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A *Jewelled Paradise*

Diamonds on your surface,
Brilliant seas in sunlight.

Emeralds are on your hills,
Brightly the greens gleam.

Sapphires hue the sky above,
Clear blue and crisp.

Golden are our Marlborough Sounds,
The treasure chest of nature.

- (Author unknown)
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requirements for the Degree of M.Appl.Sc.

TERMINAL DECISIONS:

A CASE STUDY OF COMMUNITY RESPONSES TO TOURISM

DEVELOPMENT IN PICTON, NEW ZEALAND.

By Michael C. Shone

There is a growing awareness and acceptance of the need for a strong community role
in the planning of tourism (Pearce, Moscardo, and Ross, 1996), and a belief that local
communities can have an impact on tourism development (Murphy, 1985). To this end,
locally defined goals and initiatives are increasingly being seen as an integral part of the
tourism planning process. Accordingly, residents’ responses and reactions to proposed
future developments should be seen as a crucial issue in tourism planning, as they are
key to the ‘hospitality atmosphere’ of a destination.

The purpose of this study was to examine community responses to tourism development
in the town of Picton, New Zealand. This was placed in the context of the threatened
loss of a major transportation link, Tranz Rail Ltd.’s Interislander ferry service, and
with it the potential loss of over 1.1 million passengers each year. Randomly selected
Picton residents were invited to participate in the present study. This involved
completing a self-administered postal survey, which contained questions relating to
their attitudes toward, expectations of, and involvement in, the ‘business’ of tourism
planning and development in Picton. In-depth interviews were also undertaken among a
sub-group of these residents.
The results of the study indicate that overall support for the tourism industry in Picton is strong amongst its residents. Residents were not opposed to tourism at its current levels, and even favoured its expansion. Residents also indicated a desire for active and 'meaningful' public participation in future tourism planning. In addition, statistically significant results were achieved when identifying the influence of selected variables on resident response. These findings have implications for future tourism planning, and suggest that meaningful input from local communities should be included in the formulation of regional tourism planning strategies. Any such community involvement should come from a basis of understanding what tourism can do for, and to, their communities, and an appreciation of the relative strengths and weaknesses inherent within those communities.

Additionally, recommendations are made for the inclusion of meaningful community input in the future formulation and management of a strategic tourism plan for the Picton area.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

All components of the tourism system depend on transportation for their very existence. For regions, destinations and sites, tourism development must have access (Gunn, 1993, p.76).

The issue of how communities shape and respond to ‘change’ is a driving factor in assessing community response to tourism, and a consequence of understanding community reactions to tourism will be to assist planning (Pearce, Moscardo & Ross, 1996). This study is concerned with community responses to tourism development in the Marlborough town of Picton. The research is placed in the context of Tranz Rail’s Ltd.’s proposal to relocate its Cook Strait "Interislander" ferry terminal from the present Picton location to a new location at Clifford Bay, some 95 kilometres south of Picton. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to investigate the impact of such a proposed event with regard to destination residents’ perceptions of, and involvement in, the ‘business’ of tourism planning and development in Picton. This chapter commences with a description of the context in which the present study is placed. Specific research objectives are then presented. The chapter concludes with a brief outline of the proceeding chapters in this thesis.

1.2 The Research Context

According to Matheison and Wall (1982), the significance of transport in tourism cannot be overstated. Tourism, by its very definition, involves the movement of people from their places of permanent residence to new locations. Transport should, therefore, be considered a necessary requirement of tourism (Matheison and Wall, 1982). This point is highlighted by Collier (1997), who credits the accessibility of the destination to be one of the main components of the tourist system. Not surprisingly, then, all components of the tourism system depend on transportation, particularly passenger transportation, for their very existence (Gunn, 1994). Passenger transportation is vital, as it provides the very critical link between market source and destination. Therefore,
all participants in the tourism system each have a critical stake in all transportation development, policies and practises. Any changes in routes, pricing, schedules, convenience and interfacing between modes can foster or spell disaster for tourism (Gunn, 1994).

1.2.1 Picton and the Cook Strait Ferry Service

Tourism development holds a great deal of appeal for many communities\(^1\). This appeal can be attributed, for the most part, to the much anticipated (and publicised) economic benefits that tourism can offer a destination, such as increased income and employment. However, the one factor that should be borne in mind by any community involved with tourism is that the only 'constant' is change. Murphy (1985), supports this notion and notes:

> Tourism is a highly competitive business, dependent on many external factors over which a destination has little or no control. Consequently, a destination's relative success (or failure) can be influenced by such factors as the weather, changing consumer preferences, economic cycles, and government policy (p.77).

Over the 37 years since its association with the Cook Strait rail ferries first began, Picton has been gradually transformed from a town based primarily in agriculture, forestry and fishing, to a town now heavily reliant upon tourism as a significant contributor to its economy (in 1998, approximately 1.1 million people used the Cook Strait ferry service). Consequently, the town of Picton is now in an unenviable position insofar as it is extremely vulnerable to the many external factors that influence the ebb and flow of tourism demand. In fact, such is Picton’s reliance on the ferries to deliver tourists to its ‘doorstep’ that any threat to this association carries with it some significant implications in terms of the future of tourism in Picton. Unfortunately, for the local community, it appears that such a threat now exists.

1.2.2 The Clifford Bay Proposal

In 1996, Tranz Rail Ltd., Port Marlborough New Zealand Ltd.’s (PMNZL) most significant customer, announced that it intended to seek resource consents that would be

---

\(^1\) The term community refers to "...the sum of the clustered interactions of people occupying a restricted geographical space" (Pearce, Moscardo and Ross, 1996, p. 28).
required to allow it to develop a new ferry port (PMNZL, 1996). The following year, Tranz Rail lodged applications for, and obtained, the appropriate resource consent to establish this new port at Clifford Bay, south of Blenheim, for the exclusive use of their Cook Strait ferry operations. This consent approval was granted subject to appeals to the Environment Court. After lengthy delays, on 15 November 1999 the Environment Court of New Zealand finally cleared the way for Tranz Rail to develop its proposed Clifford Bay inter-island ferry port.

At the time of data collection (July-September 2000), Tranz Rail had made no formal announcement regarding the commencement of construction, nor had Port Marlborough New Zealand Ltd. been formally advised by Tranz Rail of any intent to vacate its current Picton berthing. However, more recently Tranz Rail has announced their intention not to pursue an alternate ferry site at Clifford Bay (January, 2001). This notwithstanding, under the terms of the resource consent issued by the Environment Court, Tranz Rail still has up to six years from the date of issue to start construction on the new ferry terminal at Clifford Bay before having to reapply for planning permission. With the possibility of ongoing discontent in the future, the town of Picton faces a prolonged period of uncertainty that is likely to complicate planning decisions for many years. Thus, the present study comes at a time when the residents of Picton have been prompted to re-examine and re-assess the role, and worth, of tourism to the community. It is a salient reminder of the inherent vulnerability of 'destinations' to factors seemingly beyond their control, and of the constancy of change.

1.3 Research Objectives

The tourism 'product', when seen primarily as a destination experience, should be regarded as a product of which all the community, not just the tourism intermediaries, are stakeholders. Accordingly, the key objectives addressed in this study are as follows:

1. To assess the general attitude held by Picton residents towards tourism in Picton.

2. To investigate the significance of various factors in influencing residents' responses to tourism growth and development in Picton (i.e., social contact, economic dependence, community attachment, and physical distance).
3. To assess the desired level (or scale) and direction of Picton's future tourism development(s) by Picton residents.

4. To assess the desired level of participation in planning future tourism strategies and developments by Picton residents.

There was also a need to establish Picton's role and stage of touristic development. This indicated two additional research objectives were required to establish Picton's overall standing in the broader context. These additional objectives include:

5. To evaluate the role of tourism within Picton's everyday community life.

6. To explore whether or not the case of Picton is comparable to other community-based tourism research.

1.4 Thesis Structure

This thesis comprises seven chapters. A review of the academic literature (Chapter 2) on tourism development and community participation in tourism planning is offered, in which it is argued that community acceptance of tourism is crucial to the overall success of the 'industry'. Central to this is the concept of community participation and consultation in the planning process. Many writers have espoused the need for such community involvement, and have argued that one of the goals of their research is to contribute to a stronger role for communities in tourism development. It is the citizen that must live with the cumulative effects of such development, and therefore needs to have a greater input into how the community is 'packaged' and sold as a tourist product on the world market. Such issues have led to a call for better integration at a community level, thus establishing this study's wider context.

The third chapter introduces Picton, the study area. Picton acts as the principal port of the Marlborough region and serves as the commercial and social centre of the Marlborough Sounds. Its large, deep-water port acts as a transport terminus for the Cook Strait railcar passenger ferries, the South Island's main trunk railway, as well as an array of land and water taxis, mail and milk 'runs', fishing launches, and pleasure craft. A large number of travellers pass through the town every day, and at the height of the holiday season (December - April) the local accommodation establishments
overflow with visitors and holidaymakers. Together with Havelock, Picton also functions as the main service centre for settlers in the rural parts of the Marlborough Sounds.

In the fourth chapter, specific research methods are described, and their rationale discussed. Three methods are described: field observations, a resident postal survey, and interviews with Picton residents, along with their objectives and 'timing'. Moreover, because the research deals with public participation in tourism planning, research methods are also an integral part of the research objectives.

Research data are then presented in two separate chapters. In the first (Chapter 5), a profile of survey respondents is presented to furnish further understanding of the study area, and to provide a framework for considering the substantive issues that follow. Substantive data are presented in Chapter 6. Their presentation follows similar themes to the introductory chapters. The general role and appreciation of tourism as a development option is first pursued, along with the need and requirements for its planning. Finally, attention is paid to configuring and interpreting four major constraints that shape resident attitudes and expectations regarding tourism in the study area.

In the final chapter, results of the study are summarised, conclusions drawn, and future research opportunities identified.
Chapter 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter details an examination of the academic literature on tourism development and community participation in tourism planning. The chapter begins with a brief outline of some key concepts, so as to provide a clear starting point for the remaining review. Following this, the role of tourism as a catalyst for community change is introduced, as are the social impacts of tourism development and the nature of tourism-community relationships. Finally, the findings of previous community-based tourism research are reviewed in order to establish some context for the findings of this study to be considered. The chapter ends with a brief summary.

2.2 Key Concepts
Before embarking on an examination of the tourism literature, it is important that key terms and concepts are identified and defined. The purpose of this is to ensure that a clarity and consistency of concepts is maintained throughout the following discussion, as it is these core concepts that form the foundation of the remaining review. To this end, the following concepts are defined: what is tourism? (and who is a tourist?), what constitutes a community?, what are attitudes?, and what are carrying capacities?

Defining Tourism. Tourism is, first and foremost, a human activity. It is, however, manifested in a variety of forms and subject to a multiplicity of perspectives (Simmons and Leiper, 1993). The tourism literature offers an array of definitions as to the exact nature of tourism. It is these definitions that serve to reveal several key dimensions: those related to the tourist, to business, to the host community, to the host environment, to the host government, and to the generating regions (Tribe, 1997).

Arguably the most straightforward of definitions is offered by Holloway (1995), in which it is proposed that tourism is transport, accommodation, and attractions. This is added to by Smith (1988), who proposes that tourism is the sum of all activities that
directly provide goods and services during a stay at a destination. Leiper (1995) suggests that, to the individual tourist, tourism is an intangible experience that may represent a pivotal leisure experience, while Berno (1995) notes that, in aggregate, tourism is a form of social behaviour, often cross-cultural in its scope. For Gunn (1994), tourism, as a product, is an amalgam of four main components, each of which carries environmental, social and economic implications. The first component is the attractions at the destination, the second is the amenities at the destination, the third is the accessibility of the destination, and the fourth component is people. This fourth component is of particular importance due to the socio-cultural implications associated with tourism. However, arguably one of the best working definitions of tourism comes from Matheison and Wall (1982), who define tourism as:

...the temporary movement of people to destinations outside their normal places of work and residence, the activities undertaken their stay in those destinations, and the facilities created to cater to their needs (p. 1).

This definition locates tourism at the sum of a number of sub-activities: mainly travel, hospitality and recreation. In effect, such definitions and conceptualisations have served to reinforce the interdisciplinary nature of tourism, and whilst some analysts have attempted to describe tourism studies as a discipline, others have found evidence to support its concept as a multi-disciplinary field. This view is supported by Bodewes (1981, p. 39), who states: "tourism is not one academic discipline, but the object of many disciplines". Similarly, Smith (1988) proposes that tourism can be defined in a variety of ways according to the interests and perceptions of the different entities involved in the process. These entities can be professional and entrepreneurial associations, public sector organisations, researchers and so forth. However, many of these viewpoints have one thing in common: the development of the concept of tourism around the definition of what constitutes a tourist (Smith, 1988). Thus, according to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), a tourist is:

...a person who spends at least 24 hours outside his or her normal place of residence, in his or her own country or abroad, with a purpose other than a permanent paid activity at the destination (OECD, 1995).
Defining Community. When addressing the issue of definitions and approaches to community, Pearce, Moscardo and Ross (1996) caution that the views and definitions held by observers will direct researcher and analytical attention to certain groups, individuals or processes. Additionally, it is instructive to appreciate that the selection of one perspective may also deflect the research and empirical attention away from other topics.

According to Burr (1991), there are four theoretical approaches to community in the literature on tourism impacts. The first approach, labelled the human ecological approach, emphasises the community living together and adapting to the setting (environment). The second approach, termed the social systems approach, emphasises the roles and institutions that govern society. The third approach, termed the critical approach, emphasises the opposing forces in groups of people, including communities, and pays particular attention to the power of key groups in the decision-making process. The fourth and final approach is known as the interactional approach, and can be seen as the sum of the regular social interactions of individuals. Thus, for the purposes of this study, and consistent with the interactional approach, community may be viewed as “the sum of the clustered interactions of people occupying a restricted geographical area” (Pearce et al., 1996, p. 28).

Defining Attitudes. A variety of explanations as to the exact nature of attitudes can be found in the academic literature, with the differences between these appearing to be a matter of semantics. According to Allport (1935, cited in Oskamp, 1977, p. 9), an attitude may be defined as:

...a mental or neural state of readiness, organised through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual’s response to all objects and situations with which it is related.

In a similar vein, McDoughall and Monro (1987, p. 87), suggest that attitudes may be defined as “an enduring predisposition towards a particular aspect of one’s environment. This predisposition can be reflected in the way one thinks, feels, and behaves with respect to that aspect”. Thus, attitudes are structured along three dimensions: (1) cognitive (beliefs, knowledge, perceptions), (2) affective (likes and
dislikes), and (3) behavioural (action taken or expressed, instinct to act with respect to a particular object or place).

However, according to Pearce et al. (1996), behaviour is not always consistent with attitudes, and several explanations are offered as to why such inconsistencies may exist. For example, it might be that the questions asked to elicit attitudes were not specific enough. Similarly, poor links between attitudes and behaviour may also reflect the relevance or importance of a topic to individuals. People for whom tourism is distant or unimportant may be able to express an attitude toward tourism that is relatively 'simple', with few detailed directions for behaviour. Additionally, attitudes and actions are subject to certain constraints (e.g., the social and/or situational context that a person may be confronted with), and it is therefore unlikely that attitudes and actions will be consistent on every occasion. Another important point to note about attitudes is that positive and negative attitudes are organised differently. Specifically, negative attitudes are often more detailed and more strongly held (Moscovici, 1963).

**Defining Carrying Capacity.** According to Saveriades (2000), the concept of carrying capacity has attracted an array of definitions within the context of outdoor recreation. However, all definitions of recreational carrying capacity incorporate two central aspects: (1) the biological component, which relates to the integrity of the resource base, and (2) the behavioural component, which relates to the quality of the recreational experience (Saveriades, 2000).

According to O'Reilly (1986), the concept of recreational carrying capacity has diffused into studies of tourism due to the increasing concern regarding the negative impacts of tourism, and the realisation that destination areas display cycles of popularity and decline. O'Reilly describes two schools of thought concerning tourism carrying capacity. The first school of thought considers tourism carrying capacity to be the ability of a destination area to 'absorb' tourism before the host community feels the negative impacts of tourism. Emphasis, therefore, is placed on the number of tourists that are wanted and that can be absorbed. The second school of thought considers tourism carrying capacity to be the level beyond which tourist flows will decline due to certain capacities (as perceived by the tourists) having been exceeded. In such
situations, the destination area ceases to satisfy and attract tourists, hence they seek alternative destinations (Saveriades, 2000).

2.3 The Constancy of Social Change

The constancy of social change is one of the paradoxes of human existence (Pearce, et al., 1996). For individuals, there can be stimulation and excitement involved in shaping and responding to a changing social environment, yet there are also emotional rewards in dealing with familiar places and predictable events. At the community level, Toffler (1970) was one of the first authors to highlight that an inability to respond to change could be socially destructive, while Langer (1989) outlined a need for individuals to be mindful in order to avoid the psychological costs of relying only on familiar and established ways of thinking and acting.

Change and flexibility do not come easily to individuals, or especially communities. Therefore, the issue of how communities shape and respond to social and environmental change is a driving factor in assessing community response to tourism. The tension between embracing the future (and the change it contains) and valuing the past (and the stability and predictability it represents) is fundamental to understanding tourism at the community level (Pearce et al., 1996). This point is no better illustrated than by Murphy (1985), who states:

_The one factor that should be borne in mind by any community involved with tourism is that the only 'constant' is change. It is a highly competitive business, dependent on many external factors over which a destination has little or no control (p. 77)._  

A major shift has occurred in the economic base of many rural and small communities in recent years. Communities that once were driven by agriculture, light industry, and product-oriented businesses – communities like the town of Picton – are now seeking alternative development strategies to enhance their sagging economies. They have entered the post-industrial era of technologically-oriented businesses and service industries (Allen et al., 1988). In response to this change, a common service-oriented strategy for rural and small community development is the promotion of tourism, which is viewed as a source of new employment, increased revenues, additional taxes, and a
generally enhanced community infrastructure that will, in turn, attract other industries (Liu and Var, 1986).

2.3.1 Tourism and Community Change

According to Jafari (1986), tourism is the largest peacetime movement of people in the history of humanity, and continues to grow at an astonishingly high annual rate worldwide. In support of this view, tourism researchers have asserted that this service industry has become one of the largest and fastest growing industries in the world economy, with nations, states, and communities funding tourist boards to promote their locations and attract further investment (Edgell, 1990). However, as various researchers have discovered, tourism can have wide ranging and far reaching impacts upon a host community’s social structure, individual lifestyles, and the destination’s economy (Eadington and Redman, 1991; Gartner, 1996).

In the early 1970s, tourism was considered a 'smokeless industry', largely dependent on using and developing the natural and cultural resources of a country as attractions for visitors. Tourism was also looked upon as a panacea for stimulating economic development due to its extensive contribution to foreign exchange earnings, generation of income, employment and government revenue (Saveriades, 2000). As a consequence of this, many destinations experienced rapid development in an unplanned and casual manner to accommodate the massive influx of tourists. At the same time, evidence emerged that tourism could erode the physical and social environment of any given destination. It thus became apparent that unplanned development could transform or even permanently destroy the character of the natural and cultural resources and result in the eventual loss of tourist demand (Inskeep, 1991).

The scope of tourism’s potential for change is revealed by Upchurch and Teivane (2000), who argue that tourism undoubtedly plays an important role in: (1) the economic and technological development of destinations by stimulating the development of basic infrastructure, (2) contributing to the growth of domestic industries that supply the tourism industry, (3) attracting foreign investment, and (4) facilitating the transfer of technology. Furthermore, tourism, as an economic activity, provides a destination with income, creates jobs, reduces unemployment, fosters entrepreneurship, stimulates production of food and local handicrafts, facilitates cultural
exchanges, and contributes to a better understanding of the destination and the world at large. Certainly, then, the changing dimensions of this vast and expanding industry brings into focus concerns over cultural, ecological, environmental, social and political consequences of tourism (Edgell, 1990).

2.4 Resident Responsive Tourism Planning

The development of tourism in communities is not simply a matter of matching product supply with tourist demand. Local residents' perceptions and acceptance of visitors are also important in tourism planning. Increasing attention is therefore being paid to the necessary role of host communities and cultures, not just as part of the 'hospitality atmosphere' of a destination, but as an essential component of the distinctiveness of individual destinations, and in the search for sustainable levels of tourism development (Murphy, 1985; Simmons, 1994). Because all tourism involves some degree of interaction between members of a host community and a series of temporary guests to that locale, local acceptability must be considered (Andereck and Vogt, 2000). Moreover, it is community residents who ultimately have a voice in concluding which tourism impacts are acceptable and which are unacceptable.

For a tourism-based economy to sustain itself in local communities, the residents must be willing partners in the process (Allen et al., 1988). Therefore, it would seem useful at this point to provide an operational definition of community participation in the tourism planning process. According to Pearce et al. (1996), community participation in the tourism planning process may be generally understood as:

...the involvement of individuals within a tourism-oriented community in the decision-making and implementation process with regard to major manifestations of political and socio-economic activities (1996, p. 181).

Smith (1984) notes that there are four prerequisites for community participation. These include: (1) the legal right and opportunity to participate, (2) access to information, (3) provision of enough resources for people or groups to get involved, and (4) genuinely public (rather than select involvement) participation from these communities. Importantly, Smith (1984) warns that public participation should not be confined to operational issues, but should also include strategic and normative planning.
2.4.1 Facilitating Resident Responsive Planning

For well over 30 years it has been argued that sustainable development in any industry relies on the integrated planning and management of three interdependent systems: the environment, the economy, and the society (Lawson et al., 1998). In the case of tourism, the society and its culture are often an integral part of the product that brings the visitor to the destination, and the very development of the industry will undoubtedly have some effect on that society. Accordingly, during the past two decades, researchers have given increasing attention to the impacts of tourism (Ap, 1992), and to the responses of local residents to tourism development (King, Pizam and Millman, 1993).

A background issue that provides the context for the study of tourism and community change can be identified in the work of Hawkins (1993). In this work, Hawkins identifies several key issues facing future tourism development, including the recognition that there are finite limitations to tourism development (in terms of both the physical and social carrying capacity of a destination). Additionally, Hawkins emphasises that resident-responsive tourism is the 'watchword' for the future, and any demands for active participation in the setting of the tourism agenda and its priorities for tourism development and management cannot, and should not, be ignored.

Ritchie (1993), building from Hawkins, has compiled key research issues to facilitate resident-responsive tourism. These include:

1. To identify methodologies for improving public participation/input into tourism development priorities and directions.
2. To establish the role, impact and acceptability of non-resident ownership of tourism facilities/services.
3. Formulation of a local vision for tourism development.
4. To assess the impact of a programme to enhance public participation in tourism planning and development.
5. To determine the impacts of foreign ownership on resident support for tourism.
6. Design of a cost-effective programme to provide information to the community concerning tourism impacts and issues.
7. Assessment of the ongoing implementation of a programme to enhance resident reception of visitors.

8. To determine where to locate city-related information so as to benefit both residents and visitors.

While both Hawkins (1993) and Ritchie (1993) argue that resident-responsive tourism will become increasingly important in future tourism policies and planning, it is not the case that these issues have not been previously considered. The often-quoted works of both Murphy (1985) and Krippendorf (1987) argue directly for, and describe new approaches to, planning for tourism. Both these authors review the range of potential negative impacts of tourism on both host communities and their environment. Murphy (1985), in a much more pragmatic fashion, outlines a new community-driven tourism planning approach. Central to this community-driven tourism planning is an explicit recognition that experts cannot judge the perceptions, preferences or priorities of host communities. Murphy argues instead for the direct participation of local communities in tourism planning and development.

2.4.2 Power and Participation

In any discussion on community involvement in tourism planning and development decision-making, the question of power and influence becomes a consideration. For many individual citizens, the sole purpose of participation is to exercise power, or at least some influence, over the outcome of tourism development in their residential area (Pearce et al., 1996). To this end, Painter (1992) has distinguished between 'pseudo', 'partial', and 'full' participation. Pseudo participation is restricted to such processes as informing and endorsement, and offers a feeling of participation without its substance. Partial participation gives the participants some opportunities for exercising influence, but reserves the final power to make decisions with an authority holder. Full participation is a process where each individual member of a decision-making body has equal power to determine the outcome of decisions. These distinctions between various types of participation are founded on assessments of the potency displayed by participants. According to Pearce et al. (1996), a more elaborate typology of distinctions, but based on a similar approach, is to be found in Arnstein's (1971) "ladder of participation", with its eight rungs, ascending from manipulation through
therapy, information, consultation, placation, partnership, and delegated power to citizen control (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1: The Ladder of Citizen Participation](based on Arnstein, 1971)

The continuum of planning strategies: *Citizen Control* represents ‘bottom-up’ planning; and, *Manipulation* represents ‘top-down’ planning. The rest are varying degrees of each (as it stands at the moment, the current trend towards organisational efficiency is a leading factor in the push towards tokenism).

| (Rare) | 8. Citizen Control ▶ |
| (Infrequent) | 7. Delegated Power ▶ |
| (Quite possible) | 6. Partnership ▶ |
| | 5. Placation ▶ |
| | 4. Consultation ▶ |
| | 3. Informing ▶ |
| (Public meetings; ‘Vent the spleen’) | 2. Therapy ▶ |
| | 1. Manipulation ▶ |

### 2.5 The Social Impacts of Tourism

Tourism is a socio-cultural event for the traveller and the host, and indeed part of the attraction of travel is the opportunity to see different areas of the world, and to observe foreign cultures and ways of life. Consequently, tourism can act to either denigrate local customs and traditions, or enhance them. It has even been suggested that the host community often regards tourism as an economic necessity but a ‘social evil’ (Collier, 1997). Such an attitude reflects, in part, the growing awareness of tourism’s ability to create social stress and negative community attitudes towards the sector. This has led to the rapid expansion of research in an attempt to examine and explain these phenomena.

However, before examining specific types of impacts, it is important to understand the conditions under which these impacts take place. The terminology *hosts and guests*, popularised by Smith (1989), is now a generally accepted expression of the social dichotomy, with respect to social roles, between destination area residents and the
tourists visiting that area. Importantly, the respective levels of social, economic, and political development can be a critical factor in shaping host-guest relationships (Inskeep, 1991). Mathieson and Wall (1982) point out that host-guest encounters are staged within a network of goals and expectations. On the one hand, the tourist is mobile, relaxed, 'free-spending', enjoying their leisure and absorbing the experience of being in another place. In contrast, the host is relatively stationary and, if employed in the tourism industry, spend a large part of their time catering to tourists.

2.5.1 Theoretical Framework

Although much of the research on resident attitudes and responses toward tourism has been 'atheoretical', those that have used a theoretical framework have most often employed social exchange theory (Ap, 1990, 1992; Carmichael et al., 1996; Jurowski et al., 1997; Long et al., 1990; Perdue et al., 1987). Social exchange theory provides a conceptual base for understanding the exchange of resources of any kind (either concrete or symbolic) between individuals and groups (Ap, 1992), and proposes that residents' attitudes toward tourism follow some kind of equity or social exchange function (Lankford and Howard, 1994; Perdue et al., 1990). Thus, social exchange theory provides an economic-like analysis of interaction that focuses on the exchange and mutual dispensation of rewards and costs between hosts and guests. According to Pearce et al. (1996, p. 20), the "underlying assumption of exchange is that 'actors' behave in a way that maximises the rewards and minimises the costs they experience". Individuals evaluate the exchange relative to the personal benefits and costs associated with that exchange. As such, a host actor will perceive an exchange positively when the consequences of that exchange provide a reinforcing exchange experience. Alternately, a host actor will perceive an exchange negatively when the consequences of that exchange provide an unrewarding or unfavourable exchange experience (Ap, 1992). From a tourism perspective, therefore, residents who perceive that valued personal benefits of tourism outweigh personal costs will support tourism development (Jurowski et al., 1997).

2.5.2 The Heterogeneity of Host Communities

Despite the numerous studies that focus on resident attitudes toward tourism development, there is still only a limited understanding of resident responses to the impacts of tourism, and under what conditions residents react to those impacts (Ap,
This lack of understanding is partly explained by the diversity in the range of communities in which tourism occurs, as well as the diversity within specific host communities. In such situations it is simplistic to consider single host communities, since tourism development will have different impacts on different society segments and may bring far-reaching changes to the social, cultural and political balance of a destination area (Carmichael, 2000). Therefore, when tourism development occurs in areas of host community diversity it is not surprising that a wide variation in attitudes toward tourism will be present. In light of this diversity within and between host communities, Lankford and Howard (1994) maintain there is a continuing need to assess and report the consequences of tourism development, as there is for any other industry.

2.5.3 Hosts and Guests

The nature of host-guest encounters is determined by the characteristics of the interacting individuals or groups, and by the conditions under which contact takes place. According to a UNESCO study (1976), the relationship between hosts and guests in destinations can be characterised by four major features. Firstly, they involve transitory relationships. Visitors are usually in a community for only a short period of time, so any interaction between hosts and guests has little chance to progress beyond casual and superficial levels. Secondly, there are temporal and spatial constraints to host-guest interaction. Visits are usually seasonal and non-repeated events, so the hospitality business often becomes exploitative to take advantage of this situation. Thirdly, with the development of mass tourism, host-guest meetings lack the spontaneity associated with individual schedules. Finally, when hosts and guests meet, it is generally an unequal and unbalanced experience. Hosts often feel inferior when they compare their situation to a visitor’s apparent wealth and can become resentful at this contrast. Similarly, tourists may exhibit behaviour whilst on holiday that would be considered unacceptable in their home environment. This last point raises the question of whether or not tourist behaviour is typical of the tourist in their home environment. Inskeep (1991), in addressing this issue, states:

*The tourists' culture is somewhat different from their home culture, with tourists feeling emancipated from their ordinary cultural bounds and adopting the symbols and behaviour patterns of a non-ordinary (sic) lifestyle. Tourists have fewer...*
social constraints and typically feel less inhibited when travelling than they do in their home cultures, with some tourists seeking experiences that would not be socially accepted in their own cultures (p. 367).

The assessment of the impacts associated with tourism may be approached in a number of ways. However, according to Lawson et al. (1998), the most common way of empirically assessing the social impacts of tourism has been through the measurement of residents' attitudes toward 'the industry', and the effects that are perceived in their local communities. These resident attitudes and perceptions, it is argued, are shaped and influenced by many factors, ranging from individual factors (e.g., socio-demographic variables, personal prejudices), through to community factors (e.g., host-guest ratio, economic dependence on tourism) (Lawson et al., 1998).

2.5.4 The Importance of Community Acceptance

Much of the most recent tourism research has focused on how various sections of the community have differed in their reactions to the impacts of tourism. To this end, most have concentrated on either a single or small number of neighbouring communities. The principal reason for this attention is that the perceptions and attitudes of residents toward the impacts of tourism are likely to be an important planning and policy consideration for the successful development, marketing and operation of existing and future tourism programmes and projects (Ap, 1992). Additionally, many destination area attractions are public property or public goods, and the hospitality needed for a memorable visit must come from members of the public as well as employees of the tourism industry. Murphy (1985) notes that the development of new facilities or events increasingly requires public investment in infrastructure and shared facilities:

*It is the citizen who must live with the cumulative outcome of such developments and needs to have greater input into how their community is packaged and sold as a tourist product on the world market* (Murphy, 1985, p. 16).

Simmons and Fairweather (1998) support this view, and suggest that a key starting point for any tourism plan has to be an examination of the needs and aspirations of local people. According to Simmons and Fairweather (1998), the rationale for including community input into tourism planning is simple:
The positive and negative impacts (economic, social and environmental) of tourism have their most profound effects on host communities. Whenever tourism activity is highly concentrated in time and space, grows rapidly, disrupts community life, or ignores community input, then the seeds of discontent are sown. Encounters between hosts and tourists can turn sour, negative feedback has its impact on visitor number, and the industry...will then peak and fade (p. 1).

Consequently, any impacts from tourism that cause annoyance or irritation amongst the host community may lead to problems with long-term sustainability of the industry, and the economic benefits that may be derived from it (Lawson et al., 1998). According to Pearce (1989), any such negative community response to tourism may take several forms. It may be manifested in a reduced support for the politicians and advocates of tourism, it may result in a decreased willingness to work in the tourism industry, it may be manifested in a reduced desire to market tourism products by word-of-mouth, it may be less a than welcoming response to visitors and, finally, it may result in disruptive legal and physical activities which slow new developments or make them financially impossible. These negative responses by an alienated community can understandably create a climate of uncertainty in the minds of the would-be tourism developer.

It is because of this potential for community rejection that the willingness of residents to serve as gracious hosts is critical to the success of tourism (Noronha, 1977; Zehnder, 1976). Therefore, achieving the goal of favourable community support for the tourism industry requires an understanding of how residents formulate their attitudes toward tourism (Jurowski et al., 1997). Residents must be involved in tourism planning, they must be informed and consulted about the scope of development (Cooke, 1982; Loukissas, 1983), and their attitudes toward tourism and perceptions of its impacts on community life must be continually assessed (Allen et al., 1988). In doing so, studies of local populations' perceptions of tourism impacts can be useful in formulating strategies to gain support for tourism ventures, thus minimising the potential for friction between tourists and residents (Belise and Hoy, 1980).

2.5.5 Modelling Tourism Impacts

The growing awareness of tourism's ability to create social stress and negative community attitudes toward the industry has led to the creation of several resident-
visitor social relationship models. One direction taken by the theorists has been to focus on the stress factor and seek a threshold level between acceptance and rejection of the industry. According to Murphy (1985), this approach has much in common with the carrying capacity concept, but tends to be more abstract because one is measuring the intangibles of human stress and attitudes.

In literature on tourism impacts and community responses to tourism, stage or step models are still popular. For example, Smith (1978a) saw the development of tourism in terms of waves, or a succession, of tourist types. Smith's model was directed at cross-cultural contact issues, and her book *Hosts and Guests* contained several studies where social impacts on local communities were directly related to the expansion of tourism (i.e., Greenwood, 1978; Pi-Sunyer, 1978; Smith, 1978b; Urbanowicz, 1978). At about the same time as Smith's work was gaining attention from anthropologists encountering tourists in cultures that the researchers had come to study, Doxey (1975), in attempting to model resident attitudes toward tourism, proposed a unidirectional "Irridex" scale to assess host-guest interactions and relationships (see Figure 2).

Doxey (1975) noted that the existence of local tolerance thresholds and hosts' resistance to further tourism development was based on a fear of losing community identity. From this, he developed a model that shows a direct link between increased community irritation, or stress, and continual tourism development (Murphy, 1985). Doxey suggested that the reciprocating impacts of hosts and visitors may be converted into varying degrees of host irritations, depending on the volume of tourism, and the threat it poses to the way of life in host communities. The degree of the host irritations tends to change with time and follows a cycle similar to those of destinations (Butler, 1980). The residents of tourist destinations go through stages of euphoria, apathy, irritation and antagonism. The actual level of irritation arising from contact between hosts and visitors is determined by the degree of mutual compatibility. However, even with compatible groups, sheer numbers alone may generate tensions even when one excludes such factors as culture, economic status, and colour. Thus, it can be suggested that at some point there might arise a predominantly negative reaction that will threaten the tourist industry, unless limits are set on tourism development (Saveriades, 2000).
Similarly, Marsh and Henshall (1987) developed an expectancy model of tourism interaction for local residents. As is the case for tourists, local residents also have expectations of the tourism encounter that will be evaluated against their experience. Expectations can be based on residents' previous experiences with tourists, their own experience of being a tourist, media and opinion leaders, and general cultural norms toward hospitality. To implement their model, a continuum of four styles of tourism was developed. While traditional industry sectors (i.e., accommodation, transport, and attractions) are included, so too are 'interaction factors', including style (impersonal, neutral, positive, and mutually positive), the range and formality of social interactions, and length of visitors stay. The four tourism styles to emerge include: separatism, involuntary participation, voluntary participation, and integration.

Another proposed model for understanding resident perceptions regarding tourism development is Butler’s (1980) Tourist Area Life Cycle theory. Butler proposed that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EUPHORIA</th>
<th>Initial phase of development, visitors and investors welcome, little planning or control mechanism.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APATHY</td>
<td>Visitors taken for granted, contacts between residents and outsiders more formal (commercial), planning concerned mostly with marketing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNOYANCE</td>
<td>Saturation points approached, residents have misgivings about tourist industry, policy makers attempt solutions via increasing infrastructure rather than limiting growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTAGONISM</td>
<td>Irritations openly expressed, visitors seen as cause of all problems, planning now remedial but promotion increased to offset deteriorating reputation of destination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tourism progresses through the stages of exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation, and then decline (see Figure 3). The initial stage of exploration is typified by a new-found interest in travelling to the area. The following stage is reflective of this new-found interest, in that services begin to be established that serve the needs of this travelling public. During the third phase there is robust physical development in the area of products and services. However, this rapid development becomes an issue to the residents and to policy agents relative to host community impacts. Hence, the development phase is where the economic, sociological, cultural, and ecological impacts become an issue. This phase of development is commonly associated with considerable advertising and promotional efforts aimed at attracting tourists and in maintaining a balance with available resources. The last phase is strongly impacted by positive or negative impacts that have occurred during the development phase. Hence, the final stage of decline is largely contingent on the host community’s ability to cope with identified tourism impacts. If the issues are insurmountable, then decline follows with a concomitant drop in tourist arrivals to the area. However, if policies are enacted that sustain the balance between precious resources and tourist demands then the probability of decline is averted (Butler, 1980).

In addition to visitor and destination characteristics, Butler (1980) considers that resident reactions will be more complex than those envisioned by Doxey (1975). Drawing from Bjorkland and Philbrick’s (1975) model of attitudinal and behavioural attributes of inter-cultural perception, Butler contends that the attitudes and behaviour of residents, in turn, may be expressed via ‘active’ or ‘passive’ behaviour (see Figure 4). The resulting combination of responses allows four reactions to occur, all of which can occur in an area simultaneously (Murphy, 1985).

However, the effectiveness of stage-based models have been questioned by several tourism researchers (Carmichael, 2000; Pearce et al., 1996). Criticism of Doxey’s (1975) stage-based Irridex scale are expressed by Carmichael (2000), who suggests that because of the complexities within communities, different residents within a given time period may exhibit the full range of feelings on Doxey’s scale. Similarly, Pearce et al. (1996) express concerns over the poor demarcation between the steps or stages and question whether shifting from one stage to the next precludes the continued existence.
Figure 3: Model of the Hypothetical Evolution of a Tourist Area (based on Butler, 1980).

Figure 4: Attitudinal-Behavioural Attributes of Inter-Cultural Perception (based on Bjorkland and Philbrick, 1975).
of the previous stage. In addition, one should question the assumption of a homogeneous community, as well as question whether or not the order of the stages is invariant (Pearce et al., 1996).

2.6 Previous Research Findings

In recognition of the critical role the host community plays in tourism development, many studies have addressed the attitudes toward tourism of various types of local residents. In undertaking such studies, researchers have recognised that reactions to tourism development may vary due to certain characteristics or circumstances associated with residents. According to Carmichael (2000), individual and group differences in attitudes of community residents have been identified for some time. Early studies used *a priori* methods. For example, Murphy's 1981 study of the perceptions of tourism by business people, residents and administrators found significant differences between these groups. More recently, in taking an *a posteriori* segmentation approach, Ryan and Montgomery (1994) used cluster analysis in an exploratory study to identify three resident groups clustered on their beliefs about tourism in their region. The three groups emerged as: *enthusiasts*, *middle-of-the-roaders*, and *somewhat irritated*.

Other studies suggest that personal factors, and perceived impacts (either negative and positive) influence resident attitudes toward tourism development (Allen et al., 1993). Personal factors such as employment in, and knowledge of the tourism industry, distance of residence from the attraction and socio-demographic factors are likely to influence perceptions of tourism impacts (Belise and Hoy, 1980; Pizam, 1978; Sheldon and Var, 1984). Economic factors include perceived personal and regional benefits which contribute to income, standard of living (Pizam, 1978; Belise and Hoy, 1980; Liu and Var, 1986; Millman and Pizam, 1988), increased employment opportunities (Rothman, 1978; Belise and Hoy, 1980; Ross, 1992; Johnson et al., 1994), increases in tax revenues (Rothman, 1978; Brougham and Butler, 1981; Millman and Pizam, 1988), and increases in real estate prices (Pizam, 1978; Long et al., 1990; Ross, 1992). Perceived social and environmental consequences include impact on recreational opportunities (Perdue et al., 1987; Ross, 1992; Belise and Hoy, 1980), crime (Pizam, 1978; Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996), historic value (Sheldon and Var, 1984; Liu,
Sheldon and Var, 1987), traffic congestion (Pizam, 1978; Sheldon and Var, 1987), and the natural environment (Johnson et al., 1994; Liu and Var, 1986).

According to Pearce et al. (1996), one striking conclusion that can be drawn from these studies is that there are few consistent relationships or patterns observed. This point is reinforced in several other reviews of this material (Ap, 1990; King et al., 1993; Lankford and Howard, 1994; Milman and Pizam, 1988). For example, in some places, residents living closer to areas of higher or heavy tourism concentration are more positive about tourism (Belise and Hoy, 1980; Sheldon and Var, 1984), while in other cases such residents are more negative than those living farther away (Keogh, 1990). Sometimes attachment to a place or community is related to greater support for tourism (Davis et al., 1988), and sometimes it is related to less support for tourism (McCool and Martin, 1994). Similarly, in some cases residents who have more contact with tourists are positive about tourism (Rothman, 1978), and in other cases they are negative about tourism (Pizam, 1978).

Despite these problems, there is one important area in which patterns of relationships appear consistent: that of economic dependency or personal benefits gained from tourism. In almost all cases, economic dependency (e.g., employment in tourism) was positively related to positive perceptions about, and support for, tourism (Glasson, 1994; Husbands, 1989; Lankford and Howard, 1994; Madrigal, 1993; Perdue et al., 1990; Prentice, 1993; Pizam, 1978; Rothman, 1978). It has been argued that these results suggest that attitudes towards tourism follow some kind of equity or social exchange function (Lankford and Howard, 1994; Perdue et al., 1990). This reflects the influence of an emerging conceptual approach derived from social exchange theory (Madrigal, 1993). However, this notwithstanding, the desirable outcome of any resident involvement in tourism planning is the development of acceptable and appropriate tourism products and services individualised for each individual community. As noted by Andereck and Vogt (2000), patient and careful analysis of each local situation is a necessary prerequisite to effective development programmes. Given the importance of product development to a sustainable tourism industry, this facet must not be neglected (Smith, 1994).
2.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has set out to address the question of how tourism researchers have improved their understanding of resident perceptions, values, and priorities regarding tourism's role in the community. Central to this is the concept of community participation and consultation in the planning process. According to Pearce et al. (1996), the process of effective community involvement in tourism can generate ideas from extensive local knowledge, develop partnerships in the purchasing and production of tourism-related goods, and be the first step in the total marketing plan for the business. Many writers in the tourism literature have espoused the need for such community involvement, and Murphy's (1985) work is often quoted in this context. Indeed, many of those who have conducted research into resident perceptions of tourism have argued that one of the goals of their research is to contribute to a stronger role for communities in tourism planning and development.

The conclusion that can be made from this literature is that residents in a great diversity of communities seem to be positively disposed toward tourism. This does not imply that residents do not have concerns about the negative impacts tourism either can or does have in their communities, although specific concerns vary by community. There are certainly exceptions to the overall positive attitudes of residents, however, ordinarily, tourism is viewed positively.
3.1 Introduction
This section outlines the historical background, social patterns, and tourism development in Picton and the Marlborough Sounds region. While an array of literature has been written on the history of the region, it is not the intention of the author to provide a comprehensive history. Rather, the focus is on events and processes that provide a background for understanding Picton’s history, its role as principal township and port in the Marlborough Sounds, and the importance of tourism in the Town’s identity and economy.

3.2 A Regional Overview
In the northeastern corner of New Zealand’s South Island, and situated at the head of Queen Charlotte Sound – one of two main ‘arms’ that form the Marlborough Sounds – lies the town of Picton\(^2\). With a population of 3,904\(^3\) people, Picton is recognised as being the second-largest urban area in the Marlborough region, and the largest urban area in the Marlborough Sounds (see Figure 5 for map of Marlborough region and Figure 6 for map of Picton and Queen Charlotte Sound). The Town’s residential area extends up toward the surrounding bush-clad hills, and on into neighbouring Waikawa (see Plate 1). From this position, the residents of Picton are afforded a panoramic view of the Queen Charlotte Sound. Picton is situated 349 kilometres from Christchurch (the South Island’s most populous city), 83 kilometres by sea from Wellington (the nation’s capital city), and 29 kilometres from Blenheim (the Marlborough region’s capital centre) (Statistics NZ, 1996).

\(^2\) For the purposes of the present study, Picton also includes the adjacent settlement of Waikawa.
\(^3\) Source: 1996 New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings (Picton: 3,061; Waikawa: 843).
Figure 5: Map of Marlborough Region.

Figure 6: Map of Picton and Queen Charlotte Sound.

Plate 1: Queen Charlotte Sound, with Picton and Waikawa in foreground.

(Source: National Publicity Studios)
Known variously as 'The Place for all Seasons', 'Gateway to the South', and 'Seaport of the Sounds', Picton retains a strong association with the Marlborough Sounds area. The Marlborough Sounds are arguably the region's most distinguishing feature. Situated at the northern end of the Marlborough region and occupying approximately 2,304 square kilometres in area, the Marlborough Sounds are an extensive system of drowned river valleys and islands that extend some 96 kilometres along the seacoast. Formed by tectonic submergence of a complex fluvial drainage system, these submerged river valleys provide the underlying structure for this landscape and create a variety of characteristic landforms (Newton, 1977). The steep slopes abruptly descend towards the water and narrow ridges form a system of long land spurs, enclosing a large number of fiord-like inlets, bays and coves. Within this system of waterways are two major 'arms': Queen Charlotte Sound (Picton's sound) and Pelorus Sound, each stretching inland for more than 48 kilometres and broken up into hundreds of small bays.

3.2.1 The Marlborough Region

The Marlborough region is situated in the northeastern corner of the South Island of New Zealand, and occupies a total land area of 12,484 square kilometres (Statistics New Zealand, 1999a). The region consists of tussock-covered 'high-ground', the alluvial-rich Wairau Plains, and the Marlborough Sounds (of which Picton is the principal township).

Although the early history of Marlborough was closely associated with the Nelson settlement, the people of Marlborough wanted independence from Nelson. In 1859, nineteen years after the founding of the Nelson settlement, the Marlborough settlers' request for autonomy was granted and Marlborough became a separate province. Although gold was discovered in the province in the early 1860s the boom did not last long. While it helped to expand the region, the development of pastoralism provided the greatest long-term benefits (Kelly, 1976). Today, the region's economy is still rurally based with pastoral and horticultural farming providing major sources of income. Marlborough's inhabitants continue to utilise marine resources, with fishing and mussel farming also being important in the region. Marlborough is also home to Lake Grassmere, the country's only natural source of salt.
Grape growing has been one of the fastest growing industries and Marlborough is now New Zealand's largest wine producing region. Marlborough has achieved world recognition for its sauvignon blanc wines. Tourism is another industry that the region is focussing on, with the Marlborough Sounds being promoted as a popular area for water activities and bush walking. In common with most other regions, Marlborough experiences a distinct holiday season, with an influx of tourists during the summer months. For the March 1998 quarter, the region had over 200,000 guest nights. However, during the cooler winter months, there are fewer tourists and only 79,771 guest nights were recorded for the September 1997 quarter (Statistics NZ, 1999a). Marlborough's tourist trade is boosted by the fact that Picton is the South Island terminal for the inter-island ferry, which transports passengers and cargo between Wellington and Picton several times a day. The sunny, pleasant climate has attracted people to the region, either as holidaymakers or as permanent settlers. The region is especially popular among retired people as well as people seeking an alternative lifestyle.

3.2.2 Regional Administration

During the latter part of the 1980s in New Zealand, there were two significant state policy initiatives in respect to regional futures. The first was a reinvention of regional policy in the guise of local economic development. The second was the process of local government reform, which in 1989 produced a middle tier of government and a reorganised lower tier of local city and district councils (Le Heron and Pawson, 1996). This local government reform coincided with a period of dramatic state sector restructuring, one that was to become known as a “rolling back of the state” (Le Heron and Pawson, 1996, p. 213).

The Marlborough region, like Tasman, Nelson and Gisborne, is administered as a unitary authority in the form of the Marlborough District Council (Statistics NZ, 1999a). The Blenheim-based Marlborough District Council has a role in managing tourism development through the provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991, via economic development, and in their role as providers of public amenities in the Marlborough District. The complex nature of the problems that arise through tourism and the need for local authorities to take account of both private and public sector needs in their area, makes decision-making and planning difficult at the best of times (Getz &
Jamal, 1994; Richins, 1997). The small size of Picton and its limited financial resources make these problems all the more acute. Additionally, the tensions that occur between different community groups may also influence the development of tourism (Reed, 1997). In Picton, like many other areas around New Zealand, the local authority is central to creating and reconciling this tension (Muligan, 1994).

3.3 Tourism in Picton

When gold was discovered at Wakamarina in the early 1860s Picton’s population soared from 800 to 3000, only to drop as quickly again to 465 adults in the 1868 Census (Marlborough Harbour Board, 1985). Just as in the early gold rush days, the town of Picton still sees its population rise and fall with seasonal nature of tourist demand. Nestled among high hills, at the heart of Queen Charlotte Sound, Picton is ideally placed as a holiday resort (although industries such as boat building, fishing and forestry do share its beautiful setting). Inter-island freight also pours through Picton, but tourism is its heartbeat. From a base of about 3,900 people, thousands more pour into Picton during the peak summer season. With tourism the main industry during the busy ‘tourist season’, Picton provides well over 1000 tourist beds in cabins, motels, hotels and motor lodges. Tent and caravan accommodation at campsites in the area brings in yet hundreds more. Pleasure boats ply its marinas, commercial launches and water taxis cruise from the Town wharves, walking tracks wind through the bush and scenic drives spread out from its hub (Marlborough Harbour Board, 1985).

3.3.1 Marketing And Promotion

According to documents in the Picton Museum, in 1909 Councillor Smith began advertising the Town and District to attract visitors. This was the first step towards tourism. The responsibility for promoting and attracting visitors to the Marlborough region, as a whole, falls to Marlborough’s regional tourism organisation; Destination Marlborough. Based in Blenheim, Destination Marlborough is a centralised agency whose aim is to attract visitors to Marlborough through the marketing and promoting of the region (although this falls short of actively promoting one particular location within Marlborough over another). Situated on the foreshore of Picton itself, is the Picton Visitor Information Centre. This centre, which is funded and staffed by the Marlborough District Council, is actively involved in promoting Picton and the
surrounding region through the provision of information services (during 1999, over 185,000 visitors passed through its doors). Picton is also represented by several organised groups of residents. These include various ratepayers and business associations, as well as the Picton-based promotional organisation Picton Sounds Paradise.

3.3.2 Recreational Opportunities
The Marlborough Sounds is a popular tourist destination for travellers, and have long been recognised as a recreation area of important value (Schellhorn, 1984). This recognition is based on the distinct character of the landscape, which gives the Sounds their unique appeal for many forms of recreation. The convoluted coastline of the sounds includes numerous bays, peninsulas and inlets, many of which can be explored only by boat. The Marlborough Sounds is also popular for camping and tramping, with the area being home to The Queen Charlotte Walkway, one of New Zealand’s “great walks”. This walkway is a 69 kilometres long track connecting the historic Ship Cove (site of repeated visits by Captain James Cook, aboard the Endeavour, in the 1770s) with Anakiwa. The walk takes five days to complete and passes through privately owned land and Department of Conservation reserves, encompassing coastal and bush scenery. The region is also home to a vast array of wildlife. Many bird species can be sighted, including gannets, which are common around the outer reaches of the sounds. Other wildlife species include dolphins, seals, the South Island Robin, and King Shags. Whales can also be sighted occasionally, which led John Guard in 1820 to establish a whaling station at Port Underwood, where whales often rested during the winter (Statistics NZ, 1999a).

3.3.3 Development
The Marlborough Sounds, and Picton in particular, have long been a popular holiday destination. The peace and seclusion of the bays and coves, each offering a natural privacy, was disturbed little by the casual placement of the numerous weekend cottages built by visitors in the late 1880s (Baldwin, 1980). Today, the peace and seclusion are still there, although a small resident population and the addition of more weekend and holiday retreats has accumulated over the years. There are now a number of hotels and accommodation complexes to cater for the flow of visitors that come to Picton to admire the Sounds.
The last few years has seen an array of development initiatives being undertaken in Picton and neighbouring Waikawa (arguably, as a response to Tranz Rail’s proposal to relocate its inter-island ferry operations from Picton to Clifford Bay). The most striking of these has been the foreshore redevelopment project, which saw Picton’s foreshore area transformed into an attractive recreational area for both tourists and local residents. This redevelopment has been extended to incorporate the main street in Picton’s central business district (see Plate 2 and Plate 3). Although the subject of some derision amongst local residents, this project has succeeded in creating a ‘pedestrian-friendly’ town centre (this, however, has come at the expense of adequate parking space for service vehicles). Included in this redevelopment of the town centre have been the refurbishment of older, established buildings, and the construction of new waterfront apartments. The town of Picton is also experiencing an increase in real estate activity, with the development of several new housing subdivisions, some of which extend toward Waikawa. In Waikawa itself, several new apartment complexes and luxurious holiday homes have been constructed. These compliment the large array of yachts and motor launches that are moored at the large marina located in Waikawa Bay.

3.4 A Brief History of Picton

According to O’Regan (1987), there are some important considerations to be borne in mind when detailing the traditional history of Queen Charlotte Sound and Picton settlement. Firstly, the Sound itself is not, and was not, a traditional Maori entity, either in geographical or in tribal terms. It is rather part of a regional ‘block’ of traditional tribal associations that extends across Cook Strait (Raukawamoana). Therefore, the traditional histories of the Sound are, primarily, the traditions of Cook Strait. These are, in turn, the traditions of the pre-musket tribes who surrounded the Strait. These tribes: Ngai Tara, Rangitane, Ngai Apa, Ngai Tahu, Ngati Kuia, Ngati Tumatakokiri and Ngati Ira may be characterised by a high degree of common whakapapa, or genealogy, and shared or similar origins.
Plate 2: Central Business District Redevelopment (London Quay, Picton).

(Source: M. Shone, 2000).

Plate 3: Central Business District Redevelopment (High Street, Picton).

(Source: M. Shone, 2000).
Secondly, the geographical location of the Sound made it the major arrival point for cross-Strait travel and the principal staging point for departure in south-north travel. The Sound, particularly the northern entrance area, was then a particularly important arrival and departure point for groups travelling in the course of trade, warfare or migration. Thus, the area is marked in Maori traditional history by a high ‘throughput’ of tribal history, rather than by a long and stable occupation by one main tribal group. Prehistoric trade between the North and South Islands of New Zealand was, in all probability, always directed through Queen Charlotte Sound in much the same way that modern trade passes through the town of Picton at the head of that same Sound (O’Regan, 1987).

Thirdly, the arrival of the musket in the hands of the invading Ngati Toa, Ngati Raukawa and Te Ati Awa in the 1820s and 1830s resulted in the almost-total devastation of the tribes living around Cook Strait, Tasman Bay and Kaikoura. As O’Regan (1987) notes, in the case of the Queen Charlotte Sound and Tasman Bay areas, the term “genocide” would not be excessive as a description of those events.

Notwithstanding the above, in the earliest European days the place where Picton now sits was known by the then Maori population as Waitohi; the name of the Maori Pa that stood on the Picton foreshore. Waitohi (or Te Wera O Waitohi) was named after Te Rauparara’s sister and occupied after the Te Rauparara tribal massacres of the 1820s and 1830s (Te Rauparaha was the outstanding leader of the Ngati Toa tribe). Te Rauparaha and his warriors captured Kapiti Island – a natural fortress – from the Te-Ati-Awa tribe, and with Kapiti as a base, came to dominate the region. His attacks on the Sounds and southern regions were many and widespread, from Queen Charlotte Sound and D’Urville Island, down to Kaiapoi and Akaroa.

The first European to visit Waitohi Bay (present-day Picton harbour) is reported to be Captain William Steine, when he cruised the upper reaches of Queen Charlotte Sound, in 1832 (Potton, 1986). Captain Steine’s description of the bay is recounted in Potton (1986), in which he states:

---

4 This refers to Cook Strait – the body of water that separates the North and South Islands of New Zealand.
I entered a beautiful bay surrounded with magnificent timber interspersed with extensive tracts of the richest soil. About 200 Maoris dwelt in a small village close to the beach (Captain William Stein’s first European description of the Maori pa site of Te Were-a-Waitohi, 1832, sited in Potton, 1986, p. 139).

Steine named the area Horne Bay, after the owner of his ship, and the bay retained this title until 1847. During that year, The New Zealand Company\(^1\) cast its eye in Waitohi’s direction. The New Zealand Company had contracted with its settlers at Nelson to provide each with a town acre, a suburban section of 50 acres and a rural section of 150 acres. In due course it was found that at Nelson there were fewer ‘town acres’ available than the total number required. Picton, the future port of the Wairau district, was therefore selected as an alternative site. In late December 1848, Mr. Dillon Bell, representing the Company, and Governor Sir George Grey as head of the government, visited Waitohi Pa and began negotiations with the Maori landowners to sell. The next year the company surveyed the town and Dillon Bell returned, thinking all the details of the sale had been settled. But Paramount Chief Ropoama was dissatisfied with the £100 paid. The price, he told Dillon Bell, was to have been ‘as high as the hills’ (Kelly, 1976). Chief Ropoama finally signed the land transfer deed in 1850, after the company offered to pay a further £200 to be spent on preparing a new pa at Waikawa, some five kilometres in distance by road (Hayter, 1962).

It was in late 1859, when Marlborough was gazetted as a province, that the town received its present name of Picton (after Sir Thomas Picton, a distinguished British General who fought in the Battle of Waterloo). However, Picton was not always known by this name. It took a Government Proclamation to finally settle the Town’s name. Before the government stepped in the host of names included: Newton, Beaconsfield, Cromwell, Wakefield and Raleigh. But in 1859, the government ended the indecision, constituting the Town of Picton and also declaring it the inaugural provincial capital of the new Province of Marlborough. Soon after, however, there ensued a continuous political wrangle between Blenheim and Picton, each vying for supremacy (Ponder, 1986). In 1865, after a protracted and bitter rivalry between Picton and Blenheim and an incessant bickering between pastoralists, smallholders and commercial interests the capital was moved to Blenheim, and in 1867 Picton was constituted a borough. When

\(^1\) The New Zealand Company established colonial settlements throughout New Zealand.
the “palaver of politics” was carried away to Blenheim, Picton was able to settle down to a productive role as the major supply and processing town for the Sounds and as an important link between the North and South Islands (Potton, 1986).

### 3.5 Picton Today

Nowadays, Picton continues to act as the principal port of the Marlborough region and serves as the commercial and social centre of the Marlborough Sounds. Its large deep-water port is a transport terminus for the South Island main trunk railway, the Cook Strait ferries, the local land and water taxis, the various mail and milk ‘runs’, pleasure trips in fishing launches and the usual assortment of sightseeing facilities (see Plate 4 and Plate 5). Occasionally large international cruise ships ‘tie-up’ and release their passengers for a few hours onshore. A large number of travellers pass through the Town every day, and at the height of the holiday season (December – April) the local accommodation establishments overflow with visitors and holidaymakers (Baldwin, 1980). Together with Havelock, the main urban centre of Kenepuru Sound, Picton also functions as the main service centre for settlers in the rural part of the Marlborough Sounds (Schellhorn, 1984). Those parts of the region without road access are supplied by regular mail-boat services.

The Town has experienced short-lived gold mining and coal mining booms, but its prosperity and popularity have become increasingly dependent upon its natural advantages, rather than its industry and commerce. Picton is a good base for walks, including such walkways as: The Snout, Tirohanga, and Queen Charlotte Walkways. It is the South Island’s gateway to the enchanting Queen Charlotte Sound waterways, which are enriched with unnumbered little bays, tranquil coves, and protective headlands. Likewise, the neighbouring and easily accessible township of Havelock is the landward approach to the equally beautiful Pelorus Sound, with its maze of winding shores and forested hills (Reed, 1963). Picton is also home to two historic ships. The Edwin Fox (built in 1853) is considered to be the ninth-oldest surviving ship in the world. Originally built in India, the ship carried convicts to Perth as well as troops to the Crimean War and immigrants to New Zealand. The second, The Echo, is a beached scow, which was built in 1905.
Plate 4: Cook Strait Ferry Departing Picton.

(Source: M. Shone, 2000).

Plate 5: Yachts Moored in Picton Harbour.

(Source: M. Shone, 2000).
3.5.1 Demographic Characteristics

Population. Picton's (including Waikawa) usually resident population of 3,904 people (5 March 1996) is growing at a faster rate than the national average. Between the 1991 and 1996 Censuses, the usually resident population increased by 10.9 per cent, compared with 9.2 per cent regionally, and 7.2 per cent nationally.

Ethnicity. Marlborough, in common with other regions that lack a major urban centre, and has less diversity with Europeans and Maori predominating. On March 5, 1996, Marlborough had the third-highest percentage of people who identified with the European ethnic group (94.8 per cent). This compares to 83.1 per cent nationally. In Picton, however, a relatively small 77.1 per cent of people identify with European ethnicity. Although the South Island has a low proportion of Maori, a total of 22.6 per cent of Picton's population identifies with this group (compared with 10.6 per cent in Marlborough). Numerically, the largest iwi reported on March 1996 was Ngai Tahu, with 912 people (3.1 per cent of all Ngai Tahu nationally). Te Atiawa and Ngapuhi were other numerically significant iwi.

Age and Sex Structure. Older age groups predominate in Marlborough. On 5 March 1996, the region had the oldest median age in New Zealand of 36.1 years (compared with 33.0 years nationally). However, both Picton and Waikawa surpassed these figures, with median ages of 38 years and 44 years respectively. The region also had the highest proportion of people aged 60 years and over in New Zealand, with 18.7 per cent in this age group (compared to 15.4 per cent nationally). Once again, however, Picton and Waikawa outstripped these figures, with 23.5 per cent of people aged over 60 years.

Income. Median annual income per person in Picton was $1,121 less than the regional median ($13,591 compared to $14,712 regionally), and $2,012 less than the national median of $15,603 for the year ended 31 March 1996.

Labour Market. Occupational data from the 1996 Census tend to highlight certain industries that pre-dominate in Marlborough. Almost one-fifth of the employed population are employed in agriculture, forestry and fishing industries; double the national proportion. This reflects the prominence of three industries: horticulture (grape growing and summer-fruit production), sheep farming; and, transport and storage (the
port of Picton). In Picton, the influence of agriculture, forestry and fishing is increasing. For the period March 1991 to March 1996 the volume of people employed in these industries increased by 69.6 per cent. Similarly, the volume of people employed in wholesale / retail trade, accommodation and catering (the sectors most commonly associated with tourism) increased by 39.2 per cent over the same period. However, the relative influence of transport and storage is diminishing, with the same period seeing a drop of 14.5 per cent employed in this industry in Picton.

3.6 The Importance of Picton’s Port

Since the earliest days the critical barrier of Cook Strait has been an important feature of New Zealand life in terms of communications, culture, and politics (Ward, 1976). Some would add inter-island rivalry to the list. Today, the Cook Strait road and rail ferries run between Picton and Wellington several times a day, providing a vital service for passengers and goods (see Plate 6 and Plate 7).

According to Kelly (1976), the value of Picton as a port was appreciated from the beginning. The following is an extract from a memorandum sent to the General Assembly by the Provincial Council in 1861:

That whilst on the one hand the port of Picton offers a secure and commodious harbour, not to be surpassed in the colony for accommodation of mail steamers, on the other hand its position midway between the ports of Nelson and Wellington and its facility of approach from either side, are such as to cause little delay, were the steamers to call between the above mentioned ports (cited in Kelly, 1976, p.155).

Part of the shipping scene in Picton has been the excursions from Wellington to Picton and the Sounds. These excursions go back more than 100 years and were extremely popular from their inception (Kelly, 1976, p. 161). The first excursion from Wellington to Picton was by the S.S. Wonga Wonga on New Year’s Day in 1866. In 1873 the S.S. Rangatira made an excursion trip on the occasion of the Picton sailing regatta held on Wellington’s Anniversary Day, 22 January. Another popular excursion was by the small ship S.S. Wallace from Nelson to Picton for some years from 1876. The S.S. Picton ran regular excursions around the Sounds, leaving Picton usually at midnight on
Plate 6: Cook Strait Ferry Berthed at Picton.

(Source: M. Shone, 2000).

Plate 7: Picton Township, with Ferry Terminal in the Foreground.

(Source: M. Shone, 2000).
Saturday and returning early on Tuesday morning in time for passengers to catch the first train Blenheim. These excursions centred on fishing and shooting (Kelly, 1976).

Soon after the commissioning of the S.S. *Mararoa* the Union Steamship Company commenced what were to become regular Christmas and New Year excursions from Wellington to Picton and back on the same day. On 27 December 1886 the *Mararoa* brought more than 1,000 excursionists to Picton. These excursions, however, were not limited to Picton. In 1888 the S.S. *Maori* ran an Easter cruise to the Sounds, French Pass and D’Urville Island for fishing and shooting. Similarly, in January 1900 the S.S. *Waikare* called at Picton on a cruise that had included Milford and other fiords (Kelly, 1976). The *Tamahine* made her first excursion on 9 January 1926 when she sailed from Wellington to Picton. Leaving Picton early the next morning she went into Pelorus Sound and anchored in Tennyson Inlet, returning to Wellington that evening. The T.S.S. *Rangatira* and the T.S.S. *Wahine* also undertook several excursions. Both these ships brought between 1,500 and 2,000 excursionists on each occasion (Kelly, 1976, p. 163). Until the early 1970s the then railway ferries ran excursions on New Year’s Day from Picton down Queen Charlotte Sound to Endeavour Inlet and return. These trips were booked out before sailing time (Kelly, 1976). Now that the ferries travel several times a day from Wellington to Picton, including holidays, these short excursions have ceased.

Notwithstanding the above, the history of the Wellington-Picton shipping service is dominated by two eras: the historic and long lasting service provided by the T.S.S. *Tamahine* (commencing 1926), and the later dominance of the inter-island rail ferries (commencing with the *Aramoana* in 1962). It is, without question, the rail ferry operation that has transformed the Wellington-Picton link into New Zealand’s most important coastal sea route (MacIntyre, Field and Quinn, 1983). Since the *Aramoana* completed her first commercial return crossing between Picton and Wellington in 1962, the inter-island ferry service has offered a relatively fast and reliable means of passenger, rail and vehicle transport between the North and South Islands of New Zealand. This ferry service, arguably one of New Zealand’s most ‘visible’ forms of maritime transportation (Collier and Harraway, 1998), is used extensively by domestic and international tourists and represents a substantial source of tourism-related income and employment for the local Picton community.
The Union Steamship Company is a central figure in Picton’s history and development as a passenger ferry port. Arguably the best known and best loved of the Company’s ships, as far as Picton was concerned, was the T.S.S. Tamahine. Specially built for the Wellington-Picton run, she was commissioned in 1925 and did her maiden trip to Picton from Wellington with 400 passengers on board. The Tamahine maintained the service for 37 years (Kelly, 1976). She was finally withdrawn from service in 1962, and replaced by the first of the railway ferries: the Aramoana.

The Aramoana was launched in 1962, heralding a regular and reliable service across Cook Strait. The service with this vessel proved to be extremely profitable for the Railways Department, and soon a second ferry came into service. Named the Aranui, she came into service in 1966. Since those early beginnings the Cook Strait ferry service has continued to flourish. Tranz Rail, who now operates the inter-island ferry service, now offers a conventional ferry service with five return sailings per day, as well as a ‘fast-ferry’ service with three return sailings per day during the months of December to April.

The recent introduction of various fast-ferry services on the Cook Strait ‘run’ has heralded a tumultuous period in Picton’s recent-history. The first of the fast-ferries: the Sea Shuttle and the first Tranz Rail Lynx, arrived in Wellington in December 1994. The Sea Shuttle lasted six months before it was withdrawn from service. The next summer, North By South’s Straitrunner challenged Tranz Rail, but also lasted only six months. The smaller Mana Seacat started a Mana-Picton run early in 1998, but folded just before Fast Cat Ferries TopCat hit Cook Strait in May 1999. This service lasted only 18 months before being withdrawn from service in October 2000. Throughout this recent period of history, however, only one operator, Tranz Rail, has remained as a constant provider of a fast-ferry service between Picton and Wellington. Today the regular sailings of the Cook Strait rail ferry service continue this connection to the North Island with approximately 1.1 million passengers and over 2.5 million tonnes of freight passing over the ferry wharf each year (Statistics NZ, 1999a). For these reasons, the potential withdrawal of Tranz Rail’s Interislander ferry service poses a serious threat to Picton’s future prosperity.
3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has provided an outline of the historical background, social patterns, and tourism development in Picton and the Marlborough Sounds. The focus has been on events and processes that provide a background for understanding Picton’s history, its role as principal port and township of the Marlborough Sounds, and the importance of tourism to the town’s economy and identity.

Attention has been given to the influence of the greater Marlborough region upon the development of the township, and to the significance of the Marlborough Sounds. The town of Picton is blessed with natural scenic beauty, and is ideally placed to act as a base from which to explore the Marlborough Sounds. Picton’s relationship with the Marlborough Sounds, or more specifically Queen Charlotte Sound, is particularly important to the town, as the Sounds form an integral part of Picton’s tourism product, as well as help to shape Picton’s identity (e.g., ‘Seaport of the Sounds’). Similarly, Picton’s association with the port and harbour facilities is an integral part of the town’s history, and remains strong to this day.

The following chapter will describe the methodological approach and techniques used to address the present study’s research objectives, as outlined in Chapter 1.
4.1 Introduction

This chapter commences with a theoretical description of the research methods employed in the present study, followed by a detailed explanation of the specific research instruments used in this research. A discussion of the sampling techniques employed by the researcher is then provided, along with a description of data analysis. The chapter ends by summarising the research methods employed in this study.

4.2 Multiple Methods

*We can, and I think must, look upon human life as chiefly a vast interpretative process in which people, singularly and collectively, guide themselves by defining the objects, events, and situations which they encounter...Any scheme designed to analyse human group life in its general character has to fit this process of interpretation (Blumer, 1956, p. 686).*

According to Denzin (1989), the sociological enterprise rests on three interrelated activities: theory, research, and substantive interest. Theory cannot be judged independently of research activity. Research methods are of little use until they are seen in the light of theoretical perspectives. Substantive speciality is of little use or interest until it is firmly embedded within a theoretical framework and grounded upon sound research strategies. The separate elements of the sociological act, therefore, must be reunited and synthesised in the ‘research act’, that is in those endeavours that take the sociologist from the “vague realm of theory to substantive issues in the empirical world” (Denzin, 1989, p. 2).

Research methods help us to understand the world. According to Singleton, Straits and Straits (1993), they are an essential set of skills, insights and tools needed to answer intelligently any but the simplest questions. Different research methods yield different types of information and, because no single research method can ever completely
capture all the relevant features of any given empirical reality, the researcher should employ multiple methods in the analysis of the same empirical events (Denzin, 1989). Denzin advocates a research framework based on his principle of ‘triangulation’. The aim of triangulation is to exploit the strengths and neutralise, rather than complicate, the liabilities (Calatone, DiBenedicto and Bojanic, 1988). Thus, the integration of multiple data sources, investigators, theories and methods in a single investigation can better enable the researcher to forge valid propositions that carefully consider relevant rival causal factors.

Seiber (1973) argues that the use of multiple approaches in social research need not be antagonistic to research needs, but that an integration of fieldwork and survey methods may greatly increase the validity and understanding of the research problem. This notion is supported by Simmons (1984), who contends that the integration of formal and informal social research methods can be achieved on a systematic and comparative basis. Furthermore, an integrative approach can benefit tourism research in situations where quantifiable data are difficult to obtain, relationships between people involved in tourism are not explicit, and when qualitative data can add depth to analysis. Walle (1997, p. 524) further supports the idea of integrated research methods and suggests that in the hospitality industry “one of the purposes of qualitative research is to provide information for developing further quantitative research”. Simmons (1989), however, argues that this relationship can be reciprocal, with quantitative research readily able to provide information for developing further qualitative research.

Mindful of the need to ensure both reliable and valid data were obtained, this study utilised several different methods appropriate to the different phases of the research. Based on this aim, three principal research methods were employed to collect data over a three-month period from July 2000 to September 2000 (see Table 1). These principle research methods comprised field observations, a postal survey and in-depth interviews. The most significant technique used, in terms of contribution to the results, was the postal survey.
### Table 1: Schedule of Research Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>TIME-FRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field observations</td>
<td>Familiarisation with study area, and qualitative data collection.</td>
<td>July 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents’ postal survey</td>
<td>Quantitative data collection</td>
<td>July – September 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth interviews</td>
<td>Qualitative data collection</td>
<td>August 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 Field Observations

The first method used in this study was field observations, which was completed over two trips to Picton during mid-July (three days) and mid-September (four days) 2000. During this time the researcher was able to briefly experience a ‘snapshot’ of life in Picton and, as such, gain some insight and understanding of the issues faced and concerns held by the residents of Picton.

During these field observation periods, visits were made to the Picton Visitor Information Centre, the Picton Museum, the Picton and Blenheim Public Libraries, Destination Marlborough and the Marlborough District Council chambers in Blenheim. In addition, various contacts were established with shopkeepers and business-owners in Picton.

### 4.4 Residents’ Postal Survey

*One purpose of surveys is to identify the presence of certain characteristics among groups* (Singleton *et al.*, 1993:11).

The primary research instrument employed by this study is a self-administered residents’ questionnaire. This questionnaire comprises a nine-page survey ‘booklet’ (refer to Appendix A), which asked questions relevant to the research objectives.

---

5 For the purposes of the present study, Picton includes both Picton and Waikawa.

7 Refer to Chapter 1, for a description of the research objectives.
Given the constraint on time, and the distance of the research site from Lincoln University, a ‘post-out / post-in’ method was selected to implement this survey. When completed, the questionnaire could be simply folded and returned to the researcher via Lincoln University’s freepost address.

The questionnaire was distributed during mid-July 2000. A total of 400 questionnaires were mailed to 400 Picton residents. Records of the sample were maintained as a computer database. Returns were recorded daily to maintain a record of response rates.

4.4.1 Questionnaire Design

This survey arose from an integration of the tourism literature, issues discovered during the research ‘familiarisation period’ and specific concerns raised during telephone conversations with Picton residents. The format and questions asked of respondents maintained the underlying structure of previous community-based tourism surveys (e.g., Belise and Hoy, 1980; Davis, Allen & Cosenza, 1988; Forsyte Research, 1992; Simmons, 1989). Before the survey was finalised, it was pre-tested on a small group (ten people) of colleagues and acquaintances at Lincoln University and the Marlborough District Council (Blenheim). Several people from outside the ranks of local government and academia were also consulted to provide a layman’s point of view. Analysis of comments made by the group led to the alteration of some questions and the removal of others.

The final questionnaire was divided into six general categories, and follows many of the procedures recommended by Dillman (1983) in his ‘Total Design Method’. It begins with an introductory section to establish the study purpose and context, with major data generating sections in the middle. It ends with a series of questions that address personal demographic information.

The first series of questions focuses on the regard with which Picton residents view tourism. These questions dealt with the perceived importance of tourism to the community, as well as overall community benefits and costs.

The second section assesses the attitudes of Picton residents towards tourists and tourism development in Picton. A five-point Likert-type scale was used, with
respondents asked to indicate their level of agreement / disagreement with 14 ‘attitude statements’. These attitude statements are the same as those used in previous New Zealand community attitudes surveys (NZTPD, 1988; Forsyte Research, 1992), and therefore provide a basis of comparison with these studies.

The third series of questions addresses planning preferences for tourism in Picton, including such issues as public participation in planning, the desired level of participation in the planning process and options for implementing public participation in tourism planning.

The fourth series of questions deals with tourism development in Picton. This included assessing the preferred scale and rate of development, types of development, and ownership of tourist facilities.

The fifth section assesses experiential characteristics of the respondents. These questions dealt with the level of attachment to Picton, property ownership, employment in the tourism industry, and general social contact with tourists and visitors to Picton. This section was included to cross-tabulate residents’ responses with the specific hypotheses of this study.

The final series of questions focus on personal information, including: gender, age, ethnicity, personal income, educational qualifications and employment status. Resultant data allow for an assessment of the reliability of the sample as well as an examination of the social variables associated with preferences for tourism planning and development. The questionnaire also contained a filter question in order to recruit subjects for follow-up in-depth interviews. Blank space was provided for additional notes from this interview.

4.4.2 Sample Criterion

In keeping with local government election criteria, the criterion for inclusion in the study was set at those eligible to participate in local-body elections. This group includes all Picton residents aged 18 years and over. The 1996 New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings records the population of Picton as 3,903 people, and those aged 18 years and over as 3,108 people. Access to individual residents was gained via
Marlborough District Council’s list of Picton and Waikawa Bay property owners. This lists details 2,687 entries, and records occupier(s), postal address, location and a legal description of each property. (However, it is important to note that this list of property owners does not necessarily ‘equal’ local body electors, in that there may be more than one elector in each household).

The survey was designed to ensure that the questionnaire was sent only to residential addresses. If a business name was drawn for the sample the ‘next entry’ was selected. In order to protect against multiple entries, and therefore multiple questionnaires being sent to the same address, the final sample list was checked both electronically and visually. If a duplicate name was drawn for the sample the ‘next entry’ was selected. No incidence of multiple questionnaires being sent to the same address was reported.

4.4.3 Sample Size
A systematic sampling technique was employed to select a sample list. This technique utilises a ‘random start’ and a pre-determined ‘sampling interval’, which was set at 1: 6 resident entries. To determine the individual within the residential address who was to respond, the questionnaire instructions request that the form be completed by the household member aged 18 years and over and has the next birthday. The size of the sample to be surveyed was determined by sample size tables (Fleiss, 1981), which shows that a confidence interval of 95 per cent with a 5 per cent margin of error would be achieved with 384 responses. The final sample comprised 400 questionnaires, which equates to 12.9 per cent of the voting population (aged 18 years and over). However, this assumes (somewhat erroneously) a very high response rate.

4.4.4 Response Rate
The sample survey was held open for seven weeks. A reminder notice (refer to Appendix B), complete with an additional questionnaire, was sent to an updated sample list on the 21st day after the initial mail out. Prior to the reminder notices being sent out, 42.5 per cent (n = 170) of the questionnaires were completed and returned. The reminder notice yielded a further 26.75 per cent (n = 107) of completed and returned questionnaires (see Table 2).
Table 2: Residents’ Postal Survey Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF RESPONSE RATE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONSES (n)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial response</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary response</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from reminder notice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires returned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by postal service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET RESPONSE TO POSTAL</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the end of the seven-week survey period 71.4 per cent (n = 277) of the questionnaires were completed and returned. This provides a confidence interval of 95 per cent, with a 6 per cent margin of error. According to Babbie (1998, p. 262), this response rate may be considered to be “very good”.

4.5 In-Depth Interviews

The goal with in-depth interviews is to develop extensive information from a few people (Lofland and Lofland, 1984, p. 28).

During the week beginning Monday, 14 August 2000, 17 respondents were contacted via telephone and asked to participate in follow-up interviews. All respondents agreed to participate. This represents 6.6 per cent of responses received at that time (n = 257), and 6.1 per cent of all responses received (n = 277). Respondents were selected to participate in follow-up interviews through a process of theoretical sampling. Strauss (1987, p. 21) describes theoretical sampling as:
...sampling directed by an evolving theory...It is harnessed to the making of comparisons between and among those samples of events, activities [and] populations (p. 21).

These respondents had indicated that they would like to be interviewed and had also provided a range of comments at the end of their questionnaires. These comments indicated the possible existence of two opposing viewpoints amongst the respondents: "that the loss of the ferries would cause the death of the town", and "that the loss of the ferries would herald a new beginning for Picton". It was, therefore, thought that these respondents would be most able to articulate their views and attitudes regarding tourism in Picton, and that these views and attitudes would be representative of the wider Picton community, providing key insights for further analysis of the quantitative data.

The 17 in-depth interviews were conducted over a period of four days, during the sixth week after the initial questionnaire was mailed out. These interviews were semi-structured so as to give the researcher and the interviewees the freedom to discuss a wide range of issues, although the majority of each interview was centred around five 'core' questions. These questions included:

1. In your opinion, how important or significant is tourism to Picton?
2. How would you like any future tourism planning in Picton to proceed?
3. What types of tourism development(s) should/ should not be undertaken in Picton?
4. In your opinion, what is the greatest threat/ concern relating to future tourism development in Picton?
5. In your opinion, what is the greatest asset/ opportunity for future tourism development in Picton?

The interviews were between 30-50 minutes in duration and were conducted by the researcher. Most respondents chose to be interviewed in their homes, although this was negotiable so as to ensure that the respondents felt comfortable. In every case, the interviews were recorded on tape for later transcription. Interviewees were also required to sign a consent form, acknowledging their awareness of the nature of this research and granting permission for interview material to be used in this thesis, at the beginning of each interview. An opportunity was provided at the end of each interview for the
researcher to further disclose the nature of the research objectives and researchers' expectations. This was undertaken at the end, rather than the start of each interview so as not to unduly influence interviewee responses.

4.6 Data Analysis

Analysing Quantitative Data. Questionnaires were analysed using the statistical computer programme SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Scientists). Data provided by the respondents in the returned questionnaires were entered into a spreadsheet. Some recoding was required when entering data from Section 2 of the questionnaire, as some attitude statements were 'reverse-scored'. SPSS was then used to generate descriptive statistics and frequency tables. Inferential statistics were generated through the use of Chi-squares, t-tests, one-way ANOVAs, Mann-Whitney U-tests and Kruskall-Wallis tests. Wherever a result is indicated as significant in this thesis, it at most has a probability of 0.05 of occurring accidentally (i.e., at least 95 per cent confidence interval).

Analysing Qualitative Data. The 17 in-depth interviews were transcribed, along with any additional notes made by the researcher at the time of the interview. Notes taken during the field observations were also included, along with any comments and insights that arose from the observation. These notes gradually grew with each observation and interview, and spawned specific themes that served to support the preliminary quantitative data analysis. These themes were then separated out of the 'main body' of data using manual 'cut and paste' methods on Microsoft Word. This separation of data afforded a more precise means of analysis.

4.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has provided an explicit description of the research methods employed to undertake this study. An integrated methods approach was used to ensure that both reliable and valid data were obtained. This triangulation of research methods and data helps to minimise the shortcomings inherent in individual social research methods.

Three methods were used to obtain the appropriate data necessary to satisfy the research objectives outlined in Chapter 1. These included: field observations, a residents' postal
survey, and in-depth interviews. These data were collected over a period of three-months, commencing in July 2000 and ending in September 2000, with an overall response rate of 71.4 per cent being achieved from the resident postal survey. Quantitative data were analysed using the statistical computer programme SPSS, while qualitative data were analysed using manual 'cut and paste' methods.

A demographic profile of respondents to the postal survey is presented in Chapter 5 to provide a framework for consideration of the substantive items concerning tourism planning and development.
Chapter 5

CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

5.1 Introduction

Surveys are particularly useful in describing the characteristics of a large population. It is, therefore, important that the researcher be able to compare the sample with the study population in order to assess the representativeness of the sample. This can be achieved through statistical testing of the sample for a range of demographic variables. This chapter presents a demographic profile of respondents to the postal survey. It is included to establish a framework for considering their responses on the substantive items concerning tourism planning and development. The demographic variables tested in this survey include: gender, age, ethnicity, personal income, highest educational qualification and employment status of the sample against data obtained from the 1996 New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings. It is instructive to note, at this point, that there may have been some change in these census data since 1996, although it is unlikely that any such change would be significant.

5.2 Demographic Characteristics

The following data provides a basis for consideration of survey results. Six demographic variables are presented in order to assess the general characteristics of the survey respondents against those of the general Picton population aged 18 years and over.
5.2.1 Gender

The survey instruction asking for the household member with the next birthday appear to have been somewhat unsuccessful in ensuring a balance between the sexes in the response. The results show males are over-represented, constituting 65.2 per cent of survey respondents (see Figure 7). This figure is significantly different ($\chi^2 = 26.359$, d.f. = 1, $p < 0.001$) than the expected figure of 49.3 per cent. This suggests that the survey instructions (asking for the household member aged 18 years and over with the next birthday) may not have been followed on every occasion.

Figure 7: Gender of Survey Respondents
(n=264)
5.2.2 Age

Respondents were asked to indicate their age. The results are significantly different ($\chi^2 = 45.356$, d.f. = 2, $p < .001$) to the 1996 Census data, with a very low representation of people less than 35 years old, and a considerable over-representation of people aged 55 years and over (see Figure 8). According to Babbie (1998), this over-representation of the 'middle-aged' is a common occurrence with postal surveys, and is similar to other surveys which have noted an over-representation of the older age groups (Horn, Simmons and Fairweather, 1998; Lawson et al., 1998; Simmons, 1989). This may be attributed to the amount of 'free' time that retirees have, or it may just be that these people are more actively involved in community-related issues.

Figure 8: Age Profile of Survey Respondents
(n=255)
5.2.3 Ethnicity

Respondents were asked to indicate their ethnicity. The results are significantly different ($\chi^2 = 36.731$, d.f. = 2, $p < 0.001$) to the 1996 Census data, and indicate that Picton residents of European heritage are over-represented at the expense of the other ethnic groups, particularly those of NZ Maori ethnicity (see Figure 9). While the low number of Maori respondents is a concern for this survey, other surveys have noted the same pattern (Lawson et al., 1998). Low responses to other surveys have been explained in terms of the inappropriateness of the research methods in a different cultural context (Berno, 1996).

**Figure 9: Ethnicity of Survey Respondents**

(n=260)
5.2.4 **Personal Income**

Respondents were asked to indicate their personal income for the previous financial year (see Figure 10). The results are significantly different ($\chi^2 = 134.744, \text{ d.f.} = 3, p < 0.001$) to the 1996 Census data. Although there appears to be a degree of consistency between the two ‘mid-range’ income brackets ($15,001 - $30,000 and $30,001 - $50,000), lower income earners (loss - $15,000) are under-represented, while at the same time higher income earners ($50,000 and over) are over-represented. This inconsistency may be related to the educational qualifications of the respondents, which show an under-representation of people with no formal qualifications (see section 5.6). Such an occurrence could, arguably, contribute to the under-representation of lower income earners that is evident in the survey sample.

**Figure 10: Personal Income of Survey Respondents**

(n=229)
5.2.5 Highest Educational Qualification

Respondents were asked to indicate their highest educational qualification. The results are significantly different ($\chi^2 = 63.947$, d.f. = 2, $p < 0.001$) to the 1996 Census data, although a satisfactory level of parity was achieved between those with tertiary and trade qualifications. However, respondents with high school qualifications were over-represented, while respondents with no formal qualifications were under-represented (see Figure 11). These findings indicate that the survey sample has a higher level of education than that of the greater Picton population.

Figure 11: Highest Educational Qualification of Survey Respondents
(n=249)
5.2.6 **Employment Status**

Respondents were asked to indicate their employment status. The results are significantly different ($\chi^2 = 25.825$, d.f. = 3, $p < 0.001$) to the 1996 Census data (see Figure 12). The high proportion of 'others', which includes unpaid family workers, pensioners, sickness beneficiaries and the like, found in the sample may be a reflection of the relatively high proportion of respondents in the older age category (55 years and over).

**Figure 12: Employment Status of Survey Respondents**

(n=255)
5.3 Chapter Summary

The above data provides a basis for consideration of survey results. Six demographic variables have been presented in order to assess the general characteristics of the survey respondents against those of the general Picton population aged 18 years and over.

General characteristics of the 277 survey respondents have been presented. In many respects respondents are representative of the general demographic patterns and trends of Picton residents. There are distortions of varying degrees present in all demographic variables. While the effects of this imbalance are uncertain, it is a common feature of research of this type. For future research, additional measures may be required to ensure the representativeness of the sample. At the very least, several of the demographic variables tested are related. In particular, personal income is influenced by highest educational qualification (i.e., poor educational qualifications will contribute to low personal income). Similarly, employment status is influenced by age (i.e., an older age profile produces a higher proportion of superannuitants). As a consequence of this influence, any trends in these demographic variables will be reflected in their corresponding variables.

However, in as much as the primary goal of this research is to explore community attitudes and responses to tourism development, this postal survey has succeeded in eliciting a range of opinions concerning tourism planning and development in Picton from a relatively large proportion of Picton residents (9 per cent of the population aged 18 years and over). Thus, in building a tentative profile of the survey respondents, the 'average' respondent is: male, aged 55 years and over, of European ethnicity, earns between $15,001-$30,000 annually, has a high school education, and is either a wage and salary earner or a superannuitant.
Chapter 6
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

6.1 Introduction
This chapter examines the information supplied by Picton residents through completion of the resident postal survey and subsequent interviews conducted from July – September 2000. For the purposes of presentation, quantitative data arising from the postal survey of Picton residents are used as the template, while the more qualitative data arising from the interviews are added to provide clarification, detail and ‘colour’. Much of the data presented are descriptive. Analytical focus has been sought primarily on the factors that are associated with certain beliefs about, and attitudes toward, tourism in Picton.

Results are presented in five major sections. First, attitudes towards tourism in Picton are presented, with attitudes being evaluated in terms of a Tourism Acceptance Index. Individual factors are examined, along with the calculation of an indexed overall ‘tourism acceptance score’. Second, residents' appraisals of the significance of tourism in Picton are presented. The role and value of tourism are also considered. Third, the need for tourism planning is examined, as are residents' appraisals of options for participation in the planning process. The fourth section presents residents' appraisals of tourism development options for Picton. Issues of scale and rate of development are examined, along with ownership of tourist facilities. The final section introduces analytical data, which seeks to investigate the significance of several key variables with respect to their ‘predictive power’ over certain beliefs about, and attitudes towards, tourism in Picton.

6.2 Assessing Residents' Attitudes Toward Tourism in Picton
In order to measure residents' attitudes towards tourism, respondents were asked to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with a series of 14 statements describing the implications of tourism in Picton (see Appendix C for a full list of attitude statements). These statements, having previously been used in past research (NZTPD,
were designed to measure people’s attitudes towards tourism and tourism development in Picton. Respondents were invited to allocate a score that best reflected their attitude towards each of the 14 statements. A five-point Likert-type response format was used to measure responses to the statements, from 1 (representing strong disagreement) to 5 (representing strong agreement). For some statements reversing the numerical assignment was necessary to provide a uni-directional scale, so that all statements could be analysed consistently.

6.2.1 Tourism Acceptance Index
In order to analyse residents’ attitudes towards tourism in Picton, a Tourism Acceptance Index (based on previous New Zealand studies) was calculated. To construct the index, a mean score for each statement was totalled and then an overall ‘raw’ score calculated for the full set of statements. These scores were then translated into a scale, from 1 to 100, for ease of interpretation. A score of 50 represents a neutral attitude toward tourism in Picton. Scores that are above 50 represent a positive attitude, and scores that are below 50 represent a negative attitude (see Appendix C for the full list of attitude statements and Figure 13 for the full list of attitude ‘scores’).

The raw attitude data from the 14 statements provided an overall mean score of 46.1 (s.d. = 7.2) out of a maximum possible score of 70, which was then translated into an indexed acceptance score for Picton of 65.8 (out of a maximum possible score of 100). This score is significantly lower (t = -15.025, d.f. = 1760, p < 0.0005) than the figure of 72.3 obtained in a similar study undertaken by Forsyte Research, on behalf of the Ministry of Tourism, in 1992. Although the figure of 65.8 represents a supportive and accepting attitude toward tourism, it does signify a change in the overall general trend of increasing acceptance noted from the 1992 Forsyte study and its predecessor: the New Zealand Tourist Publicity Department study conducted in 1988. The apparent disparity between these figures may, in part, be explained by the events surrounding Tranz Rail’s proposed relocation to Clifford Bay. In addition, one must also consider that the 1992 study carried out by Forsyte Research included both Picton and Blenheim as one study area, whereas this 2000-2001 study does not include Blenheim in the study area.
Figure 13: Picton’s Tourism Acceptance Index: Factor-by-Factor

- Has created jobs: 84.9
- Promote area: 81.8
- Meet different cultures: 77.7
- Traffic congestion: 69.3
- Ratepayers costs up: 69.1
- More nightlife: 68.3
- Benefits are shared: 66.6
- Living costs are up: 66.1
- Extend shopping hours: 65.7
- Environmental threat: 51.5
- Expensive for Kiwis: 46.1
- Stranger in own town: 45.1
- NZer’s are a nuisance: 44.1
- Have a casino: 39.1

AVERAGE: 65.8
The survey respondents scored three negative factors\(^8\) relatively highly, which suggests that there may be some specific areas of concern from Picton residents regarding tourism in the area. These items include: “Tourism creates traffic congestion and parking problems in Picton” (score = 69), “Ratepayers have to pay too much towards facilities used by tourists in your area” (score = 69), and “Tourism has increased the cost of living in Picton” (score = 66). Despite these scores, respondents acknowledge the fact that tourism has created jobs in Picton (score = 84), and support for promoting the region to attract more visitors was high (score = 81). The statement “Tourism creates opportunities to meet people from different cultures” also scored highly (score = 78). Recognition of the need for more ‘nightlife’ (score = 68) and extended shopping hours (score = 66), when combined with the acknowledgement that the benefits of tourism get widely distributed through Picton’s economy (score = 67) appears to confirm that respondents are willing to see an increase in tourist arrivals, or at least to serve them better.

The preceding results indicate that Picton residents are aware of, and experience, both the negative and positive impacts associated with touristic activity in the area. Understandably, residents were less accepting of tourism’s negative impacts (e.g., traffic congestion and parking problems, high cost to ratepayers, and increased cost of living) and more accepting of tourism’s positive impacts (e.g., job creation, promotion of local area, inter-cultural contact). However, overall, Picton residents appear to be both accepting and supportive of tourism in the Town.

**6.3 Residents’ Perceptions of Tourism**

The residents’ survey included questions about the importance of tourism to Picton, and the benefits and costs associated with tourist activity in the region. Respondents were asked to indicate how important they believed tourism was to Picton’s economy. In response, 84 per cent of respondents (222 people) considered tourism to be very important\(^9\) to Picton’s economy. The comments of Respondent 34\(^{10}\) reflect this view:

\(^8\) A **negative factor** is that which reports on the adverse effects associated with tourism in Picton (e.g., increased traffic congestion). A **positive factor** is that which reports on the favourable effects associated with tourism in Picton (e.g., increased employment).

\(^9\) **Very important** includes “very important” and “extremely important”.

\(^{10}\) Interviewees were guaranteed anonymity of response. Accordingly, different interviewees are identified only by an alphanumeric postscript. In addition, responses along a common theme have been paraphrased.
I think tourism's very important, and when we look at what we've had in the past in the way of industry; that is all gone. If we look to the future, the future is pretty bleak, but the tourist industry does create jobs (Respondent 34).

This is supported by the finding of the attitude statement: “Tourism has created jobs in Picton”, which received the highest level of support out of all the individual attitude statements, with 86 per cent (225 people) agreeing\textsuperscript{11} with the statement. Similarly, the attitude statement: “Picton should be promoted to attract many more visitors” also scored highly (81 per cent [214 people] agreeing), indicating that respondents realise the benefits associated with tourism in the area, and are willing to see an increase in the number of visitors that travel to Picton each year.

However, when asked if tourism should be the mainstay of Picton’s economy, only 52 per cent of respondents (135 people) answered in the affirmative. This result suggests that although respondents do appreciate the importance of tourism to Picton’s economy, they also recognise the risk of becoming overly dependent upon tourism. This risk is acknowledged by Respondent 379, who states:

\textit{I think that tourism is very important, but there is a catch. There is very little industry in Picton, so we do run the risk of being overly dependent upon tourism. We used to have the freezing works here, and the railways, but now they've both gone. We've got nothing else here now. Tourism, I think, is the only way that we can go, although I would hate to see us in the situation of depending entirely upon tourism} (Respondent 379).

This reluctance to be overly dependent upon tourism appears to be borne out of a strong sense of concern over the seasonal nature of tourism in Picton. As one respondent commented, a lot of people get ‘burnt’ by the seasonality of Picton. In voicing this concern, Respondent 56 states:

\textit{Tourism here is seasonal; you can’t just switch-off for six months of the year. The winter months – March through to October – is a big problem for the town. We have cafes and restaurants here that close down over the winter - they just can’t make a living} (Respondent 56).

\textsuperscript{11}Agree includes “agree” and “strongly agree”.
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Respondents were then asked to indicate whether or not they believed that the whole community benefits from tourism. The results show that 82 per cent of respondents (217 people) believe that the whole community does benefit from tourism in Picton. It is interesting to note, however, that only 54 per cent of respondents (143 people) agreed with the attitude statement: “The benefits of tourism get widely distributed through Picton’s economy”. Although not as definitive as the former, this finding does, however, indicate a degree of consensus amongst respondents as to the value of tourism to the whole community.

When questioned about costs and benefits, only 58 per cent of respondents (155 people) indicated that they thought there were more benefits than costs associated with tourism in Picton. The comment made by Respondent 6 reflects the acknowledgement of both the benefits and costs that tourism can produce.

*I don’t think that tourism contributes as much as people say towards Picton’s economy. The major problem is that a major proportion of all those people who arrive on the ferries don’t stop in Picton; they just pass through* (Respondent 6).

Three associated attitude statements also correspond with this finding. These include: “Tourism creates traffic congestion and parking problems in Picton” (62 per cent of respondents [163 people] agree), “Ratepayers have to pay too much towards facilities used by tourists in your area” (52 per cent [137 people] agree), and “Tourism has increased the cost of living in Picton” (48 per cent [126 people] agree). This apparent acknowledgement of the negative impacts associated with tourism is supported by the comments of Respondent 50, who states:

*There are a lot of things that I don’t like so much about Picton being a tourist town. Firstly, shopkeepers raise their prices over the holiday season. We’ve also been forced into quite a grandiose sewage treatment plant. We, as ratepayers, are subsidising the facilities that tourists use* (Respondent 50).

Respondents were also questioned about Tranz Rail’s proposal to relocate their Cook Strait ferry terminal from its present Picton location to Clifford Bay. The results show that 68 per cent of respondents (177 people) agree that any such relocation represents a “tremendous opportunity for Picton to be developed as a ‘tourist-town’ rather than just
a 'terminal-town'”. This spirit of optimism is reflected in the comments of several respondents:

*The Clifford Bay issue divided Picton; half wanted them (Tranz Rail) to stay and the other half wanted them to go. What has happened over the last four years since we’ve been here is Picton has gotten used to the idea, and they don’t care if they go. We know that there will be other boats that will come in. If the ferries go, we’ll probably get more tourism, because it is causing major problems in the 'sounds with the wash from the fast ferries* (Respondent 341).

*Am I worried about the ferries going to Clifford Bay? No. This threat of the Clifford Bay thing has been great for Picton, and in many ways I believe that it could be the making of Picton. It's been a catalyst, and it’s galvanised these businesses into new ideas and redevelopments. I don’t think that this would have ever happened had it not been for this talk of Clifford Bay* (Respondent 34).

Some respondents, however, expressed concerns at the way in which Tranz Rail’s proposed relocation has fostered an atmosphere of uncertainty for prospective investors and developers in the area:

*The uncertainty created by Tranz Rail is really holding-up Picton. There's no doubt about it. Investors and developers get scared off because of it. We are in the same old position. Are they (the ferries) going to go, or aren't they? We still don't know. The problem is the confusion, and it's not only confusion in our minds but, more importantly, it is confusion in the minds of the people who are going to lend the money to potential developers* (Respondent 82).

Similarly, there are some who fear that the Clifford Bay proposal, if and when undertaken, may signal the death-knell for tourism in Picton. Respondent 211 reflects this fear for Picton’s future when he states:

*If you take those ferries away, then how are people going to see Picton? Some people say that it would be great to see the ferries go, but how else are you going to get that number of people passing through?* (Respondent 211).
The preceding findings suggest that while tourism is very important to Picton residents, ‘public’ opinion is divided as to whether nor not tourism should be the mainstay of the economy. This division centres on the seasonal nature of the industry, and the associated economic hardship that is experienced by the community in the ‘off-peak’ tourist season. Residents also expressed a belief that the whole community benefits from tourism in the Town, although many questioned the true extent of tourism’s contribution to Picton’s economy. Additionally, it is evident that Tranz Rail Ltd.’s Clifford Bay proposal has acted as a catalyst for renewed community redevelopment, although the associated economic uncertainty in the town has acted as a disincentive for ‘outside’ investors and developers. Thus, many residents believe that Picton can only “go forward” once the Clifford Bay issue is finally resolved.

6.4 Tourism Planning in Picton

A series of questions regarding the value of tourism planning was presented in the residents’ survey. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of planning for future tourism development. The results show that respondents consider planning to be a vital part of tourism development, with 76 per cent of respondents (203 people) indicating that planning is very important. This perceived importance is confirmed by the comments of Respondent 379, who states:

*I do think that there should be some form of [tourism] planning - it’s important that we do it right. We’ve got to have a long-term course of action that is followed through* (Respondent 379).

Respondents were then asked to specify who they thought should oversee tourism planning in Picton. The results show that “local community organisations” is the preferred choice of 40.8 per cent of respondents (107 people), followed by “tourism organisations” (21 per cent; 56 people) and “Marlborough District Council” (20 per cent; 53 people). The comments of Respondent 82 reflect the importance of local community input, mixed with ‘outside’ expertise in tourism planning:

*As far as I’m concerned, planning has got to be driven by locals. You’ve got to involve the community. The community have got to have input, and be listened to. But you must also have the experts, the developers and the investors. You must*

---

12 Very important includes “very important” and “extremely important”.
have the expertise. It's no use having the guy in a little house here who has lived in Picton all of his life saying 'well, this is what should happen in Picton', because he doesn't know what's happening in the world (Respondent 82).

This apparent desire for community involvement was tempered with a concern that any such input should be coordinated through one planning body. Respondent 94 voices this concern, stating:

*I believe that the community's got a lot to offer, but it needs coordinating. I would like to see one [planning] body, rather than three or four, with representation from people from all aspects of tourism, or potential tourism, in the region. Perhaps one of the problems of this town (Picton) is that we have too many groups from council interests – which is Blenheim-based and Blenheim-focussed – through to Picton-based groups like 'Picton Sounds Paradise', business associations, and the 'Queen Charlotte Walkway' group. It is inevitable that these groups will clash over the 'best' way to promote tourism in Picton (Respondent 94).

However, respondents were also quick to point out that the local district council (Marlborough District Council) should also assume some of the responsibility for the planning of future development tourism in Picton. The comments of Respondent 387 reflect this sentiment:

*I think there is a need for tourism planning, and I think the council needs to get behind it. The move from a borough council to a unitary authority has retarded Picton's growth, and now that it has become the Marlborough District Council I don't think they put enough work into Picton. I get the feeling that Picton is the poor relation to Blenheim. It seems to me that they are more interested in promoting the wineries and the Blenheim area than anywhere else in Marlborough, including Picton and the 'Sounds' (Respondent 387).

Respondents were then questioned about their own involvement in, and aspirations for, tourism planning in Picton. When asked if they were currently involved in tourism planning, only 8 per cent (20 people) answered in the affirmative. However, when asked about their future intentions, a total of 37 per cent of respondents (97 people) indicated a desire to be involved in future tourism planning in Picton.
Respondents were also asked to indicate their preferred means of public involvement in planning for tourism in Picton (see Appendix D for a full list of public participation options). First and second-choice participation options were provided (see Figure 14). The results show that "public meetings" was the preferred first-choice option of 36 per cent of respondents (94 people), followed by "an ongoing public advisory group" (35 per cent; 89 people). When asked to indicate their preferred second-choice participation option, 26 per cent of respondents (65 people) selected "an ongoing public advisory group", followed by "surveys" (24 per cent; 59 people).

The first-choice and second-choice participation options were then combined to measure the most popular participation option. The results show that "an ongoing public advisory group" was the most popular option with 30 per cent of respondents. "Public meetings" followed this, with 27 per cent support. "Surveys" (16 per cent) and "individual objections to developments" (15 per cent) also figured prominently. "No public involvement" (2 per cent) received the least support from respondents. These findings indicate that Picton residents do wish to see some community involvement in the process of tourism planning, and that this involvement should see a mix of industry expertise (i.e., "public advisory groups") and the ongoing evaluation of resident views and opinions (i.e., "public meetings", "surveys", and "individual objections"). This desire for community participation appears to be strong, and these findings reinforce the view held in the tourism literature that a key starting point for any tourism plan has to be an examination of the needs and aspirations of local people (Simmons and Fairweather, 1998).

The preceding results suggest that the respondents desire a degree of input into, and consultation over, any future tourism planning initiatives in Picton. These findings also infer that Picton residents feel somewhat 'short-changed' by the local council (Marlborough District Council) over the time and energy (or lack of) spent in and around the Picton area. Consequently, it would appear that Picton residents would be welcoming of any financial assistance from the local council, but suspicious of their motives and effectiveness in the planning process.
Figure 14: Preferred Options for Public Participation in Tourism Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Options</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A = An ongoing public advisory group.</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = Attending public meetings.</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = Surveys from time to time.</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = Individuals objection to developments.</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E = Attending council meetings.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = Talking to councillors.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G = The public need not be involved.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = An ongoing public advisory group.
B = Attending public meetings.
C = Surveys from time to time.
D = Individuals objection to developments.
E = Attending council meetings.
F = Talking to councillors.
G = The public need not be involved.
6.5 Tourism Development in Picton

A series of questions regarding tourism development was also presented in the postal survey. In order to assess accurately the desired level of future tourism development it is important to gauge the level of development, as perceived by the survey respondents, in 2000. In answering this question, 62 per cent of respondents (165 people) indicated that Picton experienced a ‘medium’ level of tourism development.

When asked to specify their desired level of future tourism development, 83 per cent of respondents (222 people) indicated that they would like to see an ‘increased’ level of tourism development than currently experienced in Picton. A further 77 per cent of respondents (206 people) indicated that they believed tourism in Picton should be developed at a ‘moderate’ rate. This sentiment is reflected in the comments made by Respondent 116, who states:

* I think that we've got to develop tourism in Picton, but I also think that we've got to be careful that we retain the character of the town. It's very important. I would just like to see a good, strong infrastructure develop, because there's a lot of potential here* (Respondent 116).

Respondents were also asked to indicate who they believed should initiate any future tourism development. A total of 79 per cent (212 people) indicated that an “equal mix” of private and public developers should initiate future tourism development in Picton. When asked to specify who should own tourist facilities, however, the results were less definitive. In response to this question, 58 per cent of respondents (152 people) indicated their preference for an equal mix of ‘local’ and ‘outside’ (i.e., non-local) ownership, while 41 per cent (107 people) preferred a focus on local ownership.

Respondents were then asked to indicate their preferred development options to attract visitors to Picton (see Appendix E for a full list of development options). First and second-choice development options were provided (see Figure 15). The results show that “facilities to access natural scenery” was the preferred first-choice of 29 per cent of respondents (76 people), followed by “entertainment and cultural activities” (28 per cent; 73 people).

---

13 An *increased* level includes “moderately increased” and “greatly increased” level.
Figure 15: Preferred Options for Future Tourism Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Options</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Facilities to access and enjoy the natural scenery.
B = Improve marketing and information services.
C = More entertainment and cultural activities.
D = Facilities for outdoor recreation.
E = Historical facilities and sites.
F = Holiday homes and waterfront subdivisions.
G = Hotels, motels and restaurants.
When asked to indicate their preferred second-choice development option, 25 per cent of respondents (65 people) selected “facilities for outdoor recreation”, followed by “facilities to access the natural scenery” (23 per cent; 61 people) and “marketing and information services” (23 per cent; 61 people). This apparent preference for the natural scenery and recreational opportunities that surround Picton was one of the main themes to come out of the in-depth interviews. The comments of Respondent 56 and Respondent 34 confirm these findings:

Our waterways are Picton's greatest asset. We talk about our sound - Queen Charlotte Sound - and then the Havelock sound (Kenepuru) and Pelorus Sound. So, I think you could work the Marlborough waterways. Boat trips and walking tracks like the Queen Charlotte Track (Respondent 56).

Attractions should be based around what the 'sounds have to offer; things like scenery, waterways and the bush. We have got a national treasure (the 'sounds) here that's right in the middle of the country. It is the 'sounds that attracts people to Picton; it should be a tourist 'mecca' and I believe it can be (Respondent 34).

The first-choice and second-choice development options were then combined to measure the most popular development option (see Figure 15). The results show that “facilities to access the natural scenery” was the most popular option of 26 per cent of respondents, followed by “marketing and information services” (23 per cent), “entertainment and cultural activities” (21 per cent) and “facilities for outdoor recreation” (19 per cent).

The preceding findings indicate a strong preference for natural resource-based tourism development, suggesting a link to the natural resource base (and their managers) of the surrounding area and the ongoing development of tourism ventures in the area. This is significant as such a link is a key component in the overall planning process. It is also significant that Picton residents show a desire to actively pursue tourism in the area through the improvement of marketing and information services. This confirms earlier findings, in which residents indicated a desire to promote Picton to attract more
visitors, and a desire to see an increased level of tourism development than currently experienced in Picton. In addition, the findings show that while residents are happy to see a mix of public and private developers initiating future tourism development, they are somewhat less open to the idea of outside ownership of tourism facilities. This reflects a strong desire to retain some tangible form of control over tourism in Picton – through the ownership of businesses – and to reap the financial rewards of tourist custom through profit taking (or, the risk of ‘loss-taking’).

6.6 Inferential Statistics: Analysis of Associated Variables

In addition to descriptive data, inferential statistics are also presented. The purpose of such an undertaking is to investigate the significance (or insignificance) of several predetermined ‘key’ variables with respect to their ‘predictive power’ over certain beliefs about, and attitudes towards, tourism in Picton. Wherever a result is indicated as being significant, it at most has a probability of 0.05 of occurring accidentally (i.e., at least 95 per cent confidence interval).

This analysis was guided by a foundational hypothesis that responses directed at certain questions would be influenced, at least in part, by the respondents’ relative degree of

---

14 See attitude statements, Chapter 6.2
15 See comments regarding seasonality to tourism in Picton, Chapter 6.3
16 A Note of Caution Regarding Multiple Statistical Analyses.

In any statistical test with an alpha level of 0.05, we would expect on average one out of every 20 tests to generate a significant result simply by chance. (The alpha level is the chance taken by researchers to incorrectly declare a difference, effect or relationship to be true, because of chance fluctuation). However, due to the complex nature of statistical analyses, there exists the possibility that a Type 1 error (i.e., incorrectly declaring a difference to be true) may occur when conducting multiple statistical analyses simultaneously on the same data set. Such an error may occur if the alpha level of each statistical test needs to be recalculated to take into account the number of statistical comparisons being performed. In the case of multiple statistical tests, the chance of finding at least one test statistically significant due to chance fluctuation – and to incorrectly declare a difference, effect or relationship to be true – increases as the number of tests increase.

One commonly used and relatively conservative adjustment is the Bonferroni correction. Using the Bonferroni method the alpha level of each individual test is adjusted downwards to ensure that the overall risk to find a difference, effect or relationship incorrectly significant continues to be 0.05 (or, one in twenty). Although popular, there are some drawbacks associated with using such a conservative adjustment. Among these, if the chance of making a Type 1 error is reduced, then the chance of making a Type 2 error (i.e., that no effect, difference or relationship is declared, when in fact one does exist) is increased. Thus, a stringent application of the Bonferroni correction precludes the researcher from being able to consider tests on their individual merit. Additionally, there remains differing opinion regarding the relative merits and application of the correction. In light of these shortcomings, the researcher proposes to report the results of statistical tests without the application of a Bonferroni-like correction. Instead, the researcher advises that those findings that fail to attain a high level of statistical significance (p < 0.005) should be considered with some degree of caution.
separation (or 'distance') from tourism. This notion of 'distance', however, represents more than just a conventional measure of spatial separation. For the purposes of the present study, 'distance' is measured in four ways, including both spatial and experiential separation components. The four measures of 'distance', as detailed in this section, include:

1. **Social distance.** How much general contact does the respondent have with visitors to Picton during the tourist season\(^\text{17}\)? (Five categories: very frequent / frequent / some / very little / none at all). A higher level of contact is considered to indicate a smaller degree of social distance.

2. **Economic distance.** Is the respondent, or anyone in their household, employed in jobs directly associated with tourism\(^\text{18}\)? (Three categories: yes / no / don't know). A member of the household employed in tourism is considered to indicate a smaller degree of economic distance (greater economic dependence).

3. **Community distance.** How many years, in total, has the respondent lived in Picton? (Five categories: less than 1 year / 1 – 5 years / 6 – 10 years / 11 – 15 years / more than 15 years) and, was the respondent born in Picton? (Two categories: yes / no). A greater length of residence and/or birth in Picton is considered to indicate a smaller degree of community distance (greater attachment to the community).

4. **Geographical distance.** Where is the respondent’s primary place of work located\(^\text{19}\)? (Five categories: waterfront / CBD / ‘suburbs’ / Waikawa / outside the area) and, where does the respondent reside\(^\text{20}\)? (Two categories: Picton / Waikawa). This is a measure of the spatial relationship between the respondents’ key locations (place of work, place of residence) and Picton’s tourism centre (waterfront / foreshore).

Six key dependent variables were selected in the belief that they are key dimensions in any tourism policy formulation. These dependent variables include:

---

\(^{17}\) According to several informants, the tourist season runs approximately from early-December through to late mid-April.

\(^{18}\) Includes accommodation industry, food and beverage industry, recreation and tourist attractions.

\(^{19}\) Location relative to Picton’s ‘tourism centre’ (i.e., the waterfront / foreshore).

\(^{20}\) Respondents' options were restricted to either Picton or Waikawa.
1. **Opportunity for tourism development.** Responses to the statement: “the proposed relocation of Tranz Rail's Cook Strait ferry terminal to Clifford Bay represents a tremendous opportunity for Picton to be developed as a 'tourist town’ rather than just a ‘terminal town’” (Five categories: strongly disagree / disagree / neither disagree nor agree / agree / strongly agree).

2. **Mainstay of economy.** Should tourism become the mainstay of Picton's economy? (Three categories: yes / no / don't know).

3. **Acceptance of tourism.** Respondents' acceptance of tourism and tourism development in Picton, as measured by the Tourism Acceptance Index. (A single continuous factor).

4. **Future tourism planning.** Given the opportunity, would respondents participate in future tourism planning in Picton? (Three categories: yes / no / don't know).

5. **Level of future tourism development.** Compared with current tourism development in Picton, to what level would respondents like to see tourism be developed in the future? (Five categories: greatly reduced / moderately reduced / current level / moderately increased / greatly increased).

6. **Rate of future tourism development.** At what rate would respondents like to see tourism be developed? (Five categories: rapid / moderate / slow / no developments at all / don’t know).

---

### 6.6.1 Social Distance

A series of statistical tests was performed to determine the predictive nature of social distance upon the previously described set of dependent variables. As outlined above, social distance refers to the respondents' degree of social interaction with visitors to Picton. This is measured according to the respondents' level of 'general contact' with visitors to Picton during the tourist season. Of the six tests performed, four generated statistically significant results (see Table 3 for the full list of statistical results).

A One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine the predictive nature of social distance upon respondents' acceptance of tourism. The result of this test ($F = 7.541$, d.f. = 4, $p < 0.0005$) suggests that as levels visitor contact increase, respondents' acceptance of tourism becomes increasingly more favourable. Specifically, respondents who have high visitor contact ('very frequent' or 'frequent')
are likely to have a significantly higher acceptance of tourism than those who have low visitor contact ('some', or 'none') (see Appendix F.1 for additional test statistics).

Table 3: Results of Statistical Analyses (Social Distance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>SOCIAL DISTANCE</th>
<th>Results Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of tourism</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td>F (4, 256) = 7.541, p &lt; 0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future tourism planning</td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (8, 261) = 52.797, p &lt; 0.0005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of future tourism development</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis test</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (4, 263) = 27.573, p &lt; 0.0005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of future tourism development</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis test</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (4, 263) = 19.864, p &lt; 0.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstay of economy</td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (8, 254) = 9.677, p &lt; 0.288$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for tourism development</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis test</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (4, 256) = 1.679, p &lt; 0.794$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This finding appears to support those of previous researchers (Rothman, 1978; Simmons, 1989), who found that high contact with tourists was associated with positive perceptions of tourism, particularly in communities that experience a high degree of seasonal visitors (Rothman, 1978). Drawing from Butler’s (1980) destination life cycle model, such a finding may also hint at Picton’s developmental stage (involvement-development). Interestingly, a possible explanation for the association between low contact and low acceptance may be found in the comments of Respondent 215, a recent retiree to Picton, who states:
There is quite a lot of reliance on tourism, but I think a lot of the locals would rather be without it. My main concern – and it’s probably a bit selfish of me – is that I’m retired and I like a nice quiet life. I don’t want too many people spoiling the fishing (Respondent 215).

These comments suggest that there is a fear that tourists may spoil the tranquil lifestyle presently enjoyed by many residents, particularly retirees, many of whom tend to ‘keep to themselves’. Often these people choose to relocate to Picton to live out their retirement years because of the peace, tranquillity and spectacular landscape. To these residents, tourism development may represent a threat to the very qualities that attracted them to the area in the first instance.

A Chi-square was then performed to determine the predictive nature of social distance upon respondents’ propensity to participate in future tourism planning. The result of this test ($\chi^2 = 52.797$, d.f. = 8, $p < 0.0005$) indicates that respondents who have ‘very frequent’ contact with visitors in the tourist season are more likely than expected to participate in future tourism planning. Conversely, than those who have ‘very little’ or ‘no contact’ are more likely than expected not to be involved in future tourism planning. Additionally, those who have ‘some’ contact with visitors are more likely than expected to be unsure in their response (see Appendix F.2 for Chi-square tests, and Appendix F.3 for cross-tabulations).

This finding, when considered alongside the preceding result, tends to suggest the emergence of two distinct groups of respondents. Drawing from Bjorkland and Philbrick’s (1975) model of attitudinal and behavioural attributes of inter-cultural perception, these two groups may be identified as: (1) ‘aggressive promoters of something favoured’, and (2) ‘resigned accepters of something disliked’. Using ‘acceptance of tourism’ and ‘involvement in future tourism planning’ as the model’s attitudinal and behavioural components, the results indicate that: (1) ‘aggressive promoters’ refers to respondents who have more favourable (positive) attitudes toward tourism, and are more inclined to participate in future tourism planning, and (2) ‘resigned accepters’ refers to respondents who have less favourable (negative) attitudes toward tourism, and are less inclined to participate in future tourism planning. Thus, we can infer from these findings that those respondents with high levels of visitor contact...
are aligned toward the 'aggressive promotion' of tourism in Picton, while those with low levels of visitor contact are aligned toward the 'resigned acceptance' of tourism in Picton. In a similar vein, Butler (1975) also contends that attitudes and behaviour of residents may be expressed via active or passive behaviour.

A Kruskall-Wallis test was performed to determine the predictive nature of social distance upon respondents' preferred level of future tourism development. The result of this test ($\chi^2 = 27.573$, d.f. = 4, $p < 0.0005$) indicates that as respondent's level of contact with visitors in the tourist season increases, so too does their desired level of future tourism development in the area (see Appendix F.4 for additional test statistics, and Appendix F.5 for ranks).

An additional Kruskall-Wallis test was performed to determine the predictive nature of social distance upon respondents' preferred rate of future tourism development in Picton. The result of this test ($\chi^2 = 19.864$, d.f. = 4, $p < 0.001$) indicates that as the level of contact increases, so too does the respondents' desired rate of future tourism development. Specifically, respondents who have with 'frequent' and 'some' contact with visitors are more likely to desire increased rates of development than those who have 'very little' or 'no contact' (see Appendix F.6 for additional test statistics, and Appendix F.7 for ranks).

These findings suggest that, at a personal level, respondents' self-assessed level of general visitor contact is seen to be important, and is positively associated with measures favourable to an increased level and rate of tourism development in Picton. Additionally, they also serve to further develop the idea of 'aggressive promotion' and 'resigned acceptance' (as introduced in the preceding tests) within the resident community. Adding to this theme, 'aggressive promoters' refers to those respondents who are more accepting of tourism, more likely to participate in future tourism planning, and more likely to prefer higher levels and rates of future tourism development in Picton (high level of visitor contact). Alternately, 'resigned accepters' refers to those who are less accepting of tourism, less likely to participate in future tourism planning, and more likely to prefer lower levels and rates of future tourism development (low level of visitor contact).
Additional statistical tests were performed to determine the predictive nature of social distance upon: (1) respondents' appraisal of the opportunity for tourism development in Picton, and (2) respondents' desire for tourism to be the mainstay of Picton's economy. However, both failed to yield statistically significant results (see Table 3 for details). This notwithstanding, the preceding results do indicate that higher levels of visitor contact lead to: (1) a more favourable attitude (as measured by acceptance of tourism) toward tourism, (2) a greater likelihood of participating in future tourism planning, (3) a higher preferred level of future tourism development, and (4) a higher preferred rate of future tourism development. This suggests that strong support for tourism comes from those respondents who have high levels of visitor contact.

6.6.2 Economic Distance

A series of statistical analyses was performed to identify the predictive nature of economic distance upon the six dependent variables. As outlined previously, economic distance refers to the respondents' degree of economic separation from the tourism industry. This is measured according to the respondents' (or a member of their household) employment, or non-employment, in tourism-related positions. Three of the six tests performed generated statistically significant results (see Table 4 for the full list of statistical results).

An independent samples t-test was performed to determine the predictive nature of economic distance upon respondents' acceptance of tourism. The result of this test \( t = 3.150, \text{d.f.} = 259, P < 0.002 \) suggests that respondents who are employed in tourism are more likely to have a more positive attitude toward tourism than those who are not employed in tourism (see Appendix F.8 for additional test statistics and Appendix F.9 for group statistics).

This result is entirely expected and mirrors those findings of previous researchers (Glasson, 1994; Husbands, 1989; Lankford and Howard, 1994; Pizam, 1978; Rothman, 1978) all of whom reported a positive relationship between employment in tourism and attitudes and perceptions toward tourism. Clearly, the economic benefit of tourism is a fundamental concern to those working in tourism, whether they be business operators or employees. Such an association is to be expected, as it is improbable (in the case of
Picton) that individuals employed in tourism would, overall, express negative attitudes toward the very industry that employs them.

Table 4: Results of Statistical Analyses (Economic Distance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>ECONOMIC DISTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Results Obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of tourism</td>
<td><em>t</em>-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>t</em> (259) = 3.150, <em>p</em> &lt; 0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future tourism planning</td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>χ</em>² (2, 261) = 20.497, <em>p</em> &lt; 0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstay of economy</td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>χ</em>² (2, 253) = 1.957, <em>p</em> &lt; 0.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of future tourism development</td>
<td><em>Mann-Whitney U</em>-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>U</em> = 5995.000, <em>Z</em> = -3.676, <em>p</em> &lt; 0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for tourism development</td>
<td><em>Mann-Whitney U</em>-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>U</em> = 7173.500, <em>Z</em> = -0.479, <em>p</em> &lt; 0.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of future tourism development</td>
<td><em>Mann-Whitney U</em>-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>U</em> = 7135.000, <em>Z</em> = -1.852, <em>p</em> &lt; 0.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Chi-square was performed to determine the predictive nature of economic distance upon respondents’ desire to be involved in future tourism planning. The result of this test (*χ*² = 20.497, d.f. = 2, *p* < 0.0005) indicates that respondents who are employed in tourism are more likely to be involved in future tourism planning than those who are not employed in tourism. Specifically, respondents who are employed in tourism are more likely than expected to participate in future tourism planning, while those not employed in tourism are less likely than expected to participate (see Appendix F.10 for Chi-square tests, and Appendix F.11 for cross-tabulations).
This finding suggests that respondents who are dependent upon tourism for their livelihood are likely to want to be involved in future tourism planning. This follows the findings of Lankford and Howard (1994), who reported that attitudes towards tourism were favourably influenced by the extent to which local residents felt they maintained some level of control over its planning and development. As Lankford and Howard (1994, p. 134) note, if residents feel they can exercise some degree of influence over the planning process, much of their apprehension regarding tourism development may be reduced. Therefore, by involving themselves, tourism 'workers' can exert some influence (whether perceived or actual) over the planning process, which in turn may ultimately have some bearing on their future livelihoods in the tourism 'industry'.

The preceding results, as was the case with social distance, can be modelled drawing from Bjorkland and Philbrick's (1975) model of attitudinal and behavioural attributes of inter-cultural perception. Using 'acceptance of tourism' and 'involvement in future tourism planning' as the model's attitudinal and behavioural components, the results indicate that: (1) 'aggressive promoters' comprises those employed in tourism, and (2) 'resigned accepters' comprises those not employed in tourism.

A Mann-Whitney U-test was performed to determine the predictive nature of economic distance upon respondents' preferred level of future tourism development. The result of this test ($U = 5995.000$, $Z = -3.676$, $p < 0.0005$) suggests that respondents who are employed in tourism are more likely to prefer an increased level of future tourism development than those who are not employed in tourism (see Appendix F.12 for additional test statistics, and Appendix F.13 for ranks).

This finding, in much the same way as social distance, indicates that respondents with a high degree of contact with tourists, whether that contact is 'social' or 'professional', favour increased levels of tourism development. As with social distance, strong support for tourism is seen as coming from those people who have a strong link to tourism in the area. In the case of social distance, this link was measured through visitor contact. In the case of economic distance, this link is measured though employment in the tourism 'industry'. On both occasions, these links have proven to be significant.
Three additional statistical tests were also performed. These were undertaken to determine the predictive nature of economic distance upon: (1) respondents’ appraisal of the opportunity for tourism development in Picton, (2) respondents’ desire for tourism to be the mainstay of Picton’s economy, and (3) respondents’ preferred rate of future tourism development in Picton (see Table 4 for details). All of these tests failed to yield statistically significant results, thus indicating that economic distance is a poor predictor of these variables. However, the earlier results do suggest that employment in tourism is likely to result in: (1) a more favourable attitude toward tourism, (2) a greater likelihood of participation in future tourism planning, and (3) higher desired levels of future tourism development.

Overall, the results follow the trend set by social distance, with economic distance producing a similar pattern of results (the only difference being the failure of economic distance against rate of tourism development to yield a statistically significant relationship). This apparent association between the two is confirmed by performing a Chi-square test. The result of this test ($\chi^2 = 84.831$, d.f. = 4, $p < 0.0005$) suggests that those respondents who have ‘very frequent’ visitor contact are more likely, than expected, to be employed in jobs associated with tourism (see Appendix F.14 for Chi-square tests and Appendix F.15 for cross-tabulations). However, this relationship is not surprising, given the service-oriented nature of the tourism industry.

6.6.3 Community Distance

A series of statistical analyses was performed to identify the predictive nature of community distance upon the six dependent variables. As outlined previously, community distance refers to the respondents’ degree of community attachment (or lack thereof) to the town (and surrounding environs) of Picton. This is measured according to the respondents’ length of residence in Picton (i.e., total amount of years), and birthplace (i.e., was the respondent born in Picton?). Three of the six tests performed for length of residence generated statistically significant results, while one of the six test performed for birthplace yielded statistically significant results (see Table 5 for the full list of statistical results).
Table 5: Results of Statistical Analyses (Community Distance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Community Distance (Length of Residence)</th>
<th>Community Distance (Birthplace)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test Performed</td>
<td>Results Obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for tourism development</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis test</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (4, 253) = 12.128, p &lt; 0.016$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of tourism</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td>F (4, 253) = 4.198, p &lt; 0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future tourism planning</td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (8, 258) = 15.909, p &lt; 0.044$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of future tourism development</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis test</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (4, 260) = 9.260, p &lt; 0.055$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstay of economy</td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (8, 250) = 13.906, p &lt; 0.084$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of future tourism development</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis test</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (4, 260) = 4.777, p &lt; 0.311$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Length of Residence. A Kruskall-Wallis test was performed to determine the predictive nature of length of residence upon respondents' appraisal of the opportunity for tourism development in Picton. (The following data are subject to the caution expressed in Footnote 16 regarding the level of confidence in the statistical significance of the results). The result of this test ($\chi^2 = 12.128$, d.f. = 4, $p < 0.016$) indicates that respondents who have lived in Picton for more than 15 years are likely to have a less positive appraisal of the opportunity for Picton to be developed as a 'tourist town' rather than just a 'terminal town', than all other groups. Specifically, their appraisal of such an opportunity is significantly less favourable than those who have lived in Picton less than one year (see Appendix F.16 for additional test statistics, and Appendix F.17 for ranks). These finding are best explained by the comments of Respondent 50, a long-term resident, who states:

There are a lot of things I don't like about having Picton as a tourist town. For instance, shopkeepers raise their prices over the holiday season...When we get cruise ships arriving in the summer months it's noticeable that prices increase almost immediately. Another concern is that we, as ratepayer, are subsidising the facilities that tourists use. There should be a fund set up - a surcharge or levy against the tourists - to help provide the facilities in Picton that tourists use (Respondent 50).

This suggest that long-term residents are less enthusiastic about the prospect of capitalising on future tourism opportunities, and are tired of carrying the cost of accommodating tourists for what might be viewed as minimal return. Respondent 343, a 'newer' resident, confirms the hesitancy of longer-term residents toward tourism in Picton, stating that:

A lot of the 'old blood' - the older locals who have lived here for years - have got a very narrow vision of Picton. They don't want the town to change (Respondent 343).

A One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine the predictive nature of length of residence upon respondents' acceptance of tourism in Picton. The result of this test ($F = 4.198$, d.f. = 4, $p < 0.003$) indicates that respondents who have lived in Picton for more than 15 years are likely to have a lower acceptance of tourism than all other groups. Specifically, their acceptance is significantly lower than those who have lived in Picton for five years or less (see Appendix F.18 for additional test
statistics). This result lends weight to the preceding comments made by survey respondents, and helps to confirm that strong support for tourism can be seen as coming from 'new' residents, rather than 'long-term' residents. These results appear to contradict the findings of several researchers (Brougham and Butler, 1981; McCool and Martin, 1994), who found that people who had lived longer in a community were more positive about tourism than newcomers to a place. However, Pearce et al. (1996, p. 19) note that, in the case of community attachment, few consistent relationships or patterns are observed.

A Chi-square was also performed to determine the predictive nature of length of residence upon respondents' desire to be involved in future tourism planning. (The following data are subject to the caution expressed in Footnote 16 regarding the level of confidence in the statistical significance of the results). The result of this test ($\chi^2 = 15.909, \text{d.f.} = 8, p < 0.044$) suggests that a significant association exists between the two variables. Specifically, respondents who have lived in Picton for more than 15 years are less likely than expected to be involved in future tourism planning. Alternatively, respondents who have lived in Picton for five years or less are more likely than expected to participate (see Appendix F.19 for additional test statistics, and Appendix F.20 for cross-tabulations). This finding is supported by the comments of Respondent 211, who states:

*The longer-term residents of Picton can be pretty apathetic about a lot of things, you know, they blow hot and cold. If something affects them personally, they jump up and down. Otherwise, they just don't seem to care* (Respondent 211).

These results, like those of social distance and economic distance, can be modelled drawing from Bjorkland and Philbrick's (1975) model of attitudinal and behavioural attributes of inter-cultural perception. Using 'acceptance of tourism' and 'involvement in future tourism planning' as the model's attitudinal and behavioural components, the results indicate that: (1) 'aggressive promoters' comprises those who have lived in Picton for five years or less, and (2) 'resigned accepters' comprises those who have lived in Picton for more than 15 years.
Three additional tests of statistical association were also performed. These were undertaken to determine the predictive nature of length of residence upon: (1) respondents’ desire for tourism to be the mainstay of Picton’s economy, (2) respondents’ preferred level of future tourism development, and (3) respondents’ preferred rate of tourism development. All of these tests failed to yield statistically significant results. This notwithstanding, the earlier results do indicate that length of residence of more than 15 years is likely to lead to: (1) less favourable appraisals of the opportunity for tourism development in Picton, (2) a less positive attitude (as measured by acceptance) toward tourism, and (3) lower likelihood of involvement in future tourism planning. Conversely, length of residence of less than six years is likely to lead to: (1) more favourable appraisals of the opportunity for tourism development, (2) a more positive attitude toward tourism, and (3) a greater likelihood of involvement in future tourism planning.

Overall, these findings represent an interesting separation of opinion amongst respondents, when related to length of residence. The dominance of two main groups (length of residence >15 years, and length of residence ≤ five years) and the absence of significant findings in the mid-range categories (‘6-10 years’, ‘11-15 years’) suggest a natural progression resident opinion. This takes the form of a three-stage progression, commencing with an initial stage of ‘warm’ support for tourism from ‘new’ residents (length of residence ≤ five years). This is then followed by a transitional stage of ‘tepid’ support from medium-term residents (length of residence from six to 15 years) and finally by a stage of ‘cool’ support from long-term residents (length of residence > 15 years). Such an evolution of resident opinions is reminiscent of other stage-based models, as outlined in the literature review (Chapter 2).

**Birthplace.** An independent samples t-test was performed to determine the predictive nature of birthplace upon respondents’ acceptance of tourism in Picton. (The following data are subject to the caution expressed in Footnote 16 regarding the level of confidence in the statistical significance of the results). The result of this test ($t = -2.283$, d.f. = 259, $p < 0.023$) suggests that respondents who are born in Picton are more likely to have a less favourable attitude toward tourism than those who were not born in Picton (see Appendix F.21 for test statistics, and Appendix F.22 for group statistics).
This result supports the earlier finding that length of residence is negatively related to respondents' attitudes (acceptance) toward tourism in Picton.

A further five tests were also performed. These were undertaken to determine the predictive nature of birthplace upon respondents': (1) appraisal of the opportunity for tourism development in Picton, (2) desire for tourism to be the mainstay of Picton's economy, (3) desire to be involved in future tourism planning, (4) preferred level of future tourism development, and (5) preferred rate of future tourism development in Picton (see Table 5 for details). All failed to yield statistically significant results. This suggests that birthplace (i.e., born / not born in Picton) is a poor predictor of these dependent variables, and appears to support the contention that birthplace may be a poor measure of community attachment (Lankford and Howard, 1994; McCool and Martin, 1994; Pearce et al., 1996). This notwithstanding, the results overall indicate that length of residence is a more reliable indicator of respondents' attitudes and opinions regarding tourism in Picton.

6.6.4 Geographical Distance

A series of statistical analyses was performed to identify the predictive nature of geographical distance upon the six dependent variables. As outlined previously, geographical distance refers to the respondents' degree of physical, or spatial, separation from Picton's 'tourism centre' (i.e., Picton's waterfront / foreshore). This is measured according to the location of respondents' primary place of work, and place of residence (i.e., either Picton or Waikawa). Of the twelve tests performed\textsuperscript{21}, all failed to yield statistically significant results (see Table 6 for the full list of statistical results). This suggests that geographical distance is a poor indicator of resident response to tourism in Picton.

\textsuperscript{21} Six tests each for 'place of work' and 'place of residence'.
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Table 6: Results of Statistical Analyses (Geographical Distance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL DISTANCE (Place of Work)</th>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL DISTANCE (Place of Residence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tests Performed</td>
<td>Results Obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for tourism development</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis test</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (4, 169) = 2.295, p &lt; 0.682$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstay of economy</td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (8, 170) = 8.121, p &lt; 0.422$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of tourism</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td>$F (4, 167) = 2.334, p &lt; 0.058$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future tourism planning</td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (8, 174) = 6.368, p &lt; 0.606$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of future tourism development</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis test</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (4, 175) = 3.880, p &lt; 0.423$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of future tourism development</td>
<td>Kruskall-Wallis test</td>
<td>$\chi^2 (4, 1750) = 1.376, p &lt; 0.848$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These results were unexpected, as it was anticipated that residents in Picton would be more accepting and more enthusiastic about tourism in the area than residents in Waikawa (because of the transport linkages from the waterfront to the central business district and out of the town toward Blenheim). This, however, was not the case. A possible explanation for the absence of any statistically significant results related to geographical distance may be found in the comments of Respondent 94, who states:

*Picton pays the price for the downside of the port: the logs, coal, trains, and trucks. For example, people don't like to stay in a camping ground with a train going over the top of it...It's probably why there's so much more development going on out towards Waikawa, because the trains aren't out there* (Respondent 94).

These comments suggest that Picton may be suffering from the negative impacts (principally noise, visual and environmental pollution) associated with the everyday running a busy modern port, while Waikawa reaps the benefits of the positive impacts (principally increased longer-stay visitors) associated with the port.

Following this theme, another possible reason for the absence of statistically significant findings may be due to the fact that both Picton and Waikawa experience comparable degrees of tourism developments. In the case of Picton, it takes the form of accommodation, shopping and entertainment, while at Waikawa it takes the form of holiday homes and apartments, and extensive marina facilities (it has been suggested by several respondents that Picton attracts mainly 'low-end' short-stay visitors, while Waikawa attracts mainly 'high-end' longer-stay visitors). In any case, it is evident that when compared to social contact, economic linkages, and community attachment, geographical distance is a poor indicator of resident response to tourism in Picton.

### 6.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has provided a description of the results obtained by this study. In keeping with an integrative approach to data collection, data from a variety of sources have been presented in an integrated fashion. For the purposes of presentation, quantitative data arising from the postal survey of Picton residents were used as the template, while the more qualitative data arising from the interviews were added to provide clarification, detail and colour. Much of the data presented has been descriptive. Analytical focus
was sought primarily on the factors that were associated with certain beliefs about, and attitudes toward, tourism in Picton.

A good deal of the discussion has centred on the belief that a supportive resident population will lead to greater tourism potential for Picton. By initially focussing on general perceptions of Picton residents toward tourism, this study has endeavoured to provide a broader base of understanding relating to impacts on host communities. Understanding residents’ opinions of tourism has management implications regarding their willingness to support the further development of an industry to which they may not feel a sense of attachment to, involvement in, or control over. Additionally, marketing opportunities may be missed with regards to the positive views held by the resident population, which may translate into an improved tourism product.

First, respondents’ attitudes towards tourism and tourism development in Picton were examined. A Tourism Acceptance Index was used to measure these attitudes, which provided an overall acceptance score of 65.8. This score was significantly lower than the previous score of 72.3 obtained by Forsyte Research in 1992. Although the figure of 65.8 indicates a supportive and accepting attitude toward tourism, it does represent a reversal in the overall trend of increasing acceptance among the communities included in the 1992 Forsyte study and its predecessor: the 1988 New Zealand Tourist Publicity Department study. Such a finding suggests a hardening of community attitudes, possibly fostered by the period of uncertainty surrounding the future of Picton’s association with the inter-island passenger ferries.

Second, respondents’ appraisals of the significance of tourism in Picton were examined. The results indicate that, although tourism is very important to Picton, the respondents recognise that there are some negative consequences associated with being a tourist destination. In fact, many respondents indicated that the benefits accrued through tourism, although not inconsequential, are often overstated. Concerns voiced over ‘free-riders’ (i.e., tourists availing themselves of facilities funded by ratepayers), and the seasonal nature of tourism suggests that Picton residents are aware that tourism, and tourism development, can be a double-edged sword. There was, however, an overall belief that Tranz Rail’s Clifford Bay proposal could herald the dawning of a prosperous
new era in Picton. At the very least, it appears to have galvanised the local community and acted as a catalyst for renewed community development.

Third, the relative merits of planning for tourism were presented. Respondents indicated that planning should be regarded as being a crucial part of any future tourism development, and that this planning should be overseen by the local Picton community. Presently, only a very small percentage of respondents are actively involved in tourism planning. A considerably larger number of respondents, however, have indicated a willingness to participate in future tourism planning. The preferred means of participation was through the use of a public advisory group to liaise with the community, thereby endeavouring to manage the implicit tension between the public and other planning agencies. The respondents also recommended that the Marlborough District Council should have a role in providing financial support for any such future planning and development programmes.

Fourth, respondents’ appraisals of tourism development options were assessed. Respondents indicated that they would like to see an increase in the ‘medium’ level of tourism development that Picton currently experiences. This development should take place at a ‘moderate’ rate. In addition, it was felt that an equal mix of private and public developers should initiate any future development. The respondents’ indicated a preference for developing facilities to access the natural scenery, and recommended that ownership of tourist facilities in Picton should be by an equal mix of local and outside interests.

Following this, the effects of associated variables on resident responses were assessed. These data were introduced to examine the ‘predictive power’ of four independent variables: (1) social distance, (2) economic distance, (3) community distance, and (4) geographical distance, against certain beliefs about, and attitudes towards, tourism in Picton. Three of these variables provided statistically significant results. These results have highlighted significantly different opinions regarding resident interpretations of the impact of tourism (see Table 7 for a summary of findings).
Table 7: Summary of Associated Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>Social Distance</th>
<th>Economic Distance</th>
<th>Community Distance</th>
<th>Geographic Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for tourism development</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstay of economy</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of tourism</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future tourism planning</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of future tourism development</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of future tourism development</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Key: Table demonstrates significance levels, where: * = p < 0.05, ** = p < 0.01, *** = p < 0.005, n.s. = not significant).
However, from a theoretical perspective, the results suggest that overall this extended model of distance (i.e., social, economic, community, and geographical distance) was not particularly helpful in providing a basis for explaining the processes involved in the formulation of resident responses.

Notwithstanding the above, social distance proved to be the most influential of the variables tested, demonstrating a statistically significant relationship with acceptance of tourism, future tourism planning, level of future tourism development, and rate of future tourism development. Specifically, the level of visitor contact is positively related to residents': (1) acceptance of tourism, (2) propensity to participate in future tourism planning, (3) desired level of future tourism development, and (4) desire rate of future tourism development.

Economic distance was then examined, and demonstrated a statistically significant relationship with acceptance of tourism, future tourism planning, and level of future tourism development. Specifically, employment in tourism is positively related to residents': (1) acceptance of tourism, (2) propensity to participate in future tourism planning, and (3) desired level of future tourism development.

This was followed by community distance (length of residence), which demonstrated a statistically significant relationship with appraisal of Picton's opportunity for tourism development, acceptance of tourism, and future tourism planning. Specifically, length of residence (≤ five years) is positively related to residents': (1) appraisal of Picton's opportunity for future tourism development, (2) acceptance of tourism, and (3) propensity to participate in future tourism planning. Conversely, length of residence (>15 years) is negatively related to residents': (1) appraisal of Picton's opportunity for tourism development, (2) acceptance of tourism, and (3) propensity to participate in future tourism planning. In addition, length of residence (birthplace) demonstrated a statistically significant relationship with acceptance of tourism. Specifically, residents who were born in Picton are less accepting of tourism than those born outside the Picton area. The final independent variable, geographical distance, failed to demonstrate a statistically significant relationship with any of the dependent variables previously described.
In summary, the preceding results support the contention that resident attitudes and opinions, although generally positive, are far from homogeneous. For many residents, tourism is seen as part of everyday life, bringing both benefits and problems, and generally evokes supportive attitudes toward increased public involvement in planning, and increased levels of tourism development. However, these results should be treated with caution, as the author is not suggesting that attitude determines behaviour. Many residents have strong opinions but most people do not act upon them. It is tempting to conclude that if residents do nothing their views may be ignored. This is not the case, as 'resigned acceptance' (as identified in the associated variables) in this study does not necessarily mean that there will be no effects on other types of behaviour (for example, voting behaviour). Therefore, monitoring the pulse of local feelings is important for tourism planners and managers. Similarly, the tourism industry must have a mandate from the local community in order to ensure its longer-term profitability in Picton.

Whatever the contradictions that might be apparent in attitudes within the community, planners and businesses responsible for the development of the industry must be prepared to involve local communities in consultation. Very simply, those individuals and organisations advocating tourism development must recognise the unique characteristics, aspirations, and expectations of the local community before establishing a strategy for future tourism development in Picton.
7.1 Introduction
This thesis has sought to examine residents' response (i.e., perceptions, attitudes, and expectations) to the 'business' of tourism planning and development. Central to this has been the concept of community participation in the planning process. Many tourism researchers have espoused the need for such involvement, with Murphy's (1985) work often being quoted in this context. The rationale for incorporating community input into tourism planning is simple: the positive and negative impacts of tourism development have their most profound impacts on host communities (Simmons and Fairweather, 1998). It is the citizen who must live with the cumulative effects of such development, and therefore needs to have a greater input into how the community is 'packaged' and 'sold' as a tourist product on the national and international markets. Accordingly, much of the impetus behind this study has been based on the belief that a supportive resident population will lead to greater tourism potential for the town of Picton.

7.2 Implications for Picton
This study has utilised the town of Picton (Marlborough, New Zealand) as a case study. Fieldwork occurred at a time when the future of a key component of Picton's inter-island transportation corridor was threatened. The context of this research, therefore, centres on residents' uncertainty about the future prosperity of the Town, and uncertainty of the true value and worth of tourism to the community. Picton is situated at the head of Queen Charlotte Sound, and acts as the southern terminus for the inter-island rail and passenger ferries. These ferries transport over 1.1 million passengers each year, and therefore contribute greatly to the flow of visitors through the Town (although many visitors merely drive through the Town, without stopping, on their way to southern destinations).

Picton has a relatively well-establish network of tourist-related facilities (e.g., accommodation, activities, attractions), but still suffers from the tag of “ferry terminus”
and struggles to define successfully its tourism product (as evidenced by the wide range of marketing 'catch-phrases', such as *Seaport of the Sounds, The Place for all Seasons*, and *Gateway to the South*). Therefore, the proposal by Tranz Rail to relocate ferry operations has, in many respects, been a blessing for the Town as it has prompted a 're-think' regarding the role of tourism in Picton, and the role of the community within the tourism framework. While the permanence of Picton's association with the inter-island ferries is open to debate, it is certain that the future tourism fortunes of the Town will fluctuate with the ebb and flow of ever-changing tourist demand. Murphy (1985) echoes these sentiments, noting that for any community involved with tourism, the only 'constant' is change. A key objective for the Picton community, therefore, should be to take an active, rather than passive, role in attempting to influence the nature and pace of that change.

The findings of this study indicate that, overall, Picton residents are generally positive about the role of tourism in the Town. The findings also suggest that Picton residents regard tourism as being an important component of the Town’s economy, and favour an increase in the level of tourism development currently experienced in Picton. Significantly, there was an overall belief that Picton would not necessarily be handicapped by the potential loss of the inter-island ferries. In fact, it appears to have galvanised the local community into a renewed sense of self-belief, and acted as a catalyst for renewed community development.

Many residents, in the course of this study, expressed concerns over the high cost (either real or perceived) to the Picton ratepayers in providing and maintaining tourist facilities. To remedy this, residents have suggested that a levy, or 'tourist tax' should be imposed upon ferry passengers (in the order of one dollar per passenger, to be added to the cost of their ferry ticket), and that the revenue generated from this be directed into a Picton-based development fund to help off-set the cost to the local community. However, the author advises that such a levy be implemented only after the strongest of consideration and caution, as previous attempts at similar schemes (e.g., Palmerston North Airport tax/ levy, Kaikoura tourist tax) have been greeted with much derision from both visitors and local residents.
Another area of concern for the local residents is the lack of support and interest (either real or perceived) shown by the Marlborough District Council toward the issues facing Picton. This, coupled with a perception of an almost exclusively Blenheim-focussed regional marketing campaign (i.e., focus on Marlborough’s vineyards at the expense of the Marlborough Sounds region), has resulted in a deep-seated distrust of the regional seat of power by the Picton community. To remedy this, it will be necessary for a planning framework to be implemented that fosters an atmosphere of cooperation and trust, is explicit in its region-wide focus, and equitable and ‘transparent’ in its application.

Notwithstanding the above, it is evident that residents regard the planning process as an opportunity to exercise local influence upon the shaping of Picton’s tourism product. Central to this issue of local involvement are the questions of whether or not tourism requires in-depth participation (and a monitoring of actors), or can broad-scale (or systematic) participation be achieved? In addressing this, the tourism literature acknowledges that each community is unique, and therefore the application of planning practices must be tailored to meet the unique requirements of individual communities. In the case of Picton, it is apparent that a mix of the above approaches (i.e., ‘in-depth’ and ‘broad-scale’) is the most desirable to residents. This is evidenced by the selection of “an ongoing public advisory group” (the in-depth participation component) and “attending public meetings” (the broad-scale, systematic participation component) as the most preferred means of public participation in the planning process. Thus, an outcome of residents’ participation in this study has been the generation of a set of specific public participation options, as well as a set of specific tourism development options (i.e., natural resource-based development, combined with improved marketing and information services). The identification of these options will serve to assist in the development of a community-based tourism product for Picton, and provide a clearer understanding of the most acceptable and appropriate way of facilitating ‘meaningful’ community involvement in the planning process.

In addition to the above, the tourism literature also questions the ‘soundness’ of the community’s contribution, and suggests that the most effective (and desirable) form of public participation is that which is based on a good understanding of tourism processes and impacts, as well as an appreciation of the operational requirements of the tourism
industry. Consequently, addressing the educational challenge should be a priority in facilitating participation that is useful to tourism industry and planners, and rewarding to those involved. A key outcome of this study, therefore, will be to contribute to the eventual formulation and development of a comprehensive tourism plan for Picton, which recognises the wider regional context, as well as being expansive and growth-oriented in its objectives. Such a tourism plan should be the product of meaningful contributions from both industry and community alike, and should recognise the requirements of the community, industry and environment. ‘Core values’ to be protected, therefore, should include the utility (and relative ‘purity’) of the natural environment, the current character of the Town, and the relatively slow-paced lifestyle currently enjoyed by the majority of Picton’s resident population.

7.3 Implications for Tourism Planning

From a community participation perspective, the findings that related to tourism planning are significant. Firstly, participants acknowledged the importance of careful and strategic planning for future tourism development in Picton. Participants also indicated a desire for tourism planning to be overseen by the local Picton community. Although such an attitude toward an active participatory role is heartening for the tourism industry, the soundness of their contribution in such a leading role is, as yet, unclear. Rather than the local community oversee future tourism planning (citizen control), the author suggests that the notion of ‘partnership’, as noted by Arnstein (1971), is a more satisfactory planning arrangement for community and industry to undertake. This suggestion arises in Picton because the industry currently ‘equals’ community, insofar as Picton’s tourism industry is comprised primarily of locally owned businesses. Thus, mediating the implicit tensions between community members directly involved in tourism and those with no involvement will be an important objective for any planning framework in the future.

Arguably the most important finding of this research has been that the local community has expressed a desire to participate in the development of a community-tourism product. Specifically, the present study found that local residents were eager to “stake their claim”, with respect to playing a ‘meaningful’ part in tourism planning. This finding sits comfortably with Murphy’s (1985) notion of residents as stakeholders in the
community-tourism product (remembering that local residents are not the only stakeholders). However, according to the New Zealand Tourism Council (1986), the manner in which 'meaningful' community involvement is achieved should come from a basis of understanding – an understanding of what tourism can do for, and to, their community; and, an understanding of the relative strengths and weaknesses inherent within that community. To this end, the World Tourism Organisation (1993) suggests that planners should encourage community participation from the earliest stages of planning, so that residents can have 'realistic' expectations of tourism. Any such community involvement should be managed carefully and integrated into the wider regional planning context, and should not be used solely at the expense of other traditional planning approaches (e.g., land-use, marketing). Similarly, any community participation should also be the subject of ongoing and iterative research, so that community attitudes and expectations, as well as other social, economic and environmental indicators, can continue to be evaluated.

This study has also served to demonstrate the value of employing multiple research methods, thus eliminating the intrinsic bias that comes from single method studies. This is significant, as the tourism literature suggests that a key starting-point for any tourism plan has to be an examination of the needs and aspirations of local people. The importance of using multiple data sources and methods of data collection is to improve the reliability and validity of that data, and to cross-reference data to cover for the weaknesses of using different methods. For example, a qualitative interview can improve the context and reliability of data, defining a user-group or individual through providing typical cases or representative life histories. Alternately, a quantitative questionnaire can be employed to characterise the social and demographic data of the whole survey population. Taken altogether, using a range of methods is likely to yield more reliable and valid results overall (Simmons, 1984).

The choice of Picton as a case study was also significant, as this study is placed in the unique context of a negative growth threat to tourism in Picton, rather than the more common situation of 'un-checked' tourism growth. Thus, instead of attempting to manage ever-increasing tourist numbers in a satisfactory manner, Picton is faced with having to mitigate the threat of a significant reduction in tourist numbers. Picton's 'predicament' also presents a unique challenge when attempting to model conceptually
the impact of negative growth upon the destination area, as a key requirement for any such model is to be inherently flexible in its application to all situations (i.e., growth, stagnation, and decline). Thus, the pervasive issue for Picton, vis a vis Butler's (1980) model of destination lifecycle, is the utility of the model to accommodate both 'forward' and 'backward' movement along the continuum of lifecycle stages. Presently, the town of Picton displays many signs of being at the cusp between Butler's involvement and development stages of tourism development. (The involvement stage is characterised by the positive attitude of residents, and an inclination towards further tourism development. At this stage tourism is mostly locally owned and operated by a number of small-scale businesses, with the benefits of tourism spread relatively well throughout the community. Alternately, the development stage is, to Butler, marked by outside investors coming into an area and beginning to build large-scale tourism projects associated with an escalation in tourist numbers).

With this in mind, Picton has, in many respects, experienced a 'relapse' down the continuum of stages, faltering at the development stage and moving back toward the involvement stage. This is confirmed by numerous residents, many of whom noted the current inability to attract (and retain) outside investors to Picton. These residents reported that the economic uncertainty surrounding Tranz Rail's terminal proposal was most often cited (by potential investors) as being the leading cause of investor apathy towards Picton-based development(s). Consequently, Picton's inability to attract and retain outside investors has meant that although the local community retain (albeit by default) more operational control over the industry through locally-owned businesses at the involvement stage, they must also assume more of the financial risk associated with a locally-owned and operated tourism industry. Thus, those individuals and organisations advocating community-based tourism development must recognise both the benefits (e.g., increased community influence over the development of a "home grown" tourism product) and the costs (e.g., increased financial liability) associated with greater community control over the industry.

This research has also reinforced the view that communities are not homogeneous. The fact that the Picton community comprises a variety of groups suggests that community consultation and development, as well as the integration of public and private sector interests, are the fundamental building blocks of tourism planning (Simmons and
Similarly, the present study has demonstrated that communities are resilient to change, and are able to adapt to the challenges presented by the threat of tourism growth and decline. Finally, the present study has served to add to the “body of knowledge” regarding tourism in communities.

7.4 Limitations and Future Research

There are three main points that should be addressed with respect to the limitations of this study. Included in this discussion are issues of under-representation among demographic sub-groups; the research time frame; and, the exclusion of non-permanent residents from the sample population.

Firstly, this research was handicapped by the under-representation of certain groups of Picton residents; particularly residents of Maori ethnicity, and residents aged less than 35 years. Such under-representation, although not altogether unusual, can lead to the marginalisation of certain sub-groups within the community. Consequently, within the sample population, bias is likely in relation to the groups that were poorly represented. This under-representation has implications for future research, and raises the challenge of finding appropriate mechanisms to facilitate their contribution.

Another limitation of this study has been the timeframe under which this research has been undertaken. Data were gathered over a three-month period during the ‘off-peak’ tourist season (July 2000 – September 2000), a period in which many Picton businesses struggle to survive financially. Due to the constraints (i.e., temporal and financial) of a masterate research programme, incorporating a satisfactory longitudinal component into the data-gathering phase of this study was deemed ‘unworkable’. Consequently, the present study fails to identify changes to resident attitudes over time, particularly differences during the ‘peak’ (December – April) and ‘off-peak’ tourist seasons. Therefore, any future research should be both cross-sectional (to ensure a representative sample) and longitudinal (to identify changes over time) in its application.

The final limitation of this study was the exclusion (intentional) of non-permanent Picton and Waikawa residents from the sample population. This research has focussed on permanent residents (at the expense of non-permanent residents) and has, therefore,
failed to consider all aspects of the Picton community. Permanent residents and non-permanent residents (i.e., holiday-home/bach/apartment owners) are likely to have differing opinions on future tourism development in Picton, and it is therefore useful to examine the nature of these differences. Thus, any future research should endeavour to include the participation of all groups of Picton and Waikawa ratepayers, rather than permanent residents alone.

7.5 Concluding Remarks

It is evident, from the findings of this research, that tourism plays an integral part in the juxtaposition of Picton's everyday community life. While a number of residents have been quick to point-out the negative impacts associated with tourism in the area, taken as a whole, this research serves to confirm the importance with which the local community view tourism in Picton.

Overall, there appears to be a willingness within the Picton community to participate in tourism planning, thereby taking 'ownership' of the community-tourism planning process and the types of products that may be developed for their visitors. Central to this willingness is an almost universal desire to “do it once, and do it right” with respect to developing a comprehensive planning ‘blueprint’ for future tourism development(s). This desire is, in turn, based on the principle of partnership between the community and tourism industry. Such an approach, however, requires careful consideration when developing an appropriate framework from which to overcome the inherent tensions and regional bias (either real or perceived) that may exist between these two groups.

Similarly, almost all participants in this study acknowledged the potential for future tourism growth in the area (while many lamented the perceived downturn in Picton's recent tourism fortunes). Fundamental to this potential for growth are the recreational opportunities and aesthetic value associated with the surrounding natural environment (i.e., the Marlborough Sounds). Such is the unique nature of this environment that, in this regard, the region possesses a comparative advantage over 'similar' tourist destinations throughout New Zealand. Therefore, any future tourism development must surely be centred on the well-managed use of this natural resource.
Finally, although the threatened withdrawal of the inter-island ferries may never eventuate, the uncertainty that it has created is a salient reminder of the inherent vulnerability to external factors over which a destination has little or no control. Therefore, arguably the biggest challenge that Picton now faces is to ensure that the lessons learnt during this time of uncertainty will not be forgotten, for as Murphy (1985, p. 77) notes: "the one factor that should be borne in mind by any community involved with tourism is that the only 'constant' is change". Clearly, then, they are lessons worth learning.
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APPENDIX A

RESIDENTS' POSTAL QUESTIONNAIRE
PLANNING FOR TOURISM IN PICTON

A STUDY OF COMMUNITY PREFERENCES TOWARDS TOURISM PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT IN PICTON.

LINCOLN UNIVERSITY

JULY 2000
Dear Sir / Madam

Your address is one of a number of Picton and Waikawa addresses that have been randomly selected for participation in a tourism research study being conducted in the Human Sciences Division of Lincoln University. This study is being undertaken as partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Applied Science at Lincoln University. This study seeks to examine Picton and Waikawa residents' perceptions and acceptance of tourism, in light of the possible relocation of Tranz Rail’s inter-island ferry terminal to Clifford Bay. Your contribution is important to the success of this study.

In order to ensure the randomness of our selection process could the person in your household who is aged 18 years or over and has the next birthday; please fill out the whole questionnaire. This questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete (for free postal return, simply fold and staple/ seal the questionnaire and mail it). You will also be asked to participate in a follow-up interview with the researcher. Participation in this questionnaire and/ or the follow-up interview is both optional and completely voluntary. The information provided by your participation in this study will contribute to gaining a more complete understanding of the role tourism plays within the Picton region.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality and anonymity. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that we may check your address off the mailing list when the questionnaire is returned. You may at any time withdraw your participation, including the withdrawal of any information you have provided. If you complete the questionnaire, however, it will be understood that you have consented to participate in the study and consent to publication of the results of the study with the understanding that anonymity will be preserved.

I would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write to: Michael Shone, Graduate Researcher, Human Sciences Division, Lincoln University, PO Box 84, Canterbury 8150, New Zealand. Please phone me at: (03) 388-1675. Alternately, you may contact my research supervisor; Dr. David Simmons, Professor of Tourism, at: Human Sciences Division, Lincoln University, PO Box 84, Canterbury 8150, New Zealand, Telephone (03) 325-2811 Ext. 8416.

Thank you for your assistance

Yours faithfully

Michael Shone
Graduate Researcher
Human Sciences Division
Instructions: For each question, please select your response(s) from the options provided and place the number(s) in the boxes on the right-hand side of the page. In some cases, answer directly in the box or space provided. Additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire for any comment you may wish to make.

(NB. In this questionnaire, the term “tourism” refers to overseas visitors to New Zealand and New Zealanders travelling in New Zealand).

**SECTION ONE**

1. Using the five-point scale below, in your opinion how important or unimportant is tourism to Picton’s economy?
   
   1 = Not at all important
   2 = Slightly important
   3 = Moderately important
   4 = Very important
   5 = Extremely important

2. “The proposed relocation of Tranz Rail’s Cook Strait ferry terminal to Clifford Bay represents a tremendous opportunity for Picton to be developed as a ‘tourist town’ rather than just a ‘terminal town’.”
   Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with this statement.
   
   1 = Strongly disagree
   2 = Disagree
   3 = Neither disagree nor agree
   4 = Agree
   5 = Strongly agree

3. Do you think the community, as a whole, benefit from tourism in Picton?
   
   1 = Yes
   2 = No
   3 = Don’t know

4. Overall, do you think that tourism has more costs or more benefits for Picton?
   
   1 = More costs
   2 = More benefits
   3 = An equal amount of costs and benefits
   4 = Don’t know
5. Would you like to see tourism become the ‘mainstay’ of Picton’s economy?

1 = Yes
2 = No
3 = Don’t know

SECTON TWO:
Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements.

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither disagree nor agree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

Tourism has created jobs in Picton
Ratepayers have to pay too much towards facilities used by tourists in your area
Tourism has increased the cost of living in Picton
The development of tourist facilities and attractions is a threat to your local environment
Tourism creates traffic congestion and parking problems in Picton
Tourism makes you feel like a stranger in your own town
Tourism creates opportunities to meet people from different cultures in Picton
Picton should offer more nightlife attractions to attract more visitors
Overseas tourists have made Picton too expensive for New Zealanders to holiday in
Picton should have a casino to attract more visitors
Picton should be promoted to attract many more visitors
Shopping hours should be extended in Picton to cater for tourists
The benefits of tourism get distributed widely through Picton’s economy
New Zealanders on holiday in Picton are ‘a real nuisance’ at certain times of the year
1. In your opinion, how important or unimportant it is to plan for future tourism in Picton?

1 = Not at all important
2 = Slightly important
3 = Moderately important
4 = Very important
5 = Extremely important

2. Who should be in charge of overseeing tourism planning in Picton?

1 = Central government
2 = Marlborough District Council
3 = Local community organisations (e.g., Picton Business Association etc.).
4 = Tourism organisations (e.g., “Destination Marlborough”).
5 = Local iwi groups
6 = Other
7 = Don’t know

(If OTHER, please specify ______________________).

3. Are you currently involved in tourism planning in Picton?

1 = Yes
2 = No
3 = Don’t know

4. Given the opportunity, would you participate in future tourism planning?

1 = Yes
2 = No
3 = Don’t know

5. Listed below are various methods by which residents can be involved in planning for tourism in Picton. Which two options are the most acceptable to you? Please rank your answers in order of preference, placing your first choice in the box marked (1), your second choice in the box marked (2).

1 = Attending public meetings
2 = Individuals can object to developments as they arise
3 = Attending council meetings if they wish
4 = By an ongoing public advisory group
5 = By surveys from time to time
6 = Talking to the councillors
7 = The public do not need to be involved

(1) ______________________
(2) ______________________
1. In your opinion, what is the current level of tourism development in Picton?
   1 = Very low
   2 = Low
   3 = Medium
   4 = High
   5 = Very high

2. Compared with current tourism development in Picton, to what level would you like to see tourism be developed in the future?
   1 = Greatly reduced
   2 = Moderately reduced
   3 = Development at the current level
   4 = Moderately increased
   5 = Greatly increased

3. At what rate should tourism in Picton be developed?
   1 = Rapid
   2 = Moderate
   3 = Slow
   4 = No development at all
   5 = Don’t know

4. Who should ‘initiate’ tourism development in Picton?
   1 = Only private developers
   2 = Mostly private developers
   3 = Equal mix of private developers and public organisations
   4 = Mostly public organisations
   5 = Only public organisations

5. Listed below are various development options by which Picton could potentially attract more visitors. Which two options are the most acceptable to you? Please rank your answers in order of preference, placing your first choice in the box marked (1), your second choice in the box marked (2).
   1 = Provide more hotels, motels & restaurants
   2 = Provide more entertainment & cultural activities
   3 = Provide further ‘holiday homes’ & waterfront subdivisions
   4 = Provide new facilities to access and enjoy the natural scenery
   5 = Provide more opportunities to enjoy historical facilities and sites
   6 = Provide more facilities for outdoor recreation
   7 = Improve marketing and information services

(1) (2)
6. In your opinion, who should own tourist facilities in Picton?

1 = Total ownership by 'locals'
2 = Mostly local ownership
3 = Equal mix of local and outside ownership
4 = Mostly outside ownership
5 = Total ownership by 'outsiders'

7. Should Picton try to attract more “day-trippers” or more “overnight” visitors?

1 = Day-trippers
2 = Overnight visitors
3 = An equal mix of both
4 = Don’t know

1. In which town do you reside?

1 = Picton
2 = Waikawa

2. Were you born in Picton/ Waikawa?

1 = Yes
2 = No

3. Are you a permanent resident of Picton/ Waikawa?

1 = Yes
2 = No
(If NO, please go to question 5).

4. How many years, in total, have you lived in Picton/ Waikawa?

1 = Less than 1 year
2 = Between 1 and 5 years
3 = Between 6 and 10 years
4 = Between 11 and 15 years
5 = More than 15 years

5. Do you rent or own your property in Picton/ Waikawa?

1 = Rented
2 = Owned
(If RENTED, please go to question 7).
6. How long have you owned property in Picton/Waikawa?

1 = Less than 1 year
2 = Between 1 and 5 years
3 = Between 6 and 10 years
4 = Between 11 and 15 years
5 = More than 15 years

7. Do you, or does anyone in your household work in jobs associated with tourism? (e.g., accommodation, food/beverage, recreation/tourist attractions etc.)

1 = Yes
2 = No
3 = Don't know

8. Where is your primary place of work located?
(If unemployed/not working, please go to question 10).

1 = Picton waterfront
2 = Picton's central business district/precinct
3 = 'Suburban' Picton
4 = Waikawa
5 = Outside the Picton/Waikawa area

9. In your opinion, how important is the 'tourist dollar' for the continued financial survival of your business/place of work?

1 = Not at all important
2 = Slightly important
3 = Moderately important
4 = Very important
5 = Extremely important

10. Overall, how much general contact do you have with visitors to Picton during the 'tourist season' (December – April)?

1 = Very frequent (6-7 days a week)
2 = Frequent (4-5 days a week)
3 = Some (2-3 days a week)
4 = Very little (1 day a week)
5 = None at all
1. **What is your gender?**
   
   1 = Male
   2 = Female

2. **What is your age?**
   
   [Blank Box] Years.

3. **What is your ethnicity?**

   1 = European
   2 = NZ Maori (Iwi affiliation ____________________________ ).
   3 = Pacific Islander
   4 = Asian
   5 = Other
   (If OTHER, please specify ____________________________ ).

4. **In the last year, what was your personal income?**

   1 = Loss
   2 = Zero income
   3 = $1 - $5,000
   4 = $5,001 - $10,000
   5 = $10,001 - $15,000
   6 = $15,001 - $20,000
   7 = $20,001 - $25,000
   8 = $25,001 - $30,000
   9 = $30,001 - $40,000
   10 = $40,001 - $50,000
   11 = $50,001 - $70,000
   12 = $70,001 - $100,000
   13 = $100,001 and over

5. **What is your highest educational qualification?**

   1 = No school qualifications
   2 = Some school qualification
   3 = Overseas school qualification
   4 = School Certificate qualification
   5 = Sixth form qualification
   6 = Higher school qualification
   7 = Diploma or vocational qualification
   8 = Bachelor degree
   9 = Higher degree
   10 = Other
6. What is your employment status?

1 = Wage and salary earner
2 = Self-employed (no employees)
3 = Self-employed (with employees)
4 = Unpaid worker in family business
5 = Unemployed and actively seeking work
6 = Other

(If OTHER, please specify ____________________________).

Would you be willing to be contacted by the researcher for a short follow-up interview at a later date? This would take 20-25 minutes to complete. A random sample of respondents who answer "YES" to this question will be selected and then contacted by the researcher.

1 = Yes
2 = No

If YES, please leave your name: ____________________________.

Contact telephone number: ____________________________.
Return to:

FREEPOST 36
Michael Shone
Human Sciences Division
Lincoln University
PO Box 84
Canterbury 8150
New Zealand
APPENDIX B

REMINDER NOTICE FOR POSTAL QUESTIONNAIRE
Dear Sir / Madam

About three weeks ago I wrote to you seeking your opinion on tourism planning and development in Picton. As of today I have not yet received your completed questionnaire.

This research has been undertaken because of the belief that citizen opinions should be taken into account in the formation of strategies for the planning and development of tourism in the Picton area.

I am writing to you again because of the significance each questionnaire has to the usefulness of this study. Your name was drawn through a scientific sampling process in which every household in Picton had an equal chance of being selected. This means that about one out of every ten people in Picton households are being asked to complete this questionnaire. In order for the results of this study to be truly representative of the opinions of all Picton residents it is essential that each person in the sample return their questionnaire.

As mentioned in the cover letter attached to the questionnaire, the questionnaire should be answered by the person in your household who is aged 18 years or over and has the next birthday.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your assistance

Yours faithfully

Michael Shone
Graduate Researcher
Human Sciences Division
APPENDIX C

ATTITUDE STATEMENTS
Appendix C: List of Attitude Statements

1. Tourism has created jobs in Picton.
2. Ratepayers have to pay too much towards facilities used by tourists in your area.
3. Tourism has increased the cost of living in Picton.
4. The development of tourist facilities and attractions is a threat to your local environment.
5. Tourism creates traffic congestion and parking problems in Picton.
6. Tourism makes you feel like a stranger in your own town.
7. Tourism creates opportunities to meet people from different cultures in Picton.
8. Picton should offer more nightlife attractions to attract more visitors.
9. Overseas tourists have made Picton too expensive for New Zealanders to holiday in.
10. Picton should have a casino to attract more visitors.
11. Picton should be promoted to attract many more visitors.
12. Shopping hours should be extended in Picton to cater for tourists.
13. The benefits of tourism get widely distributed through Picton's economy.
14. New Zealanders on holiday in Picton are a 'real nuisance' at certain times of the year.
APPENDIX D

OPTIONS FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN TOURISM PLANNING
Appendix D: List of Public Participation Options for Tourism Planning in Picton.

1. Attending public meetings.
2. Individuals can object to developments as they arise.
3. Attending council meetings if they wish.
4. By an ongoing public advisory group.
5. By surveys from time to time.
6. Talking to the councillors.
7. The public do not need to be involved.
APPENDIX E

OPTIONS FOR TOURISM DEVELOPMENT
Appendix E: List of Options for Future Tourism Development in Picton.

1. Provide more hotels, motels and restaurants.
2. Provide more entertainment and cultural activities.
3. Provide further ‘holiday homes’ and waterfront subdivisions.
4. Provide new facilities to access and enjoy the natural scenery.
5. Provide more opportunities to enjoy historical facilities and sites.
6. Provide more facilities for outdoor recreation.
7. Improve marketing and information services.
APPENDIX F

TEST STATISTICS FOR ASSOCIATED VARIABLES
Appendix F.1: Residents' Acceptance of Tourism in Picton, against Social Distance
(Test Statistics) – One-Way ANOVA

\[ F(4, 256) = 7.541, p < 0.0005 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2837.565</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>709.391</td>
<td>7.541</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>24081.897</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>94.070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26919.462</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F.2: Residents’ Propensity to Participate in Future Tourism Planning, against Social Distance (Chi-Square Tests) – Chi-Square

\[ \chi^2 (8, 261) = 52.797, p < 0.0005 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-square</td>
<td>52.797*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>55.977</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>7.765</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Valid Cases</td>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.50).

Appendix F.3: Residents’ Propensity to Participate in Future Tourism Planning, against Social Distance (Cross-Tabulations) – Chi-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Given the opportunity, would you participate in future tourism planning?</th>
<th>V. Frequent</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Multiple</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Overall, how much general contact do you have with visitors to town during the “tourist season”?)
Appendix F.4: Residents' Preferred Level of Future Tourism Development, against Social Distance (Test Statistics) – Kruskall-Wallis Test

$\chi^2 (4, 263) = 27.573, p < 0.0005$

(a. Grouping Variable: "Overall, how much general contact do you have with visitors to Picton during the 'tourist season'?").

---

Appendix F.5: Residents' Preferred Level of Future Tourism Development, against Social Distance (Ranks) – Kruskall-Wallis Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, how much general contact do you have with visitors to Picton during the 'tourist season'?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compared with current tourism development in Picton, to what level would you like to see tourism be developed in the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very intense</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>170.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>148.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>131.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>118.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>98.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F.6: Residents' Preferred Rate of Future Tourism Development, against Social Distance (Test Statistics) – Kruskall-Wallis Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At what rate should tourism in Picton be developed in the future?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>19.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a. Grouping Variable: "Overall, how much general contact do you have with visitors to Picton during the ‘tourist season'?").

Appendix F.7: Residents' Preferred Rate of Future Tourism Development, against Social Distance (Ranks) – Kruskall-Wallis Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, how much general contact do you have with visitors to Picton during the ‘tourist season'?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequent</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>103.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>125.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>126.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>146.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>144.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F.8: Respondents’ Acceptance of Tourism in Picton, against Economic Distance (Test Statistics) – Independent Samples $t$-test

\[ t(259) = 3.150, \ p < 0.002 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance attitude</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>3.150</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>4.1377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>3.217</td>
<td>198.679</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>4.1377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix F.9: Respondents’ Acceptance of Tourism in Picton, against Economic Distance (Group Statistics) – Independent Samples $t$-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance attitude</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>68.5248</td>
<td>9.6692</td>
<td>1.0081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>64.3872</td>
<td>10.3821</td>
<td>.7986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F.10: Residents' Propensity to Participate in Future Tourism Planning, against Economic Distance (Chi-Square Tests) – Chi-Square

\[ \chi^2 (2, 261) = 20.497, p < 0.0005 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. @ crit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-square</td>
<td>20.497*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>21.058</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of valid cases</td>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.89).

Appendix F.11: Residents' Propensity to Participate in Future Tourism Planning, against Economic Distance (Cross-Tabulations) – Chi-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Given the opportunity, would you participate in future tourism planning?</th>
<th>Do you, or anyone in your household, work in jobs associated with tourism?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F.12: Residents' Preferred Level of Future Tourism Development, against Economic Distance (Test Statistics) – Mann-Whitney U-Test

\[ U = 5995.000, Z = -3.676, p < 0.0005 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared with the current level of tourism development in Picton, to what level would you like to see tourism be developed in the future?</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Wilcoxon W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5995.000</td>
<td>20360.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>-3.676</td>
<td>-3.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a. Grouping variable: “Do you, or does anyone in your household, work in jobs associated with tourism?”).

Appendix F.13: Residents' Desired Level of Future Tourism Development, against Economic Distance (Ranks) – Mann-Whitney U-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you or does anyone in your household work in jobs associated with tourism?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compared with current tourism development in Picton, to what level would you like to see tourism be developed in the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>152.72</td>
<td>14256.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>120.47</td>
<td>20360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F.14: Economic Distance, against Social Distance (Chi-Square Tests) – Chi-Square

\[ \chi^2 (4, 263) = 84.831, \ p < 0.0005 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-square</td>
<td>84.831*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>88.031</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>70.547</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Valid Cases</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.08).

Appendix F.15: Economic Distance, against Social Distance (Cross-Tabulations) – Chi-Square

| Do you, or does anyone in your household, work in jobs associated with tourism? | Overall, how much general contact do you have with visitors to Botoa during the 'tourist season'? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | Very frequent | Frequent | Some | Very little | None |
|     | 38 | 24 | 9  | 20  | 3  |
| No  | 5  | 19 | 43 | 74  | 28 |
Appendix F.16: Respondents' Appraisal of Tourism the Opportunity for Tourism Development in Picton, against Length of Residence (Test Statistics) – Kruskall-Wallis Test

χ² (4, 253) = 12.128, p < 0.016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>12.128</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a. Grouping variable: “How many years, in total, have you lived in Picton?”)

Appendix F.17: Respondents' Appraisal of Tourism the Opportunity for Tourism Development in Picton, against Community Distance – Length of Residence (Ranks) – Kruskall-Wallis Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many years in total have you lived in Picton?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>196.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>133.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>145.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>136.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>113.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F.18: Respondents’ Acceptance of Tourism Appraisal of Tourism in Picton, against Community Distance – Length of Residence (Test Statistics) – One-Way ANOVA

F (4, 253) = 4.198, p < 0.003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1693.586</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>423.397</td>
<td>4.198</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>25517.678</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27211.264</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F.19: Respondents' Propensity to Participate in Future Tourism Planning, against Community Distance – Length of Residence (Chi-Square Tests) – Chi-Square

\[ \chi^2 (8, 258) = 15.909, \ p < 0.044 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-square</td>
<td>15.909</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>16.545</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>8.114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of valid cases</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a. 3 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.03).

Appendix F.20: Respondents' Propensity to Participate in Future Tourism Planning, against Community Distance – Length of Residence (Cross-Tabulations) – Chi-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Given the opportunity, would you participate in future tourism planning?</th>
<th>1 yr</th>
<th>1.5 yrs</th>
<th>2 yrs</th>
<th>4.5+ yrs</th>
<th>All yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F.21: Respondents’ Acceptance of Tourism in Picton, against Community Distance – Birthplace (Test Statistics) – Independent Samples t-test

\[ t(259) = -2.283, \ p < 0.023 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance attitude</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-4.3647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>38.506</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-4.3647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix F.22: Respondents’ Acceptance of Tourism in Picton, against Community Distance – Birthplace (Group Statistics) – Independent Samples t-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Were you born in Picton?</th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>( \text{Mean} )</th>
<th>( \text{Std. Deviation} )</th>
<th>( \text{Std. Error} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62.0982</td>
<td>11.0059</td>
<td>1.9456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>66.4629</td>
<td>10.0068</td>
<td>.6613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>