura, its effects on resident’s perceptions of tourism, and on their inclination to participate in the political processes associated with that development. This approach bears some resemblance to the ideas developed in political economy, which see economic change and development in the context of wider political, cultural and social environments (see also Le Heron & Pawson, 1996; Schlotjes, 1993).

Political economy, as the term is used in contemporary literature, focuses mostly on larger political, institutional and economic change, and its effect on local and regional places. It has been used within the disciplines of economics (Bertram, 1997), geography (Le Heron & Pawson, 1996), political science (Mulgan, 1997) and sociology (Roper, 1997) to try to understand the linkages between economy, state and society. Currently, the primary focus of political economy is on change. Much of the work on New Zealand political economy focuses on the major changes wrought in New Zealand during the process of economic restructuring that took place from the 1980s. Authors have focused on economic sectors, localities, and on the effects that change has had on social structures such as class, wealth distribution and employment patterns among other things (Britton, Le Heron & Pawson, 1992; Kelsey, 1993; Le Heron & Pawson, 1996). This approach is useful for understanding the role that national and global changes have on local institutions and practices.
Political economy is, therefore, useful for understanding changes at local level. Its strength is its focus on what happens in particular places as a result of the intersection of the global, national and the local. In effect, political economists take a very broad view of what is happening in a particular place at a particular time. They think of the world as a series of interconnected and interacting parts. History is also seen as important for understanding how places and institutions came to be the way they are now. These ideas resonate with a complex systems perspective, which renders explicit how external influences can affect a system. Hanson (1995) suggested that using a systems approach to understand a phenomenon requires one to try to look at the system as a whole within a wider supersystem, rather than automatically reducing it to its parts.

Political economy provides a focus that highlights the relationship between a system and a supersystem. It can, therefore, usefully provide a contextual analysis of tourism, which supports, and is supported by, a complex systems perspective. Its main drawback, as Milne (1998:37) points out, is that it tends to focus on political and economic structure, so that a central tenet is that the tourism industry sets in train a 'vicious downward cycle of dependent and unsustainable destination development' which local people can, apparently, do little or nothing to affect, because it is all due to larger political and economic processes.

As noted earlier, the above theories have provided useful tools for analysing aspects of tourism and community during the course of this research. Each theory focuses on slightly different places within the system. For example, structuration theory is useful for considering recursive patterns that lead to the development of norms and other social structures. Symbolic interactionism focuses on local interactions, actor-network theory offers insights into processes of power and the interaction of the physical and the social, and political economy focuses on the intersection of global and local processes. Each perspective offers useful insights into, and interpretations of, community life and evolution. I want to use elements of them all in my analysis of the ways in which the communities of Rotorua and Kaikoura interact with tourism and tourists. A complex systems framework provides an umbrella for doing this.
Communities as Systems

The word 'community' is used often throughout this thesis, but it is a difficult word to use with confidence and with clear meaning. As noted earlier in this chapter, the reason for this is that community is a process, as is the meaning of the word 'community'. Many different people use the word in many different ways. Community is a form of social structure – an emergent feature of interactions within the system. The meaning of the word 'community' also has a linguistic structure, in that meaning emerges from the ways in which actors use the word in their communication processes. Thus, the Kaikoura community includes the groupings and divisions that emerge from the interactions of the people living in Kaikoura. In addition, the meaning of the word 'community' emerges from the way it is used amongst the actions and contexts of people using the word in communication.

When people in Rotorua and Kaikoura use the word 'community' they often refer to the residents of the area as a whole, and so are defining community in geographic terms. Others use the word in the sense of 'community participation,' which usually implies some kind of institutional interaction with residents of a particular place, who are seen to be some kind of homogeneous group of people with one opinion. Community in this sense is partly geographical, however, at times, I suspect that it is also entirely pragmatic and actually means, 'someone living in that place who is interested enough to talk.'

However, 'community' is also used to refer to a range of smaller, different communities of local interest, some of which have links to similar communities of interest in other places. These groups are also defined by their interactions, but they may work more as a cohesive unit – as a group with a common interest. So, for example, local environmental groups in Rotorua had the local environment as their common interest, and had links to other similar groups around the country, with whom they shared a more general interest in environmental issues. Similarly, people involved with tourism in both places had professional links to other institutions around New Zealand and internationally. In Kaikoura, the linkages were fewer. They included some professional linkages, but by far the greatest number of linkages were familial in nature.

Certainly, when one looks at the geographical communities under study in this thesis, they are collections of interacting individuals and groups, characterised as much by their differences as by their similarities. Communities are dynamic processes in which
differential power relationships, conflict, tolerance, intolerance, cooperation and competition are all played out over time.

There might be some kind of ideal community in which people can work together to use their differences constructively. When I talk about community development, I am talking about the processes that we might use to facilitate this ‘ideal’ – processes such as conflict resolution and helping people develop the skills to work with others through training, reflection and participation in community organisations. People working in community development also often include this vision of the ideal community when they use the term (Frank & Smith, 1999).

As with any complex system, community can at once be seen as both stable and unchanging, and as dynamic and constantly changing. It depends on what one focuses on and how one interprets experience and action. What this means is that communities are potentially very adaptable at the same time as providing a sense of stability to those living within them. Communities are what they are – a fragmented community is still a community, however, a fragmented community provides little stability and, therefore, little support for individuals within it. Thus, it seems that such a community is unlikely to adapt successfully, since a fragmented community cannot reflect on its own actions as well as can a cohesive one, so it does not see so many opportunities to influence system outcomes. This is because in a fragmented community the focus is more likely to be on changing others rather than on changing self.

Perceived Control in Complex Systems

Another important theme that runs through this thesis is the issue of control, a factor that has been discussed as important in moderating the impacts of tourism in the Cook Islands (Berno, 1995). In a complex systems framework, the concept of control is important. Complex systems are inherently unpredictable, particularly in the long term, and yet these systems also have periods of stability, during which a major perturbation may have little or no effect on the system as a whole. At other times, when the system is at a point of self-organised criticality, a very small perturbation can cause change. Individuals living within such systems will have very different perceptions of control, which, according to psychologists, is an important aspect of human psychology. Interestingly, many fields of human endeavour are connected with trying to gain a
greater sense of control over our complex, unpredictable world. Science, for example, can be seen as a quest to make the world more predictable and, therefore, easier and safer to live in. Politics can be seen as the study of how people vie for power and for control over others. Much satisfying recreation and work-related activity also revolves around individuals feeling some balance of challenge and ability, which results in a feeling of optimal arousal (Csikszentmihalyi, 1985, 1988; Hamilton-Smith, 1992). However, clearly these different examples illustrate that perceived control comes from different kinds of understanding and experience.

There are essentially two aspects to having perceived control. The first, and perhaps most obvious, is a sense that one can directly control outcomes in which one has an interest. In the case of tourism, for example, the control might be that one feels that one can participate in a planning process and affect the outcome of that process. Science and engineering is about trying to understand the world in such a way that we can directly manipulate it. This too is a direct form of control. Of course, direct control may not be ‘real’ since the influence of individuals or groups may have been incidental to any particular outcome.

Perhaps a less vulnerable form of control is indirect control. This kind of the control is exercised by knowing how to adapt. Often this adaptation comes from choosing to see the world in a different way. For example, Victor Frankl (1984) describes the ability of some of the inmates of the Nazi concentration camps in the 1940s to find meaning and purpose in their suffering and, therefore, to exercise a form of control over what was, for most, an uncontrollable and intolerable situation. A less extreme form of indirect control also comes in some forms of outdoor recreation such as alpine climbing, which occur in situations largely out of the direct control of the individuals involved in the activity. In these situations, the challenge is to adapt to the situation at hand, for example, by using one’s understanding of a situation to judge how and when to find shelter in the face of bad weather, or to minimise danger from avalanches (Scherl, 1994).

It is this secondary form of control that Brown and Giles (1994) discussed when they looked at the adaptive strategies that people employed in dealing with traffic and congestion in Byron Bay, Australia. Of particular interest was the observation that if people felt that they were recognised as locals, they felt better about dealing with any problems that arose during the busy tourist season. Being recognised changes nothing
physically in the environment but instead is about a sense of local solidarity and reflects the existence of social networks – something that Hirsch (1981) found was central to the ability of individuals to adapt to life stresses in general.

Perceived efficacy is an element in both direct and indirect control. Perceived efficacy is the sense of confidence that people have about their ability to cope with an undesired change or to effect a desired one. Knowing that one has the ability and tools to help control or adapt to situations effectively gives people an avenue of ‘escape’ from an undesired situation. Interestingly, it appears that it is the element of choice that is important and even an unpalatable alternative can help an individual adapt more successfully to bad situations (Lefcourt, 1992). As Lefcourt (1992: 129) observes, this element of choice requires an awareness of contrasting viewpoints in any situation and this ability:

...would seem quintessential for the experiencing of one’s self as a source or agent of one’s own fate.

Having a strong internal locus of control, therefore, requires a level of mindfulness or reflexivity, which allows an individual to interpret her/his position in the world as relative and, therefore, open to different interpretations.

It is difficult to separate out here the mental space associated with sense of control, and the ‘real’ space of having been successful in managing change or conflict in one’s environment. People with little control over their own lives are unlikely to have an internal locus of control. However, given that sometimes the choices that we have seem relatively insignificant, it appears that the way people are able to reflect on their situation can have a significant effect on their experience. This, in turn, builds a level of confidence for the next difficult situation. Perceived efficacy is part of a reinforcement loop in which the way people construe the situation affects what then happens, which in turn affects the construal. This can either very quickly reinforce one’s perceived efficacy or completely undermine it, particularly if one has little understanding or awareness of these underlying processes. In a very real way, understanding psychological processes can help people see their feelings as something that happens to many people. This can help remove the sense of isolation that many feel when they are finding life difficult. Understanding one’s own experiences as normal human experiences can therefore help
an individual gain some measure of control over their ability to deal with problems facing them. This is reflected in Brown and Giles’ (1994) findings discussed above. The concept of control is reflective of other complex system processes. Individuals’ senses of control and a community’s sense of control may also be seen as fractals – patterns that are repeated at different levels of system function. For example, Wong (1992) suggests that people can build their capacity to deal with stress and change by learning to see a situation differently, or to manage emotions, use exercise and build social support. Again, building such reserves requires reflection and engagement with things that can be quite uncomfortable for the individual. Developing the ability to act and reflect, and to build these kinds of resources at community level is also the basis of community development and ‘capacity building’ (Frank & Smith, 1999). In effect, capacity building is the process of building good levels of perceived control through helping people to learn to learn, to gather their collective resources and to think about how to adapt to the issues in front of them.

Conclusions

So far, I have outlined the nature of complex systems and the ways in which the characteristics of complex systems echo many of the ideas in social theory. My overall argument, then, is that a complex systems perspective can be used as an umbrella framework for integrating the understandings that come from a range of social theories. The ideas inherent in the perspective potentially provide a means of integrating understanding from a range of levels of analysis and concomitantly a range of different disciplines. It also offers the possibility of looking at the role and interplay of both structure and agency in social systems. Because tourism is best viewed from a range of perspectives, complex systems may provide an ideal framework for understanding tourism and its associated evolution and outcomes.

While researchers are beginning to comment on the lack of theoretical development in tourism research, this is also something that researchers consider a problem in other social sciences (for example, Vallacher & Nowak, 1994 a, b). The plethora of differing and competing theories seen in the fields of management studies, sociology, psychology
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1 The reader is referred to people such as Byrne (1999), Cilliers (1998) and Mainzer (1996) for more discussion of how a complex systems perspective might be incorporated into the social sciences.
and anthropology indicate that social systems might be constructively understood from a perspective that allows for the many complex interactions that happen in those settings.

Gregersen and Sailer (1993: 798) state that the ‘only attainable scientific goal is understanding when researching a chaotic domain’ so that much research in chaotic systems must remain essentially descriptive and aimed at understanding. Ironically, realising that long-term prediction is impossible is more empowering than struggling on and making predictions which continue to go awry. The notion that social systems, like ecosystems and economic systems, are in fact chaotic or complex may help researchers see their efforts in a wider context, and to focus more on understanding and adaptation, than on prediction and direct control. The other purpose of research may also be to help subjects see themselves and their community in the context of wider local, national and global influences. All this, of course, raises ethical questions in relation to how research findings are disseminated and utilised, and which groups have access to those findings.

The concept of community is central to this thesis – perhaps even more central than the concept of tourism. I have found in this chapter that thinking about community and the word ‘community’ from a complex systems perspective can help (paradoxically) clarify the uncertainty inherent in this concept. I find that it is more certain to work mindfully with uncertainty than it is to try and ‘freeze’ meaning in a way that eventually will make that meaning meaningless. I use the word ‘community’ in the everyday ways in which my respondents use the word. Despite this fluidity, I have tried to be mindful of my use of the word to minimise ambiguity. The reader will find that I use it in a range of ways and generally my meanings can be gleaned from the context in which I use it.

Likewise, the concept of perceived control is central to understanding the impact of tourism on the communities in Rotorua and Kaikoura. Perceived control itself is not something that local people discuss directly. Rather, their perceptions of control are revealed through their discussions of local processes and through the ways in which they talk about the impacts of tourism (in this case).

Having discussed my theoretical framework and discussed my terms, I now turn to exploring what this framework implies for research and research methods.
Having outlined the theoretical framework within which this thesis is conceptualised, in this chapter I consider the implications of using a complex systems perspective for the choice of research methods. I discuss how a systems perspective fits into a ‘pragmatic’ research philosophy in which scientists see themselves as searching for a truth that is not static and final, but dynamic and changing. The final part of this chapter reports the methods used for researching the communities of Kaikoura and Rotorua and the different challenges that each community presented for doing research of this nature. The research for this thesis was primarily qualitative in nature, however some quantitative data is used, so I have provided a discussion of the community telephone survey completed in each place.

Social Research: Issues and Challenges

A systems approach conceptualises the world both as a seamless whole, and as a number of parts. Complex systems are open; system boundaries are ‘fuzzy’ and defined largely by the observer. Research and researcher are a part of the system under study, a point that offers some interesting perspectives on the nature of validity, reliability and objectivity. A systems approach at once implies that there is a complex, real world of
which we are a part, and also suggests that the ways in which we divide up that world will affect what we see.

Dividing the world by disciplinary focus, ecologists focus on ecosystems, sociologists may view a geographically bounded community as a system, political scientists may focus on the nation state as a system and economists studying the effects of multinational corporations will focus on the global economic system, yet no complex, open system can ever be viewed in complete isolation. For the geographer looking at local economic development, for example, there is much to be gained from looking at changes in national and global economic systems (for example, Le Heron & Pawson, 1996; Schloetes, 1993). Similarly, addressing the problems created by acid rain requires knowledge of the links between global weather systems, pollution sources, local terrestrial and aquatic ecosystem processes, and associated social and economic processes (Gow & Pidwirny, 1996).

This section looks at some of the philosophical and epistemological issues associated with using a complex systems perspective. These include some discussion of validity, reliability, objectivity, the role of language and its relationship to research and theory, and issues associated with reflexivity. A discussion of the implications for research arising from a complex systems framework then follows.

Reliability, Validity and Objectivity

In a perspective that focuses on complexity and heterogeneity, validity can raise some interesting questions. A valid account of a system must reflect the experiences of people within that system. Nevertheless, it is conceivable that two individuals within a system may interpret that system differently. Optimists and pessimists, for example, tend to interpret a half glass of water from different perspectives (half full and half empty, respectively). However, both would agree that it is a half glass and arguments of both parties can be understood in terms of the different ways in which they see the world. Their respective interpretations do not make their assessments any less valid, although they differ, and both may be able to see how a different interpretation is made and both might well agree that there is truth in each account. One can even argue that both assessments add something to our knowledge of that half glass of water and its effects.

Reliability or replicability present problems and always have in systems-based research. Replicability is really only possible in controlled environments where the researcher can
eliminate or manage any variation that might affect results. However, outside of controlled situations, confounding variables and interaction effects clearly have an impact. For example, the tourism literature shows that studies of the effects of tourism in different places do not always produce similar results. Similarly, since systems change over time, the same results may not even occur twice in the same place. Observing such changes is the basis of monitoring, which can be seen as a form of longitudinal research used to measure the effect of interventions in any given system.

A complex systems framework is well informed by a *pragmatic* epistemology. Pragmatists tend to begin by focusing on problems, such as how to manage tourist destinations so that their tourism is as sustainable as possible. Deising (1991: 75) argues that pragmatists 'treat science as a process of inquiry or search for truth,' although they do not believe that there is a single, immutable truth to be found. Rather, truth is contextual and subject to change, and scientists cannot expect their search to realise definitive, permanent results.

To a pragmatist, theory does not necessarily correspond to reality because this 'assumes an external, unchanging world separate from us' (Deising, 1991: 78). Theory represents a step in the process of understanding and, therefore, contains ideas that best fit the facts as they are currently understood (Smith, 1984). Theory is, therefore, just part of the process of coming to know the world as best we can. Since we can never fully know and predict system behaviour, using a range of theoretical perspectives is better than focusing on only one. If we all inhabit the same system, then some commonsense knowledge of that system may not be so different in status from scientific knowledge of that system. The different knowledges can provide different insights into a system that as individuals we cannot see completely. As Figure 6 shows, combining the knowledge of two individuals within the system makes for a potentially greater understanding of the system.

An important aspect of pragmatic philosophy is constant reflection on methods and on the use of methods appropriate to the problem or question in hand. It is not enough to make assertions about the world without reflecting on the reasons why those assertions stand. Both commonsense and scientific knowledge must be open to questioning and reflection about the basis on which that knowledge is constructed. This means that pragmatists see science not just as careful, controlled inquiry, but also as constant reflection on the inquiry process (Deising, 1991). This process of reflection is neither
confined to science, nor does it seem to be a part of all science. It can also be a part of commonsense knowledge and experience. It is a similar process to that described by Langer (1989) as ‘mindfulness,’ which involves an openness to learning new ways of interpreting the world, and to questioning assumptions about the basis of one’s own experience and knowledge.

Figure 6: Visual representation of the greater scope of combining the knowledge of different people

This is the nature of objectivity. Being ‘objective’ might be seen as being mindful or aware of the situation as it is, as if it were unfamiliar or new, which is quite different to being ‘mindless’ or relying on habitual or learned responses (Langer, 1989). That these are two quite different mind states is confirmed by neurological research which shows that in new situations, or when performing new, unfamiliar tasks, people use much more of their brains than when a task or situation is familiar (McCrone, 1999). This explains why new situations and conducting qualitative research, even in familiar situations, are both tiring. Going into a familiar situation mindfully means trying to maintain a higher level of conscious engagement with that situation, a strategy that leaves one open to new learning. Habit is adaptive because it leaves one’s mind free to engage in other tasks when in familiar situations. It may also be maladaptive, however, to the extent that it implies that one’s interaction with a situation is built on what one expects, based on some previous experience, rather than with the situation as it is at the current time.
Another aspect of this definition of objectivity is that it does not mean avoiding all emotion. For the mindful researcher, emotions of both self and others are data that may be used in the same way that visual observations, aural recordings or written answers are used. It is, I would argue, more objective to reflect on one's feelings than it is to dismiss them. However, it is not objective if the researcher acts on emotion without understanding that her/his emotions can be patterned or habitual and so may be reactions to past experiences as much as to the current situation. Similarly, this process of patterned emotional reaction can be part of the situation for other actors in the research setting. Effectively, this means researchers can benefit from some knowledge of their own psychological make up. In many respects, it seems that a researcher may only be able to observe and understand in others what she is able to observe and understand as part of herself. Again, the essential ingredient is reflection or mindfulness, so that one is effectively watching oneself as well as other individuals.

The importance of this mindful approach was apparent to me many times during my research. It was sometimes difficult to engage with an interviewee because they talked about things that seemed boring – I had heard them all before or at least I thought I had. As I reflected on my feelings during some of these interviews, I realised that I was not listening to the person opposite me. Instead, I was listening more to my own internal feeling of boredom, which stemmed from thinking that I knew it all. Realising this helped me engage more fully with the person in front of me, to ask them questions to see if what they meant was what I thought they meant. The results of doing this were often surprising, in that I realised that I had not fully understood what I was being told. A few of these people were so surprising that engaging with them was a vital part of changing my own perspective on what I was studying. Without questioning, without trying to see the experiences of the person in front of me from their own perspective, and without trying to understand and reflect on my feelings during that engagement process, I would have missed much that has been important in reaching the understanding that I have.

The Role of Language and its Relationship to Research and Theory

Another challenge in social research centres around the use of language as both a method for building representational theories, and as a form of action. Language is the medium in which most research occurs. It is the medium in which researchers communicate their results to each other and to the broader community, and it is
sometimes the focus of research, for example, in the case of discourse analysis. Moreover, researchers themselves work within the discourses of their field or discipline, so language also has implications for the way in which research results are analysed and theorised. No matter what approach researchers use, the medium within which they work to communicate their findings is that of language. This is also the medium of theoretical development. One of the ‘rules’ of this particular academic ‘game’ is that understanding must be turned into words so that it can be communicated. Without this, new learning is not available to others.

Nonetheless, there is more to life as a whole than just spoken or written language. Some authors, for example, are beginning to examine practice and embodiment. Cromby and Nightingale (1999: 1-2) argue that it is time to turn away from an exclusive focus on discourse in social constructionism and psychology:

...it is time for social constructionist psychology to loosen its almost exclusive focus on language and discourse and begin to include other vital issues. ... Three issues that social constructionism currently fails to adequately consider (sic) are embodiment, materiality and power.

In addressing this problem, however, they note that;

...we write a book – and in so doing, move on to the very territory we are identifying as problematic and insufficient.

That is, the encompassing nature of language requires them to use language and, thus, to highlight language, yet again.

Another (related) difficulty is that a systems perspective constructs the world as a seamless whole in which the researcher/philosopher is enmeshed, alongside the system components under study. Since words break up the world, it appears impossible to understand the world completely using language. According to Abe (1985), Zen Buddhist philosophers have grappled with this problem for some time. Abe argues that to understand Zen philosophy, one needs to apprehend the world in its wholeness through the senses (by practising Zen meditation techniques) as much as to comprehend the world through the use of the intellect and words. The quest for knowledge in this tradition is seen as a broader quest for understanding, using a range of human experience as data. It is also interesting to note that these are both essentially mindful processes.
Of course scientific traditions also require an embodied approach to research by requiring empirical measurement. Despite this, in comparison with more holistic traditions, deductive science has assumed that measuring the parts will lead to an understanding of the whole. While understanding the parts ‘works’ under controlled circumstances, this approach has also led to a ‘magic bullet’ approach to problem solving. Thus, the ‘answer’ to a problem is seen to be the same across many contexts and small differences between contexts are considered unimportant.

In medicine, for example, individuals are usually treated the same, with little accounting for differences between individuals. There is a focus on fixing their problems using ‘magic bullets’ in the form of drugs. These drugs treat the effects of a problem, which indicates a focus on the present state of the individual, as if their history and overall state of health are unimportant. Medical science has had a huge positive effect on the general health of society, but it is becoming clear that it might do better if we saw medicine as part of a much bigger picture. The increasing ineffectiveness of antibiotics as bacteria breed themselves into more potent, drug-resistant forms, provides an example of the problems associated with a ‘magic bullet’ approach.

The focus on effects means that the focus of medicine has been on treating sick people rather than on keeping people well in the first place, or on keeping them well once a drug has ‘fixed’ the symptoms. In addition, as medicine has become more technologically advanced, doctors and researchers have ignored the psychological and emotional aspects of disease. Recent research has begun to show their importance in treating disease (Goleman & Gurin, 1995; Pelletier, 1995; Williams, 1995). Likewise, Weil (1996) argues that this focus on individual ‘magic bullets’ means that medical research techniques are aimed at eliminating the placebo effect. Instead, he suggests that it would be profitable to understand this effect and its interactions with different treatments better, so that it can be harnessed. Most significantly, shifting the focus from trying to eliminate the placebo effect opens up some new avenues for treating people.

Another way of explaining the difference between deductive science and complex systems science is that science tends to conceptualise the scientist as ‘over-standing’ the system – as being bigger than the system and outside of it. In comparison, in more holistic traditions, people have seen themselves as a very small part of the system, which is something much bigger than them, and so requires a different, perhaps more
humble, approach to knowledge. In some respects then, this could be seen as ‘under­standing’ the system (Cilliers, 1998).

Both approaches are valid ways of coming to know the world. They understand the world (the system) from two different perspectives, which returns me to my earlier argument: that one can get a better view of a system by using parallel explanations of it. In other words, the best way of coming to know the world is by researching it from different places, listening to different narratives, and reflecting on different ‘types’ of experiences that people have within it. The Western ‘parts’ view of the world does not really present a challenge for the use of language. Trying to apprehend the world holistically is a more difficult task and draws attention to the paradoxes that language use creates.

**Embodiment**

Trying to put things into words is, to some extent, using only one aspect of the researcher’s experience and understanding. My understandings of the world, and in particular of tourism in Rotorua and Kaikoura, have grown from my embodied experiences of going to live as a stranger in those two places. Those experiences were physical and emotional as well as intellectual, and, altogether, they contributed to my understanding of life and work in those places. Experiences speak directly through body and emotions and, therefore, they are not always easily expressed in words. In the academic sphere, emotions tend to be dismissed as subjective, intuitive, and therefore, invalid as parts of the overall research process. I argue that they are intrinsic to it, since they are a vital part of coming to understand the parts of the world under study – as important as the intellectual processes that are involved too.

Law (1994) noted that researchers are not supposed to feel culturally, physically or emotionally uncomfortable or scared and, if they do, their reactions are not seen as an important part of research. Of course, many of these experiential aspects of research are removed or minimised by the methods used to investigate the subject matter: for example, postal surveys that do not involve the researcher interacting personally with
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1 Of course I have had to discuss mind, body and emotions separately here, as if people are actually made up of these parts. This arises from a limitation with the language I must use rather than from any assertion that these ‘parts’ actually exist. They are all integral to being a human being.
the subjects of the research. Instead the phone call is made by an intermediary employed for the task of collecting data. Telephone surveys also limit the physical and emotional experience of doing research, while face-to-face structured interviews also limit the time spent with research subject(s).

The importance of ‘embodiment’ or ‘apprehension’ in relation to the acquisition of understanding has been discussed in settings other than research settings. People who work in complex settings such as hospitals or in alpine environments become competent through developing both their theoretical (language-based, intellectual) knowledge and their experiential understanding (Beare, 2001; Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1996). Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1996), for example, explored the stages that nurses go through during their training from novice to expert. Novice nurses have to learn theory through reading and listening. This learning is an intellectual, language-based process. As nurses gain competence they are able to integrate more information. To begin with, they do this by recourse to more and more rule-based knowledge. As a nurse’s practical experience increases, however, their skills of observation and their assessments of the broader situations change and become more ‘intuitive.’

According to Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1996), experienced, competent nurses integrate a great deal of information and can immediately grasp the whole situation and ‘intuitively’ assess what is going on, so that they can act quickly and effectively in a way that the nurses describe as ‘not thinking’. Thus, experienced nurses appear to use intuition. This intuition is a deep level of understanding that involves the assessment of a great deal of information all at once. It is not a mysterious, incomprehensible process. Instead the process is one where individuals who have developed much understanding can see the situation in a more holistic way than a novice can. Thus, competence as a nurse develops from both intellectual (linguistic) learning and (embodied/ emotional) experience or practice.

**Reflective Intuition**

Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1996) add that, when possible, good nurses analyse their ‘intuition’ after they have made an assessment by finding ways to continue questioning what is happening. Thus, they begin once again to see if the pieces of their analysis actually fit their overall picture of what is going on. This means that experienced nurses continually oscillate between intellectual and ’intuitive’ (i.e., physical and emotional)
data to understand the complex world in which they work. While they may be able to explain their assessments in words, their assessments are not made only through using rules and theories (that is, linguistic/intellectual reasoning). The act of making these assessments is, therefore, a mindful process in which the individual continually searches for evidence from a range of sources or perspectives, both linguistic/theoretical and emotional/intuitive, to check their analysis.

Intuition in this context is, therefore, about people recognising whole-system patterns. Senge (1990) alluded to this when he noted that systems patterns can be difficult to see from inside the system but that good managers may often see how a system works intuitively without necessarily being able to articulate what exactly is going on. While ‘structures of which we are unaware hold us prisoner’ (Senge 1990:94), learning to see the structures within which we operate begins a process of ‘freeing’ ourselves from these previously unseen ‘forces.’ This is the essence of the mindfulness or objectivity discussed earlier in the chapter.

Language can be seen as a kind of technology that allows people to learn more quickly, or, as Abe (1985) suggests, to become less blind, to see more clearly. Like other forms of technology, it allows human beings to extend their influence and to make their way in the world more easily than might otherwise be the case. In addition, language allows knowledge and understanding to become more socially constructed and, therefore, to be developed by communities rather than just by individuals. Thus, language might be seen as a technology which provides a way of sharing experiences and knowledge and so is vital for building understanding and knowledge. Language reduces the world to words, but in so doing, it draws attention to aspects of the world that might otherwise go unnoticed. But there is more to knowing, learning and understanding than the intellectual or linguistic on its own.

There are good reasons to acknowledge that understanding does not develop in a disembodied mind, but it develops from the interaction of mind, body, emotions with other minds and the world as a whole. Holistic assessment of a system requires that we oscillate between contemplation of the system as a whole and contemplation of the parts of that system. Breaking a system into parts is a necessary process in developing understanding. The parts on which we focus depend on who is contemplating the system and why they are doing so. Interestingly, then, my aim as a systems researcher is to try to apprehend the world as a whole, which I can do only by both experiencing the
world and by reflecting (thinking and talking) on its parts in a continuous process of coming to understand. As Law (1994: 50) says of his research process:

> For this, it seems to me, is what ethnography – and I think, any form of learning – is about. It is about seeing, hearing, noticing, sensing, smelling and then raking over what has been noticed and trying to make some sense out of it.

Of course, writing is a part of this ordering process – the process of making sense.

Another important corollary of the development of integration and intuition, is that it makes sense to suggest that human beings are adapted for living in a systems world. An ability to learn, adapt and to understand the world intuitively could be seen to arise from the fact that our brains themselves are complex systems. Thus, they may be able to mirror the patterns that exist in the complex world around them. In a stable environment, human patterns of thinking might themselves become very structured and stable. In a changing environment, patterns of thinking will change or adapt, a fact which reflects both a system’s ability to learn, and the fact that learning and changing might also be seen as a learned pattern. As a species we can get better at learning and changing, and as a community we can get better at learning and changing – another fractal.

Similarly, Cilliers (1998) argues that it is useful to think of language, itself, as a complex system, where meaning arises from the interactions of words and their use by human beings. It also makes sense that a system of communication that arose from the intersection of many complex systems (brains, environments, etc.) is itself a complex system. Words on their own do not contain meaning. Their meanings are not representative of the world, but instead emerge from their use and interaction with other words. Thus, language as a system adapts to changes in the wider environment – it may be seen as an evolving entity that can change or remain stable, depending on the circumstances of its use.

It is fitting that the tools people use to explore the complex systems within which they live, mirror the world itself in terms of the patterns and ways in which it works. This illustrates the fractal nature of complex human social systems.

**Implications for Research**

Seeing the world from a systems perspective raises a number of questions and issues about research methods and the outcomes that researchers produce. A systems approach
implies that researchers should look at systems as a whole, seeing the relationships between different parts of the system and endeavouring to understand how past processes and influences have contributed to the current state of the system. The approach does not provide much direction for the interpretation of data and, in fact, a systems approach is more akin to the ideas espoused in a grounded theory approach (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corban, 1990) in which theory is induced from the research data. Law (1994: 50) in discussing his ethnographic research, which although not explicitly using a complex systems perspective, uses many of the same principles, reflects this in saying:

Research (and not just research) is a process, a reflexive process of uncertain and provisional imputation. It points to the ordering process in which we weave to and fro between traces and imputations. It speaks of the process which generates a sense of pattern and with that, as [sic] series of 'decisions' about what will count as warrantable simplifications and translations – what, in other words will count as 'data'. And it admirably points to the iterative or emergent character of the process of ethnographic ordering.

Thus, research itself may be seen as a system of interactions and processes through which we just learn to go on, ordering the world in ways that make sense on the basis of past learning and life experiences. Research findings are not some unquestionably correct and final outcome of research, but are better seen as part of an adaptive process, which occurs between the evolving world 'out there,' the evolving thinking of the researcher and the thinking of the greater community of researchers and practitioners. All findings are contingent and potentially subject to change. Thus, as Law (1994) put it, a 'modest' approach to doing research is prudent.

Law (1994) suggested a number of aspects of sociology that a 'modest' sociologist must understand. These are recursivity, symmetry, non-reduction, and reflexivity. These are all things that are also implied by a systems framework (Hanson, 1995; Cilliers, 1998). In addition, Hanson discussed causality in a systems approach. Each of these will now be discussed in the following sections.

Recursivity

Instead of being seen as a tension between structures and agencies, Law (1994) suggests that patterns may arise from social interaction processes. Structures, therefore, emerge from recursive patterns, which effectively reinforce themselves. He calls these processes 'self-generating processes,' and noted: 'The social world is this remarkable emergent phenomenon: in its processes it shapes its own flows. Movement and the organisation of
movement are not different' (Law, 1994: 15). When conducting research then, it is worth trying to recognise patterns of positive reinforcement.

**Symmetry**

*To insist on symmetry is to assert that everything deserves explanation, and more particularly, that everything that you seek to explain or describe should be approached in the same way* (Law, 1994; 9-100, emphasis in original).

Because in a system, causality is not always clear, it is potentially unwise to focus one’s explanation on one part of the system. All agents and structures in the world are products of that world and they are producers of it. Similarly, one should explain the whole system as much as one explains the parts, and explaining the parts might be as important as explaining the whole. Symmetry becomes an important concept when one considers that systems can be nested within larger systems, thus, in a sense, the system boundaries and, therefore, the level of explanation, may be seen as arbitrary. While it is important to look at the system as a whole, in fact any system will always be part of other systems and will intersect with other systems. Therefore, being open to explaining a range of system parts and contexts is important.

Law (1994) does not privilege human elements either. Another way to consider symmetry is to consider looking at material objects as things that deserve explanation since they also interact with the social. A table is a table not because it has four legs and a flat top (in most cases). It is a table because it is used in a particular way, it sits in a particular kind of place and because its physical characteristics afford a particular kind of use. Therefore, it interacts with other aspects of its environment in a particular set of ways. A seat may have a similar construction – four legs and a flat top (in most cases), but it interacts with its environment differently and may be explained by its place in the process of system interactions. Thus, materials and non-human elements in the environment can be seen as actors that affect action and reaction. Similarly, the environment may affect how social scientists ‘order’ the world, or it may help to maintain power structures within the system, depending on its interaction with the social or ecological.

**Non-reduction**

In his discussion of non-reduction, Law (1994: 12) wrote, ‘lying at the core of the modern project, … is the notion that there is a small class of phenomena, objects or
events that drives everything else…’ Of course, subscribing to reductionism as defined in this way, one automatically loses the idea of symmetry, since the parts that drive the system are distinguished from what they drive and so are assumed to be given and natural, rather than in need of explanation themselves.

Instead of reducing the world into its parts a priori, Law (1994) suggests that the drivers and the driven may be seen as emerging and developing from recursive patterns. To do this, one must see that these patterns are not immutable or frozen. Regularities are, therefore, seen as effects and, like everything else, including sociological explanations, they can be undone or changed. This assertion resonates with a complex systems perspective. A complex system, with its many interacting parts, may form internal structures as a result of positive feedback, but changes in the system may well result in changes to the internal structures.

Hanson (1995:9) regards this non-summativity (that is, the whole is more than the sum of the parts) as the starting point for research using a systems approach. Echoing Law, she wrote: ‘There are things that emerge only together, and therefore, cannot be taken apart and put back together’ (Hanson, 1995: 22). For example, groups of people tend to behave in patterns that depend on the actions of others and on their interpretation of the situation and their experience of what they perceive to be similar situations (Mandler, 1990; Ross & Nisbett, 1991). These patterns are not just about the actions of individuals — they are group patterns and not clearly predictable from knowing the individuals in that group. Similarly, Brewer (1984) outlines how tourists behave on fishing trips because of the stereotyping and actions of hosts. Left to themselves, the tourists and the hosts, alike, would behave differently when out fishing. However, their interactions give rise to a new set of group behaviours.

**Reflexivity**

A modest sociology, Law (1994) pointed out, cannot conceptualise research as an observation between neutral or disembodied intellects. As he says, we (as researchers) are also products of the social processes that we are trying to understand. Our writing is also a part and product of that process. As a researcher of tourism and communities, I became a part of the communities under study. My presence in the systems, and the process of asking questions and observing, may well have affected the trajectory of the system. Thus, the very act of doing research is itself something that may affect the
evolution of the system, whether or not that research is ever used for some form of intervention.

No matter what methods the researcher uses, she must step into the system under study, and by that move, she becomes an agent within it. More obviously, asking questions about topics that people may not have thought about previously can get them thinking about issues and talking to others. Some researchers see the effect of their questions directly as in the case of Buchanan (1996: pers. comm.), a masters student who interviewed disabled people about constraints on their leisure. He recounted that a few interviewees commented that just thinking about what constrained them made them realise that they did not have to be constrained by their disability. By the end of their interview, they reported that they intended participating in some new activity in the near future. For others, the effect may not be so obvious, but given that even small differences in initial conditions may affect future system outcomes, the researcher will have some kind of effect even if only very small. Of course, it may not always be clear what this effect will be.

**Context**

There is nothing new in asserting that to understand actors in a social system we must understand contextual factors (Giddens, 1984; Shaffir & Stebbins, 1991; Smith 1984). It is possible to ask for opinions in a community, but how did those people come to think the way that they do? What is the context for these opinions? What are the things that are important to people and how does tourism fit into this larger context? People may see different aspects of tourism in their day-to-day lives. Individuals who find that buses and crowds lining the streets at midday make it difficult to shop, may think of tourism in terms of crowding. Individuals who meet tourists in a setting where they can talk and learn from each other, may think of ‘tourism’ very differently.

Wall (1996:207) also alludes to the need to take account of context:

> While much is known about the consequences of tourism for destinations in a general sense . . ., much less is known about the types of tourism which stimulate these changes and the contexts in which these changes occur.

Contextual factors can be difficult to study, so researchers may need to engage with a system for some time before they can build a clear picture of what is happening. Without spending the time, there is a risk of misinterpreting what is happening in a setting (Wilson, 1993).
These ideas are common in literature on social construction, symbolic interaction and social representations, which discuss the role of context in understanding what is happening in a system under study.

**The ‘butterfly effect’ and the ‘ghost’ of causality**

The unpredictable nature of complex systems has been seen as an important aspect of the perspective. Russell and Faulkner (1999) for example, discuss the ‘butterfly effect’ (outlined in the last chapter) by looking at ‘chaos-makers’ and their role in changing the Gold Coast in Australia. They looked at entrepreneurs who had a major role in developing the Gold Coast, and compared them with people whose job was to plan and regulate tourism development. They argued that these ‘chaos-makers’ created a great deal of change at times in the development of tourism in the area. The implication here is that particular individuals caused the changes that occurred. While these individuals were certainly important in influencing the system, I argue that it is important to be careful about asserting causality in such circumstances.

Cause and effect are not always clear in a complex system (Hanson, 1995). It might appear that one individual set off a series of changes, but it would be unwise to say that they *caused* them. In fact, it is most likely that changes in the system had brought it to a point of ‘self-organised criticality’, so that any similar perturbation would trigger change. In terms of understanding the system it is just as meaningful to look at instances where people with similar characteristics did *not* create change in the system. Certainly, it would make sense to compare the stories of successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs.

Causality is, therefore, a difficult concept to integrate simply in this perspective. As an example, if Fred and Burt are arguing, who is the cause of the argument? Was it Fred who annoyed Burt or was it Burt who reacted to Fred? When behaviour is seen as a series of moves made by actors/ institutions/ communities (or whatever the unit of analysis is) in reaction to the moves made by others in the same system, it becomes difficult to see how cause and effect can be defined, particularly in light of the fact that similar systems with similar initial conditions can evolve very differently. Focusing too much on looking for ‘butterflies’ might direct observers to miss the effects of more numerous events happening within the system.
Complex Systems and Methods

While a range of methods might be used under the umbrella of a systems approach, the sheer quantity of data needed to investigate and record interactions and processes over time points to the necessity of using qualitative methods. According to Gregersen and Sailer (1993) much social research to date has been based on single, cross-sectional studies, and analysed using standard statistical methods aimed at predicting future system outcomes. For studying chaotic systems, these methods are likely to miss many important features of the systems under study. Furthermore, they argue that long-term studies are necessary and that the likelihood of doing this well using quantitative methods is not high. This is because to track change quantitatively over time, one needs to know what is going to change and how, and as illustrated in the discussions above, in chaotic systems, very similar initial conditions can lead to very different and unpredictable outcomes over time. This feature of chaotic systems makes it very difficult to know what to measure over time. As Gregersen and Sailer (1993:793) put it:

To truly access a chaotic system . . . thousands of synchronic observations would be necessary, spaced out over a long enough time period that potential divergent behaviour would have time to manifest itself. Furthermore, these data would need to avoid the potential reactivity bias of respondents providing information . . . over so many points in time.

In other words even if one was to cover the field of potential change, the sheer quantity of data, the size of the instrument and the logistics of collecting it frequently over time are going to make it difficult to get valid and useful results at a price that is affordable.

The researcher wanting to understand tourism in a complex system and its associated processes and interactions must have time to observe, participate and discover contexts, emergent features, outside influences, internal dynamics and the processes by which people negotiate the meaning of tourism, planning and impacts. Qualitative methods such as participant observation / in-depth interviews and historical research are much more able to track change, development and context (Gregersen & Sailer, 1993; Hanson, 1995; Smith, 1984). These methods allow the researcher to spend time in a setting, to observe the operation of unofficial and official networks, possible undercurrents of local tension, and to understand the impact of outside factors on the way that people live their day-to-day lives. This also allows a researcher to incorporate data from their own experiences and feelings associated with mixing with subjects on a number of different levels – not just in an official research role. In addition, physical and emotional experiences in the research setting may help the researcher develop a
whole-system view, compared with the situation of doing survey research from a distant location.

Qualitative methods also lend themselves to the analysis of interactions between individuals and groups within a community. Understanding local politics, for example, is best achieved using qualitative methods, since it allows one to observe how people affect each other's behaviour. It is more possible to map patterns of interaction using a qualitative approach.

Overall, qualitative methods, including unstructured or semi-structured interviews and participant observation, allow a much greater depth of understanding of a system. Similarly, the use of written sources, including histories, family records and previous research reports, can provide good background information which may not necessarily come to light in the use of other methods. However, the level of detail and the time required to complete and analyse interviews and observations make it impractical to apply such qualitative methods across a large number of people.

Despite their inadequacies when used on their own, quantitative methods can provide a different perspective on the way a community is currently feeling about an issue. Used in conjunction with more in-depth approaches, they provide information from a different standpoint. Quantitative methods are very good for gathering data from a large number of people who may also have widely differing views of tourism (for example). They are also good for assessing how those views are distributed across a community. Quantitative survey methods, therefore, are an excellent way to investigate a small number of relatively simple questions across a large group of people. They also allow for some overall trends to be measured over time and so may be used to monitor the effects of an intervention or management strategy. In this case, it is important to be careful whether what is being measured is, in fact, the right thing.

Denzin (1989) argues that using a range of methods helps to minimise the shortcomings inherent in each. Simmons (1985) argues that using both qualitative and quantitative methods is more likely to yield both reliable and valid results.

**Outline of Methods Used in this Study**

For the reasons outlined above, a range of methods has been used to understand the impacts of tourism on the Kaikoura and Rotorua communities and the ways in which they have adapted to change. As noted earlier in the thesis, the research for this thesis
was a small part of a multidisciplinary programme aimed at understanding tourism impacts and dynamics at community level in selected New Zealand communities. Four communities were selected as research sites based on their level of tourist flow and the size of the resident community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High tourist numbers</th>
<th>Large resident community</th>
<th>Small resident community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rotorua</td>
<td>Kaikoura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>South Island West coast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This thesis represents a comparison between the first two sites at which the research was completed. Rotorua and Kaikoura are the two sites chosen on account of their high tourist numbers.

Figure 7 outlines the focus of different researchers within the overall programme in Kaikoura and Rotorua. As the researcher looking at community responses to tourism, I spent six months living in the two places. As part of this I lived in the house rented by the programme to provide accommodation for all researchers. What this effectively meant was that most of the research team spent time staying with me when they came to collect their data. Through innumerable conversations about their and my work, I was able to learn in detail about what other researchers in the programme were doing and at times I helped them develop survey instruments or collect data. This gave me access to much information about many aspects of tourism at the two sites. This thesis includes some of that information which effectively became part of my own data.

Another important aspect of the research was that in both locations, local Māori researchers were used to complete the research on Māori responses to tourism. These Māori researchers were people that I was able to work alongside and they also were able to fill the role of a local informant – someone that I used to talk to about my findings and get their impressions and interpretations of those findings. These informants often provided a slightly different interpretation of my data than the Pākehā informants that I used in the same role. In essence, the different informants that I used in both places provided me with a new layer of data. The frequent presence of other researchers during the data collection stages of the research also provided some information that I
could use to “triangulate” with my own information and to query where our respective data seemed to be at odds or to tell different stories.

Figure 7: The overall research programmes within which the research for this thesis fitted

Community responses research

My own research included a range of different elements in both communities. Data were collected when I spent six months living in Kaikoura and six months in Rotorua. Figure 8 outlines the methods that I used to understand the responses of the two communities to being visited by large numbers of tourists.

The methods that I used had to be adapted to the different situations that were presented to me over the course of researching community responses to tourism in Kaikoura and Rotorua. Kaikoura and Rotorua were very different places with very different histories and different resources available for researchers to use. In Kaikoura, very little historical or social research had been completed, whereas in Rotorua there was a wealth of information that had been collected and collated by other researchers. Thus, the relative mix of methods differed between the two sites.

The methods also changed with changes in my and the rest of the team’s knowledge about the settings in which we were working and to our changing knowledge about what we were actually researching. Questions that seemed vitally important at the beginning of the data collection phase in both places later came to seem less important but new questions and concepts took on greater importance as the research proceeded. The research was itself an adaptive process that was influenced by a wide range of
factors and it had to be in order to draw out and develop the understanding that we all built as the research programme evolved.

This adaptation process is necessary if we are to develop and build new theoretical understandings of the community-tourism interface. Any research method that does not accommodate such change will limit its scope to collecting data based on the initial understanding of the researchers involved. Research like this allows deeper exploration of known perspectives but does not contribute much to the development of new insights and understandings.

Figure 8: The methods used to elucidate community responses to tourism in Kaikoura and Rotorua

Participant and non-participant observation

One thing that I want to highlight is the importance of spending time just living in the two places. The participant observation work that I did in both places included me attending the local woodchopping contests and the A&P show in Kaikoura, going to the local movie theatre on a Sunday, talking to people in the shops, going to the beach, the swimming pool, etc. to meet people in places where there might be the opportunity to listen, watch and talk. My attendance at public meetings, which occurred in both places, I have classed as non-participant observation, because at the time I was not observing, although in every case I had the opportunity to talk to participants about it afterwards.

The work that I describe as participant observation was arguably more important in Rotorua where it was difficult to persuade individuals not involved in tourism to be formally interviewed. They steadfastly maintained that tourism was nothing to do with
them, and did not affect them at all, so, they argued, I was wasting my time. I found a more comfortable route to learning about the general community’s views of tourism was to talk more informally to the people I met. Many conversations happened while I was formally working – when I met people in the course of my work but with people that acted more as local informants rather than as interview subjects. While in Rotorua, I also attended political rallies, market days, and whatever local events I could. In addition, I was able to observe and chat with people at times in local recreational spaces around Rotorua – the swimming pool, the gym, a yoga studio, the local forest, and the many different lakes around the area. The many observations that I made and the conversations that I had with people were not always about tourism, but they gave me insights into the issues that concerned local people and the things that they valued. There were also frequent opportunities in these activities to ask people about tourism in the local area and their perceptions of local politics and the local community.

Any information that seemed useful was recorded in a diary kept while living and participating in life in the two places. This kind of information was useful for further substantiating interview data and for piecing together community structure and function. It was also of some use in understanding the patterns of tourist movement around the towns and the kinds of interactions that tourists and locals have with each other.

**Interviews**

In Kaikoura, I completed 64 formal in-depth interviews between July 1997 and March 1998. In comparison, in Rotorua only 35 interviews were completed, however much more time was spent reading historical and social/ geographical research completed by other researchers. The Rotorua data were collected between October 1999 and May, 2000.

In both Rotorua and Kaikoura, these interviews were semi-structured and tape-recorded where possible. I also took detailed notes, many of which were later transcribed onto computer. An interview took anywhere from 30 minutes to four hours, depending mostly on the stamina, interest and time of the respondent(s). Most took one to one-and-a-half hours.

The main aims of the interviews were to build a detailed picture of community structure, function and history and to understand individual perceptions of tourism in the two places and the underlying reasons for those perceptions. They also provided
insights into the ways that the various players in the public and private sectors interact with each other, and how these interactions influence the management and development of tourism.

I arrived at each interview with a list of questions that I thought might be important. However, each interview took its own course and the interview tended to take the form of a long conversation in which I aimed to clarify my understanding of the interviewee’s perspective. Sometimes I found myself asking questions that I had not originally planned, usually when an interviewee highlighted connections or processes that I had perhaps not seen as important. Sometimes, too, interviewees would frame their answers to my questions in ways that made me realise a whole set of new connections and understanding that I had not previously grasped.

Interviews also varied depending on what I knew of the background of the interviewee. For example, I asked the ex-mayor of Rotorua about his experiences of amalgamation, and his view of what had happened around that time, while I asked the first CEO of Tourism Rotorua about what happened in the early days of that organisation and about his goals and objectives while he was working in that position. Likewise I asked one of the local social workers in Kaikoura different questions to those I asked of the local businesspeople that I interviewed. Each person I talked to had a different perspective on events and processes which required a different line of questioning even when the original question might have been similar. ‘Tell me what you think about tourism,’ for example, elicited very different responses, which then led to a very different line of questioning to explore those responses in more depth.

**Interview sampling strategy**

In both Rotorua and Kaikoura, interview respondents were initially contacted because I met them in the course of trying to find a place to live in the local area, or they had been recommended by my one or two local contacts, or they were aware of the research and had helped the team design the programme. This, as Lofland & Lofland (1984: 7) put it, constitutes ‘starting where you are’

From these initial contacts I moved into the wider community by using snowball sampling (See Lofland & Lofland, 1984). During this phase I was starting to get a picture of the way in which the community was structured which then became one element of my future selection of interview subjects. By asking for information about
each suggested person I was able to target people from a range of religious, familial, racial and socio-economic backgrounds. I also aimed to make sure that I interviewed both males and females from a range of age groups. Kaikoura interviewees varied in age from 16 to 88 years, and included several tourism operators, several social workers, several public servants, several trades-people, several retirees, two high school students, and several individuals employed in tourism as well as many people who were not specifically involved in it but who came from different sectors of the community – eg sheep farming, dairy farming, fishing, Māori, townspeople etc.

As the research progressed my sampling became more purposive and I spoke to particular individuals who were known to carry knowledge of different aspects of the community and of tourism. This means that as the research progressed the sampling strategy changed from pure snowballing to purposive sampling aimed at both getting some representation from the various community divisions and groupings and gathering specific knowledge that seemed important for understanding history and local social and political processes.

In Rotorua there was more information available from previous research. There are a number of Masters and PhD theses on different aspects of Rotorua (for example, Ateljevic, 1998; Te Awekotuku, 1981; Chrzanowski, 1997; Morriss, 1986; Schlotjes, 1993; Terpstra, 1999; Waaka, 1980). The Rotorua District Council is involved with a considerable amount of social research through the Social Policy Unit, which produces analyses of community needs (for example, Rotorua District Council, 1998a, b; 1999a, b). Another Council unit, Tourism Rotorua monitors tourism in the area, and the Business and Economic Development Unit publish Rotorua demographic and economic data (for example, APR Consultants, 1998a,b &c). Historical data were also an important part of this research, and much time was spent reading accounts of Rotorua’s history. There was also good access to local experts such as Don Stafford – a well known local historian who has written many books and has very high standing as a repository of both Māori and Pākehā knowledge.

In Rotorua the questions that I found myself asking were different to those that I asked in Kaikoura. In Rotorua, tourism was managed very differently to the way it was managed in Kaikoura. The local council was much more involved in the local management of tourism, and it appears that it had done a good job of its involvement since the local industry was less fragmented than was the case in Kaikoura, and the local
community was less concerned about tourism. Thus, much of my work in Rotorua involved looking at the way in which Tourism Rotorua had developed, the ways in which the local business community and the general public related to Tourism Rotorua and the mechanisms within Council that allowed what appeared to be the successful management of tourism.

There was less primary work to do investigating local history and political processes and the size of the Rotorua community also decreased the number of clear divisions within the Rotorua community (as outlined in detail in Chapter 8). Perhaps one of the most useful aspects of Rotorua was the presence of local researchers who had a research-based knowledge of their community. This included individuals at the Polytechnic, APR Consultants and social researchers employed at the local Council and researchers in the active local historical society. Overall, there was a greater pool of research based local knowledge into which I could tap. Nonetheless, in my interviews in Rotorua, I formally interviewed two local social workers, a few local researchers, several councillors, several council staff, several business people (both in tourism and not in tourism) and several ‘general’ community members. I talked to a broad range of age groups, a fairly even mix of genders. As noted in the section on participant observation, the fact that most of the general community were unconcerned about tourism and felt that it had little effect on their day to day lives meant that it was generally more comfortable for both them and me to talk to them informally about their views of tourism. These conversations were diarised but not taped and were not classed as interviews.

Local informants

In Kaikoura I spoke regularly with three individuals about the research. These people were useful as local sounding boards because they could help me reflect on what I was finding through the lenses of their own local experience. In Kaikoura two individuals had been brought up in the area. One of those had gone away to study and then returned to work. The third person was someone who considered herself to be an outsider in that she came into the area to work for the local Council and had only lived in the area for two years. In addition there were interviewees in Kaikoura whom I was able to use to help interpret and test some of my findings. When I did this, I did it only at the end of an interview and usually I used it as a technique for clarifying the points that they were trying to make to me.
In Rotorua, I also talked regularly with a number of people whom I never actually formally interviewed. These included people at the Waiairiki Polytechnic, people in the Department of Conservation and people with whom I regularly interacted through recreation activities. As noted earlier, the local Māori researchers in both places also talked with me about my findings and ideas and their own.

Local Records

In Kaikoura, some information came from reading both published and unpublished resources kept in the local library or the local museum. These two places try to keep a record of any research done in Kaikoura, and they also have many resources outlining local family histories. The museum also has an excellent collection of photographs, which allowed me to understand the physical changes that have happened in the town over the years.

A further source of information for both places came from reading about New Zealand history and tourism in other parts of the world. These sources of information were invaluable for making links between events that happened globally, nationally and locally. Thus, events in Kaikoura and Rotorua were reflected in and influenced by changes occurring in the wider social, economic and ecological environments.

Telephone surveys

As well as providing key information about the social context of tourism development in Kaikoura and Rotorua, the qualitative data served to inform the resident questionnaires that were conducted towards the end of both research periods. Copies of the questionnaires can be found in Appendices 1 and 2. These surveys were administered by telephone to a random sample of residents in each community.

Kaikoura telephone survey

In Kaikoura, three interviewers (myself and two postgraduate students from Lincoln University) administered the survey. Prior to conducting the survey the interviewers were briefed on the aims and objectives of the survey and on their ethical responsibilities. Residents were rung, usually between 6.00 p.m. and 9.30 p.m. Sunday to Friday. To ensure a random sample, the person answering the call was asked for the person who lived at that address who was over 15 years of age and who had the next birthday. If the appropriate person was not available, the phone number was dialled...
again later. Up to ten calls were made to reach the correct person, and many respondents had to be called back at least twice. Call backs could happen at any time of the day, depending on the preferences of the sample respondent or on the advice of the person who answered the phone initially.

Telephone numbers came from the telephone book. Every third residential number was copied from the book and put into a Microsoft Excel file where it was sorted by number so that there was no way of interviewers knowing whom they were ringing. The spreadsheets produced using this process allowed interviewers to keep track of the outcome of their calls. Table 1 shows a breakdown of those outcomes. Only 60 percent of the 481 calls made actually yielded a completed survey questionnaire. Eighteen percent of calls ended in a refusal. Another 15 percent of the numbers rung did not result in contact with the required respondent. A significant number of phone numbers had been disconnected. In all cases where the respondent was not contacted, that phone number was replaced with another.

Table 1: Kaikoura Telephone survey breakdown of numbers called

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Refusals</th>
<th>No answer</th>
<th>Disconnected</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rotorua telephone survey

In Rotorua, some questions were adapted from the Kaikoura. It would have been ideal to use identical questionnaires in the two places, but the different characteristics of the two communities, and the increased understanding that the researchers gained completing the Kaikoura project meant that differences were necessary.

APR Consultants in Rotorua ran the telephone survey during April, May and June, 1999. In order to randomise the process of contacting respondents as much as possible, the team of interviewers were requested to use the following procedure. Using a computerised version of the Rotorua phone book, each interviewer was given a randomly selected list of numbers that they were to dial, and ask to speak to the person in the household over 15 years of age with the next birthday. If that person was not available, then they were to call back later. Five hundred telephone interviews were completed. Unfortunately, no records were kept of refusals or the number of
unanswered calls. This arose from my inexperience of dealing with commercial research organisations, where it seems that such records are not kept as a matter of course.

**Characteristics of the samples**

The telephone survey sample in Kaikoura had a similar demographic distribution to the data from the census most recently completed before the research. This was taken to mean that the sample was a good one, and that refusals had had no effect on the sampling strategies used to obtain a random sample.

This was not the case in Rotorua, where the survey sample was biased in a number of different ways. These biases were of some concern, particularly as there were questions raised at the time about weighting data. The biases are outlined in more detail in the paragraphs below.

In the Rotorua sample, females were over-represented being 63.8 percent of the sample, which is significantly different from the 51 percent recorded during the 1996 census ($\chi^2=6.55, \text{df}=1, 0.025<p<0.005$). Discussions with other survey researchers indicated that this is not unusual, as male respondents more often refuse interviews.

Age group also showed some deviation from the expected, with a very low representation of people aged less than 30 and a significantly high over-representation of those aged over 50 ($\chi^2=55.083, \text{df}=2, p<0.000$). Again, this is similar to other surveys, which have noted an over-representation of the older age groups (Lawson et al., 1998; Horn, Simmons & Fairweather, 1998).

Māori were under-represented. Only 19 percent of respondents were Māori but 28.7 percent of the population over 15 years of age identified as Māori on census night ($\chi^2=22.879, \text{df}=1, p<0.000$). Other surveys have noted the same pattern (Lawson et al., 1998). Low responses to other surveys have also been explained in terms of the inappropriateness of these research methods in a different cultural context (for example Berno, 1996). This pattern may also be partly explained by the fact that Māori are over-represented in the lower socio-economic groups in Rotorua.

As well as age, gender and ethnicity, there are biases in level of education, with an over-representation of people who have tertiary or trade qualifications and an under-representation of people with no qualifications. In this sample, fewer people than expected had no formal educational qualifications. Twenty four percent of our sample
are in this group as compared with 33.9 percent at the time of the last census. In addition, only 2.8 percent of our sample declared themselves unemployed as compared with overall figures for the District of 6.5 percent.

These figures and my own understanding of the Rotorua community may best be explained by patterns of poverty. Within some of the poorer suburbs in Rotorua, many households do not have a telephone. For example, at the time of the last census, 28 percent of households in Fordlands had no telephone (Rotorua District Council, 1998a). Another factor in the low response rate may be that poverty makes it less likely that people will participate in such surveys. As Belenky et al. (1986) found in a qualitative study, people from lower socio-economic groups in the USA tended to be unwilling to talk to strangers and would actively discourage family members from talking to others. It appears that this pattern may be similar in New Zealand, which makes getting these people's opinions very difficult, no matter what form of researcher-respondent contact is used.

In summary, the people that are least well represented in this sample were young, male, Māori, unemployed people with no formal academic qualifications. Because of these biases in the sample, careful consideration was given to weighting the data. However, while weighting might make sense in many circumstances it is not a 'quick fix' and cannot be used without considerable care in interpreting what exactly is happening when data are weighted. It is feasible, for example, that weighting data may increase biases, depending on what caused the bias.

Where biases occur from well-explained sampling errors, weighting is appropriate. Where they come from refusal patterns, it is not appropriate to weight data, particularly where the explanation of the biases is either uncertain or where it offers no way to weight the data. In the case of this sample, weighting was not a valid strategy. For example, if the sample problems can be explained with reference to patterns of poverty, there are no clear ways to counter its effects in a sample like this. This is because poverty is a complex phenomenon that is best described by the intersection of many different demographic variables (Rotorua District Council, 1998a).

This assertion is supported by the fact that weighting on three demographic variables (age, gender and ethnicity) created biases in other variables such as education. In addition, the small sample size meant that the weighting process itself, even with weighting only three variables, was not robust.
In addition, one has to consider exactly what weighting means. Even without having a record of refusals, given the strategy for contacting respondents randomly, it is clear that some groups refused to participate more than others. In the case of groups with the least representation (for example, young Māori males), it is clear that refusals were more normal than agreeing to participate. In the case of groups with the least representation (for example, young Māori males) refusing appears to have been more common than agreeing to participate. Hence young Māori males in the sample are, by their participation patterns, not representative of individuals in the same demographic group. They have a greater propensity, or perhaps capacity, to participate in the survey. With this in mind, it is difficult to argue that they represent the group in terms of their thoughts about, or their involvement in, tourism, although of course there is no way of proving this, since no census data are available on these questions. This means that the less well represented a group in the sample, the more problems there are with weighting up that part of the sample using the data from those who participate.

In such a situation, weighting the data may make it look better statistically, but it does not necessarily improve its validity. For these reasons, the few data presented in this thesis for Rotorua have not been weighted, but the reader is reminded that it may, at times, be a less valid representation of views about tourism than the data that have emerged from the Kaikoura survey.

**Limitations**

The limitations of this research include the perennial problems of limited time and resources. The ethnographic research was largely carried out by one individual, an outsider by the standards of both communities. In addition, the researcher stayed in each community for only six months, which is a very short time by the standards of ethnographic research.

While every effort was made to contact a wide range of people in each community, this was still potentially limited by the researcher herself, and her ability to communicate well with those people and to make them feel comfortable about talking. The potential gaps are accentuated, because some groups or residents were more disposed towards participating in the research than others. For example, people with no clear involvement with tourism were less inclined to participate, whereas tourism operators were generally keen to participate. A few individuals refused to participate because they did not have
the time, while other people agreed to participate but refused to answer questions considered commercially or even socially sensitive. Thus, one of the potential limitations was created by individuals within the community. In spite of these limitations, there were some advantages to being an outsider. As someone who would leave the area, and who had no direct stake in its future, locals seemed to feel that I had no ‘axe to grind’ in the local area. This position meant that people could speak freely on local issues and there was no fear of the researcher using that for her own benefit within the local area.

The problem of my outsider status was also ameliorated to some extent by making use of insider informants. These informants were people who had lived in Kaikoura and Rotorua for varying lengths of time and with whom the researcher had regular contact throughout and beyond the research period. These people made suggestions about who might be interviewed, and how those individuals fitted into the community, and they were also able to confirm (or perhaps qualify) some of the researcher’s findings during the research process. More about these people is outlined above in the section on local informants.

The questionnaire data give some idea of the way that attitudes and behaviours are spread throughout the population. However, during the course of the survey, the Kaikoura interviewers noted that there was some internal inconsistency within individual answers. For example, people sometimes said that they worked in tourism and then said that they received no personal benefits from it. Another individual said that there had been no personal cost for her from tourism. Later in the course of the telephone call she mentioned that she and her family had decided to leave Kaikoura because a rising cost of living and increased heavy traffic passing their home meant that Kaikoura was no longer a good place to bring up children. This highlights one of the problems of telephone surveys. Interviewers can be ringing people when they are preoccupied with something else and talk to them about a topic that they have not thought about much before. In these situations, respondents’ answers may not be well thought out.

Another caveat that must be added is the effect of the wording on the questionnaires used in both places. My wording uses the word ‘visitors’ rather than ‘tourists’, which may have affected the way in which local people answered the questions. The qualitative data from Rotorua indicates that visitors are considered by people to be
somehow more 'like us' whereas tourists are seen as more distant from 'us' in some sense of both those words. However, I would argue that in Rotorua, particularly, local people were well aware that the terms 'visitors' and 'tourists' are interchangeable when they are used in the context of tourism.

It is also clear that on account of the pattern of refusals, the Rotorua questionnaire data are not as representative of all groups in the population as might be hoped. However, the surveys do indicate the general trends in Rotorua and Kaikoura and are supported by the interview and observation data, and by the findings of other surveys (which may well have had similar problems, but which were not discussed in the papers concerned).

**Ethics and Presentation**

All research undertaken for the completion of this report was approved by the Lincoln University Human Subjects Ethics Committee (Reference number 97/21). No one was pushed into participating if s/he did not wish to do so, nor were people pressured into answering questions that they did not want to answer. All participants were guaranteed confidentiality, and for this reason, no form of identification (including the interview number) is included with the quotations. Where particular individuals are mentioned, information has come from referenced data sources such as other research reports and newspaper items.
Chapter 4

Community Geography

Introduction

This short chapter outlines the geography of Rotorua and Kaikoura as a starting point for comparing the impacts of tourism in both places. First, the characteristics of the local population are presented and then some time is spent looking at the physical environments of both places, and the ways in which locals interact and have interacted with those environments. This includes an outline of the things that locals currently enjoy about their local area and an outline of the ways in which the local physical environments impact on the way that locals live.

Geography affects the community systems in both places. Both landscapes have influenced the lives of the inhabitants, and the shape and impact of the tourism that currently occurs in both places. I also include a small amount of history in this chapter, to show how the physical environment has helped shape the history of the two towns.

I also outline the place of the physical environment in community life. The physical environment in both places provides opportunity for many recreational activities, and is the basis of major tourism products of the towns. In Rotorua, the geothermal features and their strong links with local Māori ways of life are attractive to people from overseas. The different culture and the series of geothermal mudpools and hot lakes are features that most international tourists do not have the opportunity to experience often.
Many also find the hot water for bathing an attraction. The Kaikoura landscape is highly attractive, being bounded by high mountains on one side and a spectacular coastline on the other. The continental shelf lies close to the coast in the Kaikoura area, resulting in unusual access to the seabirds, sea mammals and fish that are attracted to the food sources associated with the edge of the shelf. At the current time, it is the sea that is the main focus of Kaikoura’s burgeoning tourist industry.

**Background**

As Figure 10 shows, Rotorua is situated in the central North Island in the Bay of Plenty region. The area under the jurisdiction of the Rotorua District Council covers 2611 square kilometres and is about 300 metres above sea level (Rotorua District Council, 1997). Rotorua’s position in the central North Island makes it accessible from the main population centres of Auckland, Wellington and Hamilton.

Kaikoura is situated on the east coast of the South Island about 180 kilometres north of Christchurch. Since the 1960s, when the Cook Strait roll-on-roll-off car ferry service began, Kaikoura has been a popular place for travellers on State Highway 1 to stop for a short break when travelling between Christchurch, the largest city in the South Island, to Picton where the Cook Strait ferries leave to transport people to Wellington and the rest of the North Island.

**Demographic Outline**

On census night, 1996, the Rotorua Territorial Local Authority (Rotorua District Council) was 16th in size of the 74 Territorial Local Authorities in New Zealand, with a population of 64,509 people. Estimates during the year in which the research was undertaken indicated that the local population had grown to 67,200 of whom 82 percent live in the Rotorua urban area (Daily Post, 18/11/98: 3).

Overall, the Rotorua community was slightly younger than the national average with 34.1 percent of the population (20,772) aged less than 20 years, compared with 30.2 percent in the whole of New Zealand (Rotorua District Council, 1998a).
In Rotorua, 33.9 percent of residents identify themselves as Māori as compared with 14.5 percent across New Zealand as a whole. This high proportion is likely to increase because 45.5 percent of people aged 5 to 24 identify themselves as Māori (Rotorua District Council, 1998b) and these are the next childbearing generation. Most of the Rotorua Māori population claim links to the Arawa Canoe, but within the Te Arawa iwi grouping are many different sub-tribes.

The sub-tribes most commonly mentioned in connection with tourism include; Ngati Whakaue (associated with much of the land around Rotorua, and with Ohinemutu), Tuhourangi (associated with the Pink and White Terraces and Whakarewarewa), Ngati
Rangiwehehi (associated with Hamurana springs) and Ngati Pikiau (who are closely associated with the Kaituna River and Lake Rotoiti).

In comparison, Kaikoura has a much smaller population, which is slightly older and has a smaller proportion of Māori residents. In the 1996 census, the Kaikoura area had a usually-resident population of 3516 people with 2208 of them living in the township. The local authority has the smallest rating base on mainland New Zealand. As a popular retirement area, Kaikoura has a few more people over the age of 60 than the national average (19.3 percent compared with 15.4 percent nationally). Many people who grew up in the area return for their retirement years and many who own holiday homes in the area choose to retire there.

Some 14.9 percent of the Kaikoura population identify themselves as Māori – about equal with the national average. Māori are comprised of a range of sub-tribes with Kati Kuri\(^1\) being the dominant group and the group who are manawhenua, that is, who claim guardianship over the local area. Kati Kuri are themselves a sub group of Ngai Tahu (sometimes also known as Kai Tahu) – the tribal group who lay claim to a large part of the South Island.

Māori in the South Island were far less numerous than those in the North island, where the climate was less harsh and where the crops that they brought with them from the Pacific grew more successfully. The different spread of Māori populations as well as the larger size of Rotorua means that one is dealing with many different runanga in the Rotorua area, while in Kaikoura there are only two runanga.

**Physical Environment of Kaikoura**

Kaikoura has a very unusual coastal and marine environment, and this currently underlies its tourism attractions (See Plate 1, which shows the proximity of the town to the sea and the mountains). Furthermore, geographic isolation is a factor in maintaining both the closeness of the Kaikoura community and the divisions within that community.

---

\(^1\) ‘Kati’ and ‘Kai’ are southern Māori dialect, while ‘Ngati’ and ‘Ngai’ are northern dialect for the same thing. As Ngai Tahu refer to themselves this way most of the time, I have chosen to refer to them that way. However Kati Kuri use the southern form to refer to themselves, thus I refer to them this way in this thesis.
Plate 1. The Kaikoura Landscape.
The Kaikoura area has a spectacular and unique geography. The Seaward Kaikoura Range towers to 2600 metres only 25 kilometres inland from the rugged sea coast, on which the township sits. Out to sea, the continental shelf is unusually close to the coast line, and brings marine mammals such as whales and dolphins close in and provides a particularly good food source for the most commonly seen mammals in the area – the seals. This same marine environment was a major factor in the development of the Kaikoura township. It is an excellent place for commercial fishing and was important for whaling, which was the earliest reason for Pākehā settlement. The Peninsula provided an ideal lookout point for whalers to watch for their quarry, which, came in to feed at the edge of the continental shelf. This industry declined by the 1920s, when whale numbers dropped to almost nothing (McAlloon, Simmons & Fairweather, 1998).

While the sea has been an important feature in community life, weather has also had a significant effect on the people of Kaikoura. Having the mountains so close to the coast affects Kaikoura’s weather, subjecting it to frequent drought and wind (when weather from the north-west predominates) and also to floods, which occur as the result of south-easterly storms. According to locals, a major flood occurs about every 30 years, the most recent occurring in 1993/94. On Christmas Eve 1993, heavy rain in the area caused the Kowhai River to burst its banks and run down through the town, causing considerable damage to the main shopping area. A few months later, a second flood threatened the town, but had more effect on farmland than on the township. In both cases, many individuals felt that the community was drawn together by these events, hence, it might be argued that the unpredictability of the environment helps to maintain a strong sense of community.

**Transport**

Kaikoura was important for servicing State Highway 1 and the Main Trunk Railway. As transport and telecommunications technology has developed during the last 15 years, this role has become less important. Just as people had to adapt to the loss of whaling, the town has had to adapt to the loss of employment from railways and roading. Kaikoura has changed from a government service town to a tourist town, a development that benefits from its position on State Highway 1 and the main trunk line, as well as from the whales and dolphins. Therefore, the development of tourism in Kaikoura can be seen as another use of the same resources on which the town has always relied for its economic well-being.
The geographic isolation of the community has had considerable influence in shaping the character of community in Kaikoura. Physical isolation meant that Kaikoura residents did not have a great deal of contact with people from outside the area. Travel to other centres such as Christchurch was difficult until relatively recently (the 1970s), when the road was improved. The hills to the north and west also provided obvious boundaries for the Kaikoura area. As one respondent put it:

*The railway didn’t go through here til the mid-40s and when my parents came here in the early 50s, it was a four-hour trip to Christchurch so you didn’t make it very often – it was a terrible road and even when we were children, a trip away was a huge thing.*

This isolation has affected the community in a number of ways. First, the Pākehā community are very aware of their own family histories and links. Family ties remain important in Kaikoura. Second, the isolation has maintained many of the community divisions that existed in the days of the first settlers. For example, the Catholic-Protestant tension that the early Irish settlers brought with them is still discernible today. Similarly, people from very different social classes settled in the area and, even today, the descendants of those classes have little communication with each other. A similar set of cleavages can be seen between groups of workers in the community, for example, between fishers and farmers. The size of the town and its isolation have helped to maintain community divisions and family relationships, which might well have disappeared in larger, less isolated centres. Further development of this argument will continue in Chapter 8.

The landscape was mentioned by 54 percent (157) of survey respondents, and the majority of interviewees mentioned landscape as very important to them. Included in this category are the people who mentioned the beauty of the mountains and the sea. However, there are different ways of interacting with the environment. One interview respondent, who had lived in Kaikoura for 18 months, said:

*Residents of Kaikoura appreciate the environment differently to strangers coming in who are quite overawed by the view. Locals tend to really appreciate the different phases of the seasons and the different climates and things like that rather than just the pristine views.*

Another respondent alluded to the fact that there are differing views of the environment when discussing the 1993/94 outbreaks of the Kowhai River. She felt that newcomers to the area were pushing the Canterbury Regional Council very hard to get them to put in a large amount of flood protection and that their hope of stopping future flooding was unachievable. Locals with long-term past experience of these floods feel that it is
impossible to control nature absolutely, so it is better to adapt rather than spend millions of dollars on protection that will almost certainly fail at some future time. Thus, major floods are seen as a part of life in the Kaikoura area for those who have lived there for a long time, whereas newcomers feel that it is just a matter of spending enough money to control them.

Access to Outdoor Activities
For 33 percent of the survey sample, and for males especially, access to outdoor activities was an important part of living in the area. Fifty-seven percent of male respondents mentioned that outdoor activities were an important part of living in Kaikoura compared to 37 percent of women (Pearson’s $\chi^2 = 25.0617$ $df=1$ $p=0.0000$). In addition, people in the younger age groups were more likely to mention outdoor activities as important: 39 percent of under 40 year olds as compared with 20 percent of over 60 year olds. The predominance of young male respondents in outdoor recreation is consistent with the profile of outdoor recreationists in general (Booth & Peebles, 1995).

The two most frequently mentioned outdoor activities were fishing and diving, although some people also mentioned hunting or walking and tramping as important outdoor activities for them. Younger residents are more likely than older residents to participate in skiing, diving, surfing and tramping/walking.

Many of the people who have retired to Kaikoura fit a demographic and recreational profile similar to those people involved in more resource-extractive activities such as sea-fishing, diving and hunting in other parts of New Zealand (Parkin, 1996). Both groups are male, have trade or technical qualifications and have participated in a range of similar activities to those listed above.

Observations and interviews indicate that the beaches are important outdoor recreation sites. Many of the local people spend time swimming and surfing during the summer, and many also enjoy boating activities such as fishing, water skiing, and sea kayaking. Snow skiing has become popular amongst some locals – especially local high school children who get special rates at Mt Lyford Skifield. A local businessman runs a regular shuttle up the mountain, which makes skiing and snowboarding affordable for many locals.

Outdoor recreation is one aspect of life in Kaikoura that may be affected negatively by tourism. There is some evidence that this is the case – some residents expressed
concern that recreational fishers may be overfishing the area, while others said that they avoided some of the walkways at busy times of the year. However, while tourism may negatively affect outdoor recreation opportunities, for those in the younger age groups, tourism may also represent a way for them to live in an area that offers good outdoor recreation opportunities. Thus, tourism may seem to afford many benefits to the younger age groups.

**Peace and Quiet**

Amongst survey respondents, 25 percent mentioned peace and quiet as an important attribute of Kaikoura. People of both sexes and in all age groups rated peace and quiet as an important feature of the Kaikoura lifestyle. It was a feature also mentioned often in interviews and casual conversations and many feel that it is threatened by the development of tourism in the area.

**Tourism in Kaikoura**

As noted, in the last 10-15 years Kaikoura has changed from being a sleepy fishing town into a bustling tourist town and an important stop for many international tourists wanting to see the whales, dolphins or seals. Prior to this, a few people, mostly from Christchurch, owned baches or holiday homes in the area. They visited the area regularly to fish, walk, hunt, swim and dive. Many New Zealanders also visited and stayed in one of the many coastal camping grounds during summer holiday season. These people participated in a similar array of activities to those in the baches.

In 1988 the first Whalewatching venture ‘Nature Watch Tours’ was set up. This business was run by an American biologist and a local entrepreneur who had previously been a commercial fisherman in the area. A short time later, in 1989, Kaikoura Tours began its operation. Kaikoura Tours emerged out of an employment initiative at Takahanga Marae. The relationship of these two companies is difficult to fathom, but some animosity surfaced in 1995, four years after the two companies had merged. In 1991, Nature Watch sold its whale watching permit to Kaikoura Tours and at that time Ngai Tahu\(^2\) came in as a partner in the business. This company has since become

\(^2\) Kati Kuri are a hapu group within the Ngai Tahu Tribe, but the two groups are also separate financial entities. At the time of research Ngai Tahu owned just under half of Whale Watch Kaikoura and Kati Kuri owned just over half. This partnership developed at the time that Kaikoura Tours bought the second whale watching permit from Nature Watch Tours.
Whale Watch Kaikoura and it continues to enjoy ownership of the only two sea-based whale watching permits.

To a large extent, local Māori have maintained their monopoly on the sea-based operations by claiming that the whales are part of their taonga (treasures/resources), of which they were promised control in the Treaty of Waitangi. However, that no one else has a permit for commercial whale watching has been a point of contention for many Kaikoura residents.

Since that time other commercial tourist activities have started. Visitors can go out in a helicopter or a fixed wing aircraft to see the whales from the air. Seal swimming operations provide people with wetsuits and take them out to swim amongst the seals. One operation uses boat access to areas in which seals are found regularly, while other operations operate from the Kaikoura Peninsula, a popular haul-out area for seals.

Another popular activity is swimming with dolphins. Two operators take tourists out to swim with the dolphins. Swimmer numbers are restricted so many people go out on the boats as passengers to see the dolphins and learn about the wildlife in the area.

Since the time of research, new operations have begun taking visitors out fishing and one operation is now offering swimming with sharks (in which swimmers are protected by the use of a cage). Numerous other activities, such as horse riding, four-wheel-bike treks and farm visits are all available in the local area. All of these activities make use of the natural environment. One of the problems with tourism in Kaikoura, according to locals, is that there is almost nothing to do on days when the weather is bad. Another feature of Kaikoura is that all the major activities occur within a radius of 3 km from the centre of town. Whale Watch and Dolphin Encounter both have offices in the centre of the town and both sail from the wharf area in South Bay. Likewise, the seal colony and the walk around the Peninsula are all within three kilometres of town (see Figure 11).

**Physical Environment of Rotorua**

Rotorua began its existence as a tourist town and today tourism is still a very important part of the Rotorua economy. However tourism has not taken over the town in Rotorua as much as it has in Kaikoura. The central city of Rotorua feels similar to the central city of many other New Zealand places.

As noted earlier, Rotorua is situated in the central North Island and is surrounded by much geothermal activity including many dormant volcanoes. The geothermal activity
in the area has been of major importance to both Māori and Pākehā in Rotorua. For Māori in pre-Pākehā days, their way of life was built around the geothermal resource, which was used for bathing, cooking, and things such as dyeing. Living amongst the geothermal resources, these people knew the area intimately, and were able to charge for guiding visitors safely around it. The safety aspect of guiding around the geothermal area may also have allowed local Māori to maintain control of these resources better than may have been the case if there had been no danger.

![Figure 11: The Kaikoura area.](image)

The geothermal resource was also important for Pākehā settlers in the area. Without the geothermal activity the town would not have developed the way it has, because Rotorua was conceived as a tourist town where people could come to ‘take the waters’ and see the unusual sights presented by the physical environment in the area. The hospital in the area was originally set up as a place for treating illnesses based on the therapeutic nature of the geothermal waters.

While the geothermal activity was, perhaps, the main attraction for Pākehā settlement, and is the main attraction for international tourists, the many cold lakes and natural bushed areas are also strong attractors for domestic tourists and are highly used for
recreation by local people. These lakes and associated rivers offer opportunities for boating, swimming, tramping, water skiing, kayaking, and general beach activities. Whakarewarewa forest (known locally as ‘the forest’) is an area of exotic trees with some areas of native scrub and bush that lies within ten minutes bicycle ride from the centre of town. It is used well by both locals and visitors alike for walking, running, horse riding and mountain biking.

An indication of the importance of these outdoor recreation resources is indicated by answers to the survey question ‘What do you like about living in Rotorua?’ in which 26 percent of respondents suggested that the local natural resources were important to them while 20 percent noted that ‘there’s lots to do here.’ Interview respondents who gave a similar answer referred mostly to the outdoor recreation opportunities around the town. Hill Young Cooper (1997) noted that one of five themes that came out of the question about the things that local people valued most about Rotorua included ‘Rotorua as an area with good natural resources’. These included resources such as the lakes, geothermal areas, bush and forested areas and rivers.

For many people in the Pākehā community, the geothermal resource seemed less important than the other natural resources of the area. A typical comment was:

In terms of everyday life, geothermal is very unimportant and like, even thermal baths – I don’t go. The Polynesian Pools are very expensive and so people come and say ‘oh, thermal baths – don’t you go every week?’ And we say, ‘no, we don’t’. In terms of recreation, going to the[cold] lakes would be the key thing for us.

This ambivalence towards the geothermal resource represents a change from the early days of Pākehā settlement. It is not shared by many of the overseas visitors to the area who flock to the Polynesian Pools to soak in the hot mineral pools and use the extensive facilities available there.

The volcanic soils of the Rotorua area made it unsuitable for agriculture until the 1930s when agricultural scientists discovered that the health of stock in the area could be improved by using cobalt supplements. In the mean time, much of the land was planted under pine forests. Forestry remains an important industry and land use in the area.

Environmental Problems
The importance of the local environment is highlighted by two major environmental problems that came to a head in Rotorua during the 1980s. First, the geysers in the Whakarewarewa thermal area began to play less and less (Grant, 1980; Smith, 1983).
Second, the condition of Lake Rotorua and its beaches deteriorated considerably during this time. These environmental problems bring into strong focus the relationship between tourism and the environment and the relationship between Māori and the environment. While much of the Pākehā community apparently ignored these problems, it was local Māori and tourism interests who made the first move in trying to clean up the lake and in restoring the deteriorating geothermal resource.

The decrease in geothermal activity in Whakarewarewa was of major concern both to Māori and to tourism interests. Between 1940 and 1980, over 900 shallow bores had been drilled into the geothermal field in Rotorua, largely for heating homes and offices. The proliferation and inefficiency of these bores was pinpointed as the cause of the decreasing activity of the geysers (Rotorua Geothermal Task Force, 1985). This finding and the ongoing monitoring of the decreasing activity at Whakarewarewa led to the closing down of all private bores within a 1.5 kilometre radius of Whakarewarewa in 1986, seven years after the first geyser stopped playing (Stafford, 1988). Of course, many locals with bores fought hard to keep them. Talking about this an interviewee said:

*Geothermal... used to be important when it was used as a heating source so it was important to a certain group of people in a certain area of town and a certain age group - like the older age group. So, for instance Sophia St [properties] had a real extra value - sort of $10- $20,000 extra on[them] because it had the geothermal and part of the problem, when they shut the bores down, was the fact that people saw the loss in property values... that’s why people were so angry, I think.*

In spite of the controversy at the time, shutting down the bores appears to have had the desired effect as the geysers have again begun playing more frequently.

Another major environmental problem was that of the pollution of Lake Rotorua caused by the lack of an adequate sewage treatment system. Unfortunately, this deterioration in water quality was accompanied by the invasion of water net (*Hydrodictyon reticulatum*), a water weed known for its bad smell. The resulting bloom of the weed left the lake edges stinking, and the lakefront became very unattractive (Coddington, 1991). Reeves (1986), amongst others, comments on the appalling state of the lake’s foreshore. A comment from Stratford (1988:102) at the time reflects these problems:

*Rotorua is a singularly unattractive town of relentlessly ugly buildings and depressing shops. The lakefront is a pig’s breakfast, often smothered in jetsam, rubbish and stinking lake weed.*
As the waterfront area became less attractive, locals also perceived it as becoming less safe. As one interview respondent mentioned:

*I remember swimming in Lake Rotorua and then not being allowed past the Odeon Theatre because that whole lakefront area was a ‘lurky’ area and us kids weren’t allowed to go down there.*

Overall, some locals were becoming less than proud of their town.

Litten (1991) found that people said that they were concerned about the lake, but there had been little discernable action on the part of the community to get it cleaned up. It appears that it was not the overall community reaction to the pollution that caused the Council to improve sewage treatment. Instead, it was the actions of the Māori community and a concern that visitor numbers were dropping at a time when unemployment was very high.

Between 1982 and 1990, tourism numbers dropped (see Table 2). This decrease resulted from a drop in domestic visitor numbers, which may be attributed to a range of factors. First, as a result of the economic changes outlined in the next chapter, fewer New Zealanders were going on holiday in the late 1980s (Collier, 1997). In addition, Rotorua was getting run down. Coddington (1991:106) reported that:

*The local people are quick to pass judgement on their home town. A high crime rate is one criticism they quickly offer, high unemployment, tatty shopping centres with empty premises are others.*

According to interviewees, many New Zealanders felt as if they had ‘been there, done that’. As a destination, Rotorua held little further interest. Conversations with domestic visitors while surveying in 1999 indicate that many of them felt that they stopped visiting during this time because Rotorua was no longer an attractive destination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Visitor numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>704,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>694,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>678,186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the time, the New Zealand Government was focusing more attention on international tourism as a means of attracting export dollars, and less on marketing New Zealand to New Zealanders than in the past. With the Government’s focus becoming more international, it is also likely that New Zealanders as a whole were developing a more
international focus, thus increasing impetus to travel abroad for those who could afford it. Added to this, airfares across the Tasman were dropping, making it cheaper (in some instances) to fly to Australia than to other New Zealand destinations. Thus, for many New Zealanders who could afford to go on holiday, Australia was a more attractive destination than places like Rotorua.

**Tarawera**

Another important part of the environmental history of Rotorua is the Tarawera Eruption. This occurred in 1886, destroying the famous Pink and White terraces at the foot of the mountain. These Pink and White Terraces were the mainstay of a tourism industry run by local Māori who provided accommodation, transport and guiding for the people visiting the area for its sites. The eruption of Mt Tarawera also destroyed the settlement from which all this activity took place. The Tuhourangi people left alive after the eruption shifted, with the agreement of Ngati Whakaue, to the Whakarewarewa site where they rebuilt their lives and tourism guiding businesses. Their descendents remain there today.

Over about the next 15 years, from 1886, the Waimangu thermal area developed (Keam, 1980). This thermal area is currently owned by the Crown, under the jurisdiction of the Department of Conservation and leased to people who manage the area for paying tourists. The recent emergence of geothermal attractions in the valley and its lack of any settlement at the time allowed this area to be managed differently from those such as Whakarewarewa and Ohinemutu in which residents must balance their needs for privacy with the fact that tourists walk through their villages regularly.

The instability of these areas, the ongoing emergence of new geysers (one of which developed in the garage of a local Rotorua resident during the time I lived there) and the memory of Tarawera remain as reminders of the destructive power of the geothermal forces surrounding Rotorua. The fact that another major, dormant volcano in the area (Makititi Dome) is said to be about due to erupt mean, that earthquakes and similar disturbances appear to be treated with greater significance by local residents than in other places in New Zealand.
Tourism in Rotorua

As is probably already clear to the reader, tourism has a much longer history in Rotorua than it does in Kaikoura. When asked, most people in Rotorua would say that their main tourist attractions are either based around the geothermal resource, or around some aspect of Māori culture. Certainly from a historical perspective these two features were the most important reason for tourists to visit Rotorua. For international tourists, this is still the case. However, in Rotorua at the time of study, 65 percent of visitors were domestic (Tourism Rotorua figures), and for many domestic visitors the major attractions are the lakes and the bush.

According to tourism industry informants, international tourists are the ones who spend the greatest amount of money on things like helicopter rides, four-wheel-drive trips up Mt Tarawera, visits to the Polynesian Pools and to the Marae.

There are a number of very important attractions spread around an area within a 30km radius of the Town (see Figure 12).

Waimangu and Waiotapu thermal reserves and Hells Gate are geothermal areas that draw many visitors. The Skyline Gondola and luge, and the Agrodome, which entertains visitors with a show that teaches them something about New Zealand agriculture, both attract many visitors. A number of areas also make use of some picturesque freshwater springs to provide visitors with an afternoon’s entertainment. Another attraction proving to be very popular is Tamaki Tours – a company that gives visitors a Māori cultural experience, including a marae visit and entertainment and a hangi (meal cooked in a pit in the ground). This company is run by the Tamaki Brothers who are Māori but not Te Arawa, which sometimes causes some bad feelings amongst groups of local Māori who feel that outsiders have no right to be selling this kind of experience in their area.

Overall in Rotorua, tourism has a long history, and so has many different attractions spread over a wide area. New Zealand visitors come to Rotorua for many of the same recreation opportunities that the local people use. Jet boating, mountain biking, water skiing, white water kayaking and walking are all popular activities amongst domestic visitors as they are amongst local outdoor recreationists.
Summary and Conclusions

The environment is an important factor in the development of tourism in both Rotorua and Kaikoura. Both tourism industries essentially rely on high quality environments, which, as the experience in Rotorua has shown, must be maintained if they are to remain attractive as destinations. The physical environment is also very important to local people in the course of their day-to-day lives. Both places have good outdoor recreation opportunities for residents, which are highly valued in both communities.

Perhaps more importantly, the environment has helped shape the structure and function of the two communities living within them. The Kaikoura community may have been very different in character without the isolation imposed on it by geography. This is
also the case in Rotorua where both the environment and tourism have helped shape the relationships between different groups of Māori and to some extent between Māori and Pākehā. As Don Stafford (pers. comm., 1998) commented, both groups need each other and always have needed each other for tourism to work in Rotorua. I argue that part of this relationship, at least, is affected by the relationships that the two communities have with their local environment. It does appear that, in an area as unstable as Rotorua, local Māori have a more intimate relationship with that environment and, because of their longer history in the area, they have a way of life that utilises the geothermal resources on an everyday basis.
Chapter 5

Communities and History: Restructuring as ‘Catastrophe’ in a Complex System

History shows that capitalism is both an expansionary and emergent system, as well as one that is prone to periods of intensified restructuring, or crises. Indeed, capitalism has only persisted because of its systemic tendency for crises to be resolved. This characteristic results in massive remaking of the economic, cultural and political landscape of territories as actors adjust to changing conditions and recreate the system in new forms and with new avenues for investment. Change is usually defined by the appearance of new relationships in the capitalist system, affecting how and where accumulation is most intense. While change might begin in one place or in a particular industry or corporation, it is important to recognise that its impact often sets in motion a prolonged dynamic, affecting people in many places for quite long periods (Le Heron & Pawson 1996:7).

The description above indicates that capitalist systems across the world periodically reach points of self-organised criticality, which then lead to periods of major structural change throughout the system. This chapter provides some background to the most

---

1 Catastrophe used in this sense means an overturning or large change rather than a particularly distressing event or a calamity.
recent ‘catastrophe,’ or period of major system restructuring, and its effects in New Zealand, with a particular focus on Kaikoura and Rotorua.

This chapter does not aim to provide a thorough analysis of the history of the last 30 or so years. Instead, its purpose is to show that change has been constant and ongoing over time, but that, until 1984, the economic system did not change structurally and neither did it have the wide-ranging effects at local level that the changes of the 1980s had. The international economic changes effected structural change on the capitalist system during the 1980s, which had profound impacts at local level. The sudden shifts that occurred, for example in the balance between the public, private and not-for-profit sectors, would have been impossible to predict accurately, but they can be explained as the intersection of many smaller changes, which destabilised the economic system. The system then had to reconfigure itself around another point of stability. This reconfiguration had major effects at local level in many different places all over the world. I make little reference to the international nature of these changes and focus mainly on changes at national level in New Zealand. The changes that occurred in New Zealand reflect international events, illustrating the principle of fractal patterns, where the overall system pattern is repeated down through the different levels of the system in question.

‘Thatcherism’ and ‘Reaganism’ were to the UK and the USA what ‘Rogernomics’ was to New Zealand. The pattern of change in each country was broadly similar. In each place, there has been a shift in emphasis from the public sector to the private sector, government philosophies have became more *laissez faire*, and as this has happened, the gap between rich and poor – whether we talk about individuals or places – has widened. Reflecting this, in New Zealand, the economies of regional and rural areas have been more negatively affected than the larger economies of the major cities. This appears to be largely because of the adoption of *laissez faire* principles by central government. At the same time, business and investment have concentrated in the more centralised economy of Auckland, and, to some extent, Wellington and Christchurch. The regions have been left with declining populations and a general lack of capital investment. This pattern is a classic reflection of relationships between the centres of capital and smaller, or more peripheral, areas of capital (Brown & Hall, 2000) and contradicts the assumption of ‘trickle down’ associated with the theories of right-wing economics.
Restructuring in New Zealand reflects similar technological and economic changes across the world. The New Zealand economy has always relied heavily on export markets that are themselves open to change. Thus, the entry of Britain into the European Economic Community in 1973 changed New Zealand’s trade with that country and had a strong effect on the agricultural sector in this country. Similarly, the oil shocks of the 1970s had direct effects in New Zealand, and indirect effects by changing the fortunes of our major trading partners at the time. As an economy that depends on export markets, New Zealand quickly feels the effects of international economic change.

Changing markets for New Zealand primary products left the country in need of ways to increase foreign exchange earnings. In New Zealand, as in many other internationally peripheral economies, tourism was seen as a possibility for diversifying the economy and attracting foreign exchange. International tourism provided one way of doing it. Similarly, local towns such as Rotorua and Kaikoura want tourism because of declines in the profitability of primary production. Thus, the global economic restructuring of the last two decades is important in understanding the attitudes of New Zealanders to the growing tourism industry.

The effects of restructuring and other changes of the last 15 years are played out differently in different localities. In Kaikoura, for example, where fishing is an important part of the local economy, the depletion of fish stocks and the introduction of the quota management system were of high importance. In Rotorua, many jobs were lost from the forestry sector. Farming is more important in the Kaikoura economy than in Rotorua, and prior to 1989, tourism was very important in the Rotorua economy and hardly existed in Kaikoura. Quite apart from these differences, the size and nature of the populations in the two places also affected how the community as a whole experienced the changes imposed on them. Despite this, some of the overall patterns of change are similar between the two. For example, Māori in both places were disproportionately disadvantaged by these economic changes.

This chapter outlines recent events that have influenced the evolution of the two communities under study. It discusses the social, economic and psychological effects that restructuring has had in Rotorua and Kaikoura and describes how it might be seen as a form of ‘catastrophe’ or sudden major structural change that occurs in complex systems. While the changes were large and sudden, they were preceded by many
changes that did not change the underlying structure of the system, but which eventually put the system into a state of ‘self-organised criticality,’ after which New Zealand’s social, economic and political systems reconfigured from approximately 1984 onwards. It first outlines the national and international level events and changes and then looks at how these are reflected by changes at local level in each place.

This chapter does not contain all the history that there is in this thesis. This is because in the following chapters there are historical elements related to each of the themes. This is not to imply that history is less important than each of the themes. On the contrary, history is so important for understanding each of these themes, it makes for a more coherent argument to include that history in the relevant chapters.

It is relatively easy to explain change in complex systems and much more difficult to predict that change. While these systems are essentially unpredictable, it is possible to influence the change that occurs. However, the way to do this is not always obvious and differs over time in the same system (Senge, 1990). Thus, success strategies of the past may not work so well in the present, but experience from the past can help us adapt our actions towards the outcomes we want.

**Economic Restructuring in New Zealand**

The year 1984 marked the beginning of a major reconfiguration of New Zealand society, from a state informed by Keynesian principles, to one informed by neoclassical or right wing principles. This was manifest in changes in tariffs and other trade protection, the structure of the welfare state, in the role and function of the state and in the relative roles of the public, private and commercial sectors (Kelsey, 1995). These changes did not begin in 1984; it was in 1984 that Roger Douglas, the incoming Minister of Finance, set in train a series of major changes in the role of government in the New Zealand economic system. Until this time, the changes in the system had not changed its structure substantially. After 1984, the level and speed of change increased. System shifts began to affect the fortunes of people and places, which, until that time, had been affected only in relatively small ways. This, however, is not to argue that the changes prior to that time were not significant.

After World War II there were about 20 years of relative economic and social stability in New Zealand. Changes in this began late in the 1960s. During the 1970s the New Zealand economy came under increasing pressure as the result of two oil shocks, and
the fact that Britain, a major trading partner, entered the European Economic Community in 1973 and so began to import less New Zealand primary produce in favour of European produce (Roper, 1997). The oil shocks, in particular, did affect New Zealanders significantly but did not cause any major structural changes in the system. The oil shocks affected New Zealanders primarily through the restrictions brought in to restrict petrol consumption. People could not drive as far at weekends and during the time of ‘carless days,’ their travel to work may have changed on one day a week.

The late 60s saw the membership of the Labour party begin to change when people against New Zealand’s involvement in the Vietnam War joined the Labour Party. These people were quite different from the blue-collar workers who predominated in the Labour Party previously. Instead, they had more formal education, and were more liberal. Being in opposition at the time, Labour could oppose sending troops to Vietnam, and therefore attracted these people as new members. These more liberal people were the ones credited with bringing in the Labour policies of the 1980s.

Another important feature of the 1970s was the activities of the National Party government, led by Prime Minister, Rob Muldoon. Muldoon came into power in 1975. His stated aim was to leave the New Zealand economy no worse than he found it, and to do this, he took a very conservative approach to managing the economy. To maintain the status quo, Muldoon had to intervene in the New Zealand economy more and more. By the early 1980s, Muldoon was both finance minister and prime minister, and was unilaterally instigating wage and price freezes on New Zealanders. In addition, in line with policies in other countries at the time, several large, and eventually unsuccessful, development projects were started (named ‘Think Big’ by the government at the time). Muldoon hoped these would improve the performance of the New Zealand economy. By 1984, the government was facing problems of major overseas debt, inflation was climbing, and the New Zealand dollar was in need of devaluation. In addition, there was a growing tension in the political system of the time, as lobby groups were pushed against this conservative approach to economic management (Kelsey, 1995).

Muldoon lost the snap election that he called in July 1984, and then did not devalue the dollar when so requested by the new government before they had taken their place as the incoming government. This allowed speculators to take their money out of the country, creating liquidity problems. The sense of crisis that this series of events
created, was then used to increase the speed with which the new government was able to push through major economic and political changes (Kelsey, 1993, 1995). This ‘crisis set in train a cascade of structural changes in the New Zealand socio-economic system, which mirrored similar economic changes in other parts of the world.

Roger Douglas at the advice of Treasury began ‘rolling back the State,’ initially by forming state-owned enterprises aimed at making the state sector work more like the private sector (Kelsey, 1993). The New Zealand dollar was floated on the international money markets, agriculture lost its subsidies, forests were sold off to the commercial sector, and similarly large changes occurred in the function of some government departments, which are now operated commercially or semi-commercially, such as postal services, telecommunications, electricity and roading. In theory, the private sector would be able to develop better in a more deregulated market and so would create the jobs that were being lost from the public service. In reality, the private sector also ended up cutting back and restructuring itself and employment did not eventuate, particularly in rural towns.

Technological change accompanied the economic and social changes taking place and, conversely, the economic and social changes added to the impetus for the adoption of new technologies. For example, increasing automation in forestry added to the speed at which employment was cut back. Labour costs, reliability and safety issues all added to the impetus for employers to adopt new technologies.

The change in government, economy and society in New Zealand continued into the 1990s. Economic reform continued with changes in the labour market and the introduction of the Employment Contracts Act in 1991. The Resource Management Act (1991) profoundly changed the way in which planning law in New Zealand operated. Its focus on ‘effects of activities’ rather than on zoning spaces for particular activities, the notion of ‘sustainable management’ and the fact that it moved the emphasis on decision making to local level, made it a world first. This continued the ‘New Zealand experiment’ as Kelsey (1995) puts it and meant that New Zealand planners had to learn this approach with no prior knowledge or experience of how it might work (Gleeson, 1996). Councils and communities are still learning how to operate under the new regime.
As part of its overhaul of the state sector, the Labour Government also initiated changes to local government. The overall role of local government has become more important as central government has withdrawn from, or changed, many of its roles at local level. The notion of local control can be construed as good, but these changes were not accompanied by financial devolution. Many councils struggled with financing and managing their new responsibilities, particularly alongside the many changes that have been imposed through legislation. This problem was greatest in smaller less well resourced areas such as Kaikoura. In addition, most residents are still not fully aware of the changes with which their local councils have had to deal. The Local Government Amendment Act 1989 required councils to amalgamate into larger bodies, responsible for larger areas. All these changes mean that the role of elected councillors has become more complex and more important. In localities with few resources, and because many New Zealanders were uncertain about the wisdom of amalgamation, some communities do not entirely trust their local council and cannot understand why they are facing the issues that they are.

These changes affected the whole of the country, but have been disproportionately felt at the bottom end of the socio-economic spectrum where Māori are over-represented. Thus, Māori as a group have felt the greatest negative effects of both restructuring and new technologies. Māori employment was concentrated in the more unskilled sectors of transport, manufacturing and labouring and these are the sectors from which most jobs were lost (Dalziel & Lattimore, 1999; Kelsey, 1995; Te Ahu Poata-Smith, 1997). This pattern is evident in both Rotorua and in Kaikoura.

The period of structural change was relatively short (from an historical perspective). However, it is important to note that it came only after many previous changes that had not caused any significant structural change. These changes gradually destabilised the global socio-economic system ‘priming’ it for change. This state of being primed is known in complexity theory as self-organised criticality. The ‘catastrophe’ is the result of the system ‘jumping’ to a new, more stable state. As Bak and Chen (1991: 26) write:

> Large interactive systems naturally evolve toward a critical state in which a minor event starts a chain reaction that can lead to a catastrophe. Self-organized criticality may explain the dynamics of earthquakes, economic markets and ecosystems.

Thus, while change is steady and ongoing, the effects of that change in complex systems are discontinuous (or ‘catastrophic’) and unpredictable. Furthermore,
catastrophic change represents a ‘jump’ in the state of the system to a more stable configuration. The effect of this jump is the sense of a kind of chain reaction, in which the changes will run their course, almost regardless of any efforts to stop them. This pattern is evident in the events of the period prior to, and during, the time of economic restructuring. At this stage, the pace and magnitude of change seemed almost unstoppable.

However, an important aspect of the changes that happened in New Zealand appears to have been a certain sense of powerlessness that prevented people from trying to affect the changes. This powerlessness stemmed from the fact that New Zealand democracy at the time was not performing well.

Many factors converged to undermine democracy in New Zealand in 1984 and beyond. First, in 1984, voters had had enough of Muldoon’s protectionist policies and they acted positively and strongly to vote him out. However, the only way for New Zealand voters to do this was to vote for the Labour Party. Labour, a left-wing party, came in and immediately instigated some very right-wing policies. This went against all expectation, and had only limited backing from the party as a whole (Gustafson, 1992). Second, Labour Party rules and the working of Parliament at the time meant that a small group influenced by Roger Douglas dominated the Labour cabinet. The Labour ministers outside cabinet had to support the cabinet line, so a small number of individuals in Parliament were able to have a very large effect on the direction of legislation and policy (James, 1986). Third, large amounts of new legislation were introduced into Parliament under urgency, so that only limited scrutiny or criticism of it was possible. Moreover, no relitigation was possible. The sheer quantity and breadth of legislation that was pushed through the parliamentary process this way meant there was inadequate time for people to scrutinise each piece of legislation well (Kelsey, 1993).

Gold (1992b: 39) argues that New Zealanders became more cynical of their political system over this time. He compares papers written in the late 1960s and 1970s with a survey completed in 1989 and argues that ‘a new and sour element has been added ... to New Zealand’s political culture...’ in this time.

It seems, therefore, that catastrophic change might be influenced (but not prevented) once it has begun. Evidence for this is provided by the Australian experience.
Australian policies have not been as extreme as New Zealand ones, so while their economic system has changed in line with global economic change, the effects of those changes have been less extreme than in New Zealand (Dalziel, 2002).

This outline merely summarises many of the complexities of change both before and during the restructuring period. The reader is referred to the many authors who have given this period of change a more considered treatment (Britton, Le Heron & Pawson, 1992; Dalziel & Lattimore, 1999, Hazeldine, 1998; Hawke, 1992; Kelsey, 1993, 95; Le Heron & Pawson, 1997; McRobie, 1992; Rice, 1992; Rudd & Roper, 1997). However, this section has outlined the overall pattern of change in New Zealand during the 1980s – a pattern which continued on into the 1990s and which has been important in the development of national policies aimed at increasing tourist visitation to New Zealand.

The Effects of Restructuring in Kaikoura and Rotorua

The events outlined above caused profound changes at the local level in Kaikoura and Rotorua. Many local jobs were lost as a result of restructuring of both the public sector and the agricultural sector, which created a need for new initiatives for employment. In Kaikoura, tourism grew out of that need, while in Rotorua, tourism became more important as a source of potential employment. The process and impacts of restructuring in each place intersect with the impacts of concomitant social, technological and environmental changes. Understanding this interaction is important for understanding the development and impact of tourism in both Kaikoura and Rotorua.

The rest of this chapter discusses the changes that occurred locally in the two places over this period. Some themes in the section relate only to one or other of the places in question – so, for example, the effects of regulating fisheries and introducing fishing quota were important in Kaikoura but not in Rotorua. The section is organised so that the themes important in both places at local level are discussed first and those important in only one place are discussed later in the chapter.

It is also important to note that Rotorua is a larger centre, and has been the subject of significant research. In comparison, Kaikoura, because of its small size and isolation, has been the subject of little research (until recently). The figures and events outlined below, therefore, have come from different data sources for the two places. The events in Kaikoura are those gleaned from local newspapers and more frequently from the
reminiscences of local people during interviews in 1997. The events in Rotorua have been recorded by other researchers whose main focus has been the specific changes outlined below. In addition, because of its bigger size, Rotorua stands alone in statistics available from the past, whereas many Kaikoura statistics are amalgamated with those from across Marlborough (the province of which Kaikoura is a part) as a whole.

General overview of events in Kaikoura

Prior to 1984, Kaikoura was a farming, fishing and government service town. After 1984, according to informants, Railways, the largest employer in the town, downsized and privatised, leaving many in the town unemployed. The local telephone exchange was automated, and the Meteorological Service automated its operation in Kaikoura. Job losses and other changes in the area have continued in both the fishing and farming sectors. Like other regions, Kaikoura fared badly in the restructuring and in particular the Māori community took the brunt of these changes. The following quote is from a Māori informant in discussion with another member of the research team at which the researcher was present:

A: The reality was that the level of unemployment amongst the Māori community was extremely high - it was actually over 90 percent.

Q: Would it be a correct interpretation of what you were saying before, when you were talking about unemployment being as high as 90 percent amongst Māori, that the economic downturn and restructuring fell unevenly on Māori or was this right across the board in Kaikoura?

A: Without a doubt unevenly. However, you've got to understand a small town. The majority of businesses in a small town are owned by families, and so families are going to employ their own. So the Māori community didn't have any animosity to the business community because that's common sense. If you have children, who are you going to employ? Your children. And so, what the real dilemma was ... was that Māori were not employers...

As this same informant (and several others) noted - the introduction of a fishing quota system\(^2\) disadvantaged many, small commercial fishers, and there were many Māori in this category. Similarly, many Māori were employed in Railways and in farming – both sectors in which there were many job losses right across New Zealand (Britton et al.,

---

\(^2\) In 1983, after fish stocks around New Zealand had become recognisably depleted, the government introduced a quota system for limiting the total amount of fish caught in New Zealand waters. In this system, a total allowable catch for different fish species is assessed annually and are allocated according to the quota that individual fishers hold (Le Heron & Pawson, 1996).
The business ownership patterns outlined by the above informant meant that Māori were disproportionately affected by these changes in Kaikoura.

In Kaikoura, many local businesses hit hard times and some shut down altogether. One business mentioned by Kaikoura respondents was the loss of Beaths, a department store that had provided a meeting place for many of the local women. The loss of this business during the 1980s meant not only the loss of their services as a retailer, but also their function as a place where women, in particular, met informally. In Kaikoura according to local informants, the small, locally-owned businesses that survived the difficult years were those most able to adapt.

**General overview of events in Rotorua**

The effects of economic restructuring were similarly profound in Rotorua. The 1980s were a difficult time for tourism in Rotorua, as both social and environmental problems (outlined in the last chapter) began to take their toll. Between 1987 and 1990, employment in the area decreased from 14,165 full-time equivalents to 12,619 full-time equivalents. By 1990, unemployment in Rotorua was at 22.5 percent compared with 15 percent for New Zealand as a whole (Schlotjes, 1993). These problems were connected to changes that occurred across all sectors in the local economy including farming, forestry and the State Sector. Māori in Rotorua were disproportionately affected by the loss of unskilled jobs in these sectors.

In theory, as the State reduced its various roles, the commercial sector was expected to pick up the business opportunities provided. However, as many respondents in both towns noted, as local incomes dropped, people had no choice but to stop spending, which, in turn, had a direct impact on the fortunes of local businesses. Thus, in Rotorua, many local businesses ceased to operate at this time. Vacant commercial/retail floor space in the Town increased from 2209 square metres in 1987 to 41,363 square metres in 1990. Manufacturing declined by 37 percent between 1987 and 1991, considerably higher than the average New Zealand decline of 27 percent (Schlotjes, 1993). The largest manufacturing decrease came in the area of wood processing and wood products resulting from a decline in the forestry processing industry during those years. Enterprises changed from being predominantly locally-owned and small, to being externally-owned, and part of a larger chain of manufacturers or retailers (Schlotjes, 1993). The general appearance and ambience of the central City declined during the
1980s as shop premises emptied, accompanying similar declines in the wider physical and social environment of the area.

**Farming**

Farming is part of the economies of both Rotorua and Kaikoura, but its significance is far greater in Kaikoura. Farming as an economic activity changed considerably after 1984. There were many changes in markets and in the way that meat, wool and dairy products are sold overseas. Perhaps one of the biggest changes for farmers was the removal of Supplementary Minimum Payments (SMPs) from meat and wool during the 1980s. SMPs were a mechanism that guaranteed a certain minimum level of return for farm produce. Because the market prices were then lower than the level at which supplementary minimum payments had been paid, this significantly decreased farm incomes. Farmers were forced to increase the number of stock units or to diversify their income base (Britton et al., 1992). At the same time according to Kaikoura informants, they had to become more efficient and more effective by changing work and employment practices. Farm labourers were used less and work was kept more within the family. One of my interview respondents commented on both the need to have more stock units and to be more efficient as a farmer:

*1500 ewes was a viable farm 15 years ago but now you need about 4000 and you can’t afford to have much debt. Farmers, like everyone else, have had to become more efficient and more effective.*

Farmers employ less farm labour now, and where labour is hired, it is often on a casual basis. This has affected employment opportunities for local youths who, in the past, would often work on local farms when they left school. In addition, it seems that in Kaikoura, as in other areas around New Zealand, many people who live on a farm have other work and investments off the farm (Pomeroy, 1996:137). These changes are reflected in social changes such as an increasing recognition of the need for formal education, and the fact that many young people now have to leave Kaikoura to find work. This also means that residents have more, and often closer, contact with people from outside the area than 20 years ago. Thus, the number of linkages with places outside of Kaikoura has increased within the farming community.

Farming is less important in the more diversified Rotorua economy than it was in the smaller, Kaikoura economy. This means that, although the changes listed above had
similar impacts on individual farmers, it did not have the same impact on the community as a whole.

**The public sector**

The public sector was more diverse in Rotorua, which, with its larger size, had a greater role as a regional centre than Kaikoura. In Kaikoura, New Zealand Rail was the main government-owned, and largest single, employer in the town. Prior to 1984 in New Zealand, the public sector nationally provided many jobs for people. Restructuring saw a large decrease in the importance and size of the public sector. The number of staff employed in the major state agencies stood at 260,890 in 1986 and fell to 171,611 by 1993 (Le Heron & Pawson, 1996). The last 15 years have also seen a decrease in the level of central government's services in the regions, a change that has resulted in fewer local services when, arguably, people are in greater need of those services because of increasing unemployment levels in the regions (Boston et al., 1996; Le Heron & Pawson, 1996). Local councils and voluntary agencies now perform many of the roles, particularly the welfare roles that were once undertaken by central government. The effects of these changes have been felt most severely in small towns (Le Heron & Pawson, 1996).

In Kaikoura, the greatest impact on the local community came from changes in the structure and function of Railways. Kaikoura had been a major service centre for the Main Trunk Railway line between Christchurch and Picton, which was completed in 1945. At its peak, Railways employed over 100 people, from guards, locomotive drivers, traffic controllers, to large gangs of labourers who maintained the line. McQueen (1992: 177) argued that that from a peak level of staff throughout New Zealand in the 1950s, railways had been gradually retrenching. When the 1980s came, the pace of change within Railways increased, prior to deregulation and restructuring. Railways was corporatised in 1982, and the deregulation of the land transport industry began in 1983 (McQueen, 1992: 177). By that stage, Kaikoura was noticing the changes. For example freight handling was concentrated into the main centres such as Christchurch and rail wagons were increasing in size. The corporation was finally privatised, and sold off, in 1993 (Pawson, 1996).

According to Kaikoura respondents, many jobs were lost from the railways during the 1980s. Many of the job losses over this time resulted from technological change.
According to informants in Kaikoura, the guards were the first people to be laid off, followed by the large gangs who worked on the tracks. The next development was that two locomotives would be put on each train from Christchurch. This allowed trains to go over the hills to the north of Kaikoura without picking up extra engines and drivers in Kaikoura, as had occurred previously. In addition, this change removed the need for shunting in the yards in Kaikoura. All shunting was moved to Christchurch and Blenheim. Refreshment staff were laid off as buffet cars were put onto passenger services. Finally, traffic controllers in Kaikoura were laid off in 1991, when traffic control was automated and controlled from Christchurch. Now, only a few Kaikoura residents work for the railways, and some of them only work on an on-call, part-time basis.

The loss of Railways meant that fewer regular pay packets were coming into the town, which, as in Rotorua, then affected local retailers. Quite a number of people left the area – some taking up similar jobs in Christchurch or Blenheim. The Māori community had provided a large proportion of the labour on the line maintenance gangs. According to several local informants, there were approximately 70-80 people employed on these gangs and most of the men supported families on their wages.

Another factor that contributed to this loss in Railways jobs was the deregulation of road transport. This deregulation allowed for a proliferation of road passenger and freight transport services. The Railways lost much of its trade at this time and, therefore, lost the need for many of its employees even without the additional influence of technological advancement.

Despite this, the administration of roading infrastructure shows parallel change during this time. The Ministry of Works, once the only organisation working on the roads, was forced to restructure as the construction market opened up and private construction companies could compete for work. This meant that it was no longer economic to keep a permanent workforce of people in Kaikoura. With improved roading and transport options, contractors working on the roads now use staff based in larger centres such as Christchurch and Blenheim. Therefore, few roading staff now live in Kaikoura. Staff based in Christchurch stay in Kaikoura only for limited periods of time, while they work on a contract basis.
In Rotorua, the state sector also shrank considerably between 1985 and 1990, with most of the job losses occurring from the state-owned enterprises. In Rotorua, Postbank, New Zealand Post, Telecom, New Zealand Rail, Works Consultancy, Works Construction, Housing Corporation and Landcorp accounted for 85 percent (624) of State Sector job losses over that time (Schlotjes, 1993).

Tourism also changed in Rotorua. The Government Tourist Bureau was privatised and eventually completely disappeared. As the environmental problems, outlined in the last chapter, came to a head during the 1980s, visitor numbers dropped and it became clear that some public sector input into tourism was desirable. This led, eventually, to the development of Tourism Rotorua, an arm of local government that focuses on the marketing and management of tourism in the area.

Technology

Alongside economic restructuring, technological advances have increased the pace and direction of change for both communities. Moving public sector service organisations into private ownership may have increased the pace at which new technologies could be introduced. Competition encourages the development and introduction of new technologies, both to reduce labour costs and increase the return on research and development costs.

In Kaikoura, telecommunications technology affected employment in the Post Office, the Railways and in the Meteorological Service base. Until 1986, telecommunications in New Zealand were controlled by the New Zealand Post Office. The beginning of telecommunications re-regulation began in 1987, and Telecom was finally sold to a private buyer in 1990 (Garland, 1996: 60). Perhaps of more importance was that telecommunications technology was changing rapidly and, through the 80s, many rural areas still using manual exchanges were modernised. Kaikoura’s exchange was finally automated in 1985 making about 25 people redundant. Similarly, changes in technology allowed the New Zealand Meteorological Service to automate its operation in Kaikoura. Their staff of about 24 in Kaikoura also became redundant and moved away. Thus, technological changes during the 1980s were another important reason for decreasing employment in Kaikoura.

In Rotorua, technological changes had similar kinds of effects. Perhaps the greatest changes have occurred in the forestry sector. Manual work positions were lost as
machines took over this work. These machines are able to complete the tasks more safely and cheaply than people do. The privatisation of state forests increased the impetus for the uptake of new machinery as has the Health and Safety in Employment Act 1992, which provided a strong incentive for employers to find safer ways of doing things.

**Local government reform**

According to Bush (1992) and Mulgan (1994), far-reaching local government reform was mooted in 1987, after the re-election of the Labour Government. These changes were finally instituted in 1989. The passing of the Local Government Amendment Act 1989 significantly changed the structure and function of local government across New Zealand. Very little changed in the Kaikoura area. However, the Kaikoura District Council (KDC) now has the smallest rating base in New Zealand except for the Chatham Islands, perhaps a testimony to its strong sense of identity and isolation. Many locals feel that the Council should be amalgamated with another council, but others argue that if that had been an attractive proposition for another council, amalgamation would have been achieved by now.

Further large-scale changes began during 1991, with the passing of the Resource Management Act, which significantly changed the ways that communities manage their natural and physical resources. The Local Government Act has since been amended and more legislation requiring action from councils has changed both the way that councils function, their accountability, and the way in which they fund local projects. These changes are not well understood by the general public, and the general apathy that New Zealanders have towards local government issues (Mulgan, 1994) means that understanding is likely to improve only slowly in the near future. These changes and their effects in Kaikoura and Rotorua are discussed in more depth in Chapter 7.

**Recent Māori development**

Another change of some importance in understanding tourism and perceptions of tourism in Kaikoura and Rotorua is the changing status of Māori across New Zealand. After WWII, Māori across New Zealand began to move into urban areas, from their traditional rural home areas, in search of work. Urbanisation began a series of changes in the status of Māori in New Zealand society. In particular, Māori became more visible
politically, and as Walker (1992) noted, urbanisation created new opportunities for Māori leadership and initiatives, particularly in education. By the 1970s, Māori were becoming more politically active in the Auckland area, where a number of eventually influential political activists began their actions to draw attention to injustices and inequalities. The 1970s were the time of well-remembered events such as the Māori Land March and the protest occupation of Bastion Point, both of which drew national attention to the claims of Māori groups.

These actions, and others, required the government to attend to Māori calls for change (Walker, 1992). Although the Waitangi Tribunal was set up in 1975 (Sharp, 1992), it was not until the 1980s that issues connected to Māori Sovereignty and the Treaty of Waitangi were taken seriously in the New Zealand Parliament. Although the process of redressing past infringements of the Treaty still has some way to go, Māori have become more prominent in New Zealand politics than they have been previously, and some groups of Māori are improving their economic status. This was another aspect of the national context within which local Māori in Kaikoura began the initiatives that led to the development of Whale Watch.

According to local Māori informants, they began plans to develop their Marae to provide a focal point for economic, social and cultural activities, at a time in the 70s when unemployment problems were beginning in Kaikoura. The process was long and difficult. At times, the actions of the local Pākehā community, in the form of objections to the Marae development, and the authorities, who were not keen to see the Marae built on its current site, made it even more difficult. Much of the Marae was built before the changes of the 1980s, and, as hoped, it has provided a centre for local Māori development and initiatives aimed at re-establishing a healthy Māori community. The Takahanga Marae now provides a range of social services and a venue for hui, for local activities and for larger gatherings.

Success breeds success. This is because when people succeed in achieving goals important to them they become more confident about their ability and more inclined to try again. Success therefore builds confidence in those who succeed. With confidence, people are willing to try new things, thus, building the Marae provided not just a home base, but gave Kaikoura Māori more confidence in starting new projects. Many innovative initiatives have emerged from activities at the Marae, including the
successful development of Whale Watch, now one of the largest businesses in Kaikoura.

Changing Māori politics at national level have allowed Kati Kuri to make progress with local institutions that, it seems, would have been unlikely had these larger-scale changes not been occurring also. While it seems, from the comments of a range of informants, that local attitudes toward Māori were likely to have impeded progress, Kati Kuri have been able to make progress by working at a higher level of politics, and using the skills and resources available to them through their affiliation and linkages with Ngai Tahu. Thus, the growth and development of Ngai Tahu as a political and economic entity has had a direct impact on the fortunes of Māori at local level in Kaikoura.

Changes in the relationships between Pākehā and Māori institutions have also been critical in Rotorua, although the history of Te Arawa is very different to that of Kati Kuri. Because of the configuration of relationships between Māori tribes at the time, Te Arawa chose to fight on the side of Pākehā at the time of the Māori Land Wars (Belich, 1996). This meant that many of the land confiscations that occurred with other iwi groups did not happen so much with Te Arawa. Additionally, Te Arawa were active participants in tourism since the early 1800s. Their guiding activities and their business acumen made them an important part of the tourism product of the area. Māori and Pākehā in Rotorua have, therefore, always had tourism as a point of contact.

In spite of this promising start, however, Te Arawa have become more marginalised over the years (Tahana, Simmons & Fairweather, 2000). A number of intersecting factors (for example, the loss of low-skilled jobs, some Māori moving off their land under pressure from local development needs, a lack of attention to Māori needs in education), have resulted in Māori being over-represented in the poverty figures in Rotorua (Rotorua District Council, 1998a). In addition to this, there is tension between Māori and Pākehā in the town as the relationship between them shifts at a political and economic level. This means that both ‘sides’ are in the process of negotiating a new relationship – a process that is uncomfortable at times.

**Forestry**

Forestry was, and still is, an important economic sector in Rotorua. The number of jobs available in the forestry sector decreased significantly during the 1980s and 1990s. Government involvement in forestry changed considerably during the 1980s when the
forestry sector was restructured, partly because of privatisation, and partly because of increasing automation. Forests were largely government owned at the beginning of the 1980s but now most production forests are in private ownership.

The changes were especially hard on small towns surrounding Rotorua such as Minginui and Murupara. Job losses were concentrated amongst lower skilled workers, 70 percent of whom were Māori. Furthermore, many people who had job skills found that they were too specialised for the shrinking job market. In addition to facing unemployment, many people were faced with increasing costs associated with housing, which previously had been provided cheaply by their employer (McLennan & Durand, 1987). In spite of this, forestry remains an important sector in the Rotorua economy, and accounted for about 15 percent of total employment in 1996 (APR Consultants, 1996).

**Fishing**

Another series of changes occurred in the management of the New Zealand marine fish stocks, which had big effects on Kaikoura. These changes in the fishing industry may be seen as quite separate from the process of restructuring, in that they happened as the result of overfishing. However, they are directly linked to the development of overseas markets for fish, and with changes in other industries. They are also based on the more neoliberal philosophy of internalising externalities by the sale of quota. In short, they brought a form of privatisation to fishing.

New fishing techniques, an increase in the size of the fish market, and the development of new transport technology made it easier and more economic to export fish overseas. While the local market had been relatively small, fishers could more easily sell their catches for a good price by tapping into international markets. As fish stocks around New Zealand became depleted, the government took steps to regulate fish catches and to bring in the quota system that now exists.

Local people in Kaikoura say that the depletion of fish stocks occurred with the development of set-netting as a new fishing technique. According to interviewees from Kaikoura fishing families, fishing began changing during the 1970s. Before that time, fishing had been a small-scale, family affair with the techniques, values and rules being passed down from father to son. A day’s fishing consisted of putting out the lines, clearing them over the course of the day and then bringing them in again at night. All
the fishers that I spoke to who remember this time talk about ‘unwritten rules’ such as ‘never leave your lines out overnight’. This, and other rules, were policed by other fishers. Groper were the main catch, and the technique of line fishing was considered sustainable because, according to my local informants, groper do not eat when they are spawning, so they cannot be caught on lines when they are spawning. Equally important in maintaining fish stocks was that there were no developed markets for fish, and there was much work involved in clearing lines.

Crayfishing\(^3\) has a long history in Kaikoura. Prior to the 1970s, crayfishers used pots made from supplejack vines. The beauty of these was that, if they were lost, they would rot and no longer catch crayfish, unlike the metal pots that are now used. Transporting fish and crayfish to prospective markets could cost more than the fish was worth on that market. It was not until the 1970s, that the value of crayfish began to increase. At this time the international law of the sea was changing, and New Zealand created a 200 kilometre exclusive economic fishing zone (Le Heron & Pawson, 1996: 154). Overseas markets began to develop, attracting many outsiders into Kaikoura as they saw opportunities to make money from fishing. As fish became more valuable, and the market for them grew, new fishing methods, such as set-netting, developed. Set-netting allowed more fish to be caught in less time. Long-term locals say that set-netting was introduced largely by people from Kaiapoi, many of whom worked on the killing chains at Canterbury Frozen Meat Freezing Works. They would work at Canterbury Frozen Meat for six months, then come up to Kaikoura and fish for the other months of the year.

They'd come in the early summer and do their set netting here and then go back on the chain . . . and then as they started closing killing chains down and that, those guys came and set up here and got into it.

The effects of set-netting diminished stocks in the wet fishery\(^4\) in Kaikoura as in other places.

As fish stocks depleted the New Zealand authorities realised the need to manage fish stocks at national level. This was the beginning of the development of the quota

\(^3\) Crayfish (*Jarus edwardsii*) are also called New Zealand rock lobster.

\(^4\) Wet fish are the fish species in Kaikoura that are caught with set nets. The name wet fish is used to distinguish these fisheries from the paua fishery or the crayfishery.
management system. Monitoring techniques were developed and the quota management system was brought in during 1983 (Le Heron & Pawson, 1996). Despite this, the science of fisheries management is not simple and is often contested, particularly with reference to the wet fishery.

Many Kaikoura locals felt that the way that fishing quota was allocated was unfair. This perception has helped to accentuate the division between long-term locals and newcomers. To the families that had been fishing in Kaikoura for many years, it appeared that the new group of fishers had little feeling for the resource that they were fishing and were out to get as many fish as possible for the least effort. The same fishers that depleted the resource were then the ones to benefit the most from the allocation of quota, because they built up a catch history, which they then used to control how quota was allocated. This consisted of nominating the years that would be used to judge how much quota individual fishers would get. The fact that the newcomers now outnumbered the ‘locals’ so that they had relatively more power to influence what would happen created ill-feeling:

*It was a toss up as to what years to take [as the basis from which to establish a quota allocation], and of course they took a vote from fishermen and of course all the fishermen . . . looked at their books and said well they were my best years . . . .

However, there was more to it than that. One informant felt that local fishers were disadvantaged because of the long-term way in which they thought of fishing:

*There’s a generation of people in Kaikoura that didn’t know any better . . . and never understood the ramifications of not filling out fishing returns. They could not understand that their whole life would be turned around by not having a history in fishing for a three-year period - they saw a history as a lifetime, you know? Not something that happened in three years.*

In addition, quota was allocated only to people who had recorded more than a minimum catch level and this disadvantaged people who had small catches over the three years that counted. One interviewee said:

*P’s dad paua-ed for many years and did less each year as he got older but unless you got a certain amount in the last 2-3 years, you weren’t given any quota. A man who had a lifetime’s history of fishing got nothing, whereas others who had just moved into the area got big quotas.*

Fishers who had fished casually to supplement other income were excluded from the quota allocation, as were fishers who were away from the district over the critical three years that became the basis for quota allocations. In comparison, many fishers who had
just moved into the area, and perhaps who were more aware of the implications of their action over the time quota was being discussed, were advantaged by being allocated large amounts of quota. Because quota can be bought, sold and leased, this gave some fishers capital resources that they never had before.

This method of quota allocation also disadvantaged many in the Māori community who had a long tradition of fishing but often on a relatively small scale. There is a chance, however, the Māori will benefit from the ongoing discussions and allocation of pan-Māori fishing quota, depending on how this is allocated between and within iwi groups.

The crayfishery has benefited most significantly from the quota management system, which has made the crayfishers the most positive of all fishers in Kaikoura towards the whole system. According to Barton (1998, pers. comm.), a marine biologist, there are several reasons for the success of crayfish management. Most importantly, scientists have a better understanding of crayfish ecology compared with other fish species, so the science of managing crayfish is a much more certain one. In comparison, wet fish stocks are difficult to count and, as with paua, there is no good understanding of the life cycles of the various species, which makes estimating total allowable catches less certain.

Conclusions

Although change is a continuous process, there are periods in history that represent a reconfiguration of the socio-economic system. As new forms and ideas emerge within complex systems, they must adapt to changing conditions and tensions both inside and outside the system in question. In the case of economic restructuring, the changes occurred right across the capitalist system, but at the same time, there were differences in the way these changes manifested in different geographic locations, depending on the actions and reactions of local people and their environments. Global and national restructuring are reflected in changes at local level throughout New Zealand, as in other parts of the world (Douglas, 1989; Gray, 1994; Mair, Reid, George & Taylor, 2001).

For the people of Kaikoura, the most significant effect of restructuring was the loss of employment opportunities, which began a steady decline during the 1980s. The group that was hit hardest by the loss of employment were Māori. However, Māori have made enormous progress in trying to remedy this problem, with Māori leaders promoting
Māori answers to Māori problems. Whale Watch in Kaikoura is the direct result of action initiated as a result of this philosophy, and will be discussed later in the thesis.

Rotorua as a regional economy has been negatively affected by the withdrawal of government services and the loss of employment as a result of restructuring. Forestry has been commercialised, and machines have taken the place of unskilled workers. In addition, many jobs in the State Sector disappeared, or were moved to larger centres, thus adding to the loss of employment in the area.

Overall, while change has been occurring steadily over the decades preceding the 1980s, it was not until the 1980s that major structural change occurred in the New Zealand economy and society. Many of the functions that were once fulfilled by Central Government are now performed by the private sector or pseudo-private-sector organisations. At local levels, this is manifest in changing employment patterns and relations, and changing relationships amongst residents, as the rich become richer and the poor become poorer. This, in turn, has impacted on the roles and responsibilities of local councils and local voluntary agencies that have had to move in to deal with the problems associated with these changes.

This pattern of change in which changes accumulate before causing systemic change is a good example of the sort of ‘catastrophic’ change, which is typical of complex systems (Casti, 1994). It also reflects the observations of Le Heron and Pawson (1996) that capitalism creates its own crises (self-organised criticality) and periods of adjustment. Roger Douglas might be seen as a ‘butterfly’ in the system, and credited with bringing about major change in New Zealand society. However, the actions and reactions of many people, both before and after 1984, contributed to the development and resolution of the critical state of the economic system at that time. This observation is supported by the apparent existence of other ‘butterflies,’ such as Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan, in other nations. Clearly, these few people did not facilitate the large-scale changes we have seen on their own.

Capitalism can be seen as just a relatively stable pattern of interactions that has emerged from a whole set of historical, geographic, social and economic processes. It is not bad or good, as some authors might have us believe. The system simply is, just as ecosystems and social systems are. However, the patterns of interaction into which the system stabilises may have good and bad effects on individuals within the system. That
the rich are getting richer and the poor, poorer, is an example. Clearly, these patterns disadvantage the poor and positive reinforcement loops make it difficult (although not impossible) for them to help themselves. Patterns of capitalism are neither completely controllable nor completely controlling. As individuals, we are neither free agents nor puppets. The question is, then, how do we use this uncertainty to move forward to manage businesses, poverty, tourism, or whatever other phenomenon captures our interest?

The lessons to be learned from looking at this piece of history might best be learned by looking at how different groups of people have acted and reacted during this period of social upheaval and change. In comparison with the experiences of countries such as Australia, New Zealand went through more political and social change than most (Dalziel, 2002). Change may have been inevitable, however, the path of that change could have been different, and our ability to cope might have been better developed. Greater social capital and less political apathy amongst New Zealand citizens may have affected the trajectory of the system.

Of most importance for this thesis are what these changes have done to local senses of 'control.' The speed and size of the changes created by restructuring and the fact that democratic processes in New Zealand appeared to become less effective during this phase of history have disempowered many New Zealanders and particularly those in the regions. There are many possible reactions to disempowerment. A lack of trust in the political process appears to have been one such reaction to the politics of the 1980s. From the comments of some interviewees, the events of the 1980s and 90s have made them less inclined to try to influence change. Others became belligerent and angry. Unfortunately this strategy can backfire – for example, refusing to comply with institutional requirements can land one in more trouble, particularly where others are complying. This happened in the case of the fishers in Kaikoura, for example, who refused to record their catches and then were not allocated quota. It might even be argued that processes that convince people of their inability to meet their own needs can effectively fragment communities, making them even less likely to influence change by their inability to act collaboratively (Lerner, 1986).

The process described here is a positive reinforcement loop and is the basis of the strategy 'divide and conquer.' The more disempowered people feel, the less constructive action they take, and the more disempowered they become. It is possible
to argue that Roger Douglas effectively managed to disempower New Zealanders and that this was instrumental in allowing him to push through the legislative changes.

While this is clearly an argument that focuses on only one part of the system, it is clear that the more Douglas managed to disempower others, the more he empowered himself and the greater his confidence and the more he sought to influence change (another mirroring reinforcement loop). Thus the actions of one person can be accentuated and reinforced by both the situation (in this case a fiscal crisis) and by the reactions of the people around them over time. ‘Butterflies,’ therefore, are individuals who find themselves acting when the system is at a point of self-organised criticality which result in positive reinforcement loops which can very quickly change the system in question.

There are three conclusions that I want to draw here. First, the conjunction of these two reinforcement loops explains how patterns of power can quickly develop and remain in any situation. Second, it seems likely that one of the major, long-term outcomes of the series of changes that occurred came not from the changes themselves, but from the processes by which those changes were brought about and the speed at which they were instigated. Third, complex systems are unpredictable, and influenced by many different factors both within the system and from outside of it. However, this is not to say that they are unmanageable. They are only partially unmanageable and, conversely, partially manageable. It makes little sense for individuals within the system to give up trying to make a difference, and yet it makes no sense to expect that it is easy to achieve any particular individual’s goals. Managing complex systems, therefore, requires a high level of adaptability and an ability to work with uncertainty. Arguably, it is also more effective if people work together. Since tourism can be conceptualised as part of a series of complex systems, communities must be adaptable and able to deal with uncertainty. Given the discussion in the last few paragraphs, adaptability is most likely to happen when the community has a collective sense of control – or sense of empowerment.

The next chapters provide a range of background information and observations about community systems in Rotorua and Kaikoura. The next chapter looks specifically at the interactions between tourism and the two communities.
Chapter 6

Community and Tourists

Introduction

As a small economy based mainly on primary produce, New Zealand has always struggled with its balance of payments so international tourism is strongly encouraged by central government through the marketing activities of the New Zealand Tourism Board. At local level, tourism is seen as a way to attract money into shrinking local economies, and international tourists are valued because, according to local businesses, they tend to spend more money than domestic tourists. What is of particular interest in this chapter are how these changes in national- and local-level policies are played out amongst the residents of destination areas.

This chapter explores the interface between community and tourism. It briefly reviews some literature on the social impacts of tourism, then discusses how Kaikoura and Rotorua residents perceive the benefits and costs of tourism development in their respective towns. I reflect on what these results might mean and on the underlying assumptions of taking such an approach to understanding the social impacts of tourism. I consider some of the ways in which Rotorua and Kaikoura residents have themselves impacted on tourism in the local area and what local authorities might do to improve local responses to tourism development in their area.

However, even in narrowing the discussion to how local people perceive tourism, interview data indicate that there is more to the way in which people in the community assess tourism than just looking at the impacts of tourists. It seems that to understand tourism impacts we must look beyond the concrete, obvious and easily measurable
familiar, impacts of tourism and, instead, as suggested earlier in the thesis, look at perceptions of tourism as part of an ongoing set of processes associated with its management and manifestation at local level.

**Research into Community Acceptance of Tourism**

The tourism impacts literature has been reviewed on a number of occasions (see, for example, Craig-Smith & French 1994; Faulkner & Tideswell 1997; Matheson & Wall 1982; Mowforth & Munt; 1998; Norohna, 1979; Sharpley, 1999). I do not propose to do a similar extensive review of that same literature. Instead, I am trying to broadly understand how that literature has developed and the assumptions on which it appears to be based.

Much research into the social impacts of tourism is based on the idea of Butler's (1980) tourist area cycle of evolution. Butler proposed that tourist destinations move through a seven-stage cycle from *discovery* through *involvement*, *development* into *consolidation and stagnation*. From here destinations may move into *decline* unless innovation and/or amelioration of impacts move the area into *rejuvenation or stabilisation*. As the destination moves through these stages, visitors change from being highly adaptive and independent to being less adaptive and more dependent on a tourism industry to provide for their needs (Butler, 1980; Keller, 1987). Underlying this model is Doxey's (1975) suggestion that as tourism increases and develops in an area, residents move through four stages from euphoria, through apathy and annoyance to antagonism. Alongside these changes, ownership of key tourism businesses moves from local to regional to national and international as more capital is required to develop tourist facilities and attractions, especially in peripheral areas. As ownership moves to larger centres of capital, so does control. Outside agents have increasing influence on the way that a destination develops while the wishes of the local people have concomitantly less influence (Keller, 1987).

This model suggests that destinations develop in a generally linear fashion and residents' perceptions become increasingly negative over time. The idea is that by monitoring residents' perceptions over time, we should be able to track these changes and see when tourism is having untenable negative impacts in an area. Although it is questioned as a predictive model (Hayward, 1986), Butler's life-cycle model is still used as the basis of much research both overseas (Douglas, 1997; Faulkner & Tideswell,
New Zealand residents in key communities have been surveyed to find out their tourism acceptance level (Evans, 1993; Garland 1984; Lawson et al., 1998; McDermott-Miller, 1988). These studies confirm that as tourist numbers increase at a destination, so do residents' perceptions of negative impacts from tourism. For example, Evans (1993), in a telephone survey of 1485 people in 15 different New Zealand towns and cities, found that in places where both seasonal fluctuations in tourist numbers are high and economic dependence on tourism is high, a greater proportion of local people will dislike tourism. However, it is not clear whether seasonal fluctuations are the problem, or whether it is the ratio of tourists to hosts at the height of the season that is the problem. Nor do all communities fit this pattern. Whitianga, a small community on the Coromandel Peninsula with a moderate level of seasonality and a very low level of economic dependence on tourism, should have residents who are mostly positive about tourism. In fact, it had a higher percentage of people that Evans classifies as 'haters' than Queenstown, which Evans rates as having a very high seasonality and a high economic dependence on tourism. In comparison, Te Anau, with a very high tourist-host density at the height of the tourist season and a very high economic dependence on tourism, has a very low percentage of 'haters' relative to other communities in the survey.

Similarly, Lawson et al. (1998) found that Rotorua, one of New Zealand's most long-term tourist destinations has a community perceptions profile more akin to places such as Christchurch or Wellington, which have relatively little tourism development. Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) also noted that residents of the Gold Coast of Australia, where there is a very high degree of tourism development, were more supportive of tourism than might be expected. They suggested that if people perceive benefits for the community as a whole, they are more tolerant of any problems that tourism presents for them as individuals, so their perceptions of tourism will be less negative. Furthermore, they suggest that with a long history of tourism development, communities can adapt by developing coping strategies and by selective migration, where people who do not like tourism move out of the area.
In a recent New Zealand case study, Shone (2001), studying Picton, questioned how level of social contact that locals have, length of residence in Picton, employment in tourism and place of residence within the town affected acceptance of tourism. His findings reflect differences between Picton and other tourist destinations that have been studied. People who had lived in Picton for more than 15 years were more cautious, or negative, about future tourism growth and development in the town, and less inclined to say that they would participate in tourism planning. The findings of Haralambopoulos & Pizam (1996) were similar, but McCool and Martin (1994), and Brougham and Butler (1981) found that the longer people had been resident in the places they studied, the more positive they were about tourism. In another example, Shone found that geographical distance from the tourist area had no relationship with people’s perceptions of tourism. These findings differ from those of Belisle and Hoy (1980) who found that geographical distance was related to residents’ perceptions of tourism. Residents living closer to the centre of tourist activity were more likely to note negative impacts from tourism. Again, there are differences in the perceptions of males and females in some cases (e.g. Evans, 1993; Mason & Cheyne, 2000), but not in others (Davis, Allen & Cosenza, 1988; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Harvey, Hunt & Harris, 1995). These differences indicate that other factors must affect the way people see tourism in different destinations.

Shone’s (2001) findings that Picton people employed in tourism tend to be more positive about it matched those of other destinations (Haralambopoulos & Pizam 1996; Milman & Pizam; 1988; Pizam 1978). The greater the level of contact residents had with tourists, the greater their level of acceptance of tourism, the more positive they were about the future of tourism in the town, and the more likely it was that they thought they would participate in tourism planning.

These findings appear to contradict the idea that the more tourists (and by inference, the greater the level of tourist-host contact), the greater the hypothesised level of local annoyance. Local encounters with tourists are mediated by contextual factors. For example, perceptions appear to be affected by how a person perceives the result of the direct benefit that they receive from tourists (Ap & Crompton, 1993). The perceived benefits are not always financial, but may reflect some form of social exchange (Ap, 1992).
Some studies have found that residents' perceptions of tourism are linked to the level of local economic development (Allen et al., 1993; Johnson, Snepenger & Akis, 1994), which may reflect the fact that many communities with a high level of dependence on tourism are less positive about it than those who are less dependent on it (Evans 1993; Getz 1994; Sharpley 1999; Smith & Krannich 1998). However, Long, Perdue & Allen (1990) found that positive attitudes toward tourism increased during an economic downturn, which one might assume would increase a community's dependence on tourism. Similarly, communities with a high dependence on tourism are likely to have more individuals earning their living from tourism and yet, as noted above, working in tourism is a factor that is supposed to increase people's acceptance of tourism. As a number of authors note, more factors, of which we are not aware, impact on host perceptions than those outlined here (Getz, 1994; Johnson et al., 1994; Ryan et al., 1998). Overall, the tourism literature suggests that the processes of community adaptation and tourism development result from a range of interacting factors, which produce the reported effects. Thus, community responses to tourism are complex in nature, and the factors that contribute to that community's acceptance of tourism may be different in each destination. To understand this complexity a different research approach is required.

Despite the focus outlined above, recent research appears to be addressing these limitations. Case studies using a range of theoretical perspectives, are beginning to appear, particularly in the international literature (Abram, 1996; Black, 1996; Boissevain, 1996; Brown & Giles, 1994; Kariel, 1993; Reed, 1997; Stonich, Sorenson & Hundt, 1995; Wilson, 1997;). These studies look at the ways in which communities have adapted tourism to fit into their local (natural, social, political, historical) environments and the ways in which tourism has, in turn, affected those environments. Significantly, each of the studies outlined above employed qualitative, inductive approaches, which allowed the authors to document a high level of complexity. These studies show how the history of an area, its natural environment, local economic factors and community power structures affect the impacts that tourism has on the place in question (Boissevain, 1996; Kariel, 1993; Reed, 1997; Stonich et al., 1998; Wilson, 1997). So far, very little of the New Zealand literature uses these more in-depth approaches specifically to understand the complexity of community responses to tourism development at the local level.
Rotorua and Kaikoura: Involvement in Tourism

Both Rotorua and Kaikoura are popular destinations, both relying primarily on natural attractions to bring in visitors – both domestic and international. However, the two areas also differ. Unlike Rotorua, Kaikoura hosts many short-stop visitors in transit between Christchurch and Picton and has a very short history of hosting international visitors. While Rotorua is a primary New Zealand attraction, which many visitors know about prior to entering the country, overseas visitors are more often unaware of Kaikoura until after they have arrived in New Zealand (Moore, Simmons & Fairweather, 1998, 2000).

Tourism is an important part of the economies of both towns. As Central Government withdrew from regional development, the regions found themselves having to work harder to maintain local services, and to attract money and capital. For both Rotorua and Kaikoura, tourism is seen as a means of increasing employment as well as bringing money into the local economy.

Local Māori are involved in tourism in both places. In Kaikoura, Kati Kuri (a sub-tribe of Ngai Tahu) and Ngai Tahu own Whale Watch Kaikoura – the biggest tourism business in the town. In Rotorua, some sub-tribes of Te Arawa have been involved in cultural performance, guiding and hospitality since the early days of Pākehā settlement, and now form a vital part of the tourism product of Rotorua.

Perceptions of Tourism in Rotorua and Kaikoura

Rotorua and Kaikoura both have significant tourism development, but each place has a different experience of tourism. These differences are reflected in the results of the telephone surveys. In Rotorua, 97 percent (484 of 500) articulated at least one benefit that tourism conferred, while only 37 percent (193) articulated one or more community costs from it. This ratio is very different in Kaikoura where 54 percent (158) articulated at least one personal benefit of tourism, while 51 percent (149) articulated at least one negative aspect to tourism (see Table 3). In addition 80 percent of the Kaikoura sample said that they thought that, in overview, the community as a whole benefited from tourism.
Table 3: Percentages of individuals citing community benefits and costs from tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotorua</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaikoura</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Tables 4 & 5 show, by far the most frequently cited benefits of tourism in both Rotorua and Kaikoura were the economic and employment benefits of tourism. What is of interest here is the relative consensus in both towns as to the benefits of tourism. Other benefits that the two communities perceived in common were the effects that tourism had on local facilities, services and recreation opportunities. The theme of economic diversification also came up in both places.

Table 4: Benefits of tourism reported by Rotorua residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>% (N=500)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural diversity</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicer place</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of activities</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good for business</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local image</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better local services</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Other’ Benefits
- Advertising the Māori culture
- Broadcasts our good name/image
- Proud of city
- Forestry
- City has grown larger
- Health education
- Increases population
- More Māori becoming involved in business
- One on one good manners
- Opportunity
- Providing personalised transport
- Real estate values have increased

Table 5: Benefits of tourism reported by Kaikoura residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>% (N=291)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good for business</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating places</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversification</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More facilities/services</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes us more outward looking</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Other’ Benefits
- Like having people around town
- Kaikoura is growing
- Better lifestyle
- Real estate boom
- Managing tourism brings locals together
- Conservation etc makes place nicer to live in
- People are happier
- Children’s jobs
- Good coffee
- I have learnt about other countries
- Transport is better

In comparison, as Tables 6 and 7 show, in both places there was no clear consensus on what the negative effects of tourism are. Residents in both places suggested a much
greater range of negative impacts, and no impact stood out as a problem for a large number of respondents, although in Kaikoura parking and crowding in town are problems for a significant number of people. This lack of consensus may result from the fact that few public figures are trying to convince people of the negative impacts of tourism, whereas there is more discussion in the media of the benefits of tourism. In addition, many tourism organisations are keen that the public hear about the benefits of tourism. Therefore, talk about the benefits of tourism is more frequently heard in public forums. This suggestion is supported by the fact that people who do not benefit personally from tourism are still able to talk about the benefits of tourism at a community level. The negative impacts of tourism are more often those experienced by the individuals themselves.

Table 6: The problems that locals attributed to tourism in Rotorua & Kaikoura

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems (Rotorua)</th>
<th>% (N=500)</th>
<th>Problems (Kaikoura)</th>
<th>% (N=291)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving/ traffic</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Parking in town</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding/ Over-exploitation</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Crowding in town</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (see Table 7)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>High rates</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic/parking</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Lack of water etc.</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>High cost of living</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High prices</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Loss of community</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rates</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Ruined lifestyle</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate tourist behaviour</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Traffic round our home</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution, litter etc</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Shops more for tourists</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside owners of tourism shops: no benefit to Rotorua</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>People moving in to town</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-commercialisation</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Bad drivers</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-dependence on tourism</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Loss of privacy at home</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on tourists, not on locals</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Not good jobs</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult communication</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Less safe</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility of casino</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Shops sell out</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Issues</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Family life</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Other concerns with tourism in Rotorua and Kaikoura

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotorua</th>
<th>Kaikoura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluctuation in work hours</td>
<td>The tourists might stop coming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate of greed/ Ripping off visitors</td>
<td>Tourists must respect the land and the people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some locally view tourists as an annoyance</td>
<td>We need to keep a balance between use and protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many Asians</td>
<td>That our infrastructure can keep up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few people resent tourism</td>
<td>Overdo it, lose whales/ uniqueness, lose tourists/unsustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could influence teenagers incorrectly</td>
<td>Selling clean and green to dirty people - need to manage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False image</td>
<td>Don't want to be like Queenstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus drivers not going to all attractions if having to pay for things that you never had to</td>
<td>Want Kaikoura to stay as it is now - not too commercialised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services not up to standard</td>
<td>Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clash of cultures</td>
<td>Too many recreational fishers and no control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism changed &amp; become geared towards</td>
<td>Some groups of local people ignored because of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youngsters - not looking at it as a whole</td>
<td>Council &amp; others spend money on tourist needs rather than local needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing environment</td>
<td>Tourism money should be spread around community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough public toilets</td>
<td>Less safe for kids, elderly or tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In some areas there’s an oversupply of tourist services</td>
<td>Tourists getting ripped off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of money wasted</td>
<td>Seasonality/ not reliable work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain shop prices are higher for tourists</td>
<td>Uncontrollable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissent at Whaka about 2 years ago</td>
<td>Loss of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intolerance by locals towards some tourists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapidly shifting population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some areas are too exposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many hotels and motels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losing a bit of our privacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough for children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The division in the attractions at Whaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregation of Māori to others in workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs education to protect the natural places</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following two graphs also show a difference between the two places in their perceptions of how much tourism is enough in the local area. Looking at Figures 13 and 14, a high percentage of respondents feel that tourism levels are ‘about right now’ in Kaikoura, while more people in Rotorua felt that it could manage more tourism than was there at the time.
Overall, from these results, one would say that both communities are more positive about tourism than negative. Rotorua people are distinctly more positive about the idea of more tourism than are Kaikoura people. Perhaps more important is the lack of consensus about what the costs of tourism are. A question is: what does this lack of

---

1 Note that the question was asked differently in both places. In Kaikoura, people were offered a scale of 1 to 10. Respondents tended to think of five as 'about right now' in their estimates of scale. Five, however, is not strictly the midpoint on the scale. This caused problems in analysis, so the question was modified in Rotorua to a five-point Likert scale. Despite these differences, one can see visually that the distributions of the two communities are very different.
consensus mean, if anything? People who are very keen to have more tourism may well argue that this lack of consensus indicates that the impacts are not ‘really’ there and that people are just negative about it for no good reason. I disagree. From living in the two places, it was clear that the two communities were experiencing tourism very differently. Talking about tourism in Kaikoura tended to elicit intense responses from residents, whether they were arguing that tourism was wonderful for the town and the only way forward, or whether they were expressing a dislike of it. In conversation, people in Kaikoura often also pointed out the negatives of tourism, even when they rated it well.

In comparison, the most common response that I got from asking Rotorua locals about how tourism affects them was for them to say that it did not affect them at all — that tourism was really nothing to do with them. Many people were so sure that tourism has no effect on them at all that they usually appeared surprised to be asked for an opinion about it.

One interviewee commented that:

R: When I came here, I didn’t want to come here because it was a tourist centre and I didn’t want to live in a tourist centre but the reality is that tourism — I mean that because I . . . [have a tourism related job], it impinges on my life — but the reality is that tourism does not impinge on the rest of my life at all. I don’t live in the tourism part of town.

I: Does anybody?

R: No, not really. So that’s interesting. I don’t know whether it would be different, for instance in Queenstown, but you certainly could live in this town and not be affected by tourism at all really.

According to APR consultants (1996: 14) many people who move to Rotorua are surprised by the low visibility of tourism:

Attendees were in general surprised by the lack of visibility of tourism to people who live here (unless directly involved in the tourism industry). They said that Rotorua was not blatantly commercialised and it was as if there were two cities — one inhabited by residents and one visited by tourists with very little interaction between the two.

It seems, therefore, that Rotorua locals were able to disengage from tourism even when they worked in tourism, whereas Kaikoura people were engaged and involved, no matter what their involvement with the industry. In Kaikoura, contact with tourists is more difficult to avoid than it is in Rotorua.
In comparison to the first interviewee above, a young woman in Kaikoura who worked with tourists said that she often avoided going out at night because there was such a high likelihood of meeting customers. When she had first started working in tourism she had found it fun, but now she felt that meeting customers all the time and having to deal with so many people was tiring. Tourism clearly impinged on her life in ways that she found difficult to deal with in the long-term. The implication here is that for Kaikoura people, tourism is ‘in your face,’ as younger respondents put it, whereas for Rotorua people it is something that they can move in and out of at will. It is possible to live in Rotorua and still escape the interpersonal pressures of tourism.

This is an interesting pattern, because Rotorua residents project a sense of neutrality and disengagement in relation to tourism. In comparison, there are few people in Kaikoura who were either neutral or disengaged. People tended to express feelings about tourism, whether they were positive, negative, or not sure about it, because everyone seemed to be aware of both positive and negative aspects of it. It seems, therefore, that the impacts of tourism are least when people view it with equanimity and generally do not have strong feelings about it. If this is so, the opposite of negative is neutral rather than positive.

This may be indicative of the maturity of the industry in Rotorua compared with its newness in Kaikoura, but it seems that there are other factors that contribute to residents’ perceptions of tourism in the two places. The following sections outline some of the factors that appear to contribute to the way in which tourism is experienced in both places. These factors are largely geographical and historical.

Factors Affecting Local Perceptions of Tourism

Factors affecting local perceptions of tourism in these two case studies appear to include the:

- relative economic importance of tourism, which is greater in Kaikoura than in Rotorua;
- visibility of visitors;
- sense of control that local people have in relation to tourism; and
- different meanings associated with tourism in the two places.
Relative economic importance of tourism

Tourism makes up a greater proportion of the local economy in Kaikoura than in Rotorua. In Kaikoura, the small size of the town means that other sectors of the economy are few and small, with tourism generating 30 percent of the town’s employment (Butcher, Fairweather & Simmons, 1998). In comparison, Rotorua, with its larger population, has a more diverse economy of which tourism creates only 18 percent of local employment (Butcher, et al., 2000). Rotorua maintains a relatively large permanent resident population because of the presence of other large economic sectors such as forestry, farming and manufacturing. Reflecting this, the employment multipliers calculated for both places are 1.21 and 1.39 respectively for Kaikoura and Rotorua (Butcher et al. 1998, 2000). Thus, the flow-on employment benefits of tourism in Rotorua are greater than in Kaikoura.

Allen, Long, Perdue and Keiselbach (1988) found that when retail sales to visitors reached 30 percent of total retail sales, residents of visitor destinations begin to feel more negatively about their community and tourism. A later study (Allen, Hafer, Long & Perdue, 1993) found that the relationship is more complex. They found (as shown in Figure 15) that residents’ attitudes to tourism development are most positive in communities with either a low overall level of economic development (as reflected by the limited diversity of sectors in the economy) and a low level of tourism development, or, a high level of economic development and a high level of tourism development.

![Figure 15: Relationship between tourism and economic development (Derived from Allen et al. 1993).](image-url)
Rotorua falls into this latter category whereas Kaikoura would appear to have a high level of tourism but a low level of economic development. This increases Kaikoura’s dependence on tourism; a factor which has already been discussed as an important factor in residents’ perceptions of tourism.

Visibility of visitors
Not only is tourism more concentrated in Kaikoura, but tourists are more visible in Kaikoura than they are in Rotorua. This visibility has the following four components which are elucidated further in the discussion below.

1. The relative number of visitors to hosts is much higher in Kaikoura than in Rotorua.

2. The size and layout of Kaikoura means that local people cannot avoid visitors when they are trying to do their everyday business, whereas the size and layout of Rotorua means that local residents do not have to move amongst tourists in the course of their everyday business (unless, of course, they are in the business of tourism).

3. Kaikoura has a higher proportion of international overnight visitors, as compared with Rotorua.

4. Because of the small size of Kaikoura, locals can easily recognise tourists as such, whereas in Rotorua it is more difficult for residents to distinguish visitors from locals. This means that where crowding or overuse occurs, Rotorua residents may not identify these impacts as coming from tourism.

The ratio of total visitor numbers to the resident population at the time of research in Kaikoura was much higher than the same ratio in Rotorua at the time of research. An estimated 873,000 people visited Kaikoura over the year July 1997 to June 1998 (Fairweather, Horn & Simmons, 1998), while approximately 1.5 million people visited Rotorua during 1999 (Tourism Rotorua figures). This ratio in Rotorua is considerably lower than that in Kaikoura or similar ratios in other tourist centres such as Queenstown, Te Anau, or Waitomo (Collier, 1997; Simmons, Horn & Fairweather, 1998). Taking only overnight visitors, the ratio in Kaikoura is 104.2 compared with 17.9 in Rotorua. Thus, the likelihood of a resident meeting a tourist is much higher in Kaikoura than is the case in Rotorua.
Another, useful way of illustrating this is to calculate the proportion of total person days spent in the town by tourists. Tables 8 and 9 show these calculations.

Table 8: Calculation of the ratio of visitors to residents in Kaikoura in person-days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>days</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>351.5</td>
<td>970,140</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short stop</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>0.1(^1)</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day visitors</td>
<td>137,000</td>
<td>0.33(^2)</td>
<td>45,210</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight</td>
<td>356,000</td>
<td>1.83(^3)</td>
<td>651,480</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>873,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,704,830</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Assumes a stay of less than 2 hours  
2. Green Globe ratio assumes 1 meal  
3. Average stay of overnight visitor

A much higher proportion of person days are attributable to visitors in Kaikoura than is the case in Rotorua. Another way of thinking about this is that in Kaikoura, 43 percent of the use of infrastructural elements such as sewerage comes from the presence of visitors rather than residents.

Another factor that contributes to the level of host contact with tourists is the size and layout of the areas in question. The high likelihood of contact is exacerbated in Kaikoura because the small size and layout of the township mean that tourists and locals all must occupy a very small space. Tourists in Kaikoura tend to spread themselves over a distance of only about three kilometres from the town centre (Moore et al. 1998), and within that area there are only three main sites where tourists congregate, one of which is the town centre. Tourists in Kaikoura are, therefore, very obtrusive for
Kaikoura people going about their everyday business, and contact with visitors is frequent and largely involuntary.

In comparison, visitors disperse widely around the Rotorua area where many visitor attractions are spread over an area within a 30-kilometre radius of the town centre. In addition, the design of Rotorua’s central business district separates a zone with souvenir shops, restaurants and cafes from other shops. This separation allows locals to avoid crowds of visitors during the course of their everyday lives. There are relatively few people who are obviously visitors in the places where locals do their day-to-day shopping. Notwithstanding this, Rotorua locals can, and often do, choose to go and spend time in the areas of the Town where there are many visitors. In this case, the presence of a wide range of visitors is seen to add to the colour and life of the area. Therefore, for Rotorua people, meeting visitors around town is more voluntary and congenial than is the case in Kaikoura.

An issue related to visibility is cultural distance, which writers have considered an important factor in understanding the impacts of tourism (see for example, Berno, 1995; de Kadt, 1979; Simmons, 1988). The greater the cultural distance between tourists and hosts, the greater the adaptation required by hosts and guests alike when they are interacting. In Kaikoura, 86 percent of overnight visitors were from overseas, whereas only about 35 percent of overnight visitors to Rotorua were from overseas. In Rotorua only 35 percent of overnight visitors were international (See Table 10).

**Table 10: Percentage of international and domestic overnight visitors in Rotorua and Kaikoura**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>Overseas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaikoura</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotorua</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also related to visibility is the fact that local people must be able to recognise tourists if they are to identify tourism as a cause of local problems. Without recognising tourists as ‘other’ or ‘not local,’ tourism cannot be blamed for problems such as crowding or a lack of parking even if those things are occurring. In Rotorua, visitors are not easily distinguished from locals whereas in Kaikoura visitors are readily identified. In Rotorua with its 67 000 residents, one cannot recognise all locals, so that in most
situations, domestic tourists cannot be distinguished from locals. In other words, 65 percent of visitors to Rotorua cannot be easily identified as visitors. In comparison, Kaikoura, with its small population, allows most locals to recognise each other, particularly if they have lived in the area for more than a year or so and this means that any unfamiliar face is likely to be identified as a tourist (whether they are or not). Therefore, all visitors and some new locals will be identified as outsiders by most Kaikoura locals. The simple act of recognition makes it easier for locals to blame visitors for problems in Kaikoura than it is in Rotorua.

The meaning of tourism
Tourism means very different things in the two places. The different tourism histories in the two places result in the residents of each community having very different perceptions of tourism, and yet, interestingly, these do not show up at all when residents are asked about the benefits and costs of tourism. In Kaikoura, people associate tourism with much change caused by the economic restructuring in the 1980s, and the sudden growth in international tourism in the local area. For many locals, the changes that arose from restructuring are connected with the changes occurring because of tourism. The changes have been far-reaching and large. Restructuring and processes such as the development of the fisheries quota system, outlined earlier in the thesis, changed the fortunes of many people. Many were thrown into unemployment and many people left the District to find work in the larger centres.

Whenever one asked about tourism in Kaikoura, residents who had been there at the time talked about the restructuring and its connections with tourism development. Tourism has continued these changes in community structure, fortunes and function. The success of Whale Watch Kaikoura and the development of Takahanga Marae have considerably changed the fortunes and visibility of local Māori, a change that has had a big effect on community dynamics and the perceptions that different groups have of themselves. It is not surprising, therefore, that Kaikoura people associate tourism with a seemingly uncontrollable set of changes (even if, like Rotorua people, they also associate it with potential for local employment).

Rotorua residents saw tourism differently. Tourism in Rotorua began back in the mid 19th century. While the Rotorua community had experienced many, similar changes from restructuring, they did not connect tourism with restructuring in the same way as Kaikoura people did. Instead, tourism remained a constant throughout this period and
many residents today see it as the one economic sector that has increased in size in recent years. Where other sectors have either remained static or diminished in size, tourism has actually grown and offers opportunities for further growth. In addition, tourism in Rotorua has not changed as much as tourism in Kaikoura. Therefore, Rotorua people see tourism as a source of stability rather than as a source of change. This sense of stability was compounded by the fact that restructuring conferred a greater sense of stability on some parts of the community than existed beforehand. Rotorua was significant as a government town and many public servants were sent to the area for a few years to get some experience before they moved on to the larger centres. After restructuring, these professional people stayed in the area and the pattern of moving through stopped. This increased sense of stability in the City makes many Rotorua people feel a strong sense of control, which, in turn, makes residents more positive about the town as a whole1.

Local sense of control
It is possible to interpret all the factors discussed in this section as being connected with residents’ senses of control in relation to tourism. For example, the history and geography of tourism in Kaikoura appear to give local people less control over their interactions with tourists than the history and geography of Rotorua where locals can avoid many of the effects of tourism with little effort. This sense of control in relation to tourism is an important factor in the way that people perceive it. This is not a new idea in the tourism literature. As early as 1987, Keller suggested that loss of local control is an important feature of the changes predicted by the tourist area life cycle, but there is more to it than just business ownership. The history and physical layout of a destination area also contribute towards residents’ ability to influence their interactions with tourists. History and physical layout also both differ between destinations.

Related to sense of control is the concept of dependence. Sharpley (1999) argued the importance of community interactions with tourism by using the concept of dependency. He suggested that, at the beginning of the destination life cycle (Butler, 1980), local communities do not, as a whole, rely on tourists for their economic well-being. Their interaction with tourists is balanced, in that the tourists are as interested in

---

1 This is not to say that all community members feel this way. Those individuals who are marginalised by their poverty, for example may see things differently.
the locals as the locals are in the tourists. However, once tourism becomes an important industry in the local area, and there are higher numbers of tourists, the balance changes. In places that rely heavily on tourism for their economic existence, the destination depends on the tourists visiting the area more than the tourists depend on the destination to supply their needs.

There is some evidence that these interaction patterns might exist in the New Zealand context. Queenstown, for example, depends highly on tourism and also recorded high local irritation with tourism (Evans, 1993). Likewise, Kaikoura depends more on tourism than Rotorua and people there are more negative in their assessment of it. However, Te Anau, a New Zealand destination with a high dependence on tourism is also very positive in its assessment of tourism. Similarly, Whitianga, a town with relatively low dependence on tourism at the time of the study, showed a relatively high level of negative assessment. Another example is provided by Kaikoura Māori, who, as a community in their own right, are highly dependent on tourism and yet appear to be positive when talking about it (Poharama et al., 1998). The concept of economic dependence offers little to explain these three apparent contradictions. It may help understand some of the patterns evident in Rotorua and Kaikoura, since Kaikoura is more dependent as a whole, on tourism than is Rotorua. However there is clearly more to it than this.

Business ownership and its effect on community perceptions of local control are also mediated by the political and historical processes occurring both within and outside of the destination area. Business ownership can contribute to a sense of local control. For example, in Rotorua, most of the local people I spoke to feel that tourism is locally controlled because many important Rotorua attractions are owned or managed by highly active, visible, long-term residents, many of whom have had family in the industry for more than one generation.

These long-term residents are prominent in the management of tourism in Rotorua, and they are well known to the community as a whole. Most of the industry people that I interviewed cited these people as the most influential in tourism, even though ‘outsiders’ such as the Hotel General Managers Group are a powerful lobby group in the town (PCE, 1997). The individuals in the Hotel General Managers Group, however, are not long-term residents. They regularly move on to other locations and so may reside in Rotorua only a few years. This makes them less visible and possibly also less powerful.
in the long-term than the long-term local business owners. The existence of prominent long-term residents in the tourism industry therefore also contributes to stability in the local tourism industry and this stability adds to a positive sense of local control.

Tourism in Kaikoura is associated with substantial change, which has been very unsettling for local people. This fosters a sense of uncertainty and doubt in relation to the management of tourism. The growth of tourism in Kaikoura has been phenomenal. During the mid 1980s, tourism in Kaikoura consisted mainly of through traffic stopping to use the local toilets and buy refreshments. International tourism was negligible. Only ten years after the first whale watching operation was set up in 1988-89, the town supported 365,000 overnight visitors who come to see the whales or swim with the dolphins (Simmons et al., 1998). These changes come on top of a whole raft of changes (outlined earlier), over which many locals expressed a distinct lack of control.

The importance of the community system history shows clearly here. The present residents’ perceptions of tourism are influenced by history and by the associations that tourism has with other change, such as restructuring, in the experiences of local residents. There is also another way in which history has a strong effect on local adaptation to tourism. In both places, local adaptation to change is based on past experiences. In the case of Rotorua, local people have more experience of tourism than do Kaikoura people, which then further affects how local people see their ability to manage or control tourism.

In Rotorua, there is a clear sense of self-confidence within the tourism industry. This was reflected in discussions of the Asian Crisis – a ‘crisis’ that had begun in the year before the study began when the Asian economies crashed, affecting a large part of Rotorua’s tourist market. As an interviewee involved in tourism in Rotorua put it:

*I’m working in New Zealand’s most established tourism infrastructure, you know it has had years to learn. It’s gone through things like the Asian downturn of last year. When it hit the country, the media flew over it and everyone started saying Rotorua is going to go down and da da da. And the minister himself was amazed when we called a forum here and there wasn’t hysteria or anything. He was the one looking more..., worried about everything and we were saying oh we’ve seen it all come and go. We’re not complacent but basically there’s ways to deal with it and we just need to not cry about spilt milk, and get on with it.*

Another interviewee talked in a similar way about the ‘Asian Crisis’;

*The collapse of the Asian market was not entirely a surprise but it did happen really fast and with very little warning. It was something that taught everyone*
valuable lessons and so they have developed strategies and learned to adapt to the volatility of all the external factors that affect the market.

This confidence is the result of the long history of the Town with tourism and the longstanding nature of many of the tourism businesses in the Town. It is also the result of the Town’s success in dealing with the environmental and economic problems of the 1980s. As Rotorua tourism has grappled with various crises and come through them, having improved local conditions, it has come to feel that there is some way of ‘controlling’ the difficulties that external changes present at local level. This is the basis of perceived efficacy – a belief in one’s own ability to adapt and manage (Lefcourt, 1992). This concept appears to have as much merit at community level as it does at individual level. History, therefore, might be seen to have taught the community that they can and do adapt successfully to change. In a positive reinforcement loop, this lesson builds upon itself, since the self-confidence to try new strategies provides people with the idea that there are always many different possibilities for adapting to crises. Their past successes give them the impetus and the knowledge to keep trying out different response strategies in the belief that they will work something out.

In comparison, the list of concerns that Kaikoura local people have with tourism includes many indications that they cannot control tourism and that tourism might well take them over or, worse, the tourists will stop coming and create more local hardship. Talk in the town about the need to direct tourism and to be careful of its negative impacts indicated some doubt about how to do this or even whether it was possible to do this.

The implication of these observations is that community leaders can help communities adapt more positively to tourism by making their decision-making processes transparent and participatory. They should be aiming to build a history of success by working on small ‘do-able’ projects and publicising their impact and success. Such a process works on building a community’s confidence in its ability to influence future outcomes in positive ways. This sounds simple, but is more easily said than done. Despite its difficulty, it is important that councils as local leaders begin developing and understanding these processes of learning to work together and building community confidence. Effectively this strategy is about creating a positive reinforcement loop in which increasing self-confidence can increase success, which increases self-confidence, and so on.
Tourists and tourism
Overall, the data presented in this chapter indicate that the impacts of tourism emerge from factors other than just the impacts of tourists. They are mediated by local community interaction processes such as the ways in which people work together, local history, local politics and local geography.

Another important event in the course of this research serves to highlight the difference between the impacts of tourism and the impacts of tourists. Some time into the Kaikoura research, I interviewed a woman who was vocally against tourism. Some people in the community were a little uncomfortable about me interviewing her, mainly because they felt that her dislike of tourism was unreasonable and unlikely to help me. I listened for some time to her stories of the problems with tourism and then I asked about her meetings with tourists. To my great surprise, she said that she enjoyed meeting tourists, had invited them in off the street into her home for a drink on several occasions, and had maintained contact with some of them. This example makes it clear that impacts of tourists are not necessarily the same as the impacts of tourism, and yet in the literature they are often considered to be the same thing.

Summary and Conclusions
While both Rotorua and Kaikoura communities perceive positive economic and employment benefits from tourism, each community has a very different experience of tourism. For Kaikoura people, there may be more, obvious employment benefits from tourism than is the case in Rotorua, but tourism is also associated with more community stress in Kaikoura than in Rotorua. The level of economic dependence on tourism along with the associated tourist-host ratios are important, with Kaikoura having a very high tourist-host ratio compared with Rotorua. In addition, Kaikoura people are more able to blame tourism for the impacts that visitors have in the town because they are more easily able to recognise visitors as non-local than are Rotorua residents.

The histories of the two towns differ significantly, which means that tourism is managed very differently in both places. Tourism is associated with stability and control in Rotorua. In Kaikoura, while some residents see tourism as a way to manage the impacts of restructuring, many others associate it closely with the changes imposed by economic restructuring. This assessment results from the relative speed of change and from the community’s perceptions of the local institutions associated with managing tourism. As
Faulkner and Tideswell (1997), and a number of Kaikoura residents, noted, communities can adapt successfully to tourism, but they need time to do so. Therefore, when tourism develops very quickly, as it has in Kaikoura, it has a much greater negative effect than if it follows a more measured pace of development.

The way in which communities adapt to tourism development depends on their historical, social, political and geographical contexts. The two communities in this study operate very differently and face very different challenges in the management of tourism. For Rotorua, the problem appears to be how to make tourism and other forms of economic development benefit the unemployed and marginalised groups within the community. In Kaikoura, the challenge is one of trying to manage a considerable amount of change, within a small geographical area, with limited financial resources and a limited skill base. It seems important to either keep tourism growth down to a rate that enables local residents to adapt, or to help residents cope with the changes occurring because of tourism. Of the two possibilities the latter would appear to be the most productive area on which to focus, since in a country where central government is trying to increase tourism, it seems very unlikely that one community can significantly influence the number of visitors arriving in the area.

The effect of the different town configurations in the two places confirms that local councils can ameliorate tourism impacts through their town planning. Ideally, towns developing tourism should aim to develop recreational business zones (which might include cafes, craft and souvenir shops), which are, in some measure, separate from general business zones in which locals go about their everyday business. While it may not be feasible for towns to develop this pattern quickly, it may be possible for councils to encourage such patterns.

Of note is that these findings could not emerge from a telephone survey of residents' perceptions that focuses on the benefits and costs of tourism. Community responses to tourism development should be viewed as a complex process of evolution, or even as a series of iterative, adaptive learning loops, rather than a linearly imposed series of changes, as suggested by the tourism area life-cycle. Another aspect of complex systems is the need to focus on processes and to be aware of the way in which language can direct the things that we see in a kind of co-evolution. For example, the phrase 'the socio-cultural impacts of tourism' implies that tourism has impacts on communities but ignores the impacts of communities on tourism or the socio-cultural impacts of other
possible change agents. In other words, the language of tourism impacts does not see
tourism and community in relationship with each other and with other phenomena. The
tourism literature focuses (unsurprisingly) on explaining and managing tourism, rather
than on explaining or managing community processes, or environment, which are
effectively different fields of study and are often downplayed in the study of tourism.
This means that there are many aspects of the interaction of tourism with community
that are not understood, so we have fewer options for improving the outcomes of that
interaction. Thinking this way can lead us to understand that calls for sustainable
tourism might be usefully considered as calls for sustainable community, or for
sustainable environmental management. Learning to think in this more holistic or
integrated way offers opportunities for action that may not be obvious when we focus
only on tourism, or even on tourists.

The central argument of this chapter is that it is not only the presence and recognition of
tourists that creates stress in the two towns. This is an important finding, because much
measurement of the social impacts of tourism is based on the assumption that the
impacts of tourism come from the impacts of tourists. I argue that this may also be the
reason why there is no clear consensus from residents about the impacts of tourism –
because when asked about tourism, they focus (naturally) on tourists and the effects that
they have, or on the visible parts of tourism. In reality those effects may not be as
important as factors such as local sense of control over tourism and local history and the
way in which tourism fits into that. Clearly, the management of tourists and tourist
flows can and does affect the ways in which local people interact with tourists,
therefore, a focus on tourist impacts is important. However, understanding the
processes and interactions occurring alongside those of tourism is equally important. So
saying, the next chapter begins an exploration of the processes and interactions
occurring within the two destinations under study.
Chapter 7

Community and Local Politics

Introduction

After providing geographical and historical background to Rotorua and Kaikoura, I discussed the perceived impact of tourism in the two places. At the end of the last chapter, I noted that the impacts of tourism are not the same as the impacts of tourists. This chapter begins an exploration of what other factors might contribute to the impacts of tourism on local people. The purpose of this chapter is to look at the relationship between the two councils and their respective communities. Naturally this will require some reflection on the history of the two councils and on New Zealand local government in general. This relationship is, after all, one part of the two community complex systems that I am studying, so history and external influences will be important factors in understanding the systems as they currently function.

There are some major differences between the two communities’ relationships with their respective councils. In Kaikoura in 1997-98 much of the community distrusted their local Council. Partly because of this, it was difficult for the Kaikoura District Council (KDC) to operate effectively. The distrust resulted in a very high turnover of Council staff and councillors, which, in turn (in a positive feedback loop with negative consequences), meant that the Council was unable to work as well as it might. This then gave the community more cause for distrust. The internal difficulties that the KDC
had to deal with at that time meant that it was left reacting as best it could to the growing need for infrastructure development created by a burgeoning tourism industry in a town with only 1850 rateable properties and significant, new responsibilities under the Resource Management Act (1991).

In comparison, the Rotorua District Council (RDC) has been more stable. At the election held just prior to the research period, only one novice councillor was elected onto the Council. In addition, the decisions that the RDC made from the late 1970s onwards has put them in a stronger position than most councils, both financially, and from the point of view of managing local infrastructure. These decisions were also well timed, occurring as they did during the early 80s, so it is likely that rising rates\(^1\) would have met with less opposition than if they had occurred more recently. In the early 1980s, New Zealanders had not been through the economic and social changes associated with restructuring, there was a lower level of unemployment, and people had a greater sense of security in their employment. There were, according to Council informants, more subsidies available from Central Government for local projects such as sewerage and water schemes, so that rates simply did not have to rise as much to accommodate infrastructural needs. As a result, the Rotorua District Council has had the resources (both financial and human) to develop a good relationship with industry in general and tourism in particular.

Many councils are involved in the promotion of tourism in their area, as tourism is seen as one of only a few possible forms of economic development that might provide local employment. Most councils place less emphasis, however, on the regulation and monitoring of tourism (Parkinson, 1997) than on its promotion. In Rotorua, the Council does much to promote tourism, and it has also been involved in managing the local tourism industry, by getting local tourism businesses to work together to improve the local tourism product. The RDC has a good partnership with the tourism industry in a way that the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE, 1997) has suggested might be used by other councils in New Zealand. While this suggestion makes some sense, different localities face different issues, both in their own operation, and in the development of tourism in their area. Thus, any model of operation must have flexibility if it is to work well across different councils.

\(^1\) In New Zealand, 'rates' are local government taxes.
This chapter describes how New Zealand councils' structure and function have changed over the last 12 years, and then looks at how tourism is managed by the two councils to illuminate some of these issues. The differences between the two councils and their current functioning must be understood within the context of the recent history of local government in New Zealand and read alongside the historical material presented earlier in this thesis. As another target of restructuring, local government in New Zealand has gone through much change since 1989. The change is underlain by:

- Changes to the 1974 Local Government Act.
- The withdrawal of Central Government from many local services such as welfare, health and employment. As restructuring took its toll, the need for these services grew rather than diminished (Le Heron & Pawson, 1996), and local government has taken more of a role in these areas (McDermott & Forgie, 1999), despite a lack of funding.

This chapter provides some background to the changes that have taken place in local government over the years between 1987 and 2000, and discusses the factors that have contributed to the relationship of the communities to their local councils. It also looks at how this set of relationships affects the ability of the community to manage tourism in the local area and reflects on the role of community development.

**General Features of Local Government in New Zealand**

Mulgan (1994) notes that at local government level in New Zealand the lack of party politics suggests that this is the cause of low participation in voting at local government level. Similarly, Bush (1992: 118) writes that:

*Local government elections count for far less than they theoretically might. Doctrinaire differences or bitter cleavages over fundamental issues are very uncommon occurrences... Councils and boards hardly ever commence a term shackled with a mandate to implement an election manifesto of coherent and explicit pledges.*

In other words, in comparison with central government, a lack of party politics gives local government a less clear sense of direction that is reflected by lower voter turnouts and a more apathetic approach towards local issues. Local body politics across New Zealand are dominated by the agricultural sector in rural areas and by established business people in urban areas. This is the case in Kaikoura, where the agricultural
sector is well represented, and in Rotorua, where people with established local businesses predominate on Council. It may be the continued dominance of the traditional power groups in Kaikoura that makes locals feel that the ‘same old people’ are on the Council, and this dominance is likely to be more apparent when the economic base of an area is changing. However, there is more to it. These same groups are apparent in Rotorua also, but the community at that time was more content with the activities of their Council than was so in Kaikoura. Thus, Rotorua residents seldom introduced the topic of council performance into conversation themselves, and they criticised their council’s performance less frequently.

Amending the 1974 Local Government Act

As with all levels of government in New Zealand, there have been many changes in Local Government. Central government reforms (associated with restructuring) began in 1984 with the election of the Fourth Labour Government and far-reaching local government reforms began in 1987 after the re-election of that Labour Government. The reforms were finally instituted in 1989 with the passing of the Local Government Amendment Act, which significantly changed the structure and function of local government across New Zealand (Bush, 1992; Boston, Martin, Pallot & Walsh, 1996; Mulgan, 1994).

These changes reflect several imperatives of the time. First, they were aimed at decreasing the size of the government sector. Second, with a decrease in central government, local government was seen as the most appropriate level from which to deliver social and environmental services to an increasingly diverse electorate. Third, and, perhaps most cynically, this was yet another way for central government to cut costs. Thus, the changes that began at this time were aimed at increasing the capacity of local government to deliver services that had previously been the responsibility of central government. Perhaps the most obvious change in the 1989 Amendment to the Local Government Act 1974 was the amalgamation of the many small county councils and city councils into larger districts, which included both urban and rural elements. The many boards and trusts (for example, drainage, catchment, harbour, and pest destruction boards and local licensing trusts) that existed at the time were put under the umbrella of the territorial local authorities and regional councils (McDermott & Forgie, 1999).
Since 1989, further amendments have been made to the Local Government Act. More legislation has changed both the way that councils operate, their accountability, and the way in which they fund local projects (Boston et al., 1996). McDermott and Forgie (1999) analysed changes in local government operating areas during the 1990s, noting that managing the reforms actually increased councils' costs. Contrary to expectation, the size of the local government sector has not decreased, although in hindsight this is unsurprising. Over the 1990s, the expenditure of local government on material or property-based provision such as rubbish, sewerage and water provision has decreased. However, in many councils, this decrease in expenditure has been offset by an increase in the provision of social and cultural services such as community development, recreation, economic development and local events. These are not core council functions – councils are not legally required to provide these services.

Local government, as a whole, now has a greater role in maintaining or enhancing community economic, social and environmental well-being than it has had in the past (McDermott & Forgie, 1999), although not all councils have chosen to increase their involvement in these areas, and some councils oppose any role in these activities. So, for example, as central government has withdrawn from supplying some local services in health and welfare, the RDC has moved to facilitate local activity in those areas. Like many other councils around the country, the RDC has appointed an economic development officer whose job it is to promote the area to business in general. This means that the Council, as a whole, now has both a promotional/local development function as well as the regulatory functions that it has always had. The KDC, by contrast, did not take on any of the economic or community development roles outlined.

The Local Government Act was further amended in 1997. This time the amendment was aimed at making local government more accountable and required councils to produce annual financial plans of their income and expenditure for the coming year. The need to produce financial plans and strategies, according to informants in Rotorua, led many councils to think about community planning and visioning. Councils must know what they are working towards, in the long term as well as the short term, so they can document, in advance, how they will spend their money.

**Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)**

Further change for local government began during 1991 when the Resource Management Act came into effect. Heralded as a world first, the RMA represents a
major shift in thinking in the planning field, significantly changing the ways in which communities manage their natural and physical resources. It replaced the Town and Country Planning Act 1977 and over 50 other statutes used in planning in New Zealand, and gave territorial local authorities greater power over their own local environments, requiring planners to think in terms of the effects of activities rather than zoning for the activities themselves. As with any change in the operation of the state, there have been positive and negative aspects to the introduction of the new legislation. Even ten years after the time in which the Act came into force, it is difficult to ascertain how well it will operate in the long term.

The emergence of the RMA from two opposing socio-political forces, namely, the environmental movement and the New Right, makes it a complex and difficult piece of legislation to administer (Memon & Gleeson, 1995). According to Thompson, Ellis and Wildavsky (1990), these two groups are likely to have different views of natural resource systems that diametrically oppose one another. Where individuals in the environmental movement see nature as fragile and in need of protecting, those in the New Right see it as forgiving and indestructible. Thus, environmentalists are interested in increasing the controls on development. The New Right focus on maximising development and profit, lobbying for minimum regulation and fewer controls on development. This difference means that the Resource Management Act is aimed at achieving both greater freedom for developers and entrepreneurs, as well as greater protection for the natural environment. These issues remain unresolved and, far from pleasing both groups, it appears that the RMA and its associated processes have maintained much conflict between them rather than facilitating constructive debate.

Adding to the problems for local authorities is the fact that the new Act requires those with a background in a town and country mode of planning to think quite differently (Memon & Gleeson, 1995) with little support given in the way of training to help staff at the time to work through the problems that they struck. The Town and Country Planning Act in New Zealand had much in common with planning legislation in Britain and Australia. In creating zones within which particular activities were allowed, the Town and Country legislation tended to operate under the principle that an activity was not allowed in a zone unless the plan expressly allowed it. The RMA changed this approach to one of 'you can do something unless the plan says you cannot'. This
premise is a difficult one to work with, as it can be very difficult to foresee what might happen over the ten-year district planning period.

The Queenstown Casino provides an example of this. There was no specific reference in the recently completed District Plan to casinos, so it was not until developers decided to build a casino that the community realised that they were unable to stop it. The District Plan effectively regarded a casino as a permitted activity (Ansley, 1997). This (understandable) lack of foresight was of some concern in Kaikoura too, since the District Plan had been written before anyone even imagined that Kaikoura might become a popular tourist destination. Therefore, there was nothing in it that addressed some of the issues raised by changes that no-one had imagined at the time it was written. Thus in times of change, the approach that ‘you can unless the plan says you cannot’ can have unforeseen consequences in the ways communities can manage change. Given the difficulty of predicting the future trajectory of a complex system, and the fact that many possible paths exist, some of which are not yet known, this precept must be interpreted as the opposite of the precautionary principle advocated by environmental groups. Having communities think about what should be allowed rather than what should not be allowed would give communities a greater sense of control, since at least they would have the opportunity to consider the suitability of any new development that was mooted for the area.

Gleeson (1996) outlines more problems with the way the Resource Management Act is working, and some of his findings reflected concerns expressed in Kaikoura. Some individuals felt that the Resource Management Act was disadvantaging local people trying to set up businesses because the costs for the small entrepreneur are similar to those larger-scale businesses. The burden of these costs means that it is more daunting for individuals without experience with the Resource Management Act, and they are also likely to find the whole process more expensive relative to the size of the business that they are considering. The same problems of expense can be argued about the way that permission is granted for building, so that, the smaller businesses are paying proportionally more than larger businesses. In addition, according to council informants from Rotorua and Kaikoura, there is evidence that experienced business interests are tending to ‘buy’ the signatures of near neighbours by offering money in return for neighbours signing off their rights to object to developments. This can be a problem where the individuals concerned may not realise the full implications of a new
development in their area. The Resource Management Act, therefore, appears to favour developments by big business rather than those initiated by small-scale local business entrepreneurs.

Rotorua, as a larger place with more development, appears to have less of a problem with the Act. The Council employs an economic development officer whose job it is to help would-be developers or businesspeople through the RMA consent process. This does mean, however, that local environmentalists feel that business interests have primacy in Rotorua. This has led to some tension between the RDC and some groups, and has meant that the Council has had problems getting their District Plan completed.

Public participation

The 1989 Amendment to the Local Government Act and the 1991 Resource Management Act also required Councils to consult with their communities to a greater extent. Consultation requirements were increased to prevent councils becoming less responsive to local needs and aspirations when local authorities amalgamated into larger governing bodies. However, problems arise from a tension between representative democracy, the current system in which elected councillors hold the power to make local decisions, and the more recently introduced ideas of participatory democracy, in which there is greater power sharing and more collaborative participation (Cheyne, 1999). Difficulties with this latter approach arise because community members have to put time and effort into learning about issues before they can make well-considered decisions. It is not enough just to express opinions in a participatory democracy (Yankelovich, 1991) as it is in much current consultation. In a collaborative environment, people must work together, learn about the issue and work through conflict (often very difficult processes), to come to consensus decisions. A collaborative approach also requires some more powerful groups to relinquish power, which many are reluctant to do (Reed, 1997). As yet, however, there appear to be few situations in New Zealand where this approach to decision making is used. All this participation can take a large amount of time, which again privileges those who have the time, the money and the capacity to participate in these processes. In particular experts and scientific views are privileged in these processes.

In Kaikoura in particular, people were cynical about consultation and whether it actually changed what was happening locally. This criticism conveyed a strong sense of powerlessness by local residents over local outcomes. In addition, the lack of good
learning opportunities and the dynamics of public meetings often means that the views of local people are poorly synthesised, so they are more likely to be ignored by decision makers. This outcome, again, feeds into the perception that there is no point in participating in local decision making processes. These observations may help to explain the Kaikoura community’s lack of interest in participating in Council decision making that local councillors and Council staff complained of in 1997-98.

I did not hear the same complaint about low participation rates in Rotorua but this observation might only reflect the difference in the size of the two communities. Rotorua with its 67 000 people is likely to have more people willing to participate in public activities than Kaikoura with its relatively meagre 3500 people. The community in Rotorua is more heterogeneous than the community in Kaikoura, as might be expected in a place with a larger and more divergent economy. The nature of the size of Rotorua means, simply, that the human resources easily available to the local community will be greater and more varied than those available in Kaikoura, where there are few employment opportunities for professional groups. In addition, higher levels of education are linked to higher levels of civic engagement (Putnam, 1996), thus in a community with higher education levels, one might assume that there will be more people inclined to contribute to public participation processes.

The small size of Kaikoura means that most individuals with higher levels of education leave the area to find suitable employment, or they only stay a relatively short time before moving away from the area. In addition, the Council in Rotorua has a greater financial resource (a much bigger rating base) to allow them to facilitate consultation in a range of different settings and times. In Kaikoura, the main source of public participation was by written submission and by public meeting, which meant that, in general, there would be only one meeting dealing with any one important issue. Such meetings are not good places for learning or developing alternatives for addressing any particular issue (Parsons, 1995; Yankelovich, 1991).

**Comparison of Experiences in Rotorua and Kaikoura**

**Amalgamation and local development**

The current situations of the two councils in question are dictated by their recent history. For the purposes of this analysis, discussion of the history of the two councils will begin with their differing experiences of amalgamation. Rotorua County Council
amalgamated with Rotorua City Council some ten years before the Local Government 1989 Amendment required it. The timing of this amalgamation and the series of financial decisions taken afterwards put the Rotorua District Council in a position to fund tourism, and to address the environmental issues that arose in the area during the 1980s. As the measures taken by the Council have had the desired positive effect, the community appears to have gained a strong sense of local control.

In comparison, Kaikoura’s Council history has resulted in the community, as a whole, feeling much less confident about what control it has over its own future. The Kaikoura District boundaries did not change much in 1989, but the number of elected councillors dropped and the responsibilities of the Council staff changed, particularly with the advent of the RMA in 1991. Before these changes, there were few Council staff and most residents appeared to know little about what these staff did with their time. The general lack of local involvement and knowledge about the Council meant that many of the changes to Council function were not something in which locals had much interest. With little knowledge of the changes, many of the Kaikoura community experienced these changes as coming from influences outside their community and outside their control. The small size of the council, and the difficulties that have arisen with the very fast growth of tourism, have only increased this perceived lack of control.

**Rotorua**

The Rotorua City Council and the Rotorua County Council amalgamated in 1979 to form the Rotorua District Council, ten years earlier than most other New Zealand councils. Soon after their formation, the RDC tackled several large projects, including a new Council building, and a major upgrade of the City sewerage and water facilities. Once completed, the money was used for projects such as the development of Tourism Rotorua. In short, unlike many councils who deferred maintenance and building projects to keep rates low, the RDC continued to develop and maintain facilities in their area, even when they had to increase rates. This put them into a strong financial position some years later when those projects were completed, and they were then able to invest a considerable sum of money into managing tourism.

According to interview respondents, in the late 70s, Rotorua was growing, and the City Council wanted to take over the newly developed suburban areas that were actually within the boundaries of the County Council. At the time, all the newly developed
suburbs in the county area were on septic tanks, which were contributing to the problem of lake pollution, so it was important that these areas were reticulated with sewerage. It did not make sense to put in a completely new sewerage scheme, and if all the new suburbs were to move into the City Council’s jurisdiction, that would allow a single authority to manage the scheme. The County Council, however, realised that removing urban areas from County boundaries would make them a marginal authority, so they suggested amalgamation and the Local Government Commission supported that move. After some considerable public debate, the councils amalgamated in 1979 with John Keaney, the previous Chairman of the County Council, as the first mayor of the District Council (Stafford, 1988). Ten years later, when the subsequent 1989 amalgamations occurred throughout New Zealand, there was no appreciable change in the boundaries of the Rotorua District Council.

After amalgamation, the District Council began extending and improving water and sewage treatment facilities. These projects, in fact, took the first nine years of the RDC’s existence. At this time, Central Government was still subsidising the development of sewage treatment schemes, so the cost to ratepayers was significantly less than if they had delayed developing the scheme.

The development of the new treatment scheme also began rectifying the pollution problems plaguing Lake Rotorua. Legislative requirements to include Māori views in decision making processes also meant that the new scheme was more environmentally friendly than it otherwise might have been. While the Council were aware that they could not dispose of their nutrient-rich water into Lake Rotorua, they suggested that instead they would pump it into the Kaituna River. However, the Ngati Pikiau people, who are kaitiaki (or guardians) of the Kaituna, successfully prevented the Council from doing this. Instead, a new and unique system of disposal was developed and operates today. The Kaituna River remains clean, and the quality of water in Lake Rotorua is considerably better at the present time than it was in the 1980s. It continues to improve (Donald, 1997), making the Lake more attractive to visitors than it was during the 1980s.

Other facilities were improved. To improve communications between the different Council departments, the District Council decided to build a new civic centre to bring the whole Council staff under one roof. At the time, it was difficult for councils to raise money for such a project, since a local poll was required if the Council were to take out
a loan for the new building. The Council of the time felt that if it were put to a referendum, the community would not support the new building project financially. To achieve their goal, then, the money had to come from income. To begin their building fund, the Council sold a number of small pieces of land around Town. By juggling finances and putting up the rates, money was found for the building, which was completed by 1986.

Over the time of building, the Council was putting about one and a half million dollars worth of rates into the building each year. Once ‘Keaney's Castle,’ as the new building was known locally, and the Convention Centre were completed, the Council had about 1.5 million dollars a year to spend in the community, and they had a community that was already used to their level of rates. Despite the harder economic times, Council were not forced into lowering rates and the money remained to contribute towards development projects such as the city and waterfront redevelopment and the development of Tourism Rotorua.

Therefore, in Rotorua, the growth of the town which led to early amalgamation and a need for new facilities meant that rate rises and new developments happened at a time when the community was more easily able to find the money. Of course, this was also the result of a council who made some bold decisions to move forward with development. The result is that Rotorua now has a good infrastructure and has been able to marshal resources to manage tourism and address rising levels of local unemployment.

Kaikoura

The experience of Kaikoura over the same time period was very different. The KDC, like most councils in New Zealand, was forced to restructure in 1989 in a move that does not appear to have been popular. Rather than being a matter of choice, the changes around 1989, though relatively slight, were imposed from outside the community. The main change was that the number of councillors dropped from eleven to seven. Many in the community felt that individuals were not as closely linked to different areas, as had been the case with the Ward system, so they were not as well represented on council. At the same time, the number of staff on the Council increased to cope with the responsibility that had been devolved by Central Government to local authorities. The new Resource Management Act had a similar effect, since the Council had more
responsibility for planning and managing the local environment than when they were using the Town and Country Planning Act.

The KDC struggled with a lack of money and with a growing need for infrastructural improvements. As the smallest Council on mainland New Zealand, with a meagre 1700 ratepayers spread over a wide geographical area, the KDC was in a very different financial position to the more densely populated and affluent RDC. Current staff and councillors, alike, were managing problems that started with the operation of past councils. Past councils had kept rates artificially low by deferring maintenance, and ignoring the need for development and regulation (Butcher et al., 1998). Furthermore, the Council used to have financial reserves, but these had been exhausted as spending became more and more necessary. With the reserves gone and the infrastructure in the township increasingly in need of attention, the rate take had to increase around 40 percent in 1995-6, which made the newly elected Council very unpopular. Local people felt that the rate rise resulted from tourism development in the town and considerable conflict arose in the town over how rates should be distributed across the different groups of ratepayers (for example, residential, commercial). Further rate rises ensued as the Council came to grips with its new roles, and grappled with the need for maintenance and development of local water and sewerage systems.

Overall, as Figure 16 shows, the two councils had quite different recent histories, which had left them with very different situations for managing the requirements of tourism.

**Comparing experiences**

In comparison with Rotorua, the Kaikoura community had less faith in their Council on account of what locals perceived as its relatively poor performance history. This sense was intensified because sizeable rates increases were fresh in the memories of local Kaikoura people, and the community and the Council alike had just been through ten years of major change. The local community’s objections to rates increases and the lack of any debate about what should happen (rather than what should not happen) indicated a lack of community confidence that rendered them unable to move constructively forward to deal with the changes around them.
**Figure 16: Council activity in Rotorua and Kaikoura from 1979 until the research period**

At the time of my research the projected sense of local control in Kaikoura was less than in Rotorua (as reflected in my discussion in the last paragraph) – something that may also reflect the fact that Rotorua was in more of a consolidation phase after a period of crisis and change, while Kaikoura was still coping with ongoing change (see Figure 16)

**Council Stability**

As in many complex systems, positive reinforcement loops were evident in the stability of the two councils and in their relationships with their respective communities. At the time of research, the RDC was in a period of consolidation, in which their responses to the environmental and social crises of the 80s and early 90s had come to fruition. The positive results gave the community a sense of coherence and control, a feature mirrored in the stability of the local council. The successful management of the local tourism industry and the 1997/8 ‘Asian economic crisis’ added to their sense of control.

In comparison, the Kaikoura community was still trying to deal with some of the problems that arose from the very fast rise in tourism. The community appeared to feel powerless in the face of ongoing, externally driven change. This was mirrored in the
apathy of much of the community. As a local woman said to me one day at a meeting I attended:

> There's been so much change over the last 10–15 years that now we feel that it's pointless to try and change things. Our experience tells us that we can't.

There was a nod of agreement from many other people at that meeting. Seen in this light, apathy is not just laziness – it occurs when people lose a sense of their own ability to influence change in a positive way. Part of building capacity for participation, therefore, is about helping people gain a sense of control. This may be facilitated by helping them understand change and by helping them achieve some results from their efforts. A further effect of this apathy was that the Council was blamed for local problems; a fact that led to the instability of the KDC and its resulting struggle to perform. Thus, a series of reinforcement loops were operating in Kaikoura to maintain a set of difficult circumstances.

**Rotorua**

The RDC was (and remains) very stable – the result of another reinforcement loop (See Figure 17). The current mayor has been in office for 14 years (4.5 terms), and so has had considerable experience in the job. The previous mayor also had several terms in office, indicating that the community were quite happy with their local leadership. This stability was also reflected in the experience of the councillors, at the time, who had already served at least one term before that. As one interview respondent said:

> I don't think there are too many important issues.... You've only got to look at the Council.... The last election last year I was expecting a major turnover in Council personnel and it simply did not happen. They just kept voting the same old people back in. Now is that because people are pretty happy with the way things are going or is it because people are just apathetic? I think it is because people in general are fairly happy with the way things are going.

This stability may also reflect the successful management of some of the problems that beset the town in the 1980s. This stability meant that the RDC had a great deal of collective experience in working in local government.
Figure 17: The Rotorua ‘trust loop’: An example of two positive reinforcement loops with positive consequences

There was some comment at the Council that turnover amongst staff was high. It seemed for example, that many of the planning staff in Rotorua had not been in the area long, and it also appeared that for that particular staff group, working in Rotorua could be tense because the elected Council were very supportive of development, where some elements in the community were keen on a more cautious approach to local development. The problems with the Tarawera variation in the district planning process illustrate this. As a planner from outside the Council put it:

\[
\text{In their old plan, they had some provisions that looked after the amount of subdivision that could occur over at Tarawera, the amount of vegetation that could be cleared and the types of activities that could occur out there. Now in the new plan there was nothing really like that \ldots, so ‘Kaitiaki Tarawera’ took them to court on the basis that what was in the old plan was much better than what was in the new plan. What was in the new plan did not achieve the aims of Part II of the Resource Management Act, which is the Objectives of the Act basically – sustainable management of that area.}
\]

\footnote{The name of a local environmental group based in Tarawera, a small settlement near Rotorua.}
... So ... they appealed on that basis. The judge asked [the council planner] a question and said, ‘in your opinion, do you think that the provisions are adequate in the proposed plan?’ And he said ‘the councillors think so,’ and the judge just pushed the fact that you know [...] he was] there as a professional, and said ‘give me your opinion’ and he couldn’t answer it – didn’t answer it because he knew it was wrong.

I: So he was the meat in the sandwich there.

R: He was the meat in the sandwich and he’d been given a job by the Council to justify to everybody else that the provisions in the plan were adequate.

Despite the turnover of planning staff, many other Council staff had worked in the area for a considerable period of time, and when put alongside the stability of the elected council, the Rotorua District Council had a good institutional memory, so the working knowledge of both staff and councillors allowed them to produce effective outcomes.

Kaikoura

The KDC was quite different from the RDC. The Kaikoura community’s relationship with its council, at the time of research, was strained and this strain was maintained by another positive reinforcement loop (see Figure 18). The community in general did not trust the Council – as one interviewee put it:

Our council from hell ... they were telling everybody exactly what they wanted to hear and then they’d turn around and do the opposite.

This mistrust was particularly evident in the relationship of Council staff with other community members and with the high turnover of elected councillors.

Council staff

The community’s attitude towards Council staff was negative in Kaikoura. At the time of study, many Kaikoura locals felt that none of the staff were ‘real’ locals, and that they did not know or understand the area. Council staff tend to stay only two to four years before moving out of the district. Staff turnover at the Council was high, particularly in the context of a small town where many families have lived for generations. It was clear, however, that the community was playing a part in moving staff out of the area, and that it was unlikely that any young locals with suitable qualifications would want to work for the Council. Indeed, the one person that I met who was very suitably qualified to work in the Council was not the slightest bit interested in doing so, and indicated that part of the reason was that it was seen so negatively by the rest of the community.
Figure 18: The Kaikoura ‘mistrust loop’: an example of two positive reinforcement loops with negative consequences

The following story was told to me to illustrate how much locals disliked the Council by a young woman (another ‘outsider’) working elsewhere in the community. She had befriended someone who worked for the council and they were in the hotel having a drink. They met some locals and were getting along all right until the locals discovered that one of them worked for the council, whereupon the two newcomers were left to their own devices for the rest of the evening. She noted that this pattern of behaviour had not been evident at any other time before or since when she was not accompanied by her council friend. These kinds of things can make Kaikoura an uncomfortable place in which to live, particularly for young staff.

Increases in staff numbers over the 1990s as the RMA came into use seemed to be an important factor in this negative attitude. At the time of study (1997-98), locals were still questioning the need for the ‘large’ number of staff at the Council. This was a particularly contentious topic at the time, because local rates had increased significantly in the months prior to the researcher entering the community. Many Kaikoura people, particularly those without much interest in what the Council were doing, felt angry
about paying rates for an 'unnecessarily' large number of staff and the services of consultants, whom they felt were expensive and not very good. Because Council staff found it difficult to build social networks, it appeared that locals were not getting the information they needed to make more sense of these changes. In the changing world of local government, it can be concluded that the relationship between staff and community is vital for the dissemination of information about what local authorities are doing and why.

While the attitudes of locals made living in Kaikoura uncomfortable for council staff, there are other factors that might contribute to staff turnover:

- Council staff must generally move away from the area to advance their career. Kaikoura District Council, as the smallest district council in mainland New Zealand, does not attract experienced staff, and neither can it provide a career path within the local area. Therefore, more than in larger councils, Kaikoura is seen as a place to gain experience before moving on to another job in a larger place.

- The youth and inexperience of some of the staff can make it even more difficult for them to feel at home in the Kaikoura community. Someone with experience is more likely to know how to develop local networks and tap into local knowledge, because they have done it before in other places. Of course, older staff are more likely to be married and have families who provide both support and other avenues into the community. Single, young staff may have little local social support, and do not have a partner or children who themselves will be getting to know people in the local area through schools, interest groups and/or other workplaces.

- The size of Kaikoura makes it difficult for partners or spouses to get work locally, particularly if they also have careers of their own, which may contribute to the need for staff to move on.

- Another factor that has contributed to staff turnover is changes in the structure of the Council itself. When this happens, as it has at various times over recent years, a staff member may become redundant or may end up in a position in which they are no longer happy, and so they move on.
While it is important that 'new blood' is able to enter the organisation both at council and staff levels, it is equally important that there are people with experience who can retain the institutional memory, and who can help new recruits learn about the local situation. Without a good 'memory', an institution or organisation is likely to repeat mistakes and to spend time on issues that have already had time spent on them.

Another aspect of this is that people who have not been in the area long will not have the informal contacts that can be useful as a form of participation. Hillier (2000), in a case study in Western Australia, concluded that informal networks are an important mechanism that citizens use to have input into local decision making. Without these networks then, not only does Council have problems in getting information into the community, but the community is likely to have less opportunity to get information to the Council.

Councillors

The Kaikoura 'mistrust loop' illustrated above was also evident in the high turnover of councillors. For the Council term during which the research was undertaken, four of the seven councillors were in their first term of office, and all the rest were only in their second term. In the following election, five new councillors were voted leaving only two with previous experience. This high turnover makes it difficult for the Council to perform at its best. One of the staff commented:

\[
\text{It seems to take nearly one term of office just to get councillors to the point where they understand some of the relevant legislation and what they are able to do within that.}
\]

A council with over half its members in their first term of office will not be able to perform well which, of course, is only likely to add to the sense of mistrust that the community has. This, in turn, results in the council being voted out of office and the cycle begins again with an inexperienced council.

Despite the high turnover, many locals commented that the 'same old people' were on the Council all the time. It is an interesting comment, because it was negative in its intent, and also because it is not literally true given the figures above. There may be a number of reasons for this perception in Kaikoura. Mulgan (1994: 189) states that, at the local level, political parties are unimportant because:

\[
\text{The main channels of political influence and accountability are informal and personal. In forming their political judgements, local councillors rely much more on their own individual experience and the opinions of their}
\]
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acquaintances. ... The social characteristics of local body members therefore become particularly significant for assessing the interests which are served by local government.

Thus, what people may be alluding to in stating that councillors are the ‘same old people’ is that they come from the same social groupings. Councillors must be able to attend council meetings and do the work required, which automatically limits the types of people who run for election to those who own established businesses, or those who can make the time – and this often includes semi-retired farmers, particularly in rural areas. Another possibility is that people standing for council in Kaikoura tend to have been much involved in community groups and activities over the years. For example, most of the councillors that I spoke to in both communities had been involved in organisations such as sports clubs, St John’s Ambulance, search and rescue or Rotary as officers. This pattern is reflected across New Zealand local body politics (Mulgan, 1994). They were therefore relatively prominent community members, and already known as people ‘in charge,’ so their council work may just be seen as an extension of this work. Another factor in this is that, in a small community, these kinds of people are likely to have more visibility than in a larger community where more people participate in community service roles.

The perceptions of the ‘same old people’ may also reflect the perceived lack of control discussed earlier, and the difficulty that the council faces in managing local change. On one hand, a sense of familiarity might increase a local sense of control, but on the other hand, when the community has little faith in the council, familiarity might decrease their sense of control. People might feel that they have a lack of choice, that there are no new ideas, and that there are no better ways forward. Of course, it is difficult to attribute causality in this example. The smaller the sense of local control, the more likely that people give up trying to make changes.

**Personality factors**

Personality also had an effect on Kaikoura’s perception of its council. Many locals perceived that one of the previous Council chief executive officers made decisions without enough consultation, whereas another was perceived to have had the opposite problem and was accused by some of avoiding difficult decisions. The perceived personalities of the mayors over the course of that time were also said to be important in either exacerbating problems or ameliorating them. Therefore, the personalities of the
people in the Council and the way that they work together has a significant effect on the outcomes of community projects and the way they are perceived.

The research was completed around the time that the CEO changed, which highlighted the different personal styles of the two men. One of these men was happy to talk to people on the street and in the local bars about Council matters among other things, whereas the other was perceived to avoid informal contact. Locals seemed to appreciate the informal contact and some Council staff noted that it made their jobs much easier when the CEO was prepared to chat to locals about Council business.

In theory, informal contact can have a positive effect on both community and council since it allows another avenue for the exchange of information and therefore a better development of mutual understanding between the two parties involved. Informal contact, as Hillier (2000) noted, can be a good mechanism for the exchange of information and certainly, because information is likely to be exchanged between small groups or individuals, it may be less threatening and more constructive for both resident and council staff. It is also potentially more effective than public meetings or submission processes, because smaller amounts of information can be exchanged more frequently. If nothing else, informal contact offers simply another mechanism for communication between the general community and community decision makers.

Perceived performance

Kaikoura District Council, with its small rating base, has relatively few full-time staff compared with other councils around New Zealand. The tasks required by a small number of ratepayers are not always correspondingly smaller than those performed for a large number of ratepayers. Staff can find themselves on call for long hours or find it difficult to get away on holiday, because there is no one else to help take care of a crisis. Staff in Kaikoura undertake a wide range of tasks, because they have to perform the same functions as all other local authorities, but with fewer people. This may add variety to people's jobs, but it can also add stress, particularly where an individual does not feel competent in all aspects of her/his job.

In addition, the Council has to use consultants for specialist tasks. To locals, their cost seems enormous, and the use of consultants exacerbates the perception that Kaikoura and the Council are run by outsiders who do not know the community or the area. This is not entirely unreasonable because, although consultants are good at managing the
legal requirements of a task, they do not know the area well and often cannot spend time trying to do so. This has led to a few errors. For example, the new wharf at South Bay originally turned out to be underwater at high tide because a consultant had measured it up at low tide, but perhaps more importantly, there is often little acceptance of the recommendations made by these people so that many ideas have not been taken up locally. The errors, in particular, make residents more suspicious of consultants than they are of their own Council staff.

Consultants can also have difficulty in communicating with local people, although it seems that it is not always obvious to them that the communication is a problem. An example of this occurred at a public meeting in which local councillors, a consultant, and one of the local Council planners (a person relatively new to the job and the area) were trying to put together a draft of the new District Plan. District planning occurs every ten years, so, for a small council like Kaikoura, it is more cost-effective to use consultants to help with the process. Consultants have experience of working across a range of councils on the same processes, so they have some useful experience and knowledge of the district planning process, and the kinds of issues that demand some attention. A district plan, however, has to meet the needs and aspirations of local people, and it has to focus specifically on the local natural and physical environment. One might assume, for example, that the issues in Kaikoura – a Territorial Local Authority (TLA) containing everything from coastal to high alpine environments and with a burgeoning tourism industry – will differ from Hurunui District Council, an inland TLA with a less extreme range of environments and pressures.

During this meeting the general format was for the consultant to introduce a particular aspects of the plan that needed some discussion, and then to ask a question about what the councillors wanted to go in their plan. These questions were generally framed in the language used in district planning, and therefore was quite conceptual in form. The councillors would then spend some considerable time doing what appeared to be trying to put these ideas in their own terms, so that they could then answer the question. For the councillors, whose experience lay in running local businesses or farming, their knowledge culture was quite different to that of the planners (see Tsouvalis, Seymour, & Watkins, 2000). They were able to grasp difficult concepts, but their way of interacting with the world was different to the mode of the planners, so they thought more in terms of concrete examples. Once a couple of examples had been considered,
they were able to quickly draw their own conclusions and provide the relevant information about the local area.

By far the largest amount of time at this meeting involved these local people working, thinking and talking so as to build some understanding of what it was that the consultant wanted from them. By far the greatest amount of work was done by the councillors, and yet one might have expected that the consultant would have had much more experience of this communication process (because she had worked with many district plans) and, therefore, would be better equipped to do some of the work involved in building a common knowledge culture.

Despite her considerable experience of working with rural councils, the consultant had never actually reflected on the process of communication that she used. She noted, with some frustration, that the councillors seemed to need to pin it to some kind of example before they could move ahead. When questioned, it seemed that it had never occurred to her to frame her introduction to the subject using examples from other places so as to help this process proceed more easily. She appeared unaware of different ways of thinking about the world – for example, conceptual thinking and concrete thinking and the need to build up some kind of common language in which the language of the planner can intersect and work with the language of people with different life experiences. This is not to show any of these actors up as being deficient. But, it highlights one of the ways in which local people might be made to feel ignorant and inadequate, and at the same time, it shows just how a consultant might easily miss important information, particularly where they cannot spend the time with people.

While consultants may be well trained in their particular area of interest, they simply cannot write a district plan without the input of local people. Without local input, plans, strategies or recommendations are unlikely to be either acceptable or useful at local level. Planners know a great deal about the legislation and how that legislation has been used in other places, but, they generally know very little about local environments, relationships and issues. Possibly, the most difficult aspect of the planning process is communication and managing participation processes, and yet little time is put aside for reflecting on these processes. The focus of planners and community, alike, is on the task and its outcomes. Communicating well across different world views requires patience and (usually) attention to the process of negotiating a ‘common language’ or ‘knowledge culture’ (Tsouvalis et al., 2000). Since this is not something that is easy to
do, nor is it something that people are generally aware of as being a problem, it appears that this will often be an unacknowledged barrier. This problem is accentuated by the fact that Kaikoura District Council staff move on as soon as they gain the kind of experience that might help them facilitate interactions between consultants and locals.

It is also worthy of note that both parties (planners and locals) appeared to assume that the planners had the superior knowledge. The councillors’ comments at the time indicated that they felt that the problems they were facing were *their* fault rather than seeing it as a problem that emerges at any such interface. The frustration that the planners expressed outside the meeting tended to centre around the councillors rather than with their own inability to bridge the gap. Of course, this assumption then made it less likely that the consultant would reflect on how she might improve the process. At the same time, the councillors continued to struggle and effectively did most of the communication work. The asymmetrical relations maintain themselves in positive reinforcement loops where the views of all parties are confirmed because none choose to question the validity of their views, nor to try and look at what is happening from a different perspective. While some might argue that the councillors are the ones who know the least about planning and so are the ones that have to move the furthest, it seems that it might actually be quicker and easier if all parties involved in the process took a constructive and conscious (rather than unwitting) part in negotiating the gap between ‘knowledge cultures’.

It is also significant that the people who are doing the most to remedy the situation are the ones who feel that they caused the problem. But, perhaps the ones with the best resources for remedying the situation are actually the people who feel that the fault lies on the other side. Communication is a two-way process, so all parties who participate in that process can increase or decrease the effectiveness of that communication. However, at any given point in time, one party may be more or less able than the others to change what is happening because of their knowledge, experience or position in the process.

**Interim summary**

So far in this chapter, I have outlined the relationship that each of the two researched communities had with its council at the time of the research. In Rotorua, indications were that the community as a whole were happy with most of the work their Council
had done. The Council had dealt with the difficulties that presented themselves in the 1980s and had developed the town centre and lakefront areas so that they were much more attractive and pleasant than they had been. These successes gave both the Council and the community confidence in their ability to deal with difficulties. In comparison, the relationship between the Kaikoura District Council and their community was more strained. Kaikoura had been buffeted by major, rapid change since the early 1980s, and residents had been able to do relatively little to control the rate or the direction of that change. With a smaller and less experienced group of staff and councillors than those in Rotorua, the Council had relatively few resources to draw on to manage such change. The result of this set of circumstances and the series of events that had led them to have a burgeoning tourism industry have left the community with a sense of powerlessness. These differences are reflected further in the ways that the two councils were working with the tourism industry at the time of research. The next section outlines the involvement of both councils in managing tourism in their respective areas.

Councils and Tourism

Elliott (1997), taking an international perspective, suggested that local councils have important roles in tourism based on two main themes. First, local government has a role in managing the negative impacts of tourism on the local community, and second, it has some interest in developing the local area economically and socially. Over the last 15 or so years, tourism has increased considerably in New Zealand and, as part of an increasing focus on economic development, many councils are involving themselves in tourism, most often in the role of marketing the local area as a tourism destination (Parkinson, 1997). This is directly in line with the focus on economic development mentioned above and was clearly an important aspect of the Rotorua District Council’s involvement in tourism. Steve Pike, the first CEO of Tourism Rotorua illustrates this in a discussion with Irena Ateljevic (1998: 151):

*Rotorua had the highest unemployment just about in the country. That is the reason that the Council made the investment in tourism, because they said we have farming, forestry and tourism. Of the three, tourism offers the best opportunity to employ lots of people because it is labour intensive. Farming does not employ many people and forestry was downsizing by automating. So that was when the whole basis for Council’s investment was to create jobs. We have to increase visitors, we have to increase their spending and therefore that would flow on and create jobs at some stage down the track.*
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By contrast, the Kaikoura District Council, at the time of study, was grappling with the difficult issue of a community that needed tourism for economic reasons (following the massive loss of employment from the district in the 1980s) but, at the same time, was struggling to accommodate the rate of change created by its growing tourism industry. For the Council there was considerable tension between wanting tourism to continue to grow, and finding ways to manage the impacts of having so many people in the area.

The relationship of the two councils, their respective communities and tourism industries are the culmination of many factors that have operated over the last few years. Tourism Rotorua was (and still is) part of the District Council, and was funded to the tune of $1.5 million by the Council. It has been commended for its management of tourism by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE, 1997). In comparison, its equivalent in Kaikoura (Kaikoura Information and Tourism Incorporated (KITI)) was funded almost completely from booking commissions and membership fees. At the time of research, according to informants involved in KITI, the District Council provided $17,000 of funding – not enough to employ even one fairly junior person for a year. Thus, KITI is a very poor relation of Tourism Rotorua.

The two communities were very different in their management of tourism in the local area. Rotorua District Council has an extensive role in tourism management and promotion, whereas the KDC had fewer resources and so had a smaller role in managing tourism. However, the role of the KDC is still changing considerably. In fact, the different tourism and council histories of the two places have a considerable influence on just what their councils can realistically do with the resources that they have. The following sections of this chapter highlight the difficulties that small communities experience when tourism develops suddenly in their midst. Times of change are always points of tension, and the differing experiences of tourism in the two communities can be explained by the differing role of tourism in each place – as a focus for stability in Rotorua and as yet another agent for change in Kaikoura.

**Kaikoura**

A problem faced by any council is that it must make complex decisions, sometimes about things of which its members have little or no experience. The very small size of the Kaikoura community means that the range of backgrounds and worldviews in the area are limited when compared with the resources available in larger and more
economically diverse communities. There is a slightly broader range of experience available within the retired community. However, in a somewhat unfortunate reinforcement pattern, retirees with much to offer are often also the ones who feel that they do not really have any right to contribute because they are not 'real locals' or they think these things should be left to younger people. These people got their potentially valuable knowledge by working in different places and different occupations to those that are common in Kaikoura. They are not well networked into the community so, if they choose not to participate in formal Council processes, the community does not have access to their knowledge. Similarly, because their knowledge is different to that of the 'local locals,' it might also be regarded as less valuable by those same people.

None of the above arguments are meant to imply that locals are not capable of making good decisions, but it does mean that they have access to less knowledge than if a wider range of people participated. In the same way that I argued earlier that researchers need to consider a range of perspectives, I now argue that so too do decision makers. To be effective, councillors must be prepared to read and learn about what they are doing, something for which previous leadership roles may not have prepared them, and something which requires much time. In addition, the different backgrounds of Council staff or consultants and local councillors can make it difficult to communicate, because the former may not be aware of what councillors need to know, and the latter may not know what they need to ask. These problems might be mitigated by some acknowledgement of both the difficulty of these communication processes, and the value of working with people with different backgrounds. In the meantime, less-than-optimal communication processes tend to reinforce the view that it is not useful to include people with varied backgrounds.

The Kaikoura District Council has a role in managing tourism development through the provisions of the Resource Management Act, the Local Government Act, and in providing for public amenities in the Kaikoura District. Very few people in the community are entirely happy with what the Council has done for tourism so far, but it is perhaps significant that this is occurring right across the range of community opinions about tourism. On one hand, tourist operators say that they are not well supported by the Council, and many of them are particularly unhappy that their rates have gone up. On the other hand, some residents feel that the Council has spent too much money on tourism and that the development has been too fast. Beautification, traffic calming,
parking facilities and the development of South Bay as a boat launching and loading facility are all things that people in Kaikoura mention as problematic. Very few people that I talked to during the course of the research did not have some criticism of the Council in Kaikoura - so much so that I was surprised when one resident offered an unqualified vote of support for the work that the Council does.

This may be reminiscent of the situation that Ross and Nisbett (1991:72) allude to when they say that two opposing partisan groups respond to the same body of mixed and inconclusive evidence by increasing the strength and polarisation of their respective beliefs. It also indicates that although the Kaikoura Council was generally unpopular, it was, nevertheless, taking account of the range of opinion within the community.

The difficulties that the Council in Kaikoura were facing are, to some extent, found in other tourism areas. The complex nature of the problems that arise through tourism, and the need for local authorities to take account of both public and private sector needs in their area, makes decision making and planning difficult at the best of times (see Getz & Jamal, 1994; Richins, 1997). The small size of Kaikoura and its limited financial resources made these problems all the more acute. In addition, the power play between different community groups may also have influenced the development of tourism (Reed, 1997), and the local authority was central to the power play in Kaikoura as in other areas around New Zealand (Mulgan, 1994).

**Rotorua**

In Rotorua during the 1980s the local area experienced difficulties in its efforts to promote tourism. It appears that many in the tourism industry were dissatisfied with the activities of the Public Relations Office, whose approach was no longer seen as adequate. The Rotorua Promotion Society was formed in October 1981. Smith (1982) considered that this was because Rotorua needed to attract visitors back to the area from other destinations in New Zealand. The Rotorua Public Relations Office was closed in 1983, and the new Rotorua Promotions Association (at their own request) took over most of their functions. However, it appears that the Rotorua Promotions Association struggled to survive for a number of reasons. Smith (1982) notes that there were difficulties getting new members, partly because of the $2000 membership fee and difficulties getting businesses in the industry to work together. Council granted the Promotions Association $60,000 per year, but despite this, the association struggled.
Some informants have suggested that the Promotions Association did not have a good vision or plan to guide their marketing activities so the Council was not keen to invest any more in their activities. It appears that many of the Association's activities relied on volunteer efforts and that made it difficult to continue to meet the changing needs of the industry at the time. A further problem encountered by the Association was its large membership and a lack of leadership, two factors that meant that the group involved were unable to make progress toward their stated goals. In the end, the Rotorua Promotions Association operated only for about a decade.

In the meantime, the conditions of the 1980s meant that some sort of Council action was required and that they should become more active in tourism. Between 1982 and 1990, domestic visitor numbers dropped from 535,000 to 370,000 (Rotorua District Council, 1992), and this drop impacted on the local economy (Ateljevic, 1998). One might also suppose that the drop in the number of New Zealand visitors resulted from the decreasing attractiveness of the Town outlined earlier. At the same time, the town was experiencing the problem of rising unemployment, so there was a local imperative for tourism development.

The RDC created a new position within the Council staff establishment, in late 1988, appointing Steve Pike as 'Promotion and Marketing Co-ordinator, Rotorua District Council.' At this stage, Pike was on his own in the office with a telephone, a promised budget of $250,000 per annum, and responsibilities for business development and marketing for tourism. The role was soon narrowed down to a single focus on tourism, and Pike's title became 'General Manager of Tourism Rotorua.' The image of the Town amongst New Zealanders by the late 1980s was negative, and local people were reflecting that in their own attitudes as discussed in Chapter 4 (Coddington, 1991; Reeves, 1986; Stratford, 1988; Interview respondents).

A large part of Pike's work at the time was to try and instil some community pride, and to improve the relationship between the community and the tourism industry, and between different players in the tourism industry. Beginning with a community pride week and a day when locals could go into many of the local visitor attractions for no charge, Pike began promoting Rotorua to the local community. To do this, he used a range of avenues including a weekly column that he wrote in the Daily Post, and local radio talk shows (Ateljevic, 1998). Further to these activities, Pike also focused on fostering co-operation in the private sector by doing things such as partially funding
joint brochures produced by people who had been fierce competitors (for example, fishing guides or scenic flight operators) (Ateljevic, 1998).

Prior to Pike's appointment, the Council embarked on a new branding exercise. ‘Rotorua: Full of Surprises’ was developed by a Wellington firm after research in 1988 showed that most New Zealanders considered that Rotorua tourism was based on Māori culture and thermal areas, and that once you have been there you had seen it all. The new brand aimed to rectify this problem and was aimed at the Auckland market in particular. It was launched in 1990. Not everyone in tourism was happy with this brand, since some (particularly those involved in tourism products with a Māori or geothermal element) felt that it did not do justice to the core tourism products in the Town: geothermal areas and Māori culture.

Developing links: a public-private partnership

At the time of launching the new tourism brand in 1990, the Rotorua District Council purchased the New Zealand Travel Office from New Zealand Railways (Don Stafford Collection, Rotorua Public Library: Tourism Rotorua resource file). In 1991, the Council launched its redevelopment plan for the central business district including the refurbishment of the travel office, and landscaping on the lakefront and in the Town centre (Ateljevic, 1998). The newly refurbished Tourism Rotorua building was opened in 1993, and housed a new visitor information office, which now operates seven days a week, all year round. It also housed the marketing staff, and included a cafe, a foreign exchange facility, retailing space, thermal footbaths, bus stop area and a shower and toilet facility (Rotorua District Council, 1997).

The Council set up the Rotorua Tourism Advisory Board (RTAB) in 1991. This group is jointly comprised of councillors and industry representatives, who inform the Council about tourism matters. In addition, during the early 1990s, the Council appointed Tim Cossar as the first Economic and Business Development Officer. The Rotorua District Council (1997:46) Handbook states that:

*The objective of the Economic and Business Development Unit is to encourage economic and business development through the provision of quality information to businesses or people considering business in Rotorua. The unit is a facilitator for a wide variety of business and economic development projects.*

It was also around this time that the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) became operative. Because of its focus on effects rather than activities, the RMA has made
business development more complex. It appears that a large proportion of business
development is supported by the Economic and Business Development Unit through the
processes of assessing environmental effects and obtaining resource consents. Clearly,
this facilitation role also had much to do with tourism in Rotorua. In fact, it was Tim
Cossar, who saw the need to develop a tourism strategy for Rotorua through his work in
economic and business development. At that time, the industry needed both baseline
information and a clear direction.

Around the same time, strategic planning was on the minds of councillors because of
pending changes to the Local Government Act. One result of Council (and industry)
concerns that emerged out of the visioning processes was the 1996-2005 Rotorua
Tourism Strategic Plan, which currently informs the structure of Tourism Rotorua, and
its activities. The advent of this plan was also seen, by some, as the beginning of a new
era in tourism management in the District, particularly as one outcome of the plan was
the development of a new brand (see Branding for Tourism Rotorua, n.d.). While a new
brand is perhaps not significant in and of itself, the processes that Tourism Rotorua and
its consultants used for developing and 'growing' the brand have provided an ongoing
focus for the development of the community as a whole, and for the tourism community
in particular.

Overall, while the Council and the tourism industry in Rotorua had a time of crisis
during the 1980s, the Council has taken a strong role in the management and promotion
of tourism in the local area. The town centre as been beautified at relatively small
expense, and the waterfront, which during the 1980s became less and less attractive, is
now an important focal point for the town and its visitors alike. The involvement of the
Council has been positive and successful in the eyes of all involved. The tourism
industry in Rotorua is largely able to pull together and to pool resources, as is evident in
their confident approach to problems such as the 1996/97 Asian economic downturn
outlined in the previous chapter.

A significant part of the work of Tourism Rotorua is in maintaining and facilitating a
strong working relationship between different businesses and between business and
council. It is interesting to note that the three CEOs of Tourism Rotorua have all had
different strengths. Steve Pike, for example, created much of the cohesion now found
amongst industry players. However, his work appears to have been less participatory in
its focus than is the case with the current CEO, who sees the involvement and
participation of a wide variety of local industry players as paramount. Tim Cossar’s strengths lay in his strategic thinking and his facilitation of that process. Each of these individuals has reflected the needs of the time in their relative strengths. It seems unlikely that any one of them would have been the best person for the job for the entire life of Tourism Rotorua.

**Department of Conservation**

While the councils in both places were important in the management and promotion of tourism, government departments in both had a role in managing the environmental impacts of tourism. The Department of Conservation was (and still is) responsible for the conservation of natural resources throughout New Zealand. The Department works alongside the territorial local authorities, and has a role in advocating for conservation in the planning processes. It has also been a major player in the development and management of tourism in Kaikoura because of the industry's reliance on the marine mammals in the area.

In comparison to the local Council, the Department of Conservation in Kaikoura is relatively well-liked today, which is similar to what Warren and Taylor (1994) found. This is partly because local Department of Conservation staff are fewer in number and turn over less frequently than their Council counterparts. Lower turnover means that they are well known by the locals, and know the locals well. In addition, they are also not paid from local rates and so locals see them in a slightly different light to the Council staff. All these factors contribute to the generally positive attitude of the community towards the Department of Conservation. Another important reason for the Department’s popularity is that many of the negotiations that have gone on with respect to tourism are not done at the local level, and therefore locals do not aim their criticisms at the local office but at some stranger at higher levels. Even the policing role of the local office is accepted by the local operators because the longer-term local institutional memory has allowed the staff at the Department of Conservation to demonstrate their ability to cooperate with, as well as police, the activities of operators.

In Rotorua, because there is a conservancy office in the area, concessions work\(^1\) is done within the town. The relationship of DOC and the local Council indicated that both

---

\(^1\) Concessions are permits for commercial (usually tourism) operators to run businesses based on Conservation lands.
parties could see merit in cooperating to manage local natural resources. It appears that the pro-development focus of the Council was at times a source of tension for both the Council and the Department, who were more inclined to advocate strongly for conservation. However, at the time the research was underway, this was not an issue of any magnitude.

**Conclusions**

The relationships and roles of the local councils in relation to their respective communities illustrate the importance of history and the role of ‘lock in,’ or positive reinforcement loops, in understanding the current trajectory of a complex system. Both councils have had similar changes imposed on them through legislative amendments over the last 12 years, and both communities have had to deal with some major effects from restructuring. However, the situations in which the researcher found the two communities at the time of the research were quite different. Rotorua people projected a stronger confidence in their Council than did the people of Kaikoura. This can be traced to the fact that the problems besetting Rotorua during the 1980s appear to have been largely solved. This confidence enabled them to meet new challenges such as the Asian economic collapse of 1997-8 with a confidence and an openness to learning. This confidence in the tourism industry appears to also be related to the fact that they have learned to work together; an outcome that has been facilitated by the Council’s work in tourism. This cohesive environment allows confidence to spread, and gives the industry better tools for addressing those things that they deem to come within their mandate.

In comparison, the Kaikoura community were less confident in their Council’s ability to manage change and the ‘mistrust loop’ helps to maintain that lack of confidence. This is not to blame the two communities or their councils in any way. They are products of their history, and changing positive reinforcement loops can be very difficult, even when people are aware of them. It is also important to consider that the size of a community may well affect its ability to actually affect its own outcomes. For example, the New Zealand economy, small by global standards, is affected by the fortunes of its larger trading partners. New Zealand, therefore, has relatively less control over its own economic well-being than, say, the United States, which has a very large domestic market and is a very large economy by world standards.

This, too, is reflective of patterns of positive reinforcement such as centre-periphery patterns in which centres of capital are, by their own success, able to attract more capital.
to them at the expense of peripheral areas (Keller, 1987). This pattern of wealth distribution between centre and periphery occurs at many levels and provides an example of a fractal pattern. The rich get richer and the poor get poorer at local level, at regional level, and at national and international level. This pattern reflects the observation that having more money to invest increases one’s capacity to earn more money from that investment. These are just positive reinforcement loops from which emerge norms and patterns that may be stable and unchanging for considerable periods of time.

Despite these difficulties, there may be different ways to achieve a sense of local control. A small place may have relatively less ability to control the effects of external forces and change. However, with a good level of understanding and an ability to reflect on their place in the wider scheme of things, it might be possible for small communities to adapt more quickly than large ones, and to have more control over the way that they change in the face of national and global change. The difficulty is that many small communities do not have the tools to self-reflect. Kaikoura, for example, had been the subject of very little research and so has had few opportunities when compared with Rotorua, to see itself through the eyes of others. However, this challenge only makes it more important that people work together and that they find and celebrate the ways in which they influence their own destinies.

Rotorua, geographically close to the universities of Auckland, Waikato and Massey has been the subject of much research. In addition, Rotorua’s more heterogenous population and greater economic base allows them to fund and request research about particular aspects of themselves, which Kaikoura cannot do to the same extent. This does not point to any lack of ability in Kaikoura. Kaikoura has shown itself well able to use the information from research and to direct its questions in ways that help it work toward meeting local needs.

Another aspect of this analysis is some reflection of the fact that in the imposition of models of local government, there has been little recognition of the different contexts in which different territorial local authorities operate. The Kaikoura District Council, for example, administers a large area on a fiscal shoestring, with a base of very few ratepayers. In comparison, in the Rotorua area, the population density is much greater—a point which acts in their favour, because this affords a good range of human, environmental and financial resources. These reflections raise the question of whether
the same financial and managerial models should be imposed across all authorities in the same way when they have such different environmental and social contexts within which to operate. There may be reason, for example, to treat Territorial Local Authorities with a small, dispersed population differently to those with larger and more concentrated populations. It may be that these councils need more support for processes such as research and planning for tourism, which are extra costs and require human resources that may not be readily available to the community. It may also be that small communities could be given the resources to work together and to learn from each other's experiences.

This chapter has looked at the ways in which communities interact with their territorial local authorities. It is clear, however, that the relationship between the community and the territorial local authority is only one of the possible interactions that affect its well-being. Both communities have their own patterns of local interaction, which will affect the ways in which each community adapts to changes such as those associated with tourism development. The following chapter, therefore, outlines some of the patterns of local interaction in each community with an eye to understanding how these affect the trajectory of the community system.
Chapter 8

Community Interactions

Introduction

So far, this thesis has outlined some of the political and historical contexts into which tourism has been cast in Rotorua and Kaikoura. Following this, I examined some of the local perceptions of tourist activity and the impacts that it has in each place. Chapter 6 outlined how local people perceived the benefits and costs of tourism and the factors that appear to mediate those impacts. However, as argued at the end of that chapter, there is more to understanding the impacts of tourism when there are individuals who like tourists, but who dislike tourism. Perhaps a clue to the difference between the impacts of tourists and the impacts of tourism lies in the observations of Crick (1989: 338) who suggested that tourism can introduce ‘...the possibility of new conflicts within small communities.’

The last chapter began exploring one particular set of relationships – those of the Council and the community. It appears also that the interactions of locals with each other will influence the way in which a community manages conflict and change processes. Reed (1997), for example, outlines the ways in which local power relations impacted on tourism planning processes in Squamish, Canada, noting that both the interactions of institutions, and of individuals, can affect the outcomes of community decision processes. Similarly, Jamal and Getz (1999), looking at tourism-related conflicts in Canmore, noted that conflict can be constructive if people find ways to talk
about their perspectives and understand those of others. Conflict, however, can be destructive. Without the attention of all players, arguments can quickly become polarised, and it becomes increasingly difficult to reach a consensus or a common point of agreement. Groups that cannot work together through difficult issues limit their ability to adapt to or influence change, since unresolved conflicts can increase resistance to change efforts.

Community interactions can also be important in helping individuals cope with the impacts of tourism. As an example, Brown and Giles (1994) found that people living in Byron Bay in Australia felt more able to cope when they were recognised as local. Thus, feeling a sense of solidarity with other community members influences how people experience the impacts of high tourist numbers. Similarly, psychologists have noted the importance of social networks and social support for individuals dealing with a range of life changes (Hirsch, 1981). Thus community interactions are a core element in understanding the effect of tourism on destination areas.

Tourism may expose and /or emphasise the structures, processes and tensions that already exist in a place (Byrne, Edmondson & Fahy, 1993; Crick, 1989; Pearce et al, 1996; Reed, 1997). It seems, for example, that many of the impacts of tourism are a direct result of the ways in which local people interact. For example, before returning to university to study, I worked for several years in Queenstown, a very important and popular tourist destination in the South Island of New Zealand. At that time, my own experience of tourism was that the rivalries between local operators, and an associated tension in community dynamics, meant that the negative impacts of tourism arose as much from local-local interactions as from large numbers of tourists. Schreueder (1995) observed something similar in noting that one of her respondents had commented that the most difficult part of setting up and running the Banks Peninsula Walkway was dealing with the other landowners. Thus, one must understand what community processes and structures exist to understand how tourism fits into them and what effects each has on the other.

This chapter outlines community processes and structures in the two localities under study. It discusses some of the patterns that exist in each community, what social and economic problems each community has to confront, and how these patterns of interaction contribute to their ability to adapt constructively to external change such as that imposed by tourism.
Difficulties of getting to know the community

Coming to understand Rotorua and Kaikoura took considerable time and effort. Kaikoura, with its small population, was easier to become familiar with than was Rotorua, simply because, in a smaller place, it was easier to meet and talk to a greater proportion of community members. However, even in Kaikoura it was not easy to get to know people from some sections of the local community. It was easier to mix with the people with whom I had most in common, so they were the people that I got to know best. Some groups of people prefer not to speak with strangers and tend to keep to themselves, which also limited my access to their perspective. In particular, Māori with low levels of education and employment are difficult to engage for the purposes of research such as this, which was relatively short in duration and did not have these people as a particular focus.

Intuition and its role in my learning

My starting point for this chapter is the very different ‘feel’ of both communities. The size of this difference was surprising to me. Neither Lawson et al.’s (1998) survey nor the quantitative surveys conducted in this research showed a great deal of difference between the community assessments of tourism. In addition neither survey left me feeling that I had any real understanding of how tourism impacts on the two communities. The differences that came up in the surveys did not appear to be things that could account for the differences that I noticed while living in each place.

This lack of differentiation raised the question of what exactly we measure in such surveys and what it means in terms of managing tourism better. Measuring the balance between the positive and negative impacts of tourism does not expose the processes by which communities build their perceptions and social representations of tourism. It is, in effect, a very superficial look at how tourism might affect a community.

Conceptualising the two communities as complex adaptive systems implies that it is important to understand the adaptation processes of each community. As Chapter 5 showed, community history provides an important layer of understanding, as does the relationship that the community has with its local government. What are the effects of other local interaction patterns on the way in which a community adapts and changes? This chapter explores this question, beginning with an outline of the structure of each community and explores how those structures affect their adaptability.
Overview of local patterns in each place

The two communities have some features in common. The need both communities have for employment is an important driver of community support for tourism development in both Rotorua and Kaikoura. Both communities also have a significant number of people identifying themselves as Māori and, while I was there, both were struggling with the concept of biculturalism, although the manifestation of that differed considerably in the two places because of the different community histories. Rotorua, in particular, was also facing issues associated with poverty that were reflected in pockets of crime and violence in the town. This is not to say that people in Kaikoura have plenty of money, but in a small coastal town there are more opportunities for subsistence food gathering and growing, which may confer a greater level of control for people on low incomes than occurs where there is little access to these opportunities. Thus, the sense of powerlessness or frustration associated with poverty in a place like Rotorua is unlikely to manifest as strongly in Kaikoura. In addition, as locals in Kaikoura observe, in a small town where people know who is who, it is less easy to get away with crime, which means that it is likely to occur less often.

There are also significant differences between the two places. In Kaikoura, I quickly developed a sense of a town containing many different groups, and I could articulate and demonstrate the divisions that existed in the town. This was supported also by the observations of a sociologist who had also spent some time in Kaikoura (Colin Goodrich, pers. comm. 1997), who felt that the Kaikoura community had many divisions. In comparison, in Rotorua, the only division that is clear is cultural. Even after six months of reading, talking and observing I was unable to see any divisions of the same quality as those in Kaikoura. Like any community, these divisions exist – for example, divisions on the basis of employment – but they are not so evident in the way that people speak of each other. Another difference was that the Kaikoura community had relatively few networks into places outside Kaikoura, while Rotorua had many links to other places across New Zealand and across the world. These differences may be partly explained by the difference in the populations and history of each place.

Community Structure and Patterns

Consistent with their very different ‘feels’, the ways in which the two communities described themselves to me were also different. This section outlines the various
descriptions that the local people in both places gave of the structure and nature of their community. In both places, employment provides one of the most important contexts for local interaction, so it provides one of the strongest community patterns, but there are qualitative differences in the way that the two communities talk about these divisions. The relationship between Māori and Pākehā also provides an important division and point of tension in both communities. I argue that this is at least partly influenced by the changes occurring across the whole of New Zealand, as Māori assert their rights with respect to the Treaty of Waitangi and participate in a renaissance of their cultural values and structures. These changes require Pākehā New Zealanders to accommodate the new situation and therefore to change themselves.

In addition to these two general divisions, Kaikoura people articulated the existence of community divisions based on religion and on family history in the area. A Council staff member told me, before I arrived in Kaikoura, that it was important to understand that Kaikoura is controlled by people with connections to one or more of the five main settler families. Compared with Rotorua, very little formal written history exists in Kaikoura and much of that has been written for family reunions. Despite the lack of written history, Pākehā and Māori alike maintain a good oral history, particularly within the ‘old’ families. One needs to know the elements of these histories to understand much of what happens in Kaikoura – a fact which points to the importance of some local divisions. The size and relative isolation of the town maintain social patterns based on religion more clearly than in Rotorua, where I found little evidence that religion is a significant aspect of community division, although it was still a significant aspect of the community.

Kaikoura

Māori and Pākehā

A major division within the Kaikoura community exists between the descendants of the original Kaikoura Māori (Kati Kuri) and the Pākehā community. During my six months fieldwork in Kaikoura there appeared to be little informal interaction between Takahanga Marae and the Council, between Whale Watch and local Pākehā businesses, and between the Māori and Pākehā communities in general. The division between the Māori and Pākehā communities is racially and/ or culturally based, and as a result, racism is an issue that the community discussed. Since race and culture are major
cleavages in Rotorua, this split will be analysed alongside a discussion of similar issues in Rotorua.

Other community divisions

Kaikoura people saw themselves as part of a ‘close knit’ community. Paradoxically, once this ‘close knitness’ was asserted, many informants went on to differentiate themselves from others in the community, and to point out the wrongs of other groups. Another aspect of the Kaikoura community is what some locals referred to as ‘small town syndrome’ in which everyone knows everyone else – but perhaps not that well. People involved in social or community work noted the paradox of this ‘close knitness’ accompanied by the divisions.

An illustration of the division comes from a local social worker who had grown up in the area. She said of her childhood in the town:

_We were sheep farmers, and the sheep farmers did not have contact with the dairy farmers, and the dairy farmers were very separate from the town. In the past, it used to be the railways and the Ministry of Works guys would stick together and the fishermen would stick together. The boundaries have got a bit more blurred with Rogernomics . . . the majority of the dairy farmers and the old Kaikoura families have very strong Irish Catholic roots . . . and that's quite a split._

This illustrates the ways in which employment influences local interactions. It also alludes to the importance of Catholicism in the evolution of the present structure of the Kaikoura community.

In Kaikoura, current employment patterns reflect, in part, the history and interactions of the different groups of original settlers who arrived from England and Ireland during the 19th century. The relative isolation of the Kaikoura District meant that local history had been well confined and the long occupation of a few families meant that many residents were related to one or more of the families who first settled the area. These factors, and the way in which the divisions were used in local discourses of conflict and control, gave the divisions in the Kaikoura community a very different quality to those found in Rotorua.

Fishing

The fishing community was considered a discrete entity. They had their ‘own’ pub (The Pier), and some locals reported that heavy and frequent drinking was part of the culture of the fishing community, a pattern that appears to have existed since Pākehā
whalers first arrived in the area. The whalers were among the first Europeans to arrive in Kaikoura and lived there at the discretion of the local Māori chief. Many whalers married Māori women. Farmers and whalers had very different backgrounds, which contributed to the separation of the whaling community from the wider settler community. When whale numbers dropped, becoming uneconomic to hunt, many of the whalers became fishers.

Farming

The present farming community falls into two separate groups, dairy farmers, and sheep and cattle farmers. These two groups are separated geographically. Five families originally settled Suburban Flat (to the north-west of the town) and Hapuku (to the north of the town)\(^1\). Some settlers used the gold that they found on the goldfields on the West Coast to buy a patch of land, while others traded their labour. These people were Irish peasant farmers who arrived in Kaikoura with the aim of owning their own land. The settlers were generally hardworking, self-sufficient and practical; traits which are still visible in their descendants (Boyd, 1992). It was through their labour that the large swamp that existed on Suburban Flat (on the northern side of the Kowhai River as shown in Figure 21) was gradually settled. The descendants of these settlers are now mainly dairy farmers.

In comparison to the Irish settlers, the sheep and cattle farmers who first settled the area were generally the younger sons of upper class English families who were unlikely to inherit property in England (Sherrard, 1966). They settled country South of the Kowhai River. The two farming groups did not mix socially, since they were from very different social classes, different countries and different churches. Boyd (1992:11), a descendant of one of the Irish families, reflected this division in both social group and geography when he wrote:

> Anyone living over the Kowhai River was thought not quite ‘up to standard’ – a sort of ‘outside the circle’ kind of person. Some of this talk still exists even today.

This separation exists today because there is still little common ground on which the two groups meet. They mostly go to different churches, and they educate their children at different schools (the sheep farmers are more likely to send their children to boarding school for their high school years and there are seven different primary schools around

---

\(^1\) The reader is referred to Figure 10 in Chapter 4 for a map of these locations.
the Kaikoura area). Furthermore, they all live outside the town boundaries, so they do not meet each other often.

Apart from work, but also underlying some of these work divisions, are divisions based on religion, family history, and geography.

**Religion**

Underlying the divisions in the farming community, between the farming community and the whalers, and between Māori and Pākehā in Kaikoura was a difference of religion. These differences linger today. The Catholic Church has been (and is) influential in the Pākehā community. For three interviewees, their observation of the influence of the Catholic Church was connected with a comment that the majority of the Council were Catholics (a point I later found was true). One interviewee explained this by saying:

... *the Catholic community has a huge vote and they vote for their own kind.*

Similarly, one older informant mentioned:

*When the chips are down, the Catholics stick together.*

This perception that Catholics run the community has some truth to it, especially when it is considered that, according to the last census, only 15.9 percent of the community identify themselves as Catholic. However, this assessment of Catholics voting for their own kind is a little simplistic.

According to King (1997), the Catholic Church instils a strong sense of community in its congregation and, for many in the Catholic community, this translates into working voluntarily in various organisations within the community. It is a natural progression for people with a history of voluntary work to move into local politics. Their involvement in community groups means that they are known in the community, and their capacities are known, so people vote for them. For many of these people, serving on the Council is seen as another form of community service. The non-Catholics on the Council are similarly motivated and have a similar history in community groups. It seems likely that doing community service activities is something that can be passed down through families, so that those involved may no longer consider the church an influence on their participation. However, the values the church once taught may still remain and still influence people today. These patterns illustrate how historic patterns can remain in a system even when the original influence weakens.
Catholicism is also an important aspect of the Māori community in Kaikoura today. According to local informants, approximately two-thirds of the children at the local Catholic primary school are Māori, a high proportion given that only 14.9 percent of the community are Māori. The Catholic Church also played a part in the development and building of Takahanga Marae. A workshop run by the Church helped local Māori begin building a central meeting place from which they could then begin to work on the social and economic development issues that they faced as a group.

**Family History**

Many Kaikoura people talk about ‘local locals’, that is, people from families who have been in the area for a few generations, who can trace their family history back to the first settlers. Clear evidence of the importance of local history lies in the fact that all except one of the interviewees who had a long Kaikoura family history began their interview by outlining their family history. The only one who did not begin that way told me about it later in the interview. Knowing people’s history in the area was something that gave some Kaikoura residents a sense of stability and pattern, as illustrated by the following comment made by a male who could lay claim to a very long family history in Kaikoura.

*You stopped and talked on a Friday night and everyone chatted with everyone, everyone knew everybody else’s family history and where they belonged in society. There’s a very hierarchical structure and things like that and of course that’s all breaking down.*

This breaking down of what this man calls local structure is only likely to add to the loss of stability and control that some groups of locals were already feeling as a result of restructuring and the development of tourism in Kaikoura. Family structures in Kaikoura are still an important part of life in the area. Even now, locals who were born in Kaikoura, or whose parents moved to the area, are not seen to have quite the same roots there (nor the same status) as the ‘local locals’.

**Who is a local?**

*Well there are degrees of being a local . . . there are quite a few ‘local locals’ whose family have lived here since the settlers, and looking at the tourist industry, not many of those local locals are in it . . .*

Thus, there are degrees of ‘localness’ that afford the holders of it some form of legitimacy in community affairs. Newcomers apparently have less right to cause change in the town or introduce new developments or businesses.
Oh I think so because whenever you bring out a new scheme people are suspicious of it – when a new idea comes forward there's the great Kiwi clobbering machine immediately gets into action, only its a very efficient Kaikoura clobbering machine and, you know, who do they think they are – they've only been here ten minutes and they're wanting to do so and so. You see you've got to be here about 18 years before people even notice you're in Kaikoura.

[...] I mean I remember my father saying to me – I said 'who are those people?' and he said 'Oh, I don't know,' he said, 'they're new people – they're something to do with railways I think.' I found out they'd been here about 18 years but as far as he was concerned they were new people and he didn't know them very well.

These quotes illustrate the points that knowing your family links was, and still is, an important part of knowing someone in the community. However, I argue that this 'knowing' may only have been relatively superficial and really represented a form of labelling along the lines of ‘you belong to this family, so you are this kind of person, and you should be treated this way.’ Likewise, for people used to knowing an individual’s family history, not knowing a person or their family history may make locals uncertain about how to deal with that person. This may be a reason why it can take a long time to be accepted in Kaikoura.

Being able to claim a family history in the area affords people status, and presents a way of dividing the community. As a local school teacher said:

There is quite a bit of competition between the 'blow-ins' and the old families who have been here for generations.

These and other statements like them indicate that this division can be used to differentiate groups from each other, and to defend one’s position in those groups. Since tourism has brought with it new people, with new ideas, this community division appears to have become more important when people discuss tourism. This discussion illustrates how community divisions can be accentuated by the way people highlight differences between themselves and others in the community.

As illustrated in the quotation above, this same pattern was evident at the time the railway was built during and after the war. At that time, many new families came into the area to take up jobs with this new transport medium. Until the 1980s, these people were considered to be the ‘blow-ins’ and some of them still talk about that, sometimes with a degree of bitterness.

There is also a split between town and country, which can be seen as similar to the family history divisions. The town originally developed as a service centre for farming
and fishing in the area. Later, many people came to the area to build and service the railway line (completed in 1945) and the road, and they took up residence in the town (Sherrard, 1966). Thus, the country/town split is underlain by the division between the ‘old families’ and a set of ‘newcomers’ and a division between the way these groups make their living. The loss of government departments from the area meant that many townspeople left the area in the 1980s, and the subsequent development of tourism, which has brought a new group of people into the town, has accentuated this particular cleavage. In this context, therefore, tourism is having similar effects to those that the development of the railway had on the town during the 1950s.

Another group of even lower status on the ‘localness’ scale are the people who have holiday homes (or baches) in the area. Kaikoura is a coastal town to which a few New Zealanders have always come during the summer for the many fishing, swimming and diving opportunities in the area.

Over time, some bachowners retired, chose to upgrade their bach to a house and moved into the area permanently. There is a concentration of these people in South Bay and Peketa, which remain geographically separate from the main town. Many of these people are ex-tradespeople with a passion for boating and fishing. They are seen as separate from the longer-term residents of the area. Some of this is because they do not move into the area until they are in their 60s, so they are unable to make up time in service clubs or sports clubs. This is not to say that they are not active in sports and service clubs; they are. However, because they do not have the personal history in the community, they have few links with the younger community, even though they have a strong community of their own.

Interestingly, these retirees use a similar language to that of the longer-term residents to differentiate themselves from those who only visit the area. In South Bay, residents distinguished between bachowners (or loopies) and residents or ‘permanents’, with ‘permanents’ having the higher status as illustrated by the comments of this retiree – a previous bachowner.

*I mean the bachowners are part of the locals are they?*

_Yeh (hesitation) um, I had the figures on how many are bachowners and it's about half and half permanents and loopies as we call them. Well they come up for their three weeks holiday and you know they go loopy - they're in and out of the water with their boats ten times a day._
Despite such statements, retirees are aware that they were once in the same position as the people whom they are consigning to a lower status. They are also aware that they need the cooperation of the bach-owning holidaymakers for political purposes. It is the permanents, therefore, who organise the South Bay Residents' Association and they enlist the help of the 'loopies' so that they can work together politically to raise Council awareness of issues in South Bay.

As might be imagined, these patterns can make living in Kaikoura difficult for some groups of people. In particular, professional people such as teachers and council staff can find living in Kaikoura difficult. As a relatively recent female arrival involved with the local school observed:

*It can be quite difficult to come into this community – as they like to categorise you here and if they can't, they get a bit difficult!*

She continued:

*The people that run the netball, the rugby are continually being picked at - normal for small very isolated communities. If you stick your head up you'll get it shot off until you've established yourself and I find now that most people will think twice before they have a go at me – but when I first arrived – the first 6 months was like a honeymoon then it became like a sport and everything turned to custard – the 'blow-in' mentality – gone through all that and feel that I have established myself but you are always fighting a rear guard action because of your position in the town.*

Similarly a member of the council staff said:

*I like living here but sometimes I'm made to feel an outsider and I find that hard. It's a nice relaxing place and the natural environment is a calming influence. I think I like being more anonymous. Being in the limelight can be difficult. Problems with my position at Council are that it's quite high profile, so I'm watched a lot and commented on. If it has been a rough day I will avoid going down town.*

Another group that find Kaikoura difficult are young people:

*I think people my age, mostly when you leave school you want to get out – they've just had enough of small-town syndrome and they get out [...]*

*So what exactly is the small-town syndrome?*

*Its just when everyone knows each other, knows what you do, knows everything that happens – just gossip – that sort of thing [...] – you don't realise that it happens til you get to a certain age and the all of a sudden you know that people know things about you and you think oh how do they know that? Till about 15–16 you don't realise that happens and as soon as you hit that age then – you learn to live with it but its [...] just not very nice.*
Gossip can be particularly problematic when it is not correct. In a town like Kaikoura where ‘grudges are passed down’ through the generations, people can know enough to be able to identify a person, but not know them well. In such an environment, it is easy for people to misinterpret an individual’s actions and for the gossip associated with that to have a negative effect on that individual:

There is a tremendous lot of gossip, picking and downright lies that go round the community about various people. People here make a lot of incorrect assumptions and there is a gossip machine in action.

Such situations means that people can find life in Kaikoura very difficult at times. These underlying patterns of interaction are important in understanding the problems that the Kaikoura community faces in managing problems and conflicts that arise. Many of these conflicts are underlain by conflicts that have their origins in the divisions and tensions I have just discussed. Part of understanding the patterns surrounding tourism, then, is understanding the ways in which people in Kaikoura talk about and interact with other groups within the community.

How do people talk about Kaikoura divisions?

What makes these divisions important is not that they exist, but the way in which they are used and discussed in relation to points of tension. The implication that newcomers have no right to change things in the local area is a case in point. This can make it difficult for some newcomers and is one of the reasons why council staff and schoolteachers can find it difficult to live in Kaikoura. These are people who arrive with ideas or training different from those of the ‘local’ locals. The example where the speakers differentiate themselves from people they identify as Catholics is similar, and is used to complain about the activities of others. Of course, people also complain about the ‘local’ locals at times, too, as illustrated above.

This discourse of differentiation is one found in other conflict situations (Ibarra & Kitsuse, 1993). It provides a way for people to differentiate themselves from those whom they oppose and, in this case, to build themselves some high moral ground. However, some of the discourse implies a sense of powerlessness over the change that these other people apparently cause. When speaking like this the speakers place themselves as a victim of circumstances beyond their control, a situation that can prevent them from taking any constructive action to change the outcomes of potential changes. What action they may take is more likely to involve confronting other people.
rather than the problem itself. Here again is another reinforcement loop, illustrated in
Figure 19. The more one blames others for one’s problems, the less likely one is to
explore the issue in any depth to work out how to take constructive action. Not taking
constructive action is only likely to increase a sense of powerlessness, which then
results in less action. The powerlessness, maintains the outrage towards the other
people, and hence the need to maintain a sense of distance and difference from those
who are blamed for the speakers’ problems. Likewise, continually blaming others for
one’s problems may mean that much energy goes into processes of conflict, which
diverts attention away from the issue at hand making it less likely that a constructive
way forward can be found.

Figure 19: Reinforcement loop – how community division can prevent constructive adaptation.

I want to emphasise here that I am not arguing that people should not feel outraged by
the actions of others. However, people speaking from powerless positions such as these
do not usually go on to address the issue in hand constructively. The implication is that
the other person or people ought to change what they do and the speaker cannot do
anything. A lack of constructive action is not a useful adaptive response to change.¹

Of course, not everybody speaks with these patterns. In fact, the patterned nature of
discourse requires that there are other patterns, which play in concert with these ones.
Another discursive form implies that others are unreasonable, irrational or wrong and,
therefore, should be ignored. Likewise, individuals may try to exercise a form of direct
control by behaving in a very confrontational way (We have seen both of these forms in
the debate on genetically modified organisms in New Zealand, for example). Such

¹ I am not arguing that changing patterns of interaction is easy, however, recognising this pattern is the
only way to change it.
confrontation also implies a level of powerlessness because confrontational people are usually reacting against decisions and processes already in place. In their confrontation, they may inadvertently act to maintain the status quo, either by acting too late, or by annoying those who may have supported their stand. In Kaikoura, for example, the confrontational behaviour of two different individuals seemed to undermine the support of those who actually had similar opinions. Their confrontational behaviour focused mostly on the wrongs of others, which made people feel that the two individuals in question were just repeating their antipathy in a loud and unreasonable way. Strong patterns of apathy, intolerance and confrontation, therefore, are indicative of communities or groups struggling to work together constructively.

It is interesting to note that these patterns can change – for example in times of disaster like the 1997 floods, in which water came down through Kaikoura, damaging the museum and the central business district in the town. At this time, the community pulled together to deal with the consequences of the flood. Effectively, the floods provided a strong focal point around which people could take action in a concerted way, a fact that is appreciated by many who refer to this situation when discussing how close-knit the community is. In sudden disasters like this, it is clear what action to take and what the community as a whole want to achieve. Such events are also limited temporally. However, in many situations, change is slower and more complex, there is less agreement about what should happen, and the community has to learn new ways of thinking and acting in order to adapt successfully. In these situations, community fragmentation appears to have a significant, negative effect. Such complex change appears to have the potential to accentuate the divisions, whereas more concrete and comprehensible changes such as a flood appear to lessen those divisions.

A similar pattern of division occurred in relation to the changes in fisheries management outlined in Chapter 5. Differentiation here was based on the history of different groups in the local area. Some fishers blamed the newcomers for the changes in fisheries management and felt that they benefited from those changes at the expense of local fishers who had been fishing in the area for decades. This particular discourse also reflects a sense of powerlessness. However, it could be argued that this powerlessness arose because some long-term local fishers had little understanding of the changes that were going on in the wider world of fisheries management. According to informants, they were either not able, or not willing, to engage with information that would have improved their understanding of changes in fisheries management and how that might
affect them as fishers in Kaikoura. This example illustrates that understanding economic, political and social processes external to the community are an important part of people’s ability to take action and adapt. Learning, then, is central to adaptation, particularly in complex situations.

These ways of talking about other groups and using them as a basis for assigning rights makes the divisions in Kaikoura more important than similar divisions in Rotorua. In Rotorua, similar divisions exist, but they are not used to dismiss the views of others, or to explain their problems. This is not to say that Rotorua people never blamed, confronted, or dismissed the views of others, but that the patterns were less predominant in general conversation.

In Kaikoura, complaints about the negative impact of tourism are often associated with other groups in the local community rather than just with tourists. Many studies focus on the interaction of hosts and guests, or on variables such as tourist density, where hosts live, or how they perceive the benefits and costs of tourism. Doing this may miss some important local dynamics that impact on the well-being of the community and therefore on that community’s ability to adapt to tourism.

**Rotorua Patterns and Structure**

With a population of 67,000, Rotorua is too big to have all the characteristics of a small town, and yet many residents feel that it does have many of those characteristics. As one interviewee put it;

... *it’s a small-town mentality. I mean, a lot of the issues about parking in this town are to do with the fact that people want to park outside the shop as you would in a small town. And it’s a terribly gossipy town – I mean, we had [some problems] last year and it felt like the whole town was talking about it.*

It is worth noting, however, that the community of people amongst which this person moves would be quite small relative to the size of the whole town. Her feeling that the whole town was talking may indicate only that they were people whom she did not know well, but with whom she may have shared some closer friends.

People who have lived in the Town for a few years feel that the community is very interlinked, particularly within the Māori community. As one informant put it:

*Rotorua is a very interrelated place – when you start talking about it to people, everyone has relations here. It is a very small town. My partner has a nephew*
that works at MACI, a niece who does concerts, a cousin working at Tamaki Tours and a nephew that works at Skyline...

It appears that like every other community in the country, there are residents with high standing in the area who are seen as important in the running of the Town. Some respondents mentioned the presence of old families – families that have been important in the Town for several generations. Others talked about the role of money and position:

_This Town is driven socially by a very small group of people who are on the top of the mound if you like. They are the people with money. They are people with position. They own big companies or they are successful professional people. But they put a lot back into the community as well. They are the people who organise charities... and arts events..._

While this quotation suggests some kind of hierarchy, it was not one that any other informant discussed. Nor was it used as a means to differentiate those others from the speaker in the same way as people spoke of different groups in Kaikoura. The only time that this happened in Rotorua was in discussions of Māori – Pākehā relations. For example, a few Pākehā interviewees complained that the balance of power had gone too far in favour of local Māori who, they felt, had an unfair advantage over most Pākehā.

Overall the Rotorua community appeared less fragmented than the community in Kaikoura. In terms of tourism, it appeared that many groups in the area are ‘flying in formation’ with each other in terms of tourism management. The tourism industry as a whole appeared to be able to work constructively together to improve tourism in the area, despite the fact that they still faced differences of opinion. However, an issue of concern to many in the community are the problems associated with unemployment and poverty. The next few sections look at the issues of unemployment and poverty in Rotorua. These problems are associated with tourism in a number of different ways including problems of crime, the causes of poverty and the focus of local agencies trying to mitigate the effects of poverty and its associated unemployment. It is likely that the kind of work that the Council has done in getting a very fragmented, competitive tourism industry to work together, might also have application in managing some of the other social issues that the community faces.

**Unemployment, poverty and council response**

Interviews and past research (for example, Hill Young Cooper, 1997) indicated that unemployment was of considerable concern to the Rotorua community. In spite of their
long association with tourism in the area, the Māori community in Rotorua had an unemployment rate of 20 percent in 1996 (the time of the last census before the research was undertaken. This figure was significantly higher than the New Zealand unemployment rate for Māori (17.5 percent). It was also considerably higher than the 9.6 percent unemployment rate for the District as a whole. Furthermore, the Rotorua District had higher unemployment than the country as a whole (that is, 9.6 percent compared with 7.7 percent) (APR Consultants, 1998a).

In the census prior to the time of research, Rotorua also compared unfavourably with the New Zealand average on indicators of poverty (Rotorua District Council, 1998a). Key findings of a Rotorua District Council report on poverty in Rotorua are that, at the time of the 1996 census:

- 21.5 percent of families in the Rotorua District were single parent families as compared with the national average of 15.7 percent.
- 8.3 percent of households in the area had no telephone as compared with 4.9 percent across New Zealand. The figure is as high as 31 percent in one area unit.
- The average annual household income was $1200 lower than for New Zealand as a whole. In the lower socio-economic areas of Rotorua, the mean household income in three suburbs was around $28,000 when the mean New Zealand income was around $45,000.
- 15 percent of dwellings are 'high occupancy' 1 dwellings as compared with a national average of 13.1 percent.
- 12 percent of all households had no motor vehicle as compared with 11.5 percent across New Zealand (high, considering the lack of cheaper forms of public transport in Rotorua).
- 36.7 percent of Rotorua people aged 15 or over have no formal academic qualifications as compared with the national average of 34.7 percent.

---

1 Dwellings defined as high occupancy in this report (Rotorua District Council, 1998) were:
- Single bedoomed dwellings with 3 or more occupants
- 2 bedroomed dwellings with 5 or more occupants
- 3 bedroomed dwellings with 7 or more occupants
- any other dwelling with 8 or more occupants
• As a mean of all area units\(^1\) in the Rotorua area, overall higher levels of deprivation as defined by the NZDep96 index (6.4 points) when compared with the mean for New Zealand (5.5 points). Fourteen of 39 area units (36 percent) had a deprivation score of nine or ten (ten being the most deprived). Furthermore, although the average deprivation score for the District improved between 1991 and 1996, the most highly deprived areas in 1991 actually increased their level of deprivation. In other words, the 'trickle-up' effect so commonly described between centres of capital and their peripheries (see for example Keller, 1987; Schlotjes, 1993; Pearce, 1993), occurred within the community in Rotorua and the poor got poorer between 1991 and 1996, while the rich got richer. Trickle up, or centre-periphery patterns therefore appear to work in a series of fractals: we can see these patterns of capital working globally, nationally, regionally and locally. This is not unlike the patterns that Chrystaller (1966 cited in Haggett, 1983 & Openshaw & Turner, 1998) suggested in his work on Central Place Theory.

Māori were disproportionately represented in these figures. According to Barbara McClelland of the Social Policy Unit of the Council, Rotorua Māori like other Māori around the country were disproportionately affected by the events associated with economic restructuring (outlined in Chapter 5 of this thesis). Another informant felt that the loss of land that some Māori suffered as a result of the development of the local airport was also part of the cause of the problem. While the Council provided housing for those Māori who had to move, it seems that the group lost a central part of its focus. Added to the effects of restructuring, this group is now in a situation of considerable deprivation.

However, other groups also appear in the deprivation figures outlined above. Mirroring the fortunes of Māori around New Zealand, the Rotorua area units with the greatest levels of deprivation contained the highest proportion of Māori. These were also the areas where unemployment and the incidence of crime were highest according to two police informants. Similarly, a Rotorua policeman mentioned that about 70 percent of the criminals that they deal with are Māori, a very high percentage considering that they were only 30 percent of the overall population in Rotorua.

---

\(^1\) There are 39 area units defined by Statistics New Zealand in the Rotorua Region.
According to Hill Young Cooper (1997) and interview informants from this research, there was considerable concern within the community about the increasing gap between rich and poor. Many see this as an issue that Council should be working on, and it was something that the Council was beginning to address by creating a Community and Social Policy Committee.

At the time of the research, the Rotorua District Council had no community development officer. Such a position did exist during the 1980s, but once Central Government stopped funding it, the community development role was terminated. Some community informants felt that this happened because the community development worked and encouraged more groups to participate in local political processes, which, in turn, made Council's job more difficult as more demands were made on local resources. Since councils are not obliged to be involved in community development work and there was no longer any funding for it, it would have been relatively easy to stop the community development. However, many in the community feel that the Council did need to be involved in work with a social focus.

In answer to this concern, the Council set up the Social Policy Unit in the early 1990s. This need arose particularly as a result of restructuring and the (continuing) loss of social services provided by Central Government. The Social Policy Unit is charged with social monitoring – providing research about the community in Rotorua. An example is a recently completed project that looked into the needs and wants of youth (Rotorua District Council, 1999a, b), a project that resulted in the development of a youth festival that took place in the Town for the first time in September 2000.

Similarly, they have published summaries of census data related to poverty in Rotorua (Rotorua District Council, 1998 a, b & c) and on health services in the area (Barbara McLelland, 2000, Pers. comm.)

It is difficult to assess the position of the Social Policy Unit within Council. Certainly, at the time of the research, the Social Policy Unit was isolated geographically from the rest of Council, so that there were few opportunities for this social monitoring work to be disseminated informally around other Council units. Other council units are not even aware of the work of the Social Policy Unit and those that are do not always see how that information can help them achieve their objectives. An example of this was that the Economic Development Group who have a focus on reducing unemployment in Rotorua appear to feel that neither the data produced by the Social Policy Unit, nor the
understanding of its staff could be a useful part of successful economic development planning. For example, tourism in Rotorua is seen as a way of increasing employment for unskilled workers. However, whether tourism can help ‘fix’ many of the problems of poverty, undereducation, and unemployment that afflict the Māori community, in particular, is open to question. Poverty is not a simple absence of money or jobs. It is a complex social-political-economic process, which implies that focusing only on developing jobs does not address the problems of poverty.

The processes of poverty

Poverty is sometimes viewed as a condition, but like many social structures it is perhaps best viewed as a set of interacting reinforcement loops and fractal patterns in which patterns of capital echo throughout the economic system and are maintained by a number of associated social-psychological processes. Belenky et al. (1986:160), who studied the effects of life experience and education on the world views of women, noted that their work with individuals from areas with low socio-economic status reflected the work of other social researchers. They wrote:

*Family psychiatrist Salvador Minuchin and colleagues (1967) depict a pattern of family life amongst the urban poor that is remarkably similar to the pattern that we found in these families among the rural poor. They describe disorganized slum families unable to withstand the demoralizing and shattering effects of poverty. The children tend to be action-oriented, with little insight into their own behaviours or motivations. Since they do not expect to be heard, and if heard, they expect no response, the volume of their voices is more important than their content. They lack verbal negotiating skills and do not expect conflicts to be resolved through non-violent means.*

*Families that are relegated to the bottom of the social class structure are often shaken by the collapse of an outmoded way of life. Values, symbol systems, and patterns of communication are torn asunder. Parents feel they have lost their way and have nothing to teach.*

This means that little teaching goes on and families in poverty have less chance of learning how to participate in activities with others. These comments indicate why violence is often associated with poverty and how poverty can undermine the confidence of individuals, since they have little or no sense of control over their world. It may be possible to avoid or mitigate some of the consequences of poverty where there are strong communities (see for example Berno, 1995). However, where poverty is ‘new’ as in some parts of New Zealand society in the 1990s, communities in poverty are more likely to be fragmented for the reasons outlined above.
One of the main ways in which communities are maintained is through the associations and interactions that occur when individuals go out to work (Fukuyama, 1995). This is supported by reflecting on the importance of work in understanding the divisions within the Kaikoura community. Also, the development of strong community requires trust in others. It is difficult for trust to exist in situations where individuals have little or no understanding of the processes affecting them. In such situations, according to Belenky et al. (1986), many of these people are not even aware of themselves enough to articulate opinions that most of us would take for granted – for example, on how to judge right from wrong. This, of course, makes it difficult to engage these people in research about tourism or about any other aspect of their lives.

Poverty is another positive reinforcement loop (as illustrated in Figure 20) Like other forms of social structure, once it has emerged, it affects individual behaviour patterns, which then perpetuate the social structures that 'hold' people in poverty, and so on. Poverty is, therefore, a complex problem connected with such issues as housing, identity, stereotyping, self confidence, health, and education (see for example Philp, 1999).

Figure 20: The poverty cycle as it appears to work in Rotorua
Poverty has implications for the community as a whole. First, through the processes outlined above, poverty tends to weaken communities. Second, in large towns, it may be easy for the rich to avoid seeing these problems because they are separated spatially from them. In small towns, however, it is more difficult to ignore the problems of crime and violence that accompany poverty. Thus, the relatively small size of Rotorua compared with other New Zealand cities increases the community’s awareness of unemployment, poverty and its associated problems. In addition, the poverty figures outlined above indicate that these problems are greater than average in Rotorua. Third, the racial patterns associated with poverty reinforce racist attitudes when some community members focus on race as the problem rather than poverty. People who focus only on the local problem may not see that these patterns are similar across a wide range of other communities around the world and depend on poverty rather than race. Fourth, these are difficult problems to solve once significant numbers of people live in conditions of poverty because of what is referred to as the ‘poverty cycle,’ outlined below.

This positive reinforcement loop indicates that a singular focus on unemployment, welfare and health services, or education are unlikely to ‘fix’ these problems. While decreasing employment opportunities would appear to be a causal factor in the development of poverty, it is not just a case of reversing the trend. Increasing the number of jobs in tourism, for example, is unlikely to be helpful to an individual with little confidence, little experience of turning up to work on time, and with few communication skills. It might be more important to begin at the ‘grassroots’ by working with people in poverty to help them begin to participate in their own solutions. This might include working to support families or developing community projects that help people get to know each other in a work like situation. This is easier said than done. However, developing jobs, without also developing a community’s capacity to do those jobs, will mean that the jobs go to outsiders rather than improving the fortunes of those already in the area. Building the capacity of people to participate in helping themselves is a slow and difficult process, but one which can build positive reinforcement loops of success. Trying to help them only materially, from the outside only accentuates their already powerless position in society and contributes little to building the perceived efficacy of these groups.
Hence, family support and community development in its broadest sense are, arguably, an important tool that councils have in dealing with the problems of poverty. From this perspective, it can be argued that community development ought to have a higher priority than economic development for local councils in addressing poverty. There is no legislative requirement for councils to be involved in either economic or community development. However, many councils do support some form of economic development and some also do community development work. The above discussion suggests that economic development without some kind of community development may not have all the effects that communities are looking for from encouraging business investment. Certainly, addressing economic development issues without addressing a community’s capacity to take up new opportunities will mean that poverty and its associated problems, such as poor health and high crime, remain.

Tourism and poverty

Tourism is considered to be a way to deal with the problems of unemployment and crime in Rotorua. It seems unlikely, however, that tourism will directly help individuals living in poverty without some other form of intervention. It is considered a good supplier of unskilled jobs, but good interpersonal skills are necessary for most tourism-related jobs. People without confidence, good interpersonal and timekeeping skills are unlikely to work satisfactorily in such a service industry. These ideas are supported by survey data, which indicate that most people working in tourism in Rotorua have secondary or tertiary qualifications (see Table 11).

Table 11: Age Group by Qualifications of those saying they are employed in tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Age Groups (N=500)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/ unspecified</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>14 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>13 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>11 (55%)</td>
<td>19 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no evidence in these figures that tourism employs good numbers of unskilled workers, even though in Rotorua it does employ a significantly greater proportion of Māori than Pākehā (Horn et al., 2000). Considering that a relatively high proportion of Māori are employed in tourism and that a disproportionate number of Māori have to
contend with poverty, and low education levels, one might expect that the figures would show a higher number of less qualified people employed in tourism.

**Māori – Pākehā Relations**

Linked to patterns of poverty are patterns associated with race and culture. The high proportion of Māori living in poverty in New Zealand mean that patterns associated with poverty can be mistaken for Māori patterns of behaviour. Both communities showed a clear division between Māori and Pākehā. This section discusses the patterns associated with this division.

At the present time in both communities, the relationships between Māori and Pākehā are changing as a reflection of larger national level processes of change. The last two decades have brought tensions between Māori and Pākehā into sharper focus. Pākehā New Zealanders have not previously had to face cultural difference directly. Until the 1960s, Māori with strong Māori identities lived in rural areas and did not often come into direct contact with most Pākehā who lived in cities. Moreover, Māori who first moved into urban areas were encouraged by the social policies of the time to assimilate to Pākehā ways, so many of them became ‘Europeanised’ (King, 1992; Walker, 1992). Pākehā were able to believe that New Zealand had the best race relations in the world, when in fact that relationship was one of almost complete domination, and relied on Māori losing or denying their cultural identity. As more Māori have migrated into urban areas they have begun to rebuild and reassert that identity. The Māori protest groups of the 1970s indicated the beginning of the changes that resulted from Māori urban migration and the problems that arose with that for Māori. Since that time Māori have been working through processes like those of the Waitangi Tribunal to reassert their rights under the Treaty of Waitangi. Developments such as urban Marae, the rebuilding of Marae in rural areas, Kohunga Reo¹, Māori Immersion schools, and the rise of Māori music, kapahaka², are a few examples of the work that Māori are doing to support their cultural identity. These changes have not occurred in New Zealand alone. They have been accompanied by an international indigenous renaissance (Davis & Partridge, n.d.; Yellow Bird, 1999) and the development of closer relationships between different groups of indigenous people from around the world, as evidenced by

---

¹ Māori language preschools.
² Māori cultural performance
international gatherings and conferences both here in New Zealand and overseas on topics such as indigenous knowledge, indigenous rights and ethnobotany, to name a few.

The renaissance of Māori culture and identity and their calls for more bicultural processes appear to have made life uncomfortable for many New Zealand Pākehā who, ironically, find they are uncertain about their own cultural identity (King, 1999). It is possible to argue also that Pākehā have largely been unaware of the differences between the cultures, based on observations in a range of settings. On occasions, Pākehā mentioned that their awareness of their own ignorance of Māori culture and protocols can make communication uncomfortable.

On the surface, it appears that Māori have made political gains and that institutions have to consult with Māori more than has previously been the case. However, access to greater consultation is only a small part of self-determination. My experience of talking with Māori in both communities showed the extent to which those Māori with resources feel that they must work to improve the lives of their people. Crime, poverty, low education, and the drug and alcohol problems associated with such conditions are much greater for Māori than for Pākehā. In addition, Māori I spoke to feel that there is much work to be done in increasing the capacity of young Māori to participate effectively in politics and management, which is, in itself, no mean feat. It requires finding ways to increase the number of Māori achieving self-confidence, high levels of education and understanding of political processes. These necessary activities are even more difficult because of the economic position of Māori and the ways in which patterns of poverty work against these outcomes.

There will always be some tension associated with negotiating biculturalism or even multiculturalism. Despite these changes occurring at national level, the fortunes and history of Ngai Tahu and Te Arawa are quite different so the relationships between Māori and Pākehā in each community differ significantly. Furthermore, one must also acknowledge the efforts being made by people to improve these relationships in both Rotorua and Kaikoura through a range of social and political channels.

Kaikoura

In Kaikoura, there is a wide range of views in the community about Māori – Pākehā relations. People I spoke to at Takahanga Marae felt strongly that they were
marginalised by the larger Pākehā community and they often mentioned the racism that they saw in the wider community. My notes from conversations I had with many people at the Marae read:

*I have been struck by all the conversations that I have had up at the Marae by the level of hurt in that community – it goes tremendously deep -- not surprisingly after what they have been through. The act of building the Marae and getting the land for it created a lot of bitterness as people objected to having the Marae there on what was always land used for Marae in the past.*

However, the fact that these objections happened after the amount of work that had been put into raising money for the building was a blow for those trying to improve the fortunes of their people. The negative attitudes of some locals towards the success of local Māori creates a certain level of bitterness amongst Māori in Kaikoura, particularly in the face of the struggle that they had to find the land and the money to build their Marae. Of particular note, was the tenor of some of the objections to the Marae, which implied that some Pākehā locals expected the Marae to be the site of drunken parties and disturbances. To local Māori, it seemed that people in the local community are actively trying to keep them from improving their economic and social status. This point illustrates the difficulty that people of low social status face in trying to improve their status. In this case, however, Kati Kuri managed to build their Marae and have made considerable gains as a community.

In addition, Whale Watch Kaikoura, a business set up by Māori for Māori, was at the time, the centre of some controversy. Many locals were contesting the fact that Whale Watch holds both permits for whale watching in the Kaikoura area and there was a ban on issuing any more permits under the Marine Mammals Protection Act. It seemed that few local people expected the business to be the success that it has been, and that the fact that local Māori managed to do this has, at times, met with a less than enthusiastic response. Certainly this is how it appears to the Māori involved, so it seems as if Pākehā are trying to get in the way of Māori improving themselves.

A few Pākehā say that racism arises from jealousies associated with the changes that local Māori have created by becoming the owners and operators of a very successful business. Through the success of Whale Watch, they are more visible and have more legal status and economic power than they used to. As one Pākehā woman observed:

*There's a real problem with racism here -- no one liked the fact that the Māori were suddenly running a successful Whale Watch business. They were used to Māoris being bums and unsuccessful and liked the fact that they could take the*
high moral ground and look down on them, so when they started to get out of that, there was no high moral ground to stand on any more! Every business makes mistakes but when Whale Watch made mistakes the comments always attributed it to the fact that the Māoris never could get anything right.

Similarly, another woman felt that:

*The fact that Kaikoura's main business – whale watching – is run by Māori successfully cheeses people off.*

Of major importance in changing the status of Māori in Kaikoura is the growing political and economic power of Ngai Tahu and other iwi within the New Zealand context. The growth and management of Whale Watch, has met with community resistance, as would also be expected. Much of the recent growth and development of Whale Watch and the concomitant change in status of Māori, has thus been negotiated outside of the Kaikoura community. An example of this was that Ngai Tahu claimed ownership of the whales as part of their potential settlement with the Crown, which effectively prevented DOC from issuing more whale watching permits. This gave Whale Watch more time to consolidate its position before the next challenge came from people wanting a permit. In this case, the debates about these permits were taken outside the community and negotiated through higher-level agencies. Had this debate occurred only at local level, it may not have culminated in the same results. Another example is the legislative requirements for Government and local government to consult with Māori that emerged at national level. These changes have given Māori greater input to decisions at local level than might have been the case had these changes had to develop within the community.

In response to recent moves by Māori requiring the Government to acknowledge the Treaty of Waitangi there is now a requirement in much New Zealand legislation requiring consultation with Māori. The requirement that Māori be consulted in local planning processes has increased the political power of Kati Kuri at local level. These changes represent an improvement on past practice, and they may not have been so quickly achieved had these negotiations occurred only at local level. However, that these changes have occurred at national legislative levels has meant that some Pākehā feel that they have been kept out of the process of negotiating a new relationship with Māori.

Another factor that contributes to these relationships are the negotiations and debates surrounding the land and fisheries settlement claims. These appear in the media from
time to time, and for many Pākehā, are the main source of information about Māori. This distorts their perceptions of Māori – apart from anything else by making them appear as a single group rather than as a set of individuals, iwi or hapu with different ideas and opinions.

During the Kaikoura research period, the salience of these kinds of claims was high as the Ngai Tahu Claim\(^1\) was settled in 1997 and formally signed in late 1997 at Takahanga Marae.

One Pākehā interviewee’s views of this process were expressed in the following way.

\[I\ have\ a\ few\ beers\ with\ them.\ \text{In\ general\ though, I\ think\ the\ problems\ with\ the}\ \text{race\ relations\ in\ New\ Zealand\ \[pause\]...\ \[we’ve\]\ got\ to\ be\ very\ careful\ I\ think.}\ \text{I\ think\ there\ are\ things\ that\ have\ gone\ wrong\ and\ fair\ enough\ you’ve\ got\ to\ put}\ \text{‘em\ right,\ but\ at\ the\ same\ stage\ \[...\ I\ was\ born\ here,\ my\ parents\ were\ born\ here}\ \text{and\ my\ grandfather\ was\ born\ here.\ We’ve\ got\ some\ rights\ too.}\]

\[...\ \text{as\ long\ as\ its\ fair\ no\ problems.}\ \text{I\ think\ if\ it\ starts\ coming\ to\ the\ stage\ where}\ \text{they’re\ saying\ they\ own\ the\ whales\ or\ the\ dolphins\ or\ whatever\ and\ they\ claim}\ \text{half\ the\ land\ and\ its\ all\ given\ to\ them\ and\ you’ve\ got\ to\ balance\ that –\ that’s\ right}\ \text{through\ the\ whole\ country.}\ \text{I\ think\ we\ work\ very\ well\ here –\ but\ as\ a\ New}\ \text{Zealand\ thing\ I\ think\ there\ is\ a\ big\ issue\ that\ needs\ to\ be\ handled\ properly.}\]

The lack of any obvious local forums for discussing these issues might be seen to add to the division between the two communities.

Despite these changes many people, including Pākehā, say that there is racism in Kaikoura:

\[...\ \text{certainly\ in\ terms\ of\ Māori – Pākehā\ relations,\ this\ town\ has\ to\ be\ the}\ \text{ultimate\ in\ bigoted\ red-necked\ racism.}\]

A young Pākehā woman put it this way:

\[If\ you\ are\ part\ of\ a\ really\ strong\ Māori\ family\ and\ have\ a\ lot\ of\ contact\ with\ the\ \text{Marae\ and\ that,\ then}\ Pākehā\ aren’t\ so\ keen\ to\ become\ involved\ with\ you\ because\ you\ are\ such\ a\ strong\ Māori\ family,\ whereas\ if\ you\ are\ an\ odd\ Māori\ person\ just\ intermingling\ happily\ and\ not\ talking\ about\ your\ culture\ and\ things,\ then\ you\ are}\ \text{accepted\ as\ being\ OK\ because\ you’re\ sort\ of\ a\ white\ person.}\]

This quotation illustrates the reasons why some older Pākehā say that they feel the relationship between the two groups is now more difficult than it was when they were growing up. In the past, and in many situations still, Pākehā culture was taken as the

---

\(^1\) The Ngai Tahu claim was a claim made by that tribe in relation to the Treaty of Waitangi, in which the Crown apologised for past infringements of the Treaty and reparation was negotiated between the two
norm and Māori who mixed with Pākehā tended to adopt those cultural norms as their own – hence they became ‘sort of a white person.’ As Māori reclaim the right to their own cultural norms, the relationship is beginning to become more bicultural. But as noted above, this requires changes from Pākehā as well as from Māori, which creates uncertainty and therefore discomfort about what is the right thing to do in any given situation. What has previously been taken as the norm for both groups no longer holds for either group, but neither are there any clear norms to replace the old relationship forms.

A young Māori woman felt that some young Māori needed to think about their attitudes as much as others, implying that racism is not perpetrated only by Pākehā in the area.

What would you say Māori – Pākehā relations are like in this community?

In the older generations it is good, but in younger generations, it’s not racism, but it’s quite a lot of superiority – its just their attitudes towards people – it’s mainly like the younger Māori generation who think they are superior to anyone in Kaikoura... I’m Māori and I’m proud of it but there are people who just take it too far.

Of course, not everyone agreed that relations are good between the older generations but nevertheless, the interesting thing about this quote is that she is suggesting that perceptions of inferiority and superiority and the ways that these are played out when the different groups mix underlie the relationship problems that manifest as racism.

Some Pākehā feel that they have little contact with Māori in Kaikoura. Long-term residents say that contact has stopped since Takahanga Marae was built, whereas for those new to the area, it is just seen to be because they move in different social circles and, therefore, there do not seem to be the opportunities to socialise with Māori. For Pākehā who were used to socialising with Māori in local hotels, etc., it might well appear that the two communities are now more separated than they used to be. This would appear to be the result of Māori becoming less ‘Europeanised’ as they reassert their cultural identities.

No matter what the cause, Pākehā feel that they are unable to make contact with the Māori community even on their own terms, and Māori on the Marae say that the Pākehā community takes no interest in what is going on there. Many Pākehā said that they had parties. This claim is part of a much bigger claims process in which iwi throughout New Zealand are making claims in relation to the Treaty.
never been invited to visit and they have little idea how to make contact. Some individuals at the Marae counter this by saying that they are busy working for their own people and do not have the energy to put into making contact with the wider community.

This separation may be a necessary phase of development for local Māori. A Pākehā woman put it in terms of abuse relationships. The following are from notes taken from an interview:

\[ P \text{ says there is racism in Kaikoura and it cuts both ways – it is largely caused by ignorance and because of the ignorance there is conflict and maybe some anger – some of it linked to Treaty of Waitangi claims. At the moment, Māori are separating themselves off a little bit – mainly through their involvement with the Marae but } P \text{ sees it as a similar process to recovery from different forms of abuse. When dealing with abuse, the victim has to go away and lick her/his wounds for a while and avoid contact with the abuser, and that's where she sees that Māori are now.}\]

The feelings in Kaikoura arise from a mixture of local level politics and the media debate that is occurring at national level.

At this stage in Kaikoura, as in many parts of New Zealand, the recent debates have chosen to focus both groups on the differences between Māori and Pākehā, in stark contrast to past assumptions that Māori were ‘just the same’ as Pākehā. My own experiences and conversations with others in Kaikoura indicate that an approach that accepts our similarities as human beings, while at the same time, understands that there may be cultural difference is probably the most constructive way through these difficulties.

**Rotorua**

Rotorua people also have differing views of the relationships between Māori and Pākehā. Some individuals (mostly Pākehā) say that the relationship is excellent while others disagree. There appears to be some tension between the two communities that is denied because Rotorua depends on the veneer of a good relationship between Māori and Pākehā. As one Pākehā informant put it:

\[ \ldots \text{ on the surface, they seem to work together but, in actual fact, I believe that they operate quite separately} \ldots \text{ there are over 50 marae in the Rotorua District and I don't believe that most Pākehā people have been to any other than the tourist ones.} \ldots \]
Rotorua depends on the veneer of biculturalism without the hassles and Rotorua accepts that this is what makes the Town work. So that's what everybody does—Māori and Pākehā. They just sit on the lid and every now and again somebody... will come along and give the lid a good kick and everybody gets worried until it all settles down again.

This split between the two groups is also reflected spatially around the Town. As another respondent noted:

At our [children’s] school, we would have maybe nine percent Māori and there are 30-35 percent in the Town, and I think that the Māori who live in [our area] have quite different views from the ones I know... I think Māori who are more in tune with their culture choose not to live there—they choose to live in places like Rotoiti or out at Ohinemutu or those kinds of places as a conscious decision... it worries me a lot because I think—I am very strong that racism is about not knowing people personally and the experience for my children is that they've had almost no... contact with Māori children which is extraordinary in a town like this one.

These comments highlight the inherent tension in a bicultural society. Paradoxically, to live successfully in a bicultural society individuals need both contact with people from other cultural groups and to be surrounded by their own culture. A strong cultural identity and acceptance of oneself in that culture is required on the one hand, while on the other hand, an understanding and tolerance difference between cultures is important.

Māori in Rotorua appear to be more involved and prominent in the community and its decision making processes than are Māori in many other parts of the country. The Rotorua District Council is making efforts to consult better with local iwi through a range of mechanisms such as the appointment of Māori staff and through setting up the Arawa Standing Committee, which examines a wide range of Council business and policies on a regular basis. Local Māori are also key players in the Integrated Lakes Management Strategy which is currently being developed for the area with inputs from a range of agencies including iwi, the Department of Conservation, the Bay of Plenty Regional Council, and the Rotorua District Council. While these things all represent progress, there are clear indications that Māori feel that they still have some way to go.

Hill Young Cooper (1997:21-22), for example, list the following points that the Māori community identified as problems:

- a lack of recognition of the land and gifts that Te Arawa have bestowed on the Rotorua community. In fact, many of the public recreation areas around the Town are places that were gifted to the City by local iwi.
• a lack of local recognition of Māori ownership of the land and the lakes.
• a desire by the Māori community to have more representation on Council.
• institutional racism, such as the way that the media portray Māori.
• a desire for more self-determination in tourism and tourism-related issues.
• a desire for a greater role in conservation in the local area.
• a need for full and meaningful employment.

Māori are also an important part of tourism in Rotorua, and have been since the beginning of Pākehā settlement. However, even in this sphere, some Māori feel that there is a need for greater self-determination and participation in the decision making processes involved in tourism. The difficulty is that the people most able to participate are those who run successful businesses and who have the personalities to deal with the associated politics. Mike Tamaki, co owner of Tamaki Tours and local personality, is one such individual. Nevertheless, because few Māori own well-established businesses, few are available to participate to any extent in the politics of tourism in Rotorua.

Interim summary

Māori – Pākehā relationships are gradually changing across New Zealand and the effects of these changes are evident in both communities. Patterns of racial tension emerge from these changes since changes in the fortunes of one group affect the fortunes and perceptions of the other, so all involved in these processes have to adapt. An important issue in Māoridom at the current time arises from a period in which activism has been aimed at fighting for justice and Māori rights to be Māori in what has become a Pākehā world. As changes occur, Māori as well as Pākehā must change and learn to work alongside each other rather than in opposition to each other.

‘Working alongside’ does not mean giving up one’s own perspective, nor does it mean imposing that perspective on others. It is a difficult and dynamic balance that shifts and changes with context. What is important is that the processes in place allow both groups to feel represented and to develop an understanding of the other. In many ways, this ‘dance’ reflects my discussion in Chapter 1 of the tension in the research role between having to work alongside my subject matter without either imposing my own view on it, or not engaging with it enough.
This paradox is also reflected at an individual level in understanding individuals and their patterns in relationships. Without a good sense of self and self-acceptance, it is difficult to develop good relationships with others (Dowrick, 1991; Lerner, 2001). The relationships that one forms with others are thus dependent, both on the health of the self, and on learning to tolerate differences in others with whom the self interacts. In the case of cultures, similar patterns appear to exist. On the one hand, if two (or more) cultures are to have a good and equal relationship, they both need to develop a strong awareness of their own identity and what that means. At the same time, they each must develop an awareness and tolerance of difference – a process that requires interaction between cultures and a level of self-awareness or reflexivity at a cultural level.

This example illustrates how the idea of fractal patterns in complex systems may be useful. In this case, psychologists’ understandings of individuals and their interactions with each other may provide some insight into issues occurring between groups or cultures in the same system. Just as individual reflexivity helps one build more successful relationships, it appears that reflexivity at a cultural level is important if there is to be a successful relationship between two cultures. In other words, for biculturalism to work successfully, it is necessary that each cultural group reflect carefully on its own culture and its own assumptions about the world. If each can do this as a culture, they are more likely to succeed in building a constructive relationship, which builds from points of similarity, while respecting points of difference.

The Effect of Community Size on Community Interactions

While the Kaikoura community appeared to be very divided, what I saw of the Māori community there was a group of people who were able to work together very well in pursuit of the common aim of improving the well-being of the Kaikoura Māori community. In Rotorua, it seemed that the opposite pattern might be emerging. While I was not able to spend much time working with local Māori in Rotorua, it appeared from the time that I did spend, that the community suffered at times from similar kinds of fragmentation or division that I saw across the Kaikoura community as a whole. There appear to be similar patterns of family rivalry between different hapu groups as seen in the Pākehā community. Yet, the Rotorua community, as a whole, were doing better in terms of biculturalism and in terms of being able to develop a common vision. It seems, therefore, that where and how one draws the boundaries around a community system
can lead one to see different patterns of interaction. These patterns may have something
to do with the size of a community.

One of the major differences between Rotorua and Kaikoura is their different sizes. As
noted above, size affects how well the researcher can get to know the different groups of
people who make up the community. Community size is an issue for tourism impacts,
because the smaller the size of a resident population, the greater the ratio of visitors to
residents, and the smaller the area in which tourists congregate. Another major effect of
size is the human and financial resources available for managing the physical and social
environment. The larger the community, the more heterogeneous it is and, therefore,
the greater the breadth of human resources available to that community. In addition, a
small place has fewer people to call on when it needs community support for local
projects. It is difficult to say, however, whether on a per capita basis there is much
difference between Kaikoura and Rotorua in terms of the people who put time into
voluntary efforts in their community. Many Kaikoura people put much time into their
work in the community. In Rotorua, however, there are simply more people who are
prepared to do this kind of work and, in a bigger place, there will also be efficiencies of
scale.

Population also affects the financial resources available for local projects. Logically,
this is probably a function of population density so, for example, a council with a few,
small population centres is likely to strike similar problems to a small council with only
one small population centre. In the end, a small population centre still needs to spend
money on setting up infrastructure and this is not always linearly proportional to the
population size. However, this section suggests that tourist-host ratios, and social and
financial resources are not all that is involved in considering the effect of community
size on tourism perceptions and management processes.

As noted earlier in Chapter 6, size affects the ability of local people to recognise each
other as locals. As well as making it possible to recognise people as local or non-local
with reasonable accuracy, in a small place it is possible to know much about the people
who one meets around the local area. Sometimes, however, this knowledge is relatively
superficial. It comes from what an individual knows about another's family or place in
the community, rather than arising from any meaningful personal interaction with that
individual. Knowing this kind of superficial information is important in understanding
how to treat people and what to expect. Not knowing a person’s whakapapa\(^1\) in a small insular community may therefore afford a sense of not knowing them very well. Thus, knowing someone by knowing how they fit into the community, is more about stereotyping or labelling than it is about knowing people personally and, in a small community, it would be easy to interact with them in a stereotypical way.

Stereotypes and the labels associated with these stereotypes have a direct effect on the performance of individuals subject to such things (Adler, 2000). In a small community, being close knit can be a double-edged sword, in that individuals assume that they know each other, when in fact, all they know is the label that an individual has been given. These labels may maintain divisions at the same time as they maintain familiarity. A sense of ‘close knitness’ can therefore exist alongside deep divisions. In addition, it might be more difficult to change oneself in this social environment because there will be so many interactions that act to maintain the status quo.

This may well account for the ‘typical small-town’ feeling, often associated with rigidity, a lack of change and an associated sense of confinement, which many people feel when they live in a community like Kaikoura. People can feel that everybody knows who they are, but they may not know them well as individuals. This can mean that patterns such as the division between Catholics and Protestants or interfamily rivalries can be maintained over many generations. Because the stereotype also affects interactions, this kind of labelling can profoundly affect relationships and interactions within that community. Perceptions of difference may mask the many things that people have in common, particularly in an isolated community, which has relatively little interaction with the outside world.

In comparison, in a large town like Rotorua, it is not possible to recognise such a large percentage of the people who one passes on the street. When a person meets somebody new, they will form opinions only on the basis of the normal visual cues that are used by everyone all the time to judge each other very superficially. As far as possible then, the interaction may be more open to learning about the other as an individual. Where appearance is important, the same kind of stereotyping and labelling may be present, so, for example, one’s gender or race may affect the kinds of interactions that one has with

\(^1\) A New Zealand (Māori) word for family history
others, but other invisible social differences cannot contribute to the initial interactions that one has.

Labelling may also influence interactions in very small communities. However, the very small size of the community creates more need for people to interact more frequently and meaningfully, so stereotyping can lose its power. This is not to say that there will be no intolerance in a very small community, but that it is more likely that people will know both the good and the bad in each other and so be more tolerant than in a larger community. This means that the way in which people label each other mediates interactions and changes the ways in which the community pulls together (See Figure 21).

![Figure 21: Effect of town size on local interactions](image)

It seems, then, that making changes (and therefore community adaptation) might be easier in very small communities of only a few hundred people, where there are fewer networks to ‘hold’ people in particular behaviour patterns and where labelling has less effect. Networks in very small places can accommodate change because enforced, closer acquaintance may not rely so much on a label or stereotype for identification. Similarly, in larger places it may be easier to achieve a level of anonymity, so that there are opportunities to interact with people in a less stereotypical way. Stereotyping is likely to be maintained where a label is clearly visible, such as in the case of race (Māori and Pākehā) or gender. Social patterns associated with appearance may,
therefore, be more difficult to change than those that have fewer cues to inform participants of what ‘should’ happen.

If these ideas hold, then an even greater challenge for moderately small communities will be that the more rigid social structures will reinforce a lesser sense of individual control than will be the case in communities where the social structures may be less rigid. In addition, the greater rigidity of social structure in a moderately small community may make it more difficult for them to adapt to external change than it is for large, or very small communities. The patterns of interaction in a moderately sized community, therefore, appear to be a significant factor in understanding community adaptability. These communities may benefit more than most from interventions such as community development aimed at helping them manage change.

Conclusions

I began the last chapter with the observation that quantitative analyses of residents’ perceptions of tourism simply did not show the kinds of differences that I experienced while spending six months living in each of the two places. I observed that the impacts of tourism seemed much greater in Kaikoura than in Rotorua. However, Kaikoura people are not anti-tourism. They want it. They need it. But it is a point of tension for them. Rotorua people are not greatly positive about tourism, particularly in comparison to Kaikoura – in fact they are quite neutral about it – they profess in large numbers that it really ‘doesn’t affect them.’ The difference seems to centre around emotional response: Rotorua people are not emotional about tourism in comparison to Kaikoura people – who most definitely are. Both communities agree largely on the benefits that they get from tourism, and there is much more variation in what people across both communities assess as the costs. People in both places more frequently name benefits than costs.

It is on the premise that there must be more to the impacts of tourism than the impacts of tourists that I have explored community relationships and processes in the last two chapters. There are clear differences in the ways that the two communities interact with their respective councils and the patterns of interaction that are evident between different groups of residents in the two places. Of particular interest to me, as a social scientist, was the way in which history has affected community structures. Community structures in Kaikoura reflect more rigid, longer lasting and important divisions than
was the case in Rotorua as a whole. It is possible to argue that within the Rotorua Māori community, divisions based on iwi groupings may have the same rigidity and importance within that particular part of the community. However, my own research is not able to confirm this for certain, since it was not something that I explored in any depth while I was there. It is also important to note that racial/cultural differences appear to be maintained in both communities and it seems that it is possible that the visibility of race is the means by which difference is recognised, labelled and therefore maintained.

Kaikoura people project a sense of insecurity about tourism – a sense that they have little control over tourism development, and this reflects the patterns of division within the community. In Rotorua, in comparison, there is a strong sense that no matter what happens in tourism, the industry and the community are able to influence their own destiny. Past experience has shown them that they can adapt quickly and effectively to major difficulties and changes. This confidence is reflected in the ways in which local people talk about tourism.

Kaikoura, as a small town with a small population base, has a more difficult path to tread than does Rotorua. Not only does a larger population confer more financial and human resources, but there appear to be economies of scale from which Kaikoura cannot benefit. In addition, it appears that community cohesion and trust (social capital) is lower in Kaikoura than in Rotorua. There is much less trust in the local council and the community divisions are deeper than is the case in Rotorua. I put this down at least partly to the effect of size. Kaikoura’s small size means that its community behaviour networks are easier to maintain, and more difficult to change, than is the case in the larger centre – Rotorua. While it might be true that a smaller centre could be more adaptable, it appears that, in fact, the Kaikoura community, as it was in 1997, was less adaptable than its larger counterpart, and that fostering cohesion would be more challenging in a town this size. It is unfortunate that this comes on top of the observation that Kaikoura’s small size also makes it more vulnerable to negative impacts from tourism.
Chapter 9

Discussion and Conclusions

This thesis has examined the impacts of tourism in Rotorua and Kaikoura using a number of different standpoints within a complex systems perspective. Initially, my standpoint could be summarised as ‘tourism as something that impacts on communities’ or tourism as something of significant economic importance.’ That view changed into ‘communities as something that interact with tourism’ and ‘tourism as part of ongoing historical change within community complex systems.’ Each of these viewpoints has some validity, and yet each contributes towards our understanding of tourism and its interactions with communities. This chapter reviews the standpoints that have been presented throughout the thesis and further analyses how communities interact with tourism, and how a complex systems perspective might inform future tourism planning and tourism research.

To do this, I summarise the separate but interwoven threads that have appeared throughout the thesis. First, there are the processes of tourism in Rotorua and Kaikoura and the ways in which tourists interact with the characteristics of the destination to influence local perceptions of tourism. Second, I outline the way in which processes of community interact and overlap with tourism to help shape local perceptions of tourism. Third, I look at the implications of a complex systems perspective for research into and
management of tourism in destination areas. Fourth I return to the tourism research perspectives such as the tourist area life cycle that I discussed in my introduction and look at how a complex systems perspective expands on and complements that research approach. In that section I discuss directions for future research.

Perceived Control

The psychological concept of control and perceived control underpins many of my explanations throughout this thesis. It was explained in Chapter 1. People with high levels of perceived control feel that they can participate in community life and know how to do so (although they may choose not to), and tend to talk positively but realistically about the events that affect them. They may not be able to control the world directly, but they are aware of ways in which they can adapt to, and find meaning in, the events that affect them. This means using some form of internal or secondary control. As Lefcourt (1992) points out, this adaptability means seeing that one has choices, no matter how bad the alternatives might seem to be. This choice is often linked to being able to see significant events from different perspectives (Langer, 1989) and to accept what happens as neither completely outside one’s control nor completely within it.

Tourism

There are differences in the ways in which local people interact with tourists in the two places. In Rotorua, tourism interferes much less with the day-to-day lives of locals than it does in Kaikoura because:

- in Rotorua, the recreational area in the central city is separated from the main business district, whereas in Kaikoura, locals and tourists share the same small space.

- the large number of tourist attractions in Rotorua are widely dispersed. They cover an area with a 30 kilometre radius from the central city, while in Kaikoura the three main attractions are within three kilometres of the town centre.

- the tourist-host ratio in Kaikoura at the time of study was ten times higher than that of Rotorua. Thus, while tourists in Rotorua place about 12 percent of demand for infrastructure such as water and sewage treatment, 43 percent of demand in Kaikoura does.
demand for these services comes from visitors to Kaikoura. This puts a much
greater financial load on Kaikoura ratepayers and does not take into account the
extra strain already in place because of the small size of the population and large
area under the jurisdiction of the Kaikoura District Council.

• the ratio of overseas visitors to domestic visitors was also considerably lower in
  Rotorua than in Kaikoura at the time of study. Greater cultural distance between
tourist and host increases the impact of tourism (Berno, 1995). The greater
proportion of international visitors to Kaikoura means that their impact would be
greater than in Rotorua, if all other factors were equal.

• Rotorua people could not distinguish New Zealand visitors from locals, whereas
  in Kaikoura, they were also able to distinguish New Zealand visitors from locals.
  This means that visitors are recognised as such more in Kaikoura than in
  Rotorua, so the potential to associate problems with visitors is, therefore, much
  higher in Kaikoura than in Rotorua. Kaikoura people can blame problems on
tourists since they can more easily identify them, and they see them more often.

These factors make locals' contact with tourists in Rotorua less frequent and more
voluntary — that is, their contact is more under the control of local people. If Rotorua
people choose to go to the café zone or the lakefront, they will meet tourists, but in
these places, tourists actually add interest and ambience. In the course of their everyday
lives, locals do not come into contact with people who are obviously tourists. In
comparison, contact with visitors in Kaikoura is more frequent, more inconvenient,
involves more congestion and crowding, and is more difficult to avoid.

It is not that Kaikoura locals do not like the ambience of tourists in the local cafes.
They do. However, when they are trying to complete errands at the post office, the
bank or the pharmacy, they can find it frustrating to have to deal with large numbers of
people. Overall, Kaikoura locals are less able to control when and where they meet
with large numbers tourists than are Rotorua locals.

**Dependence on tourism**

As Chapter 6 discusses dependence on tourism does affect the perceptions of local
people in Rotorua and Kaikoura. For example, in Kaikoura, tourism is very important
and, as the surveys indicate, people are well aware of the benefits of tourism. However, relying on tourism for the community’s economic well-being means relying on the fortunes of others, and on their propensity to visit the area. This dependence could contribute to a low sense of control over community outcomes, which could worsen the more aware people are of the benefits that tourism confers locally. This sense is conveyed in the comments of people in Kaikoura who talked about being concerned that tourists might stop coming to the area. Thus, the effect of higher dependence on tourism does not necessarily mean a more negative assessment of tourism benefits.

Asking people about how they perceive the benefits of tourism takes no account of the complexity of their interaction with the industry. It may be that because residents see the benefits of tourism, they may feel less safe or secure about relying on an industry that relies on the tastes and whims of others. Small rural communities have a reputation for self-reliance, and it can be argued that this form of dependence could create an even greater sense of insecurity than it would in places where self-reliance was less important to a sense of local identity.

In Rotorua, reliance on tourism may be less of a problem, because as a community the tourism operators have had a long experience of relying on the fortunes of others. They project a much higher level of confidence about their own ability to manage downturns, and they have much collective understanding of tourism as an industry that has ‘ups and downs’. In Kaikoura, that collective experience is not there, and while a few operators are confident in their ability to adapt to whatever comes their way, many in the industry and in the general community project a lower level of perceived efficacy. It is, therefore, possible to suggest that the level of community dependence on tourism is also influenced by the collective community attitude towards change, which is, in turn, influenced by their collective past experience or history.

What can local government do?

It is interesting to consider how local government could take an active role in using these mediating effects to manage tourism. It appears that there is relatively little that a council can do to avoid becoming dependent on tourism, particularly in the case of small councils with relatively few surplus resources at their disposal. There is no consistent evidence that destinations can have any substantial effect on the number of
visitors to the area, or the number of residents that move into or out of the area. They cannot affect the size of their town, except perhaps in a very small way by marketing the area to investors. However, it appears that the actions of councils in peripheral areas have little impact on the movement of capital from peripheral areas to more central (larger) areas of capital. There is, at this stage, no clear way in which a council can quickly affect the way a town is laid out, although this is something that could be encouraged in a long-term strategy. Focusing on the physical impacts of tourism, therefore, yields only limited options for trying to minimise the direct negative impacts of tourism. This is particularly the case when one considers that the negative impacts of tourism are often directly proportional to the benefits of tourism. More tourists create more crowding, but also more money comes from their local spending.

**History and tourism**

Understanding a community's history also offers a way of understanding how its current patterns and processes have developed and are being maintained. Perceptions of tourism in Rotorua and Kaikoura have been directly affected by their different histories. Thus, conceptualising tourism as part of an ongoing historical process offers insights into the impacts of tourism on communities.

Tourism means different things in Rotorua and Kaikoura. In Rotorua, tourism is as old as the town, and it has always been an important economic sector in the area. Rotorua people think of tourism as a tool for ameliorating some of the problems of unemployment that have arisen throughout the years of economic restructuring. Tourism is the one major, local industry that has survived intact throughout the restructuring period. It is also the only sector forecast to increase its employment of local people. Tourism in Rotorua is, therefore, a source of stability. To many locals, it is a familiar and welcome part of the town, which has remained constant throughout a period of considerable social and economic change.

In comparison, tourism in Kaikoura is a much more recent phenomenon. Locals strongly associate it with economic restructuring, when the effects of government policy changed, and new technologies eliminated or changed roles of many residents employed by New Zealand Rail and the fishing industry. Tourism arose from the need created by economic restructuring, the opportunities provided by a growing tourist interest in the
natural environment, and a growing international tourist market. Locals turned to it in some desperation following the demise of their local economic options. In addition, over the 10 to 15 years prior to the time of research, tourism had itself changed the town considerably. From a sleepy fishing village with shops aimed at the local market, it changed to a bustling tourist destination with many cafes and handcraft shops aimed mostly at visitors. Thus, in Kaikoura, tourism is strongly associated with change.

The idea of stability and change are indicative of the ways in which tourism contributes to the sense of control that local people have over their own lives. When tourism is a source of stability, it becomes a tool for achieving more control. When it is a source of change, it confers a lesser sense of control. Seeing tourism as part of a community's ongoing history therefore highlights the fact that the impacts of tourism are mediated by the changes associated with tourism in that particular destination. Each destination has a different history and therefore each destination is likely to have a different set of events and processes associated with tourism.

**Past experiences of dealing with challenge**

A community’s sense of control is affected by historical factors such as the level of community experience and expertise in dealing with the vagaries of tourism. Rotorua’s long experience of tourism means that long-term residents and businesses project a strong confidence in their ability to manage their way through international and local crises alike. Many well-established tourism businesses in Rotorua know from their past experience that they can weather any downturns and that they can take action to counteract the problems that they encounter. This gives the tourism industry in Rotorua a high perceived efficacy and an high internal locus of control.

Tourism Rotorua, in working to unite the local tourism industry and taking a leadership role in the area has contributed significantly to this strong sense of control. The Rotorua tourism industry appeared skilled and experienced in working together to address problems and it had a clear sense of its own direction. Moreover, tourism provided only 18 percent of the local employment figures at the time of research (Butcher et al., 2000) – smaller than Kaikoura’s corresponding 30 percent (Butcher et al., 1998), so the effects of any downturn in tourism would have been less in Rotorua than in Kaikoura.
Each of these factors contributes to the sense of stability and control that many Rotorua people express in relation to tourism.

Kaikoura, in comparison, had experienced rapid growth in tourist numbers (Simmons & Fairweather, 1998), had much less experience with tourism, far fewer well-established businesses, and a higher percentage of local employment dependent on tourism and no clear point of leadership. Any downturn in tourism, therefore, stood to have a significant impact on the lives of Kaikoura people, so its newness conferred a sense of potential instability. The Kaikoura community, as a whole, did not express the firm sense of control that Rotorua had in relation to tourism. Neither had they the experience of working together in times of adversity from which to draw confidence in their own capacities to manage change.

Section summary

As Table 12 illustrates, many factors contribute to the different experiences that Rotorua and Kaikoura residents associate with tourism. While I began my research focusing on the benefits and costs of tourism, I have completed this part of it in the realisation that focusing on recording these alone misses much possible explanation of the impacts of tourism. This review indicates that there are a whole series of processes that underpin a community’s sense of control — from their previous experiences as a tourism destination, their ability to recognise tourists as such to the way in which tourists move around the destination area, which in turn is based on the spread of attractions and amenities.

Table 12: Summary of factors affecting community perceptions of control over tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Rotorua</th>
<th>Kaikoura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism associated with changes from restructuring</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism perceived to cause major change in recent years</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry experience of downturns</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-established businesses</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of locals in tourism Mgt.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment from tourism</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Direction</td>
<td>‘Flying in formation’</td>
<td>No clear vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>Active through branding process, concessions etc.</td>
<td>Little formal inclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

232
Community confidence | High | Low
---|---|---
Community confidence in future | High | Low
Tourist-host ratio | 22.4 | 249.4
Proportion of tourist loading on local infrastructure | 12% | 43%
Dispersal of tourists | High | Low
Visibility of tourists | Low | High
Resident control over contact with visitors | High | Low
Overall community perceptions of control in relation to tourism | High | Low

* Most people see the Council as the main manager of tourism and many of them do not regard the staff as local even though an outsider might regard them as such.

The two communities studied in this thesis are subject to many different influences from outside the system. The processes outlined here reflect global growth in tourism over the last 15 years, which is manifest in increasing numbers of international visitor arrivals in New Zealand. This trend has the approval and encouragement of Central Government. Tourism, as an export industry, brings foreign exchange into the country, and it is growing at a time when other export products are becoming more difficult to market.

The ways in which Rotorua and Kaikoura associate tourism with changes from restructuring differ considerably between the two communities. Thus, the community’s history and experience of tourism, and the way that different events are associated with tourism, influences local residents’ views of tourism. These associations come from the juxtaposition of events, the ways in which locals talk about tourism to each other, and remembered experiences of surviving difficult periods. Thus, residents’ perceptions and experience of tourism emerge through local discursive interactions associated with tourism which also stem from the physical and historical characteristics of the destination. In their everyday conversation about tourism, people associate it with a range of other local events and processes, which then become part of the impact of tourism on the local area.

These discursive patterns and memories also contribute to the level of control that local residents express in relation to tourism and thus are important ways in which communities themselves influence the impact tourism has on them. Importantly this
means that the word ‘tourism’ has different meanings in both places. The next section builds on this observation to look more closely at the ways in which local meanings of tourism emerge from local community processes.

Tourism and Community

This section reviews the ways in which the two communities interact with tourism and how the meanings of tourism are linked to processes of interaction within them. Communities clearly interact with tourism in different ways to produce different outcomes (Abram, 1996; Aziz, 1995; Black 1996; Boissevain, 1996; Wall, 1996). The data presented in this thesis support Wall’s (1996) argument that communities are not defenceless entities, reeling from the impacts of tourism. Instead, as Chapter 6 shows, communities want tourism for its potential benefits – particularly employment and economic wealth. Neither Rotorua nor Kaikoura wanted to get rid of tourism, although the communities do differ in their propensity to want more tourism in their local area.

Black (1996) and Tucker (2001) both argue that, in the settings they studied, local people involved in tourism have a strong influence on the manifestation of tourist–local interactions and on the ways in which their culture is ‘sold’ to the tourist. It seems, from their writing, that the communities they studied have control over the tourists and they use and maintain that control. It is not clear from the articles just how much locals describe their behaviour as a calculated method of control or whether the processes are more tacitly understood. Whatever is the case, locals use these mechanisms in their interactions with visitors.

This section explores this idea further, focusing on the community side of the relationship. People’s perceptions of tourism are connected to their understanding of local community relationships and processes, and of their own situations within those processes. I begin with the idea noted at the end of Chapter 5, that people who dislike tourism may not actually dislike tourists and their impacts. Tourists and tourism are not the same, so the impacts of tourists cannot be equated with the impacts of tourism (although, of course, the two have some features in common).

Tourists are real, concrete entities, so the problem of defining tourists is smaller than the problem of defining tourism. Tourists are people behaving in particular ways. We may have trouble defining the distance they travel, or the activities in which they participate,
but in both Rotorua and Kaikoura, tourists are recreational visitors who do not live permanently in the area. In comparison, at the beginning of this thesis, I alluded to the difficulties associated with defining tourism based on the principles of emergence and the fact that language reifies things that do not actually exist as entities. Another way of thinking about this is that words are attractors for the meanings associated with them.

Tourism is a concept and is enmeshed in history, and the emotional experiences associated with that. Rotorua people see tourism as a source of stability where Kaikoura people see it as a source of change. However in listening to people talk in depth about tourism, it emerges that individuals’ experiences associated with decisions about tourism development also impacts on their feelings about tourism. Through these observations, I argue that the meaning of tourism is also enmeshed in the experiences and emotions associated with the interaction processes of the local community. More specifically, community processes have a profound effect on local perceptions of tourism within that community. This is a key finding of this thesis.

This argument is supported by my observations in Chapter 8 that some of the impacts of tourism are a direct result of the ways in which local people interact with each other. For example, competition between tourism operators can create conflict and rifts within a community. In addition, disagreement over specific development plans can create conflict within a community, as in the case of the residents of Hana in Hawaii (Wyllie, 1998). Likewise, the respondent (see Chapter 6), who expressed dislike for tourism but then told me that she liked meeting tourists, was most concerned about the decisions and actions of the local Council and the consultants they engaged to work on tourism projects. In short, she was talking about tourism in terms of local development projects and processes, and she was less concerned about tourists and their specific effects.

In Kaikoura, a large part of the impact of tourism comes from residents’ expressed lack of perceived control over developments and potential developments. In Kaikoura at the time of study, ‘tourism’ was faceless, nameless and, therefore, difficult or impossible to control. It was difficult to lobby anyone directly because, at the time, there was little clear institutional leadership in relation to tourism and what was there did not appear to instil confidence in the community. Part of the lack of leadership appeared to come from having no community vision and no strategy for working with others to achieve
that vision. Without clear processes for doing this, those who might have participated felt powerless to do so. Hence it seems that if people do not understand or trust local decision-making processes, or if those decision processes do not seem accessible to all stakeholders, they will not feel secure about tourism in their area.

The sense of control over tourism in Rotorua was much less insecure. In comparing the two places and their experiences of tourism, it is possible to suggest that this trust in local processes can come from a range of sources. Rotorua residents had had access to community visioning processes and knew who the main figures were in the tourism industry in Rotorua. The Council’s visioning, strategic planning and branding processes all had involved a wide range of people, had been well publicised and provided a good base for decision making processes. Tourism Rotorua staff were interested in improving their participatory processes and keeping the industry ‘flying in formation’. Tourism Rotorua had spent much time building coherence into what had been a fragmented industry group. Staff at Tourism Rotorua also saw their branding and strategic planning processes as ongoing, and they were working with other organisations on those projects. This gave more of the community linkages into the work of Tourism Rotorua. As such, perceptions of tourism in Rotorua came from a sense of knowing what the tourist industry was trying to achieve and having some faces and names with whom to connect tourism. They knew who to go to if they wanted to discuss a tourism related issue.

Thus, it is possible to suggest that locals senses of control in relation to tourism in Rotorua appears to come from three main directions:

1. Understanding processes associated with tourism management.
2. From seeing a cohesive tourism industry group working well.
3. Trusting the individuals who are visibly involved in these processes, as was the case in Rotorua, where well known, long-term, local operators were visibly involved in managing tourism at community level.
4. The existence of clear leadership and a clear community vision for whatever is being debated at the time.
If the tourism industry in Rotorua were not able to work well together and maintain links with non-tourism parts of the community, it appears that local people would not have the same acceptance of tourism. This would appear to be confirmed by my experience of working in Queenstown where the industry at the time was highly fragmented and competitive, and where residents reported many negative perceptions of tourism (Evans, 1993). Likewise there was little clear industry leadership and no stated vision in Kaikoura at the time of my research.1

It may also be that communities that appear to be coherent in their approach to problems are actually communities with no major issues currently at stake. When decision processes are going well, and there are no major issues on local agendas, communities have less need to understand how to make problem-solving processes work well. Often, in times of relative stability, these processes are not questioned or examined. However, major change requires that same community to draw on its members’ abilities to work together to re-establish a local sense of coherence and control. When this is lacking, the community has few resources on which to draw, and the fragmentation in the community can adversely affect that community’s ability to adapt.2 This is analogous to the way individuals function. In times of calm, it is easy to assume that everything is all right, but in times of stress people react in different ways, drawing on what psychologists call their ‘inner resources’.

This suggests that reactions to stress may also be fractals so an understanding of individual reactions to stress might contribute to an understanding of community reactions to stress. Individuals go through stages of adaptation in response to major life events or changes. A range of factors are associated with helping individuals cope positively with these changes, including the existence of good social support (Mandler, 1990; Wong, 1993), the ability to see the same event from more than one perspective (Langer, 1989) and the ability of the individual to find novel solutions to old problems (Wong, 1993). These mechanisms all increase an individual’s level of perceived control over a situation that is out of their direct control.

---

1 This situation has since changed in Kaikoura.

2 This is analogous to a leaky roof. When it is not raining, the roof does not leak – but it is generally considered better to fix a leak when it is not raining than when it is.
Likewise, it is possible to argue that community development processes help people to develop these kinds of resources for dealing with change. At community level, supportive social networks might be translated into trust between people at local level, and perhaps networks with other communities who might be experiencing similar stresses. The ability to see the same event from different perspectives might translate into tolerance for the different perspectives of others within the community and the ability to find novel solutions to old problems may reflect a community’s ability to work together, and manage and use differences to develop a common direction or strategy.

Working in this way is much easier when the community has a clear vision about what it values and what its future direction is. When one is aware of the vision on which the decision is to be based, as long as the decision reflects the vision, it is easier to trust the process. Likewise, if one trusts the people involved in a decision, it is easier to accept that decision, even without direct involvement.

The need for trust between local people is illustrated by those people who express a dislike of tourism, who speak in ways that imply a lack of control in relation to tourism. This loss of control comes only partly from the direct impacts of tourists. In Kaikoura for example, the loss of control felt by some sectors of the community comes from the apparent power of newcomers to the area who are perceived to be influencing local decisions too much. For other sectors of the community it comes from not trusting those groups who are perceived to be in control. The tension that a few people expressed about the power of ‘those Catholics’ in Kaikoura is another such example. Thus, an important factor in local perceptions of tourism comes from a sense of trust in the community processes associated with tourism development. The sense of control and perceived self-efficacy of the community is important in any form of change management, just as it is at an individual level (Berno, 1995; Lefcourt 1992; Mandler, 1990; Nicholson, 1990).

**Community fragmentation and planning processes**

As outlined in Chapter 8, population size may impact on the way a community maintains divisions and a lack of trust across the community. In fragmented communities, without an agreed vision, it can be difficult for people to trust local
decision making processes. This may spread to a lack of trust in consultants and other experts, which is exacerbated further by the fact that there is no easy way for an expert to work with a community in which people are not used to working together on complex issues.

Without an ability to work together with a range of others, including outside experts, the community as a whole has less access to a breadth of information, and to good processes for generating new collective knowledge\(^1\). Effectively this means that there is less collective understanding of the local system and how it interacts with the wider regional, national and international systems. These conditions make it more likely that decisions will be less than optimal. When this happens the lack of community trust may be maintained by ‘bad’ decisions that did not include the knowledge of the different groups in the area.

In addition, under such circumstances, there is likely to be less local buy-in to decisions, which in turn decreases the likelihood that any decision will be implemented successfully. This only serves to make people feel more cynical about community decision-making processes. Thus, lack of trust is likely to lead to more decisions that do not work well, partly because of the decision itself, and partly because people do not accept it. A fragmented community, therefore, has less capacity to work together constructively and may find it more difficult to escape the positive reinforcement loop summarised in Figure 22.

People in Kaikoura felt that they had little involvement in local decisions, which then fostered resistance to Council decisions. The other side of this was that the KDC was interested in input from residents, but did not have the financial resources to put consultation processes into effect that might have achieved this. Local discussion of council decisions only seemed to reinforce negative attitudes about the Council, which in turn, reinforced a sense of powerlessness in those complaining.

---

1 Authors of research into knowledge management consider that information can be passed from one context to another, whereas knowledge is contextualised information — analogous, perhaps to the difference between data and analysis in social research terms (Brown & Duguid, 2000; Davenport & Prusak, 2000).
These observations indicate that tourism is a set of interlinked processes that affect, and are affected by, the dynamics of the community system. While, without doubt, having more congestion in local areas and increasing traffic are the kinds of things that tourism causes, these impacts appear to be relatively easy for people to manage at an individual level (Brown & Giles, 1994). In other words, locals can adapt successfully at either a physical level (by avoiding town) or a psychological level (by deciding to enjoy the street life or by feeling solidarity with other locals in the same situation).

However, for people who have a deep connection with a place, feeling powerless to affect development might be as important as the more accepted tangible impacts of tourism development. This seems even more likely in light of the fact that when people feel some level of control over their lives and the things that are important to them, they are more able to cope with change (Wong, 1993). Thus, a useful approach to managing tourism impacts is to understand the factors that contribute towards helping people adapt to change in ways that allow them to feel in control. To consider such an approach, it is important to understand how communities adapt and how the adaptation process might be facilitated more constructively.

One useful approach to thinking about adaptability is to consider the fact that it is not so much what happens to people, but how they interpret and make meaning out of life.
events that dictates how these events affect them (Dowrick, 1991; Langer 1989; Ross & Nisbett, 1991). The way people think about events and phenomena influences their reactions. They might participate in decisions that affect them, frame a problem so that they can see the choices or, alternatively, they might grudgingly work around problems that arise without any sense of having choices. It appears that this is also the case with communities. The dominant discourses and the quality of the interactions within a community will influence how that community feels about (Pearce et al., 1996), and therefore adapts to, any form of change, including that created by tourism.

I am not arguing that communities have complete control over the effect of tourism on them. Tourism has clear effects, but the way that these effects manifest within any single destination will depend on the destination itself – its history, geography, its size, on the coherence of its community and on the discursive processes going on there. Much of the work currently available on the impacts of tourism takes the simplistic view that there are a few impacts and demographic variables that explain variation in people’s response to tourism so managing the impacts of tourism is easy once we know what these are. However, this takes little account of the adaptability of individuals and the range of possible responses that there are to environmental stress.

**Redefining the tourism community relationship**

Tourism does not exist as a tangible entity. Instead, like other concepts, it emerges out of our actions and the actions of people and material things around us. Borrowing from the arguments of Law (1992), I argue that ‘tourism’, like ‘community’ is usefully conceptualised as a set of processes, rather than as an entity. Furthermore, the community processes associated with managing tourism development and the local changes that occur in relation to tourism, influence the way in which it is perceived. For example, a community with inadequate trust and tolerance of difference between different groups is less likely to have constructive participation processes and is less likely to be confident in its decision makers than one with high levels of trust and tolerance. In fact, to use systems terminology, trust and tolerance co-evolve with good leadership, constructive participation and confidence in local decision processes. Trust, as O’Neill 2002 points out, is the basis of an individual’s and a community’s capacity to
cope with, and adapt to, change in a way that leaves community members feeling as if they have a sense of control over their lives.

This indicates that community development work might be an important aspect of managing tourism. Community ‘capacity’ and social capital are linked to education, and equality of wealth (Dobell, 1998; Kawachi, 2001, pers. comm; Putnam, 1996). The strong link between education and a community’s capacity to work together and achieve desired outcomes is explained at least in part by the work of Belenky et al. (1986). They studied a wide range of women with different levels of education to see how it affected their world views. They found that women who grew up in circumstances characterised by low levels of trust, aggressive behaviour, little open communication, often with low levels of wealth and health saw the world and even their own behaviour as unpredictable and bewildering. This research showed that education helped women make more sense of the world and provided them with some insight into their own behaviour and into the behaviour of others. This implies that finding ways to assist people’s learning about tourism and participation at local level might help them to build a stronger sense of control in relation to tourism.

Community development aims to build the capacity of people to work together. In effect, the work that Steve Pike did in the early days of Tourism Rotorua was building the capacity of the players in the Rotorua tourism industry to work together. A community, institution or organisation with this ability is able to learn, and can build confidence in its ability to influence system outcomes even when these outcomes are not always predictable (see Figure 23).

This is the process underlying the current confidence within the tourism industry in Rotorua. It is best if community development occurs during times when community stress is relatively low, but as mentioned, there is little incentive for communities to do this work at those times. Doing this work under conditions of low stress increases the adaptability of the community to cope with change and its associated stress.

---

1 Seminar given by Ichiro Kawachi in the Department of Anthropology, University of Canterbury, June 2001.
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Managing Tourism

The information provided in this thesis suggests some possible strategies for facilitating better tourism planning and management. As outlined in Chapter 6, there are steps that communities can take to ameliorate the negative effects of tourists. However, many of the problems with tourism are not easily controlled by small destinations that find themselves part of a global tourism system dealing with growing tourist numbers.

My main recommendations can be summarised as focusing efforts on facilitating community adaptability and putting the needs of the local community for leadership and vision, foremost. In other words, tourism planning ought to include working with groups involved in activities such as environmental management, health, and social issues to build the capacity of local communities to learn about, and adaptively manage these problems. To be adaptable, communities need some sense of direction, some knowledge of how to get where they want to go, and access to information and networks, which allow them to exchange information and to build knowledge to improve community outcomes in tourism destinations.

At Central Government level, New Zealanders need a strong clear sense of direction that focuses on outcomes for all stakeholders. Ideally, this should be developed from the bottom up by destinations and include the input of researchers, managers, and planning and policy experts.
This must be accompanied by similar (maybe connected) processes, which facilitate the development of leadership and visioning in both the local tourism industry group and the community as a whole. Community development work to help communities learn and work together well will also be vital for improving a community’s ability to adapt.

Not all communities are the same. Different communities will feel the pressure of tourism in different ways, so they will need different kinds of help. Small communities are likely to need more help to plan for, and manage, tourism. The very small size of Kaikoura means that ratepayers have a much greater financial burden in providing facilities for tourists than is the case in Rotorua. In addition the lack of resources will be evident in planning processes associated with tourism. Small places may require a much greater input of voluntary time from the local community and access to local facilitation and information sources may be somewhat less in smaller places. In comparison, in Rotorua, the Council has been able to pay individuals to develop strategies and run participatory processes. Thus, policies need to be flexible enough for communities to have considerable say in the kind of help that they get from Central Government. This might be provided by a contestable fund, and information/human resources which destination areas can apply for to develop a community vision statement and strategy. Once this is done, for a particular destination funds might be given for other local projects associated more directly with managing tourism.

A useful role for the Ministry of Tourism may be as information broker. Research information needs to be summarised and freely available, ideally through the Internet. In addition, an information resource should include the input of community groups working in the area, so that they can share experiences and learn from each other as well as from researchers, and other experts. This might entail setting up sister-destination-type schemes where money is provided for building personal networks between communities. It might be useful for different communities to have access to each other’s strategic plans – something that again might be provided by putting them all onto an Internet site.

Reflecting on Research

A complex systems perspective frames the researcher as part of the system which she is studying. When researchers begin research, they step into the system and so by
definition, will have some effect on that system. When, for example, I found people asking others some of my interview questions, I realised that the mere act of talking to people can get them thinking in different ways, and conceivably this might change the future trajectory of the system, although it is, of course, impossible to say exactly how.

**Reflexivity**

Working within the system like this requires one to grapple considerably with the issue of reflexivity. It seems that this is an important point for anyone working only with quantitative methods where it is easier to imagine oneself separate from the system. However, being 'separate' can mean that one’s interpretations of data miss the mark. It is clear, for example, that asking people what they think of tourism or of aspects of tourism may in effect be a very different question for people in different destinations.

As research into complex systems becomes more qualitative, issues associated with reflexivity become increasingly important for understanding the processes going on within the system under study. However, qualitative methods are able to get at forms of knowledge that quantitative methods simply cannot. Quantitative methods can help us explore the many facets of meaning that emerge from the use of words such as 'visitor' 'community' and 'tourism' just as they are most useful for exploring context, history and interaction patterns. Had I used only quantitative methods, I could not have shifted my understanding of system processes and their interconnections. I could only have tested what I already understood.

**Boundaries and Scale**

Research, inevitably, involves the drawing of boundaries, yet clearly, the application of complex systems theory to these case studies has revealed a relationship between the positioning of the boundaries and research findings. Complex systems are open – their boundaries are fuzzy and overlap with the boundaries of other systems. Boundaries are human constructs – ways of helping us make sense of our world, but they shift our understanding of the world in which we live and in doing so may limit our options for action within that world. Perspective, therefore, may be seen as partly about shifting system boundaries. In traditional tourism research the boundaries are put around the actions of tourists and the community’s reactions to those. In this research the boundaries have been drawn differently, and that has drawn out some different
understandings of those same impacts and how they emerge. For researchers, then, it is important to be aware of these boundaries, since drawing them in different places gives us very different views of what is going on. One way of looking at the difference between quantitative hypothesis testing and more open-ended qualitative methods is that the latter significantly change the boundaries of the questions that we can ask and the possible answers that respondents can give.

Similarly, drawing a boundary around each community produced different results compared with drawing them, for example, around only the Maori communities, whose fortunes seem in opposition to the fortunes of the community overall in the two case studies used here. In Kaikoura, the Maori community have a clear vision and strong leadership which gives them strong direction as a group and which has helped them build a high level of perceived control and perceived efficacy. They have successfully developed Whale Watch Kaikoura, they have rebuilt their Marae from which they run their development activities. In Rotorua, the different hapu groups have fared very differently over the last century and a half. Rotorua Maori, as a whole, have gradually lost their once tight control of tourism in Rotorua and the Maori community as a whole appear to be fragmented – in a similar way to the whole community in Kaikoura.

Thus, where I look in the system and where I draw the boundaries affects what I see. In a similar way, researchers who draw their boundaries around the social impacts of tourism may get a very different picture of what is going on in a destination than if they make an effort to shift the boundaries of their observations. This process of boundary shifting is similar to the notion of changing one's standpoint that I have discussed at some length throughout the thesis.

Integration

A corollary of this is the importance of integration. By this I mean both integration within science (across disciplines), and integration between science and other perspectives, including those of different levels of managers, policy makers, business people, and community groups. However, as yet, there is still some way to go in improving both aspects of this. We know relatively little about how to actually ‘do’ integration and even how we would know when we had achieved it. Certainly it requires the development of what can be called ‘a common language.’ Effectively it means the
development of a new research and a new managerial culture in which time is given to building relationships, making connections with different people and learning to work reflexively with others. This is a difficult and complex process – made more so because, in my experience of a range of settings, many people trying to work together feel that it ought to be simply a matter of ‘just doing it’ without reflecting on their own communication, and what makes it work well at times and work badly at other times. Perhaps the most difficult aspect of integration, therefore, is the time it takes to build what are effectively personal relationships so that we can productively and creatively integrate our perspectives. In today’s busy world it can be difficult to justify putting time into what seems like unproductive activities such as relationship building. This is unfortunate and, I believe, is stopping us achieving our best. Again, to be successful this work requires a distinct level of reflexivity in which individuals not only evaluate their performance in terms of the task but also give attention to their performance in terms of the processes that they use to achieve their goals.

Another important aspect is the effect of current research policy in New Zealand on the outcomes of research such as this. Had my research been written only in the reports I wrote to complete the requirements of the research contracts, I would not have been able to develop my thinking enough to draw out these findings. The thesis development has provided more opportunities to explore the interrelatedness of ideas and different standpoints in a way that ‘researching by objective’ does not.

**Implications and directions for current tourism theory and research**

In this section, I return to frameworks such as social exchange theory and the tourist area life cycle, which I discussed earlier in the thesis, to consider how this research might broaden or complement research that is informed by the tourist area lifecycle. This research also has some interesting implications for the ideas offered by Ap (1990), that tourism might be seen as a form of social exchange and that local people who feel that they get something back from tourists are more positive about tourism. The tourist area life cycle also explicitly focuses on patterns of tourist visitation as the main source of impacts at a tourist destination. The tourist area lifecycle implies that the researchers are external to the system under study, and the analysis is ‘over-standing’ or a top down one in which the overall system patterns are assumed to be the result of increasing
impacts from tourists. This analysis has focused more from the bottom up to see how perceptions and impacts emerge from the actions of people, events and objects such as attractions. While from a system wide perspective, the life cycle concept is intuitively attractive, there are questions that this analysis raises.

Social exchange theory.

Ap (1990 & 1993) has suggested that social exchange theory might explain the different reactions of destination residents to tourism. He suggests that when people feel that they benefit from interactions with tourists they have quite a different attitude towards tourism than if they feel that their interactions with tourists are all negative and associated with crowding and congestion. This research would not refute this analysis – but it takes it further by suggesting that social exchange between residents might be as important as social exchange between residents and tourists. This idea is also supported by the findings of Brown and Giles (1994) that residents felt that a sense of local solidarity helped them adapt more constructively to the crowding created by the presence of tourists. Interestingly, thinking about this from an actor network perspective, it is possible to extend the analysis even further to suggest that for individuals living in tourist destinations the recreational opportunities offered by the physical resources, that is, their interactions with physical resources such as mountains, beaches, etc. in the area might be as much a part of the exchange as interactions with other people. It seems then that some questions might be explored about the complex ‘weighing up’ of the costs and benefits to them as individuals that local residents do to make decisions and how this is also influenced by local discursive patterns associated with the many processes associated with living and working in such a place.

What is tourism?

While there have been many arguments in the literature about what tourism is – an industry (Smith 1988), a partially industrialized phenomenon, a system (Leiper, 1990) - it appears that local residents in Kaikoura and Rotorua also implicitly define tourism in terms of the decision making and social interaction processes and historical events associated with its development and management in the local area. This is of major importance for understanding the impact of tourism because it requires researchers to
look beyond the impacts of tourists to understand the interconnections and interactions associated with tourism locally.

The research presented here indicates that that tourists are not the only, or even always, the worst triggers of irritation for local residents. Friction within the community over local decision processes related to tourism or conflict between groups who are traditionally rivals over some aspect of tourism may be more important that congested shopping areas or crowded attractions. Likewise a lack of social support within a community may mean that residents in fragmented communities are less able to adapt to the changes and frictions associated with tourism development.

Scale

I have noted on different occasions throughout this thesis that where one looks in a system affects what one sees. For example, from a qualitative perspective, if one tries to ascertain the level of irritation in Kaikoura overall, it is quite different from the level of irritation expressed by the Maori community in Kaikoura. The tourist area lifecycle was formulated mostly at the destination level, but if we look at the communities within the community, how do we limit tourist numbers for one section of the community but increase them to please another? Likewise, if we look at New Zealand as a tourist destination, we see would make a different assessment of the overall stress levels of New Zealanders. How for example do we limit tourist numbers at a national level – groups of people should we be listening to in terms of setting targets for tourist numbers? This looks like a zero sum conflict in which one group are going to lose and another will win and therefore the right decision can never be made.

If, however, the focus is moved away from tourist numbers we can then question the underlying assumption that the people who are irritated by tourism want to see tourist numbers limited. The research presented in this thesis suggests that the answer is 'not necessarily'. This in itself may offer some different lines of reaction that may revolve around the things that do irritate them – for example working to improve local participation processes or finding ways to increase the privacy of people in busy tourist areas.
How is research related to management?

I began my research with the aim of understanding the impact of tourism on communities in the hope that it might help communities to manage tourism better. This, I believe, was the ambition of most of those participating in the research programme, and I think this is the basis of much research effort particularly that funded by the New Zealand Tourism Board and the Tourism Industry Association. In New Zealand at least, one of the ways in which the tourist area lifecycle has been used is by measuring residents’ acceptance of tourism (Evans, 1993; McDermott Miller, 1988). Mostly, these analyses are done at the level of a territorial local authority. Given that at the level of territorial local authorities there is relatively little control over the number of tourists visiting an area one must question the relevance of trying to measure irritation as a function of tourist visitation.

Thinking of the impacts as arising from the visitation patterns of tourists limits the actions a local authority might take since it leaves them focusing on engineering options or on trying to limit tourist numbers — which, as pointed out earlier in this chapter, are not always feasible options. There is no evidence that any action has been taken as a result of such surveys in New Zealand which indicate that a significant group of local people in places like Queenstown are unhappy with tourism in their area (Schöllman 2001 pers comm). The question is, how has research into residents’ perceptions of tourism been useful for managing tourism and how could it be useful?

An important question to emerge here concerns the characteristics of ‘good’ tourism management. How would we know it if we saw it? What might we use as indicators of success across different destinations? Much previous tourism research focuses on the development of ‘alternative tourism’ as being the ideal (Butler, 1992; Eadington & Smith 1992; Lanfant & Graburn 1992; Robinson, 1994). This kind of tourism is aimed at maintaining the conditions found in the destination at the time of ‘involvement’ when local people are enthusiastic about tourism, are keen to attract more tourists and have a strong sense of control in relation to tourism which is locally owned and operated. The trouble is that almost inevitably if the industry is to grow, more tourists will come, more

---

1 PhD student researching community responses to tourism in Queenstown, New Zealand.
outside investment will come in, and change will happen. Both of the destinations in this study have clearly gone beyond the ‘involvement’ stage of the lifecycle and it still makes sense to be actively managing tourism constructively. In this context, what does good management look like? How would we know when we have it? What elements of that management are transferable across destinations?

The Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment in New Zealand (PCE, 1997) suggested that Rotorua provides perhaps the best example of good tourism management, at least from an environmental perspective, in New Zealand. This research supports that assessment. Of interest perhaps in reflecting on my findings is that perceived control and perceived efficacy are common elements both in what I found in Rotorua and to some of the conditions suggested to be present during the involvement stage of the lifecycle.

**Carrying capacity**

Another element of the tourist area lifecycle is the destination carrying capacity. While the concept of carrying capacity is another intuitively attractive concept – a level over which the impacts of tourism become unacceptable – it is clear from the recreation literature (e.g., Shelby & Heberlein, 1984) that the concept is difficult to define. The problem is that the notion of the tourism area lifecycle implies that carrying capacity is reached only when the increase in tourist numbers begins to slow and therefore is only reached once during the development of the destination.

It is clear from this research that the local stress occurs more during times of the fastest change. If local stress is indicative of some aspect of carrying capacity (and the incorporation of Doxey’s (1975) ‘irridex’ ideas into the lifecycle imply that this is the case) then carrying capacity is at least partly a function of the rate of increase in tourist numbers and so is more likely to be exceeded when tourist numbers are increasing at the fastest rate. In other words, carrying capacity will change considerably over time as a function of local senses of control over local levels of change. These of course are linked with the social, historical and political contexts as well as with the physical context. In the case of tourism, it may be more useful to think about the limits of local adaptability rather than as a single limit of acceptable change as implied by carrying capacity as we know it.
New Zealanders’ acceptance of tourism

The work in New Zealand measuring New Zealanders’ acceptance of tourism would be more profitable if it were part of a programme of adaptive management where management decisions were aimed at improving local acceptance levels. At the current time, it is uncertain exactly what the figures mean and it is also not clear from those studies just what needs to be managed or who should manage it. This study has focused upon the local level where, it seems, most of the adaptation has to occur. Therefore, much of the management should also presumably occur at this level. However, it is clear that some territorial local authorities struggle to manage tourism with few financial resources and with a minimum of access to information that might help them work towards helping the local community manage tourism constructively.

Reflections on the utility of the tourist area life cycle

Because the tourist area life cycle is an intuitively attractive model of destination development it has had considerable impact on tourism impacts research. Its quantitative focus makes it attractive for policy makers and as a model it drew much needed attention to the fact that tourism areas do in fact cycle in terms of popularity and that residents in those areas do suffer negative impacts from tourism. However, over time, it might be argued that the same focus has limited our understanding and therefore our management of tourism and tourism impacts. For example, it is not clear just what tourism related policies should be aimed at and what planning strategies might be useful when based on this model. Likewise, trying to assess how a destination is faring in relation to tourism can result in quite contradictory outcomes depending on the level of the system on which the assessment is focused and where the research boundaries are drawn.

The findings of this research also indicate that the quantitative focus of the lifecycle model has limited our understanding of the relationship between communities and tourism. Working with qualitative open-ended research methods has revealed that there is a lot more to perceptions of tourism than merely the easily identified benefits and costs of tourism. Residents’ feelings about tourism emerge from the interaction of a whole series of contextual factors that are not considered in the lifecycle model.
It is time, therefore, to consider some new approaches to the planning and management of tourism which take account of the variability of destinations and to find ways to work with this variability rather than looking only for common patterns between destination areas. My research indicates that tourism research and management could benefit from focusing more on management strategies that can be adapted to local conditions and used across different destinations. This requires more of a ‘bottom up’ focus, which takes account of the views, understandings and needs of all stakeholders in the system. It also requires some understanding of local social and political processes, and historical events and how that affects the ways in which local people construct the meaning of ‘tourism’. Such an approach opens the door to some new and interesting lines of research as follows.

**Helping communities manage tourism**

There is merit in researching how best to help communities and individuals learn about tourism and about managing tourism. I do not mean this in the sense of ‘educating’ the community about tourism. Instead, I mean it in the sense of helping them to think about their own issues and questions and maybe then helping them to access the information that they want.

Useful ‘tools’ might include a set of questions that each community can use as points of focus for thinking, evaluating and learning about tourism and its impacts in the local area. This might include questions such as what do you want from tourism? What do you value locally? Where would you like to see this destination in 20 years? Who is likely to benefit and who is likely to suffer from the impacts of tourism? What can the industry or the council do to ameliorate the effects of tourism? How do you manage conflict processes? How do local decision making processes work? Which groups are currently marginalised in these processes? What steps might you take to change this situation? The utility of such questions in different destinations and the development of other questions may also be a useful line of research.

Many of my questions for future research, therefore, are not so much about how to mitigate the direct effects of tourists, but how to help people learn to manage change better. This leads to a line of questions such as:

- How exactly do people become more reflective?
• What factors and processes encourage people to become more cooperative?
• How can institutions improve both personal and community development processes?
• What tools or approaches are helpful for people when they are trying to work together?
• What are useful ways of managing conflict and how can conflict situations be made constructive rather than destructive?
• How can communities engage more in the process of designing their own destinies?
• What processes are useful for finding local solutions to the problems that arise from tourism.
• How can research information be made more relevant to people so that they can more successfully manage their interactions with their various environments?
• How can people manage information and the problems of information ‘overload’?
• What is the best use for research in planning and management?
• How can more integrated approaches to research and management be facilitated?
• How can research and practice be better integrated?

Cumulative Impacts
Another important aspect of a complex systems perspective is that it highlights the importance of cumulative impacts. Systems may remain stable through a considerable amount of change and yet is clear that the change can slowly destabilise the system until it reaches a point of criticality. At this point major, fast change in the system itself becomes inevitable and is not reversible. There are many questions that surround our understanding of this process. How much can we influence change at these points of criticality? Can we and, if so, how can we monitor complex systems to try and predict the probability of this kind of ‘catastrophic’ change?

Action research
Many of the issues raised in this section can only be explored using qualitative methods. However, on looking at questions such as how to manage complex systems and how to
use research information, I have come to realise that another useful social research method is that of action research. An action researcher uses similar kinds of methods to those I have used in this research. However, onto that is added a step of working with people in the research setting to bring about desired change. The researcher therefore mindfully steps into the setting and directly influences people in it. The processes of change, working together and the reactions to those changes are recorded and evaluated usually be those in the setting along with the researcher who effectively acts as facilitator of the process. Once evaluated, more action is planned, executed and evaluated with the learning recorded so that other groups working in similar ways can learn. In this way it is possible to learn about the system in question and the ways in which it responds to the changes that are made.

Effectively, this method takes research beyond observation into the realm of experimentation but in a way that has the participation and knowledge of those in the setting. It is also an effective way of utilising research findings and of helping groups learn about the processes and contexts they are trying to manage. The role of researchers in these situations is to document the processes and actions and to learn about different destination systems so that lessons can be drawn across them.

This means that tourism research and management may be usefully integrated into an ongoing process of research in which all players are participating. This is the basis of adaptive management.

Adaptive management is based on the premise that the webs of inter-relationships that define who we are, what we know and what we want to become are in constant flux in natural and human systems. The fundamental challenge of linking disciplinary knowledge, policy design and evaluation is a problem of maintaining a rich dialogue among people – experts, managers, policy designers, decision makers and constituencies. (ibid: 4)

Adaptive management is about managing and integrating a wide range of information and knowledge in a transparent process to reach some agreement about future actions and visions. It implies getting people together from a range of different backgrounds, speaking a range of different (technical) languages with a range of experiences of power and participation, and a range of levels of ability to reflect, to talk on an equal footing.

Working with multiple stakeholder groups can be frustrating and unproductive, particularly if a lack of attention is paid to also learning how to work together as part of
a group. Learning to work together with others in this way is neither easy nor a short-term project as the development of Tourism Rotorua illustrates.

Reed (1999) has begun some research into the use of adaptive management in tourism settings. I believe it would be productive to continue this line of enquiry into the use of such a process in managing tourist destinations to see what barriers and opportunities lie in using such an approach. Using this approach would also help researchers and managers learn about the nature of tourism in a particular destination, the purpose of research associated with monitoring the effects of tourism, the characteristics of good destination management, and into how to conduct community development, visioning, planning, and participatory evaluation processes with a range of stakeholder groups.

Concluding Note

Tourism began as the main focus of this thesis and yet a complex systems perspective required me to shift my focus significantly to understanding the processes underlying our ability to manage and plan for tourism. It has also led to some clear understanding of how different communities define both themselves and tourism, and the implications that these differences have for understanding tourism's impacts on communities. Thus the complex systems perspective has led me to a more sophisticated, complex understanding of tourism and communities, which, in turn, has opened up new possibilities for thinking about the management of tourism particularly at the local level. In particular, this perspective has exposed the usefulness of observing processes and considering how outcomes emerge from the complex interactions of different processes within a system.

The needs of communities for leadership and visioning and a sense of control over their lives are reflected in a fractal pattern, at national level. Such a perspective has led me to understand that there are many constructive initiatives currently going on in tourism management, which may be supported by such a perspective. The national tourism strategy is a case in point. The leadership of the New Zealand Tourism Industry Association is laudable, particularly if there is a concomitant focus on empowering communities and working with them to adaptively manage tourism, rather than imposing on them to try and 'make local people like tourism more.'
Testimony to the usefulness of such perspective is provided by the observation that these are the same as the processes that underlie our ability to work together on adapting ourselves to a myriad of problems and situations – from environmental management to dealing with poverty and conflict. Underlying all these processes are the needs of human beings, and these needs appear to include having enough perceived control and perceived efficacy to go on adapting and acting in a complex, and at times unpredictable, world.

As the history of science and technology illustrates, as a species we want to find ‘magic bullets’ that we can use to ‘fix’ our problems, and yet in many, if not most, cases, the magic bullets that we have found, have unexpected effects in the longer term. In a complex world, we have to be constantly observing, constantly monitoring and constantly questioning how things look from different places. In other words, to live successfully in a complex world, our most important tool is learning how best to ‘dance,’ by working to understand and change things around us by understanding and changing ourselves.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Kaikoura Questionnaire

Appendix 2 Rotorua Questionnaire

Appendix 3. Interview themes, starter questions and categories
What are the things that you like about Kaikoura?
(Do not suggest options. Rank in order as answers are given)

- Peace and Quiet/Space/Isolation
- Knowing people in town
- Having family here
- Climate/weather
- Spectacular scenery/landscape/countryside
- It's a safe place to live
- The close knit community/friendly people
- There's work here
- Access to natural environment
- Lifestyle

Other

---

A) If you were in Kaikoura 5 years ago, what was your main form of employment?

B) What is is your main form of employment now?

- Not applicable
- Fishing/fish factory
- Tourism
- Other services
- Dairy farming/factory
- Sheep/cattle/deer farming
- Retail Services
- MOW/telephone exchange
- Local government
- Railways
- Other govt. Depts
- Homemaker/housewife
- Retired
- Unemployed

Other (specify)

---

Have you worked in tourism in the last year? (✓ as appropriate)

1. Yes
2. No

If yes: About how many hours did you work during summer and winter.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does anyone else in your household work full time or part-time in tourism?

1. Full time 2. part-time

Person 1
Person 2
Person 3

******************************************************************************************

THIS SECOND SECTION of the survey is designed to gauge your overall reactions to tourists and the tourism industry in Kaikoura.

For you personally, have there been any benefits from tourism?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Unsure

If yes, what are they?

Ben1
Ben2
Ben3
Ben4

For you personally, has tourism had any negative impacts?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Unsure

If yes what are they?

Impact 1
Impact 2
Impact 3
Impact 4

Do you think the community as a whole benefits from tourism in Kaikoura?

1. Yes 2. No 3. unsure

If yes what are they?

Comben1
Comben2
Comben3
Comben4
What is your greatest concern about tourism in Kaikoura?

Over the next 5 years, do you think that tourism in Kaikoura will:

1. Decrease  2. increase  3. stay much the same

Last year the district council’s rates increase was presented as being necessary for tourism development. Which of these statements BEST applies to you?

1. I was happy to pay my rate increase.
2. I would have preferred to have paid lower rates increase but paid without complaining.
3. I have complained to the KDC about paying my rates increase.

What is the reason for your action?

In what ways, if any, has your daily life changed because of tourism?

**UNPROMPTED**

change

change

change

change

If needed, prompt:
What about when you go to town? And/ Or If the respondent works with tourists: have you made any adjustments to family life because of the hours you work?

**PROMPTED**

change1

change2

change3

change4
The next questions are about how much contact you have with visitors to Kaikoura.

Overall how much general contact do you have with visitors to Kaikoura during the tourist season? Read out options

1. none
2. Very little
3. Some
4. frequent

When you are at work, how much contact do you have with tourists?
Read out options

1. none
2. Very little
3. Some
4. frequent

Are there any particular types of tourist that you:

Like

Dislike

The next section is about the future of tourism in Kaikoura.

On the following scale of 1-10, where would you place yourself?

1 = there is already too much tourism in Kaikoura

10 = Kaikoura should develop tourism as much as possible

Record any explanations below (Ask why if no explanation is given)

Regarding facilities that benefit tourists and locals (for example breakwaters, slipways, landscaping), what proportion should be paid by ratepayers and what should be paid by tourist businesses?

Council | Business
--- | ---

you may need to prompt to get a proportion - eg. so 50-50? Record DK if they cannot decide
If you had the opportunity, would you participate in tourism planning?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Unsure

IF YES, how would you prefer to be involved in tourism planning? NO PROMPT
Please record a first and second option (if offered)?

- Public meetings
- By objecting to developments as they arise
- By attending council meetings
- By an ongoing public advisory group
- By surveys from time to time
- Talking to councillors
- The public do not need to be involved
- Other

******************************************************************************

THE QUESTIONS IN THIS FINAL SECTION will allow us to check that we have a good cross section of the community. Some of these questions are personal, but remember that your answers will be kept confidential and you remain anonymous.

19) What age group are you in? (Read options until stopped)

1. 15-19 2. 20-24
3. 25-29 4. 30-34
5. 35-39 6. 40-44
7. 45-49 8. 50-54
9. 55-59 10. 60-64
11. 65-69 12. 70+

What is your ethnicity?

1. Kati Kuri
2. Kai Tahu (not Kati Kuri)
3. NZ Pakeha/European/NewZealander
4. Other NZ Maori (if possible, specify Iwi group)
6. Both Maori and Pakeha/European
7. Other
   (specify)
Are you 1. male or 2. female

What is your highest educational qualification? (✓ only one)
1. Some high school
2. School Certificate
3. 6th from certificate/ UE
4. 7th Form
5. Apprenticeship/ trade qualification
6. TOPS/ KCCE or similar
7. University degree / polytech/ teachers college/ nursing
8. Other (please specify)

In the last year, what income group was your household in (read until respondent stops you)?
1. Nil income or loss
2. $1-$5,000
3. $5,001-$10,000
4. $10,001-$15,000
5. $15,001-$20,000
6. $20,001-$30,000
7. $30,001-$40,000
8. $40,001-$50,000
9. $50,001-$70,000
10. $70,000 - $100,000
11. $100,001+
12. Don’t know
13. refused

Thank you for your time and cooperation.
Rotorua Residents’ Survey

Interviewer instructions appear in italics - please do not read these to the respondent.

Introduction

Hello. My name is ________________, and I am working for Lincoln University. We are trying to find out what the local community thinks of tourism and the visitor industry in Rotorua.

To make sure that we have a random and balanced survey, I need to interview the person in the household who is 15 years or over and who has the next birthday. Is that you?

[If not: May I speak to that person please? Repeat introduction: if necessary....]

Is it convenient to ask you a few questions. This questionnaire takes about 10 minutes to complete and the answers are kept entirely confidential. We do not even need to know your name

If not, Is there a more suitable time when I could arrange to call you back?

Proceed . . .

If you feel that this person just needs some encouragement to participate:
[Your views are important and we are trying to get the views of many different types of people within the community, so it does not matter whether you feel that you have anything to do with visitors to the area or not. We would still like to hear what you think of tourism here in Rotorua]

Please note that this questionnaire is for people who reside in Rotorua and not for bachowners or owners of holiday homes who do not live in the area
This questionnaire is in 3 parts. You do not have to answer every question.

THE FIRST SECTION: asks some general questions about living and working in Rotorua

1) How long have you lived in Rotorua?

(Delete one)

Years/ months

(if respondent mentions family / other connections, please note here- no probe)

2) What do like about living in the Rotorua area? (Record in order as answers are given)
1
2
3
4

3) In the last year, have you worked casually, part time or full time in any of the following tourism-related jobs - tell me as I read them out (try to get an estimate of the average number of hours per week worked in each & length of time they worked for (months))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Type</th>
<th>Average Hrs/Wk</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation e.g. motels, hotels, backpackers,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport e.g. bus/ taxi driver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants/ cafes/ bars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel agency/ information centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour guiding or tourist attractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souvenir shops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) Does anyone else in your immediate family living in Rotorua work full time or part-time in tourism-related jobs?

No (✓) [ ] (if yes) Person 1 [ ]

Person 2 [ ]

Person 3 [ ]

Full time [ ] Part time [ ]

THIS SECOND SECTION of the survey is designed to gauge your overall reactions to visitors and the tourism industry in Rotorua.

5) What, if any, benefits are there from tourism and visitors in Rotorua? Record in order as spoken.

If not clear, check whether this is a community benefit and/or one that affects them individually (or both).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community (✓)</th>
<th>Personal (✓)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are none

7) What, if any, problems are caused by tourism and visitors in Rotorua? Record in order as spoken.

If not clear, check whether this is a community benefit and/or one that affects them individually (or both).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community (✓)</th>
<th>Personal (✓)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are none
6) Do you think the community as a whole benefits from tourism and visitors in Rotorua?


(if 4) specify who ____________________________

8) What are your greatest concerns about tourism and visitors in Rotorua?

1

2

3

4

9) Have you ever been concerned enough about these things to do something like write to a newspaper, or contact the council or an MP?

1. Yes  2. No

If yes: What did you do?

10) How often would you meet visitors/ tourists while you are doing your favourite recreation activities?  Read out options

If 3 or 4: what recreation activities?

1. Never
2. Very little
3. Sometimes
4. A lot

11) Overall how often would you meet visitors/ tourists in Rotorua?

Read out options

1. Never
2. Very little
3. Sometimes
4. A lot
12) The next few questions use a 3 point scale: never, sometimes or often

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>s/times</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed your shopping times to avoid crowds?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed your local recreation patterns to avoid crowds?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone away at busy times to avoid crowds in the Rotorua area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you ever take your own visitors to local attractions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you ever go to these attractions without visitors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(If other things are mentioned note below)*

13) Are there any places in Rotorua that you enjoy seeing and meeting visitors / tourists?

14) Are there any places in the Rotorua area that you would prefer not to see visitors/ tourists?

15) Are there any types of visitor / tourist that you particularly like or dislike?

    Like
    Dislike

16) I have a 5 point scale here I would like to know where you would place yourself on it. 1 means that there is far too much tourism now, 3 means that there is about the right level of tourism now and 5 means that we could do with a lot more tourism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is far too much tourism now</td>
<td>There is about the right level of tourism now</td>
<td>We could do with a lot more tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE QUESTIONS IN THIS FINAL SECTION will allow us to check that we have a good cross section of the community and to make comparisons with census data. As I said before, your answers are completely confidential.

17) What is your main form of employment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism (accommodation, transport, attractions)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafe, restaurant, bar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Services</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade (eg. mechanic, plumber, electrician)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (doctor, dentist, private consultant, nurse, teacher etc)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other govt. Depts</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker/ housewife</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18) Are you

1. male or 2. female

19) What age group are you in? *(stop me when I reach your age group)*

1. 15-19 5. 50-59
2. 20-29 6. 60-69
3. 30-39 7. 70+
4. 40-49

20) What is your highest educational qualification?

1. Some high school
2. School Certificate
3. 6th form certificate/ UE
4. 7th Form, Higher school cert.
5. Apprenticeship/ trade qualification
10. Other (please specify)
21) In the last year, what income group was your household in? *(Read until respondent stops you)*

1. Nil income or loss
2. $1-$5,000
3. $5,001-$10,000
4. $10,001-$15,000
5. $15,001-$20,000
6. $20,001-$30,000
7. $30,001-$40,000
8. $40,001-$50,000
9. $50,001-$70,000
10. $70,000-$100,000
11. $100,001+
12. Don’t know
13. Refused

22) To find out how close you live to a tourist attraction or a main road, we would like to know what street you live in.

Is the number of your address odd or even?

What is the nearest side street?

23) What is your ethnicity? *Tick only one.*

1. Maori *(if possible, specify iwi & hapu group?)*
2. Pakeha/European
3. Both Maori and Pakeha/European *(iwi/hapu?)*
4. Other *(specify)*

*If Maori (1 or 3):*
Another part of this study is looking at tourism issues that are important to Maori in Rotorua. Would you be prepared to participate in this part of the study?

If you agree, we will record your first name and phone number will be passed onto our researchers so that they can contact you at a later date.

Thank you very much for your time
Appendix 3

Themes and starter questions for interviews

Tourism
What is tourism?
Tell me about tourism in Kaikoura/ Rotorua
What is your role in relation to tourism or
What if anything is your interest in tourism?
Overall is tourism good, bad or indifferent? Why do you say that?
What things make you aware of tourists around here?
When do you meet tourists?
How often do you meet tourists?
Tell me how tourism is managed here
Who would you say are the important players in tourism here?
If you wanted to discuss an issue to do with tourism, who would you go to?

Community
Tell me about the community here in Kaikoura/ Rotorua?
Who are the people that you picture when you say ‘community’?
What different parts are there to the local community?
What are the issues that you think are important here in Kaikoura/ Rotorua?

History
Tell me what happened when ....
What do you remember about events.
Draw out stories that come up in other parts of the interview?

Politics
What do you think of the council
Which councillors do you know of and
How happy are you with the work of the council?
How well is tourism represented on Council
What do you feel about (different local developments in the relevant areas as brought up by the interviewee – the eg airport, casino in Rotorua; the marina, the carpark in Kaikoura)

Important themes in Kaikoura:
Catholicism
Family history
Maori Pakeha relationships
Who are 'locals'?
Public drinking patterns
Tourism history
Local events
Local effects of restructuring
Recreation patterns

**Important themes in Rotorua**

The development of Tourism Rotorua
Poverty
The relationship between Māori and Pākehā
The millennium
Development of the airport
Crime
Town redevelopment
Issues surrounding the lakefront
Issues surrounding the Geothermal resource
Recreation patterns

Table 1: The categories considered when selecting interviewees (note that some interviewees fitted more than one category.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rotorua (35)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Kaikoura (64)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local tourism operators</td>
<td>Local tourism operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers in tourism (non-owners)</td>
<td>Workers in tourism (non-owners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General business people</td>
<td>General business people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Staff</td>
<td>General business workers (non-owners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected councillors</td>
<td>Council Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Rotorua staff</td>
<td>KITI staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>Elected councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/ female</td>
<td>Fishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Conservation Staff</td>
<td>Housewives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>Retirees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social researchers</td>
<td>Maori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>Different family histories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different age groups</td>
<td>Recent arrivals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Because tourism was less of an issue for most Rotorua people, I found it easier to talk with people I met informally rather than trying to formally interview them as outlined in the Methodology chapter.</em></td>
<td>Department of Conservation Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different age groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A journalist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>