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Increasingly, tourists and tourism companies are incorporating sacred places into their travel plans and itineraries. While pilgrimage, in a religious sense, has occurred for centuries, many people travel to sacred sites for pleasure or spectacle. Given the lack of empirical research surrounding the impacts of this tourism to, and tourists at, sacred places, this thesis attempts to fill this void. The focus of the research involved investigating the impacts of tourist visitation to sacred places in New Zealand and the key research question asked ‘what impacts does tourist visitation to sacred places have on those for whom the place is sacred?’ In order to address this question, the research employed qualitative methods including in-depth interviews with local worshipping communities, a mapping exercise, observations, and photography at two sacred places. The two case study sites are located in Canterbury, New Zealand; both are Christian Churches. Rich data identified clear results surrounding impacts identified by the worshipping communities. Further to this, extra, valuable findings emerged from the data. The results of the research are discussed in relation to relevant literature and theory including, meaning and spirit of place, carrying capacity, tourist typologies, consumption of place, commercialisation and commodification of place and relevant practice literature. Within their current situations at the sacred places, the worshipping communities have developed coping strategies in reaction to tourism to, and tourists at, their place. The research, therefore, creates a rich picture of the impacts of tourism to, and tourists at, sacred sites within New Zealand. This picture may assist management strategies and policy as well as furthering the objectives of the sacred places and expanding the literature surrounding the topic.
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Chapter One
Introduction and background

“…travel and tourism are extremely significant features of the modern world…”
(Urry, 1995, p. 163).

“Throughout the world more people, for whatever reason, are visiting religious sites”
(Shackley, 2004a, p. 226)

1.1 Research context

It is undeniable that tourism is a significant factor operating in our world. Increasing numbers of people are moving about the globe, and indeed, about their home country (United Nations World Tourism Organisation [UNWTO], 2009). This movement of people, argued to be central to the nature of modern societies (Urry, 1995), does, however, involve impacts, both positive and negative, for the places and peoples visited (Lawson, Williams, Young & Cossens, 1998; Shone, Horn, Moran & Simmons, 2005; Smith, 1977). Indeed, “to a host population, tourism is often a mixed blessing…” (Smith, 1977, p. 8).

Tourism has occurred for centuries and tourism to religious sites is argued to be one of the oldest forms of tourism (Nolan & Nolan, 1992); pilgrimage for religious and spiritual reasons may take adherents to far and exotic places. These sacred places, primarily constructed for the purpose of hosting pilgrims and local worshippers, are seldom created nor managed in order to receive the large volumes of non-worshipping tourists that many sites host today (Shackley, 2005). Indeed, 12 million visitors per year visit the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris (Shackley, 2004a) and “the 43 Anglican Diocesan Cathedrals in England attract in excess of 30 million tourist visitors per year...” (Shackley, 2002, p. 345) while Christian sites in Europe, “form the single most important category of visitor attractions” (Shackley, 2004a, p. 226). Furthermore, tourism to sacred places is set to expand as people increasingly search for spiritual experiences (Reisinger, 2006). Reisinger reminds us that “in the future, an interest in spirituality may translate into high demand for spiritual travel products and experiences” (Reisinger, 2006, p.152), therfore, “…tourism marketers may need to respond to the increasing human need for spirituality” (Reisinger, 2006, p. 155). However, many of the visitors to sacred places do not ascribe to the religion or spiritual teachings associated with the place. While “many places are constructed around attracting and receiving large numbers of
visitors” (Urry, 1995, p. 165) many are not and are instead created for vastly different reasons than for the profane activity of tourism. Reisinger (2006) suggests that some destinations actively promote themselves in connection with spiritual travel motivations and that “spiritual tourism is becoming one of the most dynamically growing areas of the tourism sector” (Reisinger, 2006, p.149). This marketing and motivation encourages the large numbers of non-worshipping visitors to sacred sites, however, these large numbers and the potential ‘culture gap’ between tourist and local worshipper presents diverse and complex management issues for sacred place caretakers and authorities (Shackley, 2004a). These challenges are particularly complex if a sacred place does not actively market itself as a destination yet is positioned as one by other agencies and organisations and consequently receives high visitor numbers.

There exists, much writing regarding various impacts created as a result of tourism. This literature includes reports and analyses on environmental, economic, social and cultural impacts and mixtures of these. This thesis will focus on social impacts which may be defined as “…the changes in the quality of life of residents of tourist destinations” (Mathieson & Wall, 1982, p. 137). It is intriguing, however, that little literature exists regarding the social impacts of tourism at sacred places, from the perspective of the worshipping community. This is particularly intriguing considering the increases in numbers of tourists to sacred sites, the fact that they are often icons and central attractions within destinations and considering the potential impacts of tourism to these places. While some writing exists on the matter, there has been very little completed within the New Zealand setting, though, as at other locations, there does exist some writing surrounding the impacts for indigenous groups from tourism to their sacred sites. Though there is a lack in this research area, Ap (1990) reminds us that research from the perspective of the host is valuable. Ap suggests, “one aspect of social impact research which has been investigated and which provides valuable information for future planning is resident/host perceptions of tourism” (Ap, 1990, p. 610). The focus of this project, then, concerns the social impacts of tourism to, and tourists at, sacred places and it will do so from the perspective of members of the local worshipping community. Throughout the research, the term ‘worshipping community’ is used and refers to the local church community who revere the place, who hold it sacred and who use it for sacred, religious and spiritual purposes (Shackley, 2002).

Urry has considered touristic use of places and tourist’s consequent impact upon those places. Urry suggests that tourism and travel to places can result in places being “…remade in part as objects for the tourist gaze” (Urry, 1995, p. 164) and that through ‘gazing’ tourists come to
consume the places they visit. Olsen, speaking specifically about religion and religious places and events, furthers the discussion when he notes “…religion and its associated sites, ritual, festivals, and landscapes are seen by many government officials and tourism industry promoters…as a resource that can be transformed and commodified for tourist consumption” (Olsen, 2006, p. 104). These conceptions further refine this research project’s focus to include consideration of how this tourist gaze, and the consumption and commodification of place, may impact it and the worshipping community’s experience of it.

Thus, the present study includes consideration of how the commodification and consumption of place via tourism impacts the place itself and the local worshipping community who use it for non-touristic, spiritual purposes. This study is considered within a theoretical context including spirit and meaning of place, consumption, commercialisation and commodification, carrying capacity, tourist typologies and host reactions to tourism. These theories frame and inform the research as well as assist in the analysis of data and explanation of results. The research, therefore, has theoretical as well as empirical value as it may inform management and policy at the two case study sites, as well as at different sacred sites. The research may also extend theoretical discussion surrounding the impacts of tourism upon host communities, particularly those of sacred places. As suggested by Shackley (1999, p.95) in regards to the impacts of tourism, “…nowhere can these impacts be better observed than in the context of religious tourism…” The study, therefore, has value in that it fills a void in current knowledge and literature. Further to this, there is value in that the research may give voice to the impacts felt by the worshipping community regarding a place which may be central to their life and in particular their spiritual life.

In order to capture the depth and complexity of meaning for the worshipping community surrounding their sacred place, as well as the impacts they feel occur due to tourism, the research will consider questions such as ‘what does the place mean for the local worshipping community?’; ‘where’ is the sacred place/where are the boundaries of sanctity?’; ‘how does tourist visitation to the place impact upon worshippers’ use of the place?’; ‘how does tourist visitation to the place impact upon staff and worshippers’ ‘feeling towards’ or ‘connection to’ the place?’; ‘how would worshippers like to see the tourism develop at the sacred place?’ Asking a range of questions such as these will illuminate what the place means for the participant as well as the breadth and depth of impacts felt by them. Arguably, the more central and important the sacred place is in the lives of worshippers, the more deeply they may feel any impacts towards the place and their experience of it.
The study incorporates qualitative methods in order to elicit this in-depth and personal understanding surrounding the place and any impacts resulting from tourism to and tourists at the places. Specific methods used in the study include semi-structured interviews with members of the worshipping community, including a mapping exercise, and personal observations completed by myself as researcher, including noting tourist numbers, flows and behaviours and some photographic documentation of the sites and tourists.

### 1.2 Research sites

The research considers two Christian sacred sites as case studies. The research considers these two sacred places in order to compare and contrast them. Comparing and contrasting allows for trends in data to be identified within and between sites, highlights differences which may occur between the sites in relation to their specific context, and allows me to consider how influential a site’s specific context is in relation to the impacts identified. Enlisting two case study sites also allows for strong patterns to clearly emerge.

The first of the two sacred places is the Anglican owned and managed Church of the Good Shepherd, Tekapo, New Zealand. This small inter-denominational church sits on the shores of Lake Tekapo, South Canterbury, and hosts regular religious services. The church has very high numbers of tourists visiting throughout the year, although a great deal of the marketing of the church as an attraction is done by tour agencies not directly associated with the place. While the site is well known as a tourist attraction, it has a low level of commercialisation or commodification at the site.

The second sacred place to be investigated is the Christchurch Anglican Cathedral located in Christchurch, New Zealand. This Cathedral is a focal point of Christchurch and a key attraction for tourists in the city. The Cathedral has also been included as part of the Christchurch City Council’s ‘Cultural Precinct’ which was set up in order to draw tourists and locals to certain areas of the central city. The Cathedral has very high numbers of annual visitors and actively encourages visitation by those outside the regular worshipping community. The Cathedral has a high level of commercialisation, including an on-site visitor gift shop and cafe.

These two sites are already easily contrasted in terms of their level of involvement in the tourism industry and level of commercialisation for the industry. The study therefore provides
greater understanding of the impact of that commercialisation as well as other factors, including the visitation of tourists themselves.

1.3 Research aim and objectives

With the above background and context in mind, a specific aim and several objectives were created. These will be the focus of, and guide to, the research. The aims and objectives are as follows:

**Overall Research Aim:**

To investigate the impacts of tourist visitation to sacred places in New Zealand.

**Main Research Question:**

What impacts does tourist visitation to sacred places have on those for whom the place is sacred?

**Specific Objectives:**

- To assess the meaning of the sacred place within the lives of parishioners and staff of the Church of the Good Shepherd, Tekapo, and the Christchurch Cathedral;

- To assess the impact of tourist visitation on congregation members of the Church of the Good Shepherd, Tekapo, and the Christchurch Cathedral;

- To assess the impact of tourist visitation on staff members of the Church of the Good Shepherd, Tekapo, and the Christchurch Cathedral;

- To assess the tourism development preferences of congregation and staff members of the Church of the Good Shepherd, Tekapo, and the Christchurch Cathedral;

- To relate findings to relevant theory and provide management suggestions which may minimise negative impacts.
1.4 Thesis structure

Following this Introductory chapter, the thesis covers the literature deemed relevant to the study. This literature review covers previous writing regarding sacred place, tourism impacts, tourism to sacred places as well as the main theories relevant to the study. This literature review holds a few key purposes. First, it will frame the research so that I, as researcher, and my audience can better understand tourism in general and any existing gaps in the study of tourism, particularly surrounding tourism impacts and tourism to sacred places. Second, to provide a context within which to situate this project. Third, to provide an understanding of where the project’s specific research questions and objectives eminate from, are influenced by and how the results of these may feed back into theoretical and empirical knowledge within the field of tourism. The thesis then goes on to explain the methods incorporated in order to carry out the project and address the research questions. This section includes the research approach, collection methods, research process and methods of data analysis.

Following the methods section, I present the results which emerged from in-depth analysis of the data obtained during the study. From this in-depth analysis, clear results were identified. This Results chapter outlines each of these results while providing examples and support from the raw data collected via the different methods. Results of the research highlight tourism created impacts upon the place as well as upon the experience of the worshipping community. The results are presented first, as those which are pragmatic in nature and then those which relate to the experience of the tourist or members of the local worshipping community. Results were multifaceted as they revealed the meaning of the place within the lives of the worshipping community, specific impacts identified by them as well as my own observations of tourism at the places which could then be compared with interview data. Unexpected, though unsurprising results also emerged and these too are presented. The Results chapter is followed by the Discussion chapter which incorporates relevant theory and literature in order to help explain, and further, the results identified within the research as well as situate them within existing tourism work. Following the Discussion chapter, a final Limitations, Suggestions and Conclusions chapter is offered.

The thesis is written in the first person narrative. While much academic writing is written in third person, I consider that writing in the first fits the specific topic of this project more readily. I consider constructing the thesis in this way also creates better flow for the reader. Furthermore, writing in the third person felt awkward and inauthentic, again, particularly considering the core focus of the thesis surrounds experience and relationships with others.
Moreover, while all steps were taken to mitigate and manage researcher bias, a small degree of this ultimately exists within research of this nature. Therefore, writing in the first person seems more honest and eliminates the possibility of disguising myself, my research design and its analysis as being neutral or void of bias.

A note must be made regarding the impact upon the project of the Canterbury earthquakes which devastated Christchurch city and severely damaged the Christchurch Cathedral. These earthquakes (September 2010; February 2011; June 2011) delayed the research process, however, this was towards the end of the project. Data collection and analysis was complete prior to the major earthquakes meaning delays involved the ‘write up’ process only. It is for this reason that no changes to the project have been made. However, I must acknowledge that the delay between data analysis and writing is not ideal.

Further to this, discussion and recommendations regarding the Christchurch Cathedral are written with a ‘pre-quake Cathedral’ in mind. This is because I can in no way assume how a re-built Cathedral may be and therefore how tourism would operate at the new place. Also, data was collected surrounding the Cathedral as it was before the earthquakes meaning this data needs to discussed and concluded upon ‘as it was’ at the time of collection. It would be unfair and unethical towards project participants, and their contributions, if I were to comment upon their data in a situation other than which they offered it; it would be unethical and unwise to apply ‘pre-quake’ findings to a ‘post-quake’ Cathedral.

Lastly, in terms of rebuilding the Christchurch Cathedral, and indeed other damaged sacred places around Canterbury, this project may indeed be valuable. This research involves key findings regarding the impacts of tourism to the place and these may be used to inform rebuild design and management. The findings of this research may foster more positive tourism experiences for the worshipping community, the tourist and Cathedral management.

1.5 Chapter summary

This chapter has briefly covered the thesis background and context, aims and objectives, case study sites and structure. Chapter Two will now cover literature which is relevant to the project.
Chapter 2
Literature review

2.1 Introduction

Having provided a brief outline of the research, this next chapter will cover literature deemed relevant to the project and its findings. Due to the nature of the research, and its results, the following literature review is diverse. The review is therefore brief however it provides a framework within which to situate the present study. The review first covers those theories which are considered applicable to this project. The chapter then goes on to cover literature surrounding the concept of place and sacred place, tourism to sacred places, literature which covers the impacts of tourism, specifically the social impacts upon host communities.

2.2 Theory

It is important to briefly review the main bodies of theory which inform and contribute towards the research’s formulation and completion. A collection of central theoretical positions are considered within this research project. These include the meaning and spirit of place, carrying capacity, tourist typologies, the consumption of place and the commercialisation and commodification of place and sanctity.

2.2.1 Meaning of place and spirit of place

The theories of meaning of place and spirit of place are important to consider when looking into sacred sites. This is because of what these places may mean to individuals and communities.

*Meaning of place*

The significance of places, within the lives of individuals and communities, may be great. It is important to understand that places may hold profound meaning in the lives of communities and the individuals that make up those communities (Relph, 1976). Manzo agrees and suggests that “…a wide array of places constitute our lifeworld and are of central importance in our lives…” (2005, p. 69). Considering their importance in life, understanding the meaning
of places assists in validating important aspects of human experience (Altman & Low, 1992, cited in Manzo, 2005) as well as aiding the preservation and management of those sites (Horn, 1996; Relph, 1976). Relph clarifies our connection to place when suggesting that places can be “…important sources of individual and communal identity, and are often profound centres of human existence to which people have deep emotional and psychological ties” (1976, p. 141). Manzo and Shackley support this when stating “…places contribute to one’s sense of self…” (Manzo, 2005, p. 76) and “…place has very much more influence upon human experience than is generally recognised…” (Shackley, 2005, p. 35). Relph further explains that people can hold “…a sense of deep care and concern…” for places (Relph, 1976, p. 37) and that “for the religious person the experience of such space is primordial, equivalent perhaps to an experience of the founding of the world” (Relph, 1976, p. 15). Manzo further argues that it is not only place that holds meaning for people but also the “…‘experience-in-place’ that creates meaning” (2005, p. 74). Due to the significance of places, and experiences at those places, within people’s lives, any changes or impact to the place due to tourism may be deeply felt by those involved with the place. Understanding the meaning of sacred places, within the lives of the regular, worshipping communities, is therefore fundamental in recognising the depth and breadth of impacts resulting from tourism and ultimately working towards effective and mitigative management practices at sacred sites (Horn, 1996). Relph supports understanding the significant features of place and peoples experiences of places as, without this understanding, “…it will not be possible to create and preserve the places that are the significant contexts of our lives” (1976, p. 6). This may be particularly so considering sacred places that are tourist destinations, for, as Desforges suggests, the character of places may change “…as their relationship with the global become mediated through tourism” (2005, p. 523).

**Spirit of place**

A precise definition of spirit of place is hard to come by. Shackley (for example, 2001; 2005) mentions spirit of place many times within her various works. From Shackley’s work we may come to think of spirit of place as the emotive or spiritual quality of a place or, when speaking of a specific place, Shackley mentions “…an atmosphere which both welcomed and intrigued visitors yet provided them with the opportunity to experience something out of the range of their normal lives” (Shackley, 2001, p. 24). In the same work, Shackley warns that visitor presence and behaviour can impact a site’s spirit of place; appropriate behaviour may preserve or strengthen spirit of place while inappropriate behaviour may destroy it. Shackley also points out that this element of a place is what draws people to the site but is also what may be
impacted by their being there. She suggests, “visitors come to encounter the spirit of the site and to understand its meaning, to be in some way changed by it….But visitors also consume the site psychologically for its spiritual benefit and physically by the impact of their presence” (2001, p. 54). Shackley (2001, p.xvi) further highlights, that one of the biggest challenges for sacred place managers and caretakers is maintaining a site’s spirit of place. She notes that,

visiting a sacred site is, or should be, an emotive experience and site managers are also charged with the task of preserving that elusive spiritual quality referred to as ‘spirit of place’….at the same time they must facilitate the religious use of the site….and cater for the frequently-conflicting demands of worshippers and visitors.

This quote clearly highlights the complex and challenging situation facing many sacred places around the world.

2.2.2 Carrying capacity

Related to impacts upon spirit of place is the concept of carrying capacity. Spirit of place may be affected and other impacts created once carrying capacity is reached or exceeded. The theory of carrying capacity has its roots in agricultural and wildlife management and includes different types of carrying capacity, namely ecological, social, physical and facility (Glasson, Godfrey & Goodey, 1995; Shelby & Heberlein, 1986). Carrying capacity is argued to be “…strictly related to the sustainability of tourism development” (van der Borg, 2004, p. 163) meaning that tourism at a place is unsustainable if carrying capacities are breached.

Involving both descriptive and evaluative components, carrying capacity may be understood as “…the level of use beyond which impacts exceed acceptable levels specified by evaluative standards” (Shelby & Heberlein, 1986, p. 12). Of the types of carrying capacities, the most relevant for the present study are social and physical carrying capacity. Physical carrying capacity is concerned with impacts relating to physical structures and environment (an example in this study being the church buildings) while social carrying capacity is understood as the carrying capacity that “…refers to impacts which impair or alter human experiences” (Shelby & Heberlein, 1986, p. 21). Shelby and Heberlein recognise, however, the complexity in determining social capacity because of the difficulty in establishing evaluative standards surrounding the resource in question. This is because these evaluative standards are based on
social judgements which, by their nature, may vary considerably. Indeed, “…value
judgements lie at the heart of any carrying capacity determination” (Shelby & Heberlein,
1986, p. 9). The present research is valuable, therefore, in shedding light on the thresholds
around, and reactions to, tourism at sacred places.

When used in tourism studies, the concept of social carrying capacity, compared with other
carrying capacities, is concerned with the impact upon visitor experience (Shelby &
Heberlein, 1986). However, the present study concerns the experience of the worshipping
community. The concept may still be applied when considering the worshipping community’s
experience as opposed to that of the visiting tourist. In fact, it may be further argued that a
social carrying capacity based upon local or ‘host’ experience, as opposed to visitor
experience, is a valuable, if not essential element of overall carrying capacity assessment and,
more broadly, adds to more informed and sustainable tourism at the place in question. The
present study will allude to the value judgements of the worshipping community which may
inform the place’s social carrying capacity.

Physical carrying capacity, when used within tourism studies, considers the number of people
using, or within, a specific physical area (Shelby & Heberlein, 1986). Evaluative standards
suggest optimum number of people within the area and numbers which exceed this exceed the
place’s physical carrying capacity. An example of exceeded physical carrying capacity within
a sacred place is when no further people can sit upon Church pews or fit within the physical
structure of the place.

Determining carrying capacity traditionally involves creating numerical figures representing
acceptable levels. Creating such figures is outside of the scope of this research project,
however, this project will apply and enlist the concept of carrying capacity in order to
illustrate that increases in tourist numbers to the sacred places may impact upon local
worshippers experience and create unwelcome social impacts. The concept will be used as it
has by other authors, “…as an underlying philosophy…” (Glasson, Godfrey & Goodey, 1995,
p. 44); “…implicitly applied…” (Mexa & Collovini, 2004, p. 245) as Mexa and Collovini
suggest may be done, whereby the basic concept of limit is considered.

Shelby and Heberlein (1986) also cover the concept of crowding and highlight that crowding
is both situation-specific and, similar to carrying capacity, is subjective. Shelby and Heberlein
define crowding as “...a negative evaluation of density; it involves a value judgement that the
specified number is too many” (1986, p. 63). Indeed, these evaluations may well be different
for tourists compared to members of the local worshipping community. Shelby and Heberlein (1986) and Glasson, Godfrey and Goodey (1995) also note that increasing numbers does not necessarily equate to crowding or a place’s carrying capacity being reached, however, the potential relationship is acknowledged. The subjective nature of both crowding and the basis of carrying capacity formulation provide support for the investigation of perceptions surrounding the density of tourists as experienced by the worshipping communities of sacred places.

MacCannell’s 1999 work is also valuable to note here. MacCannell builds on the work of Goffman (1959, cited in MacCannell 1999) and argues that ‘front’ and ‘back’ regions exist where social encounters take place. “The Front is the meeting place of hosts and guests...” suggests MacCannell (1999, p. 92) whereas the back regions are the guest-free areas where hosts retreat to in order to relax and prepare for their next ‘performance’ in the front region. MacCannell makes the further important note that this division is essentially social, and though architecture often supports it, it is “...based on the type of social performance that is staged in a place” (MacCannell, 1999, p. 92). The above points have relevance in regards to areas within the sacred place deemed acceptable for tourist access as well as the impacts encountered within front regions.

2.2.3 Tourist typologies

It is important to consider who it is that comes to sacred places; who the visitors to sacred places are and whether they are all similar. While this was not initially a focus of the study, the results necessitate an inclusion of tourist typologies. There have been many tourist typologies suggested in tourism literature and Leiper (2004) suggests that arranging tourists into typologies removes the assumption that tourists hold the same motivations, expectation, attitudes, and behaviours. Tourist typologies often, however, relate to tourists in general, therefore, for the purposes of this study, a brief outline of only those which relate to sacred places will be offered, with the exception of Cohen’s (2004) explanation of tourist experience.

Cohen’s typology of tourist experience is valuable when considering tourists generally. Cohen explains that, “different kinds of people may desire different modes of touristic experiences; hence “the tourist” does not exist as a type” (Cohen, 2004, p. 66). This point is important to consider as it highlights the potential for diversity among tourist motivations and desires and therefore behaviours and potential impacts tourists may create. Cohen’s work presents tourists
in “an ascending order from the most “superficial” one motivated by the desire for mere “pleasure”, to the most “profound,” motivated by the quest for meaning” (Cohen, 2004, p. 79), though Cohen also recognises that a person may experience different ‘modes’ within a single trip. Perhaps most importantly for the present study, Cohen suggests that, “…tourism spans the range of motivations between the desire for mere pleasure characteristic of the sphere of “leisure” and the quest for meaning and authenticity, characteristic of the sphere of “religion”” (2004, p. 81). Cohen’s (2004) study involves modes beginning at the most superficial, ‘recreational’ mode and moving through ‘diversionary’, ‘experiential’ and ‘experimental’ to that seeking the most meaning, which he terms ‘existential’.

Similarly to Cohen, Olsen and Timothy (2006) offer the general suggestion that those who visit sacred sites have differing motivations. They suggest that tourists “may visit because they have an educational interest in learning more about the history of a site or understanding a particular religious faith and its culture and beliefs, rather than being motivated purely by pleasure-seeking or spiritual growth” (Olsen & Timothy, 2006, p. 5). Shackley’s 2005 work supports this with the suggestion that the motivations of tourists who visit sacred sites differ to the motivations of those who traditionally used them.

Similar to those which relate to tourists in general, some work has created typologies of tourists who visit sacred places. Shackley’s 2004a work suggests that those who visit sacred places, “may be divided into two basic groups; those whose primary purpose is to gain a religious experience (including pilgrims) and the potentially far larger group of those whose major motivation is visiting an element of the Europe’s religious heritage” (2004a, p. 227).

While Shackley’s above article divides those who visit into two groups, Cohen creates 4 groups within his 2003 work which considered the motivations of students attending University in Israel. Cohen’s work identified that, for students, ‘religious’, ‘tourist’, ‘tourist-religion combo’ and ‘other’ motivations exist surrounding visiting Israel for study. Within this study, ‘religious’ motivated students cited religious but not touring factors as important in their decision to travel, the ‘tourist’ group cited touring motivations but not religious motivations, ‘tourist-religious’ motivated students cited both touring and religion as factors in their decision to travel to Israel and the ‘other’ group cited neither religion or touring as important to their decision.

Finney, Orwig and Spake’s 2009 work builds upon Cohen’s 2003 study. This work categorizes sacred place visitors as ‘seekers’ including those who intend to visit both secular
and religious sites; ‘lotus-eaters’, including those who intend to visit only secular sites; ‘pilgrims’, including those who intend to visit only religious tourist sites; and ‘accidental tourists’, referring to those who intend to visit neither type of tourist site. Finney, Orwig and Spake’s article also reminds us that “traditionally, tourism has been profane, while religious pilgrimage has been sacred” (Finney, Orwig & Spake’s 2009, p. 151). Simply, and similarly to Shackley’s abovementioned 2004a and 2005 work, this distinction sets apart those who come to a sacred place for sacred reasons and those who come for secular reasons.

The above mentioned studies suggest that those who visit sacred places fall into one of a few specific, defined categories. Nolan and Nolan suggest, however, that “…there is no obvious dichotomy between pilgrims and tourists: Many fall into the range of intermediate categories” (1992, p. 69). Nolan and Nolan’s work argues that tourists to sacred places may fall anywhere within a spectrum of secular tourist and religious pilgrim, as opposed to within a certain & distinct typology as the above studies assert. This is similar to Cohen’s 2004 assertion mentioned above. The present study will consider who the worshipping community perceives to be tourists to the sacred places, thereby furthering the understanding of the typologies surrounding those who visit sacred places. Furthermore, the present study creates this typology from the perspective of the worshipping community which is not an avenue previously explored. Also, the present study specifically considers how the worshipping community of the sacred places feel about those who come not because the place is a sacred or religious site but because it is a tourist attraction. This specific focus again fills a void in our understandings regarding the topic.

### 2.2.4 Consumption of place

Urry has completed much writing regarding the consumption of place as a result of tourism. Urry’s 2005 work suggests that, via a visual ‘gaze’ or appropriation, tourists consume the places they visit. By gazing upon places, tourists consume those places, or as Urry further explains, they become “…wasted, used up…” (Urry, 2005, p. 26). Urry also suggests that “through the often active consuming of certain services the place itself comes to be consumed” (2005, p. 22). While Urry no doubt speaks of services broadly and in terms of tourist services such as transport or guiding services, the same concept may be applied to the services offered by sacred places. For example, a worship service may be consumed by tourists visiting a sacred place. Bell and Lyall (2002) further Urry’s argument and suggest that
“the world’s icons can be listed and ticked off as one adds the experience of looking at them to one’s gaze collection” (2002, p. 156). Tourists, it is argued, consume the places they gaze upon, as they add to their gaze collection.

Urry also wrote of the consumption of place in his earlier 1995 work. In this work he claims that “places are chosen to be gazed upon because there is an anticipation…” (1995, p. 132) and that “such anticipation is constructed and sustained through a variety of non-tourist practices, such as film, newspapers, TV, magazines, records and videos which construct that gaze” (1995, p. 132). Meethan, (2006) further suggests that the values upon which a place rests also make up the ‘product’ that can then be sold on the market. Indeed, the meaning and spirit of place may be packaged for consumption. These points of Urry and Meethan are noteworthy because the worshipping communities of the sacred places that are packaged for the tourist market, and the potential gazes that accompany this, may not themselves wish for this packaging to occur and certainly may not do it themselves. While sacred sites may be open to tourism and tourist visitation, this ‘packaging of place’, which encourages and enables tourist consumption of the places, may have negative consequences for the place itself and local worshippers experience of it. Watson and Kopachevsky recognise this when they state that “…working under the tourist gaze (Urry 1990: 68-81) places particular strains on the social relations between hosts and guests…” (1994, p. 653). This point is particularly pertinent considering the above mentioned increases in tourism to sacred places including tours and agencies promoting visits to sacred sites as part of their tourism product.

Urry’s gaze concept has been critiqued. Indeed, “...critics have argued that the gaze metaphor is too simplistic...” (Shono, Fisher & McIntosh, 2005, p. 239) and that tourist places and attractions visited by tourists may be engaged in by tourists more than simple gazing. 

Noteable critique, in regards to the present study, is the work of Cloke and Perkins (1998) who suggest that the gaze can move beyond merely visual senses and involve the body also, via activities that tourists undertake. Cloke and Perkins illustrate this using the example of adventure tourism in New Zealand, suggesting that this type of tourism is about active “...‘being, doing, touching, and seeing’, rather than just ‘seeing’” (1998, p. 189).

Similarly, while speaking of tourist involvement in nature activities, Perkins and Thorns (2001) assert that tourists are not merely passive observers of nature. Indeed, Perkins and Thorns (2001, p. 186) assert that
the gaze metaphor is too passive to encapsulate the full range of the tourist experience and suggest that a better metaphorical approach to tourism is to talk about the tourist performance, which incorporates ideas of active bodily involvement: physical, intellectual and and gazing.

Perkins and Thorns (2001) sugget that Urry’s view is Eurocentric and neglects consideration of the context within which the tourism experience unfolds. They suggest it is more accurate to describe tourists as participating in a ‘performance’ instead of a mere gaze (Perkins & Thorns, 2001). Both of the above works suggest that there is more involved in tourist encounters of place then simply gazing upon it as Urry’s theory suggests. These critiques have value within the present study as tourists to sacred places may engage on a deeper level than ‘from the outside gazing in’.

Urry suggests two further points which require consideration for this project. First, he suggests that local worshippers are part of the tourist ‘product’ at sacred places, in much the same way that a flight attendant is part of the product of air travel (Urry, 2002). According to Urry, the local worshipper, while participating in spiritual activities, becomes involved in the profane activity of tourism, where they are gazed upon and consumed by tourists. The local worshipper, however, may not wish for this to occur, particularly considering it occurs while they are attempting to partake in the sacred act of worship, prayer or meditation. Second, Urry argues that “the gaze is directed to features of landscape and townscape which separate them off from everyday and routine experiences” (1995, p. 132). Considering that, as Urry suggests, tourists are more likely to be attracted to that which is different to their norm, this may consequently mean that they are less likely to know or understand appropriate behaviours regarding visiting those places. The increased likelihood of a lack of understanding on the part of the tourist may equate to increased negative impacts for the worshipping community of sacred sites as a result of that lack of understanding. It may also be more difficult to portray an understanding of appropriate behaviours to tourists where the ‘cultural gap’ is greatest, even if this cultural gap surrounds religious culture as opposed to a culture based on country of origin. These two points add further dimension to the situation and greater potential for impacts upon the worshipping community due to tourism at the sites.

Regarding sacred sites specifically, Shackley has done a large degree of the writing surrounding consumption of place. Shackley speaks briefly of the consumption of sacred places in her 2001 (p. 54) work when she states,
visitors come to encounter the spirit of the site and to understand its meaning, to be in some way changed by it. This is what has been termed as ‘visitor experience’. But visitors also consume the site, psychologically for its spiritual benefit and physically by the impact of their presence.

This quote illustrates that tourists consume a sacred place in different regards, both psychologically and physically. This passage also suggests that people may be motivated to visit a place because of a certain spirit of place or visitor experience and by visiting they consume this aspect of the site. Somewhat ironically, however, as noted earlier, the spirit of place may then be negatively impacted by the presence of the tourists. Shackley’s 2004b article takes an in-depth look at the consumption of sacred landscape. This work looks at Uluru, Australia, a sacred place for the indigenous Anangu. Many tourists visit this place and consume it via visitation and climbing ‘the rock’, which is against Anangu wishes. The article describes how this consumption desecrates the landscape and impacts the Anangu. Shackley notes that “non-aboriginal visitors to Uluru consume its landscape superficially….” (Shackley, 2004b, p. 72), identifying that some tourists may choose to consume the place in a superficial way, not necessarily caring about the importance of the place, or why and how the place is sacred and delineated from the profane world. This superficial consumption of place has the potential to lead to greater impacts for local worshipping communities as those who consume the place superficially are less likely to wish to understand the place’s sanctity or norms of appropriate behaviour. Furthermore, the superficial consumption of a sacred place as no more than a tourism attraction changes the place from one of sanctity and worship to a profane place involving more commercial tourism realities; the meaning of the place alters. This consumption of place is closely related to place commercialisation and commodification.

2.2.5 Commercialisation and commodification of place/sanctity

There lies, within sacred places, huge potential for their commercialisation and commodification. Not only are these places within the frame of tourism attractions that may be commodified as any other attraction, but also, their sanctity creates another element which may be commercialised and/or commodified. Throughout history an element of commercialisation and commodification has occurred at sacred places. As Digance (2006, p. 40) reminds us, “in medieval times, souvenirs were sold at the major shrines…”. Today, this type of commercialisation and commodification continues but is a smaller part of a growth in
the commercialisation of the sacred. Tours, souvenirs, guided audios, marketing strategies incorporating sacred places, as well as many more examples of the commercialisation and commodification of place tie sacred places to commercial activity and turns a place of worship and sanctity into one involving the profane activity of commercial trade and exchange. Dogan suggests that “tourism transforms human relationships into a source of economic gain…” (1989, p. 218) and Digance further observes that “the search for meaning offers unlimited business opportunities for small and medium enterprises and multinationals alike…” (2006, p. 40) suggesting that companies and agencies can use the human desire for meaning to further their commercial goals by incorporating sacred places in to trips and tour itineraries. Dignace further explains when he states, “in today’s consumer society, religion is just another marketable commodity or meaning system (Olsen, 2003), with individuals being able to choose packaged meaning systems” (2006, p. 38). Olsen and Timothy further support the notion and suggest that “...venerated places are now being seen as tourism resources that can be commodified for travellers...” (2006, pg 1). Clearly, religion and spirituality, as well as places, may be commercialised and commodified. Meethan reminds us that the built environment is no exception when commenting, “…the commodification of the built environment in which heritage became a tangible asset…” (1996, p. 326).

The mixing of the commercial and the sacred, however, is something that is discouraged in the Bible. The most famous passage regarding this is of Christ clearing the temple (for example, Mark 11: 15-17). This situation, encompassing the potential for commercialisation and commodification at sacred places yet being discouraged by Christ in the Bible, presents an interesting challenge for sacred site managers and caretakers. Johnston also acknowledges this when describing what impact commercialisation can have for sacred sites. He states, “…desecration happens within the first moment of commercialisation.” (2006, p. 116). Commercialisation, according to Johnston, leads to a decrease in the sanctity of the place. This is something that Shackley’s above mentioned 2004b article regarding Uluru also reports as well as Universitas Udayana and Francillon’s 1975 summary of reports regarding the impacts of tourism in Bali.

Cohen (1988) has also written on this concept of desecration when explaining the commoditisation of culture. Cohen acknowledges that “…commoditisation, engendered by tourism, allegedly destroys not only the meaning of cultural products for the locals but, paradoxically, also for the tourists” (1988, p. 373). However, Cohen goes on to critique the assumptions inherent in the theory that tourism automatically leads to commoditisation that then renders cultural artifacts and services meaningless. Cohen, instead, suggests that tourism
presents an opportunity for the strengthening of cultural components that may assist in their revival and survival and that members of the local host community may take pride in performing for tourists. He suggests, “…what used to be a religiously meaningful ritual for an internal public, may become a culturally significant self-representation before an external public” (Cohen, 1988, p. 382). The present study will consider how the local worshipping community feels about the commercialisation and commodification of their sacred place. It will highlight whether, in the eyes of the worshipping community, these processes alter the meaning and spirit of the place or if, as Cohen argues, they do not.

2.3 Practice literature

Now that the theoretical literature has been covered, it is necessary to consider literature surrounding the ‘in practice’ aspects of the topic. This part of the review covers place and sacred place, tourism to sacred places, the tourism - religion relationship, and host and community impact literature.

2.3.1 Place and sacred place

Places are created. Ascribed value and meaning, and their use by people, makes places distinct from space. Indeed, “what begins as undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value” (Tuan, 1977, p. 6). Place without meaning or ascribed value is merely space.

Building on the concept of place, sacred places are created by their use and reverence by those associated with particular religions and spiritualities. Indeed, “most religions designate certain places as sacred or holy…” (Park, 1994, p. 245). These places can become central features of the belief system, foci for worship or meditation and centres of reverence or pilgrimage. As Shackley (2001, p. 13) explains,

a sacred site both exists within sacred space and contains sacred space within it. Sacred space has been defined by Jackson and Henrie (1983: 94) as ‘that portion of the earth’s surface which is recognized by individuals or groups as worthy of devotion, loyalty or esteem’. It is usually sharply distinguished from the profane world around it.
Sacred places encompass a range of different types of place (Reisinger, 2006; Shackley, 2001) and sacred places can hold a strong ‘spirit of place’, mentioned earlier. It is place that, as noted earlier, may be consumed by tourists and commercialised or commodified for tourists. It is important to note also that, in the eyes of individuals, sacred places may not necessarily be those associated with defined religions or worshipping communities. An individual may consider a particular river or house or other seemingly random location to be a sacred place; one person’s random space may be another person’s sacred place. Nevertheless, many sacred places are considered so by large groups of people and literature regarding sacred landscapes demonstrates the importance places receive once they are deemed sacred by a group of people (for example, Digance, 2003; Johnston, 2006; Price, 1994; Reeves, 1994; Shackley, 2004b).

The importance of sacred place relates to the centrality of its associated spiritual belief within a person or community’s life. It is this spiritual belief, and its importance within the lives of local worshipping communities, which makes the investigation of tourism impacts towards places associated with this belief so valuable.

The human experience of religion and spirituality can be central to life. On an individual level, religion can provide an ethical structure, giving purpose and meaning to life and providing understanding within it (Pratt, 1993). This can manifest as peoples beliefs, attitudes and behaviours (Lupfer et al., 192, cited in Sharpley, 2009). However, on a broader level, religion can also be a unifying and community building feature of society (Pratt, 1993) and a “…integral part of the social system (Vukonic, 1996: 26)” (Sharpley, 2009, p. 240). On the societal level, religion has shaped and impacted cultures and histories (Pratt, 1993). “The pervasive impact of religion as a factor of human history and cultures is undeniable” suggests Pratt (1993, p. x). The places of religion and spirituality, that is, sacred places, may therefore be deeply meaningful for individuals and hugely important in their life. This can be further understood by Tuan’s, suggestion that “place can acquire deep meaning for the adult through the steady accretion of sentiment over the years” (1977, p. 33). The meaning and importance of the sacred place may be equally true for the larger community but particularly for the worshipping community of the place. While Tuan speaks of place in general, it may be assumed that, because of the centrality and importance of spirituality within people’s lives, the places associated with that spirituality may have equally strong importance and meaning for individuals. Shackley further notes that “…increasing numbers of people are going to be looking at sacred sites for some means of defining a more acceptable reality” (Shackley,
2001, p. 192) and this may be particularly true considering the increasing secularization of the Western world (Reisinger, 2006; Shackley, 2004a).

It is clear that religion, and the places associated with religion, can be hugely influential to the individual lives and societies of religious adherents and this may therefore mean that the impacts of tourism to these places may be more deeply felt than at non-sacred places. Further to this, many sacred places and their associated worshippers and managers may not wish for tourism at their place and indeed may not actively market the site as a tourist attraction. However, these places may be included in the marketing strategies of tourism companies and agencies not directly associated with the place. As Olsen notes, “religious sites are commonly used in tourism promotional literature as cultural resources to be consumed by tourists” (Olsen, 2006, p. 112) and as Olsen and Timothy further explain, “mosques, churches, cathedrals, pilgrimage paths, sacred architecture, and the lure of the metaphysical are used prominently in tourism promotional literature…” (2006, p. 1). Similarly, companies may include tours of sacred places as part of the services they offer (Johnston, 2006). This means that these companies not only encourage tourism at the place but also actively bring tourists there, thereby mingling the profane act of tourism with the sanctity of the place, while benefiting from it as a commercial entity. This complex situation calls for an understanding of how the worshipping communities of the sacred places feel about this mingling and how, if at all, they feel impacted as a result of it.

While many sites are fundamentally sacred places, many are also, through their own or another agencies development, visitor attractions, viewed and operated as places which may be visited, and thus consumed, by tourists. Leask (2008, p. 3) points to this dual role when speaking of visitor attractions generally and stating, “at their most basic level they work to attract visitors to an area, while many also operate in a much broader sense as agents of change, social enablers and major income generators”. Churches and Cathedrals, may be ‘agents of change, social enablers and major incomes generators’ but they are also sacred places, places of worship. The fact that many sacred sites have dual or multipurpose and use, and therefore differing attitudes towards the place held by differing user groups, is where the potential for conflict and impacts arises. One user group (the worshipping community) may view the place purely as a sacred site whereas another group (tourists and tourism agencies) may view it purely as a tourism attraction. Again, this complex situation becomes even more so when the broader community, or indeed the tourism industry is involved directly in, and benefits from, tourism to sacred places. As Shackley suggests, “the tourism industries of
countries such as Israel and the Vatican City are entirely dependent on sacred sites” (Shackley, 2001, p. 19).

### 2.3.2 Tourism to sacred place/tourism and religion

Tourism and religion have long been associated (Sharpley, 2009), however, relatively little has been written on the topic of tourism to sacred places. Considering the work which has been done, Olsen and Timothy (2006, p. 6) suggest,

…most research and writing on the topic has centred on four distinct themes of inquiry: distinguishing the pilgrim from the tourist; the characteristics and travel patterns of religious tourists; the economics of religious tourism; and the negative impacts of tourism on religious sites and ceremonies.

Olsen and Timothy make an accurate observation and for the purposes of this research it is necessary to note some key works. Noteworthy studies that relate to tourism, religion and sacred sites include Reisinger’s 2006 work suggesting why tourists visit sacred sites and Finny, Orwig and Spake’s (2009) similar work which classified tourists into four separate categories based on their motivation for visiting religious sites. Andriotis (2009) has investigated the experiences of pilgrims to sacred sites, with Shackley’s 2008 work mentioning these also. Vuconic (1996) has written of the relationship between tourism and religion, specifically looking at the similarities between tourism and pilgrimage, tourists and pilgrims, the theological view of tourism and the churches’ reaction to tourism. Digance further looked at the similarities and differences between religious and secular pilgrimage, commenting that traditional religious pilgrimage is based on “…an act of faith…” (2006, p. 45). Cohen has also considered the comparison between tourism and religion and states, “tourism and religion are both closely related and diametrically opposed modalities of social conduct” (2004, p. 147), while Urry (2002) too has written of the similarities between tourists and pilgrims. Allcock offers the suggestion that tourism possesses a “…quasi-religious characteristic” (1988, p. 33). Digance (2006), Shackley (2002) and Nolan and Nolan (1992) have noted that various user groups visit sacred places, Nolan and Nolan suggesting that the diversity of user groups situates sacred sites “…among the most complex of attractions…” (1992, p. 68-69). Much has also been written regarding the sacredness of landscapes, particularly mountains, and the implications of tourist visitation to these areas (for example, Bernbaum, 1997; Digance, 2003; Shackley, 2004b). There has also been some work
surrounding tourist visitation to temples (Kang, 2009; Universitas Udayana & Francillon, 1975). Many of these studies regarding temples and landscape particularly focus on the impacts felt by indigenous peoples (see Bernbaum, 1997; Booth & Cullen, 2001; Digance, 2003; Johnston, 2006; McIntosh & Johnson, 2005; Price, 1994; Reeves, 1994; Roven, 1994; Shackley, 2004b). Shackley (1998; 2002; 2004a & b; 2005 & 2008) has done the most extensive writing regarding tourist visitation to sacred sites, though her work focuses mainly on operations management and management implications. Considering this proposed research will investigate two religious sacred sites (one small church and one cathedral), the focus of the literature reviewed below is on tourist visitation to built sites and places of religious significance. The review purposely excludes the broader literature regarding tourism and religion as, while these may inform the study, they are too many to include and are not central to the focus of the research.

Shackley’s 1998 work considers the impact of increasing visitor numbers to Saint Katherine’s monastery near Mount Sinai, Egypt. The monastery, home to around 25 monks, is a hugely important sacred site for the Christian faith. The Monastery is the oldest in continuous existence, houses a large range of historical artefacts and is situated at a geographical location central to the faith of Jews, Christians and Muslims (Shackley, 1998). Shackley suggests that the unplanned tourism development of nearby coastal resorts has had a significant impact on the monastery as it has increased tourist numbers who, despite attempts to limit numbers and hours of visitation, disturb the site as well as monastic life for resident monks. Shackley covers the ways in which monks living at the monastery are impacted by tourist visitation to Saint Katherine’s, including being woken by tourists climbing Mount Sinai accompanied by loud portable stereos, crowding at the site, lax observation of open hours, inability of monks to attain ‘holy silence’ as a monastic principle and the inappropriate dress of some visitors. The disruption of monastic life is an issue also highlighted by Mydans in his 2008 article and within Shackley’s 1999 work where she reports briefly on the impacts of tourism to Buddhist monastic festivals in Nepal, Bhutan and North India. Interestingly, Shackley’s 1998 article speaks briefly of the impact, not only for the local worshipping community of monks who reside at the monastery, but also the surrounding Gebaliya Beduoin community. This community feels the ‘spirit of place’ has been destroyed due to increasing numbers of tourists. Indeed, the community feels “the God-created sacred space around the monastery has been violated” (Shackley, 1998, p. 128). Shackley also mentions the impact upon visitor experience of increasing numbers of tourists to the site. Of Shackley’s works noted above, this article provides the most in-depth discussion of the impact of growing tourist visitation on the local
worshipping community; in this case, the monks of Saint Katherine’s as well as the wider community. Though not directly applied, the article hints at tourist consumption of the place as well as its physical and social carrying capacities being exceeded.

Focusing on English Cathedrals and likening them to Foucault’s heterotopia (1986, cited in Shackley, 2002), Shackley’s 2002 article discusses the difficulties that arise at sacred sites which are open to tourist visitation as well as the local cathedral community. Some of the management challenges Shackley raises which are relevant to the proposed study include the different experiences expected by visitors; the fact that, for cathedrals, their core ‘business’ surrounds providing for those who wish to worship, pray or meditate; that admission fees may alter the ‘spirit of place’ for both tourists and the local worshiping community; how to ensure ‘spirit of place’ is maintained amongst growing numbers of visitors; that many tourists do not understand or adhere to appropriate behaviours and dress within the cathedral; and the issue of crowding. The degree of, and ways in which, ‘spirit of place’ is effected by tourist visitation is a central consideration of the present research. Shackley’s article is valuable in its identification and discussion of the impacts and challenges that arise at sacred sites which attract both tourists as well as the local worshipping community. Shackley’s 2001 work supports this when she states “sacred sites are arguably the oldest type of visitor attraction within the tourism system but few were designed to cope with the volume and flow of today’s visitation pattern and the expectations of today’s visitor’s…” (Shackley, 2001, pg 19). In stating this, Shackley identifies the potential for issues to arise from tourism to sacred places and specifically within this statement those relating to carrying capacity. While both her 2001 and 2002 work focus on management issues, these are important considerations within the present study also. The present study seeks to provide further insights regarding management issues at cathedrals by contributing an understanding of the impacts felt by the worshipping community of sacred places.

Shackley’s 2005 article considers many of the same issues which her previous work highlights but also applies principles of customer service delivery to assist in the management of these. Shackley also notes the issues the application of these principles may create. One of the key issues surrounding visitation to sacred sites is that tourists may have very different motivations for visiting, for example, some may come for worship and some to look at the site as an historical building (Shackley, 2005). Indeed, “the nature of the experience which a sacred site offers to its visitors is highly complex…” (Shackley, 2005, p. 34). Further, “…part of the challenge of managing visitors to cathedrals lies in difficulties associated with an interface between the sacred and the profane” (Shackley, 2005, p. 38). This means that
owners and managers of sacred sites have the dual task of providing visitor services while maintaining their ‘core focus’ of sites as places of worship, prayer and meditation (Shackley, 2005). While it is recognised that many tourist attractions may also be multi-focused, the difficulty for sacred places is that their foci, that is, the sacred, is so very different to the profane world of tourism. Shoval supports this concept in stating, “[t]ourism and religion are both closely related and diametrically opposed modalities of social conduct” (2000, p. 253). This is a point that Urry also recognises when speaking of tourism in general and stating, “tourism results from a basic binary division between the ordinary/everyday and the extraordinary” (2002, p. 12). Tourists may visit sacred places out of curiosity or because the site is a ‘must see’ destination but, according to Urry, tourists visit certain sites because they are ‘novel’ compared to the tourist’s ‘everyday’. The local worshipping community, however, visit because the place forms a sacred part of their spiritual belief system and may be a focal point for prayer and meditation. The interaction of people who visit for different reasons and who consider a different meaning of the place is at the heart of where impacts may arise. Within this context, Shackley’s 2005 work suggests ways in which business management principles may be applied to sacred sites in order to assist the management of these challenges, noting, however, that this may not ‘sit’ well with those who see sacred sites as necessarily separate from business principles.

Shackley’s 2008 work covers much the same material as the aforementioned articles. This piece, however, provides a more detailed analysis of how sacred place can be classified. The article also mentions purpose-built religious attractions that “…to some extent makes a commodity of the religion which it purports to promote” (Shackley, 2008, p. 255). These attractions, which claim to be educational, though are “…blatantly commercial…” (Shackley, 2008, p. 255), are built without any authentic sacred elements and may be, for example, replicas of holy places such as ‘Nazareth Village’ built near the supposed site of Jesus’ childhood home (Shackley, 2008). The construction of these “…theme park…” (Shackley, 2008, p. 255) sites have angered those who belong to the religion presented at the sites (Shackley, 2008) and shows clearly how sacred places may be commercialised and commodified. The interface between sacred and profane may again be considered here, a relationship that is also considered by Olsen when he suggests, “…when religious sites become tourism attractions they change from being a religious space for worship and ritual into profane tourism space” (Olsen, 2006, p. 107). The relationship between the profane world of tourism and the sacred world of religious and spiritual sites hints at the complexity of the situation surrounding tourism at sacred places. In the instance mentioned in Shackley’s
article, sites such as Nazareth village may be considered sacred by many people however it has been created for commercial gain. Mention of purpose-built, ‘theme park’ religious sites is also interesting to note as tourists may choose to visit sites such as this instead of ‘real’ sacred places meaning visitor numbers may decline, potentially resulting in decreased impacts.

Shackley’s 2004a article looks at the retreat house sector of the hospitality market, focusing on those within the United Kingdom. The article includes the impacts of tourism on those operating the places which often carry out a dual-purpose as religious centres, convents or monasteries. An impact identified in the study was based around community members feeling that visitors who were “…unaccustomed to the retreat ethos may make unreasonable demands on their time, which is usually unpaid” (2004a, p. 234). Tourists to other sacred sites may make similar demands on the time of local clergy or guides as well as creating other impacts if they are ‘unaccustomed to the ethos’ surrounding the place and hold the meaning of place as essentially profane as opposed to sacred. Shackley’s other work of the same year focuses on the impact of tourists to the sacred landscape of Uluru, Australia. This article considers the consumption of sacred landscape by tourists and the impact this has for the local Anangu tribe. The work further highlights the joint-management of the place by local Anangu and Government authorities.

While Shackley’s articles are beneficial to the present study because they identify the main issues and challenges involved with tourist visitation to sacred sites, her focus is generally one of operations management. This focus on operations management at sacred sites is also covered by Olsen with regard to Temple Square, Utah (Olsen, 2009). Shackley, however, briefly discusses the impact of tourist visitation for the ‘worshiping communities’ of the sites (1998, 2002 and 2004b). This analysis, though, does not go in to depth regarding the issue, and often seems based only on observation and brief discussions with the local users and worshippers of the sacred sites. The present research would, therefore, provide greater and in-depth analysis furthering Shackley’s suggestion that tourist visitation to sacred sites impacts upon the local worshipping community.

2.3.3 Host/community impact

Since there is little previous research which investigates the impact of tourist visitation to Christian sacred places upon the local worshipping community, those studies which cover
tourism’s impact upon the wider local, ‘host’, community, are covered below. In order to keep the reviewed literature relevant and focused on New Zealand, these impact studies generally consider New Zealand case studies only. While there is a large volume of impact studies regarding other destinations around the world, they are too many to include here. Further to this, the reviewed studies consider impacts at the wider community level, whereas the present research considers a ‘community within a community’, that is, the worshipping community as a section of the wider community. Therefore, New Zealand based studies are deemed sufficient from which to pull background knowledge, considerations and theory to inform the project’s development, analysis and completion. In saying that, however, those studies from outside New Zealand which have important or fundamental findings relevant to the study are also included in the background analysis.

Patterns of unrest – are resident attitudes towards tourism predictable?
According to Horn and Simmons, “much of the New Zealand research into the social impacts of tourism is based on Doxey’s (1975) index of resident irritation” (2002, p. 133). While Doxey’s 1975 work is now dated, it provides a basis from which to consider the interaction of tourist and resident and the impacts perceived by residents due to tourist visitation. Furthermore, while Doxey recognises that responses of both resident and visitor will vary at different locations, his proposed ‘irridex’ seems to suggest a general, linear progression through four stages of reaction to tourism development. The irridex also focuses on the perceptions of local residents and suggests their perceptions as, initial ‘Euphoria’ towards tourism development, moving through ‘Apathy’ and ‘Annoyance’ to eventual ‘Antagonism’ towards tourists and tourism development (Doxey, 1975). Doxey’s irridex is useful when considering the local worshipping community’s potential reactions to tourism at their sacred place.

Doxey’s model rests on the idea that, within both resident and visitor, there exist a ‘tolerance threshold’ which, if breached, causes irritation within each. The idea of a threshold is similar to that of carrying capacity. This point, however is perhaps what allows critique of Doxey’s model – Doxey generalises the ‘thresholds’ of the community while later studies suggest impacts are felt, and must therefore be considered, at an individual level. Considering the present study investigates, in-depth, the perceptions of a small slice of two New Zealand communities it will certainly further knowledge surrounding resident ‘irritation’. Many studies have critiqued Doxey's work, and the present research will provide further insight regarding local community perceptions of tourism impact, particularly as they regard sacred place.
Horn and Simmon’s 2002 study compared the impact upon the two popular New Zealand tourism destination communities of Kaikoura and Rotorua and critiqued the work of Doxey. Their work asserted that “…the tourism literature is inconclusive in its findings, suggesting that the processes of adaptation and development are not necessarily linear, but instead result from a range of factors…” (2002, p. 134). Horn and Simmons concluded that community adaptation to tourism development rests on factors more complex than Doxey’s theory would suggest. Horn and Simmons instead suggest that local history, the ‘relative economic importance of tourism’ and the ‘visibility of visitors’ are factors which create differences in the impacts felt by community members (Horn and Simmons, 2002). This finding again rebuts the work of Doxey and other scholars who suggest that community responses to tourism development take a similar and prescribed, linear path. The findings of Horn and Simmons’ study lend support to the present research’s in-depth look at impacts felt by host communities as well as the consideration of wider social, historical and development factors. The in-depth investigation offered by the present study may bring further light to the question of the factors influencing resident’s reactions to tourism development.

The early work of Lawson, Williams, Young and Cossens (1998), used quantitative techniques to investigate the perceptions of residents within ten New Zealand towns regarding tourism impacts. Lawson et al.’s literature review suggested seven key factors which influence community perceptions of tourism. These factors include the ratio of host to guest; the perceived cultural distance between host and guest; the economic dependence on tourism of the host community; the degree of control the host community had over decision making; the destination’s stage in the tourism life-cycle; the degree of seasonality and the type of tourism which occurs within the community (Lawson, et al, 1998). These suggested factors will be valuable to consider when investigating and analysing the case studies of the present research. The study’s findings highlighted the contradictions in people’s perceptions when it came to tourism impacts, including that participants recognised the benefits of tourism at a national level, but not at an individual level. Lawson et al (1998) compared the reported tourism effects across the 10 New Zealand towns and suggested that this range of factors contributes to the impacts felt by residents of different communities. This finding is similar to those of Shone et al. (2005).

Shone, Horn, Moran, and Simmons’ (2005) work provides a thorough overview of their research which investigated the responses of five New Zealand communities to tourism development. The study, which spanned a 5 year period, built on the work of Doxey, Butler and Kelly (1975, 1980, 1987, cited in Shone, et al, 2005). The results of the study, coupled
with a review of other community impact research, suggested there is “…no clear pattern of community response to tourism…” (Shone, et al, 2005, p. 99). This finding again contrasts with the suggestions of Doxey (1975) whose model identifies four key stages that host communities pass through when encountering increasing tourism development. Instead, the authors suggest ‘destinational’ (historical and geographical) and ‘community’ (community processes and sustainable communities and inequitable power relations) factors as more likely to influence how host communities are impacted by tourists and the tourism industry.

Host reactions to tourism

Two further studies which rebut the idea that communities take a prescribed, linear path in reaction to tourism are that of Dogan (1989) and Ap and Crompton (1993).

Dogan’s 1989 work suggests that if negative perceptions exist regarding tourism impact, the coping strategy will be resistance, however, if positive perceptions exist, reactions will be more accepting of tourism and tourists. Dogan suggests that negative changes to culture due to tourism create psychological tension among members of the resident population. In order to ease this tension, people develop coping strategies as a result. Dogan’s analysis hints at individual thresholds, after which reactions and strategies alter. Dogan outlines a handful of strategies which residents adopt in order to cope with tourism at the place. Dogan identifies strategies including, ‘resistance’ which is characterised by hostility and aggression towards tourists and tourism development; ‘retreatism’ which involves the local community “…closing into itself…” (Dogan, 1989, p. 222), avoiding contact with outsiders, reviving old traditions and increasing consciousness regarding their own culture; ‘boundary maintenance’ involving creating defined boundaries between the culture of the local community and the tourist as well as locals presenting their culture in a different context so as to minimise negative impact; ‘revitalisation’ which, as the title suggests, involves a strengthening or preservation of aspects of the local culture due to their becoming tourist attractions; ‘adoption’ refers to the local culture adopting the cultural norms and ways of the visiting tourist. Importantly, Dogan suggests that the reactions to tourism take various forms depending on factors related to the resident community and that the above strategies may occur simultaneously within a community. He further notes that his analysis is general in nature and that factors outside of the control of the resident population may impact their reactions, an example being power structures within the region. Accordingly, there is value in ascertaining the reactions to tourism that members of worshipping communities of the present study take.
Ap and Crompton’s 1993 study identified the strategies that local residents exhibited in order to respond to tourism. The study found that ‘residents’ reactions to tourism could be placed on a continuum comprised of four strategies: embracement, tolerance, adjustment, and withdrawal” (1993, p. 48). As the name suggests, the coping strategy of embracement involves the resident community welcoming tourists and often including a desire for increased tourist volumes. The tolerance reaction involves the local community exhibiting ambivalence towards tourism and tourists, the local community acknowledging positive and negative aspects to tourism. The next strategy that Ap and Crompton identified was adjustment. This involved people altering activities in order to avoid tourists and tourism. Lastly, the authors identified that local residents may withdraw temporarily or permanently from the community. Ap and Crompton hypothesise that their findings relate not to cultural gaps between resident and tourist, as Dogan would suggest, but rather due to high tourist volumes and tourist behaviours. An important point Ap and Crompton note is that these strategies exist along a continuum upon which individuals may constantly move and that “...at any time there may be a diversity of reactions to tourism in a community, and that these reactions will be manifested by different behavioural strategies” (1993, p. 49). According to Ap and Crompton’s assertion, the local worshipping communities of a sacred place may hold differing reactions to tourism at the site and, therefore, differing coping strategies towards tourism.

Many of the abovementioned studies, therefore, suggest that varying factors influence how hosts react to tourism and that these patterns are not necessarily universal within a community. Furthermore, the coping strategies of a community may also be diverse. The above work also suggests thresholds of tourism, where, if a threshold is exceeded, negative reactions to tourism will occur. Indeed, Dogan states, “it may be said that every region has a threshold level for touristic development. When this level is exceeded, negative feelings toward tourism and tourists become wide-spread among the local population” (1989, p. 221). These thresholds will be based on individual values, beliefs, levels of involvement in the industry and benefit from it. The concept of threshold is also used in theories of carrying capacity, mentioned above, a theory also involving differing individual perceptions. The abovementioned studies allude to the complexity of the interaction between the local community and the tourists that visit as well as the reactions and coping strategies of the local community when tourists visit their place.

*Locals losing ‘their place’*

Urry suggests that when areas have large visitor numbers, locals may feel as though they have “…‘lost’ their space” (1995, p. 166). This statement supports Smith (1977) who suggests that
large numbers of tourists increases stressful contact between them and their hosts. This feeling and conflict situations may be increased when places are not actively marketed by the owners and users of a place, yet still attract large volumes of tourists. This is indeed the case at the Church of the Good Shepherd. Furthermore, local users of the place may feel particularly aggrieved if the place they feel they have ‘lost’ is a sacred one considered central to their spirituality. These two considerations are investigated in the present study and when coupled with the meaning of place, as ascertained through this study, will provide an indication of the support for Urry’s assertion in the particular situation of sacred places.

Work completed by Horn (1996) suggested the use of conflict, sense of place and social exchange theory to better understand and explain the social impacts of tourism for local residents. Horn suggests the need for development of theoretical perspectives surrounding tourism’s social impacts due to inconsistencies in the results of previous studies (Horn, 1996). Horn highlights the appropriateness of conflict theory due to the differences in situation, motivation and culture of tourist and host and suggests that “social impacts….may be conceptualised as a form of resource conflict” (Horn, 1996, p. 19). These differences, leading to the potential for conflict are also suggested by Nolan and Nolan (1992). Horn goes on to highlight the need for appropriate management of the ‘inputs’ of tourism (specifically, attractions, such as historic buildings, and local residents) in order to avoid a change in meaning of the place and consequently the experience of place for both host and guest. An example presented by Horn is when tourists behave inappropriately at tourist attractions (Horn, 1996). The potential for inappropriate behaviour at attractions is increased within the present study because the site is sacred. Horn also makes an important observation that members of small communities may not wish to voice opinion regarding tourism impacts as it may be seen as anti-social considering that other community members rely on the industry for employment (Horn, 1996). This observation is pertinent to the present study as one of the case study sites, the Church of the Good Shepherd, is located within a small, rural township where tourism is a key industry. Furthermore, as Shackley (2005) suggests, and as was noted earlier, places are influential upon human experience meaning their significance within the wider community may not be understood until tourism is at its height and impacts are already being created. Lastly, Horn (1996 p. 19) argues that:

understanding the meanings that these places have for all users and the implications that these meanings have for the social impacts of tourism is fundamental to successful management. Understanding the meaning of place may help explain why social impacts differ between destinations.
Mathieson and Wall (1982) have briefly covered the social impact of tourism’s interaction with religious places. Mathieson and Wall provide an overview of the impacts of tourism to religious sites which may inform the present study. Specifically, their work mentions the potential for conflict between “…locals, the religiously devout tourists and the curious visitor…” (1982, p. 153); that the development of sacred places for tourism detracts from their religious significance; the negative effect on living conditions and religious experiences because of inappropriate tourist behaviour; the change in meaning of religious artefacts due to their production for sale and the use of sacred places, such as temples, for touristic performances and displays. While these impacts are only briefly suggested by the authors, they are points that the present research focus on. The present study will certainly further the suggestions made by Mathieson and Wall, particularly those regarding interactions between tourists and local worshippers, touristic development at sacred places, the impact of tourist behaviour and the meaning of place for the local worshipping community.

Nolan and Nolan (1992) have also commented on tourism at religious sites. Their article mentions some of the impacts related to tourist visitation to three main types of religious sites in Europe, focusing on how religious and non-religious visitors’ expectations are fulfilled. Nolan and Nolan recognise the potential for conflict arising from crowding, sites hosting a greater number of tourists than local worshippers and the commodification of performances for, and consequent consumption by, tourists. Nolan and Nolan (1992, p. 76) hint at carrying capacity, crowding and gazing tourists when they state,

problems begin to develop when the size of crowds begins to outstrip the physical availability of space, when the numbers of tourists grows to the point that they seem to overwhelm the scene, or when, for one reason or another, the celebrants come to feel that they are putting on a show for outsiders rather than for the object of their devotions and themselves.

The authors do, however, suggest that “…there is no evidence to suggest that tourism and pilgrimage are intrinsically incompatible” (1992, p. 77), that is, tourists and local worshippers may indeed mix at sacred places, without negative effect.

The differing conclusions of the abovementioned studies lend support for the in-depth investigation of worshipping community perceptions regarding tourism impacts. This is supported by Horn who, when speaking of tourism impact studies, suggests “the inconsistency of results between studies indicates further theoretical development is
necessary” (1996, p. 11) and Simmons and Fairweather who suggest that “future research opportunities exist across all dimensions of the host-guest encounter” (2005, p. 265). Nolan and Nolan (1992, p. 77-78) further support the study of tourism at sacred places when they state,

visitor interactions, as well as the simultaneous growth and decline of pilgrimage shrines and the complex mix of artistic-historic and devotional characteristics of religious tourist attractions, all offer rich fields for investigation in applied tourism research as well as theoretical social science.

Not only will the present study highlight local community feelings regarding tourist visitation, it will do so within the specific context of sacred place. It is suggested that this factor will make resident feelings towards tourists and tourism development stronger and trends in resident perceptions more clearly evident. This is because the places being visited are central to the spiritual life of the community being investigated. The present research has value in that more light may be shone on host community reactions to, and coping mechanisms surrounding, tourism. These understandings will provide further clarity within the field of tourism impacts. Furthermore, the present project has value in that, as far as I am aware, there exists no research which specifically considers the reactions of the worshipping communities of sacred places to tourism to, and tourists at, their sites.

### 2.4 Chapter summary

This chapter has covered literature relevant to the project. It has done this, first, regarding the theory which is relevant and then the literature relating to the practical aspects of the topic. The theories of meaning and spirit of place, carrying capacity, tourist typologies, consumption of place and commercialisation and commodification were covered. Literature regarding place and sacred place, tourism to sacred place and the tourism/religion relationship and host and community impact was also covered. This literature frames the research as well as assisting in understanding the results which emerged from the study.
Chapter 3
Methods

3.1 Introduction
This chapter discusses the approach used to conduct the research. The chapter also covers the qualitative research methods used to gather data which informed the research. The specific methods used were semi-structured interviews, including a mapping exercise, and participant observation, including site photography. These multiple methods of data collection were used in order to triangulate the data which is argued to be pertinent in the complex field of tourism (Beeton, 2005) and particularly appropriate when using case studies (Yin, 2003). The chapter goes on to describe the case study sites as well as the research process, covering the lead up to data collection, the data collection process as well as data analysis.

3.2 Research approach
The main aim of the research was to investigate the impacts of tourists to sacred sites through the eyes of those who used the site as their regular place of worship. The study was therefore an ethnographic one which necessarily employed qualitative research methods. This concept will be discussed, following a brief discussion regarding reflexivity.

3.2.1 Reflexivity
It is important to also note the influence that reflexivity may have upon the creation, analysis and reporting of research. The concept of reflexivity highlights the influence of the researcher’s own ‘self’ when researching the ‘other’ that is their participants (Fontana & Frey, 2008) as well as the interview setting and other factors inherent to the research (Babbie, 2004). A researcher’s, and a participant’s, beliefs, history, worldview, opinions, will undoubtedly influence interviews and their outcomes, data collection, data processing and reporting. It is important, therefore, that I am mindful of my own position and continually reflect upon the impact that my ‘self’ has on the research participants and the data they provide as well as other external factors that may have a bearing on the research data and therefore results. Cole furthers this idea when stating, “while participating with insiders it is
clear that the researcher is part of the context being observed and therefore to some extent modifies and influences the data” (Cole, 2005, p. 64). This point is particularly pertinent considering one of the data collection methods within this research is participant observation. For example, while participating in observation sessions I am sat in the sacred place. My presence, therefore, may have a bearing on the results I obtain.

3.2.2 Ethnography

Ethnographic studies emerged from the area of cultural studies (Veal, 2006), specifically, anthropology (Silverman, 2006). Ethnography aims to observe people in naturally occurring settings (Brewer, 2000, as cited in Silverman, 2006). This can develop an “…holistic understanding of a society, group or organisation from an insider’s perspective…” (Altinay & Paraskevas, 2008, p. 79). Ethnography attempts to “…see the world through the eyes of those being researched, allowing them to speak for themselves…” (Veal, 2006, p. 205).

The suggestion that the current research is ethnographic is supported by Brotherton (2008, p. 127) when he states that ethnography

is a design that is very appropriate for research attempting to develop an in-depth understanding of a group of interacting people within the context of a particular type of location or setting, who are engaging in their normal activities without any outside manipulation.

When undertaking ethnographic research, researchers often participate directly in the activities they wish to understand and with the people they wish to know more about (Brewer, 2000, as cited in Silverman, 2006). This approach to data collection involves in-depth interactions with usually small groups and often involves a variety of techniques as opposed to a single technique (Veal, 2006).

An ethnographic approach fits well with the aims and questions the research attempts to address. The central aim of the research is to discover how those who hold sacred sites sacred, and use the place as their regular worshipping site, feel about tourism and tourists at the site. It is, therefore, only possible to discover insights by ethnographic means which involve in-depth interactions and observations in natural settings; means which will allow the insider’s perspective to become clear, allowing them to speak for themselves. Studies of an ethnographic nature, including the present study, are considered qualitative research.
3.2.3 Qualitative research

Qualitative methods are clearly essential considering the ethnographic nature of the research and particularly considering the research aim, questions and context. Qualitative research “…attempts to gather evidence that will reveal….the ‘multiple realities’….from participants’ perspectives” (Burns, 2000, p. 388). Further, “[q]ualitative methods attempt to capture and understand individual definitions, descriptions and meanings of events” (Burns, 2000, p. 388) and “…focuses mainly on experiences and emotions…” (Altinay & Paraskevas, 2008, p. 75). Phillimore and Goodson (2004, p. 4) support this when stating that “with qualitative approaches, the emphasis is placed upon studying things in their natural settings, interpreting phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them, humanising problems and gaining an ‘emic’, or insider’s perspective”. Considering the research investigates sacred places specifically, and because of the nature of sacred places, participants may well have quite different perspectives on what the place means for them and consequently how tourism impacts the place and their experience at it. Therefore, developing an in-depth and rich understanding of participant’s experiences, views and feelings regarding tourists to their sacred site will be best achieved using qualitative means.

Compared to quantitative approaches, qualitative enquiry “…involves gathering a great deal of information about a small number of people rather than a limited amount of information about a large number of people” (Veal, 2006, p. 40). Qualitative methods will, therefore, provide a thorough understanding of how tourist visitation to sacred places affects those for whom they are sacred. Phillimore and Goodson (2004, p. 4) again support this when succinctly stating that “…qualitative approaches offer a great deal of potential, much of which remains largely untapped, for helping us understand the human dimensions of society, which in tourism include its social and cultural implications”. The implications of tourism to and tourists at sacred places will indeed be highlighted via qualitative means. Qualitative methods will allow for these different meanings, experiences and perspectives to be conveyed by participants via interviews and explored by the researcher via observation.

3.2.4 Data collection

Using a range of data collection methods is common when completing an ethnographic study (Veal, 2006). A range of data collection techniques also ensures that the data is triangulated
and validated. The specific data collection methods used in the present study are outlined below.

### 3.3 Data collection methods

#### 3.3.1 Semi-structured, in-depth interviews

“…interviewing is becoming a global research method for understanding and making sense of the lives of the people of this world” (Jennings, 2005, p. 99). Jennings (2005) highlights that there are many ways of defining and undertaking interviews and for the purposes of the present research semi-structured, in-depth, face-to-face interviews were conducted. Interviews were chosen for their ability to glean in-depth data (Brotherton, 2008) as well as providing participants the opportunity the share their feelings concerning how they considered tourism to their sacred site impacted their experience, the site itself and the meaning of place.

Interviews were chosen to be semi-structured, as opposed to structured. This was to allow for questions to be left out, altered slightly or explained further if the situation required (Altinay & Paraskevas, 2008). This level of structure to interviews was also decided upon to allow for other feelings, experiences and views of participants to be conveyed even though they were not included as the key questions asked by myself. I considered it important to give participants this element of ‘freedom to speak’, particularly considering the topic and aim of the research.

Interviews were conducted with members of the regular congregations as well as selected staff of each of the case study sites. The case study sites and details regarding interviews are discussed below in section 3.4.

#### 3.3.1.1 Mapping

Mapping, as a data collection technique, has not commonly been used within the field of tourism impacts research. The purpose of the mapping exercise was to gain an understanding of two points of view of participants – where they felt the sacred place was and where they felt it was appropriate for tourists to go. The exercise was designed to gather a clear understanding of the physical boundaries of the places participants perceived and experienced. The maps therefore highlighted the ‘boundaries of sanctity’ as well as the ‘boundaries of acceptable touristic use’. 
These places, marked as specific areas on the maps, were able to be used as reference points when participants spoke of the site. Further to this, the two areas designated by participants (the sacred place and the appropriate areas for tourist access) were able to be compared and any ‘overlap’ or contrast of areas considered. The point at which tourists entered the sacred place and where they ‘overstepped’ the boundaries into areas that were not acceptable for them to be were clearly identified using the mapping exercise. This sort of exercise has value in marking clearly those areas otherwise merely assumed by researchers and planners. Further, this activity has application to other academic work related to tourism such as McCannell’s (1999) writing on front and back regions which furthers the work of Goffman (1959, cited in McCannell, 1999) as it shows specifically the areas that could be deemed front and back regions.

### 3.3.2 Observation

Participant observation is argued as “…the most appropriate method when the research is concerned with human meanings and interactions from the insiders’ perspective, especially where there are important differences between the views of insiders as opposed to outsiders” (Cole, 2005, p. 64). Observation, coupled with in-depth interviews is therefore an appropriate and valuable means by which to achieve the research’s desired aim of discovering the impacts of tourism at sacred places. By observing tourism to the chosen sacred sites, I could observe myself the number of visitors, their behaviour, other people’s relations and reactions to them and the impact on my own experience at the place. Specifically, I completed both participant (attending scheduled church services) and non-participant observation (observation at the sites outside of service times) (Altinay & Paraskevas, 2008; Brotherton, 2008) at the sites over a period of days (see section 3.4 for details). This allowed me to experience the impact of tourists to the sites during both structured, scheduled worship times as well as more personal, ‘free’ worship times.

While I was mindful that my own experience at the sacred place – and therefore any impact upon that experience due to tourism – would be quite different to those of the local worshipping community, my own experience could nonetheless inform participant interviews, assist in understanding responses offered by participants as well as triangulate and validate the data collected via interviews and the mapping exercise (Altinay & Paraskevas, 2008).
3.3.2.1 Photography

Photographs are a useful medium to visually convey tourist numbers, positions or gathering points and behaviour at a site. The notion of ‘a picture painting a thousand words’ is recognised by Veal (2006) who recommends the use of photography in conjunction with direct observation. Photography was used in the present research for the reasons which Veal describes, that is, to convey “[t]he level of crowding of a site, it’s nature and atmosphere…” (2006, p. 189). Further to these aims, photography of the case study sites was completed in order to show the size of the sites, their situation among their surroundings and tourist movement outside and within the sites. The scenes and situations captured in photographs of the sites aimed to support and validate the findings of the other research methods.

3.4 Research Process

3.4.1 Question formulation

Interview guides were created for semi-structured, in-depth interviews at the two selected sacred sites. Two sets of questions were created, one set for parishioners within the regular worshipping community and one set for staff members of the sites. Considering that questions must be created which have the research focus and approach in mind (Brotherton, 2008), both sets of questions were constructed with the aim of obtaining rich insight surrounding the central research question of the impacts of tourism to, and tourists at, sacred places.

Questions were the same for both sites, with slight alterations such as site name. Parishoner questions focused around the meaning of place and participant use of it; participant contact with tourists; impacts of tourism and tourists felt by participants; participant views on tourism development at, and regarding, the site; participant involvement in the tourism industry (see appendix A for a copy of the interview guide). Staff questions focused on contact with tourists as part of work roles; impacts of tourism and tourists felt by participants, particularly concerning the impact upon work role; tourism development at the site; business relationships the site has with visiting tourism operators; feelings surrounding possible tension between tourism and the sacred place (see appendix B for a copy of the interview guide).

Questions were constructed so as to be open-ended. This allowed participants to respond how they wished and provided me with rich, in-depth data. These open-ended questions were best suited to the research project as it was attempting to discover feelings, views and beliefs. This was necessary as the research investigates sacred places which, by their nature, require
explanation as to their meaning and importance for participants. Veal (2006, p. 133) supports this when stating that the unstructured, open-ended approach to question design is regarded as the most suitable where “…in-depth information is required to generate a ‘rich’ picture of the issues being investigated. Its inherent flexibility facilitates in-depth enquiry…” While questions were open-ended, they were the same for each person at each site. That is, the interview guide was followed as closely as possible for each person and I attempted to ask questions in the same order and using the same wording for each interview. While probing and clarification of questions was allowed, care was taken in order to ensure the reliability of the questions (Brotherton, 2008).

While a different set of questions were created for parishioners and staff, interviews were intended to be semi-structured and therefore flexible enough to encompass other comments and information that participants wished to provide (Veal, 2006). Also, this flexibility allowed me to probe participants if required and to ask extra questions where the opportunity arose. Veal (2006, p. 133) again supports this approach when stating “[t]his flexibility also enables more in-depth responses to be captured, which are often crucial in the collection of qualitative data”.

Questions were also focused around how participants felt as opposed to what they thought. Questions were framed this way as feeling is considered a more appropriate reference point than thought when investigating social impacts and particularly experience. Further to this, the research involves places of sanctity which inherently incorporate participant’s feelings and beliefs. Therefore, asking participants how they feel about tourism at their site is more likely to allow answers which attend the research aim and which provide rich responses.

Once created, questions were re-visited and, if required, altered to ensure they were clear and to exclude double-barrelled, leading or loaded questions (Brotherton, 2008). Once questions were finalised, they were ordered considering their content, interview ‘flow’ and the possibility of earlier questions influencing responses to later questions (Veal, 2006).

Demographic questions were also asked of both parishioners and staff. These questions were asked at the end of the interview. Demographic questions were asked in order to ascertain the mixture and range of participants compared to the wider worshipping community. This information could then highlight the validity of the sample.
3.4.2 Site Selection

A case study approach was utilised within the research. While the use of case studies has its limitations, they are also valuable for many reasons, including being “…the focus or ‘heart’ of the research as the unit of analysis…” (Beeton, 2005, p. 40). Beeton goes on to argue that “one particular strength of taking a case study approach lies in its holistic-inductive nature and grounding in actuality with an emic (insider’s) perspective, which is pertinent to applied disciplines such as tourism…” (2005, p. 40). Beeton’s support of a case study approach fits well with ethnographic research which, as mentioned above, involve taking an insider’s perspective. Beeton goes on to argue for the use of case studies when suggesting that they enable “…the researcher to obtain place-specific conceptual insights…” (Beeton, 2005, p. 39). This point is particularly pertinent considering the place specific and context-laden nature of the present research.

Two case study sites were chosen for the research. While others were considered, the Christchurch Anglican Cathedral in Christchurch and the Church of the Good Shepherd in Tekapo were selected. The sites selected for the research necessarily incorporated a few key elements. First, the site needed to be viewed as sacred or of spiritual importance by a community of people, however, this sanctity needed to be easily understood by, or identifiable to, the general public. Second, the site needed to have a community which held and used the space as a sacred place. This community is, for both sites, a section of the wider community and is known as the ‘worshipping community’. This worshipping community provided a select group from which the study’s participant sample was taken. Third, the site needed to have a degree of tourist visitation. These elements and their interaction may be represented in the following diagram:
Tourists may view worshipping community as 'part of' the site; their experience is impacted by worshipping community’s attitude towards tourists.

However,

Worshipping community may be impacted by tourist visitation to the site; worshipping and wider community may reply on tourism industry for livelihood options.

Sites within New Zealand were considered due to time and budgetary constraints, though indeed many sacred sites around the world would be ideal places to conduct the research.

The Christchurch Cathedral, Christchurch.

The Christchurch Cathedral, opened in 1881, was designed and built as a focal point of the early settlement of Christchurch City (Christchurch Cathedral, 2009a). The Cathedral is the centre for the Anglican diocese and a central feature of the Christchurch cityscape. Cathedral Square surrounds the cathedral and is also a well known feature of Christchurch and arguably a tourist hub.

The Cathedral hosts over 700,000 visitors per year and in 1995 built a visitors centre to accommodate its many domestic and international visitors (Christchurch Cathedral, 2009a). The Cathedral holds over 14 regular services per week and operates with a small number of paid staff and many volunteers (Christchurch Cathedral, 2009a). Volunteers are available to assist visitors and provide tours of the building. As well as being open daily for visitation, the cathedral hosts events and festivals such as ANZAC day commemorations and Kids Fest programmes (Christchurch Cathedral, 2009c, Programmes and Events section, para. 2).
The Cathedral is costly to operate. Costs amount to around $3,500 per day meaning that alternate sources of funding are welcome. Recently, the cathedral has positioned ‘donation’ boxes within the main entry and exit points, suggesting that visitors make a contribution of $5 to assist in maintenance and operation of the site. Cathedral management are also exploring other ways of increasing revenue. For example, donations towards the cathedral may now be accepted at a local supermarket (Christchurch Cathedral, 2009b, para. 1).

The cathedral is also an historic centre for the city. It houses memorial tablets to some of the founding members of Christchurch City and the Cathedral, antique books and Bibles and other artefacts of historical importance. There is also much history associated with various other aspects of the cathedral, for example, the Greenwood Memorial window which is dedicated to two of the earliest settlers of Christchurch and the bench-mark which is used today to measure the city’s height above sea-level (Christchurch Cathedral, 2009d, West Porch section, para. 7). The Cathedral is a multi-cultural place, housing also Maori tukutuku panels and a Pacific Chapel (Christchurch Cathedral Brochure, 2009a).

The Cathedral is one of 11 ‘major attractions’ within the Christchurch City Council’s Cultural Precinct (Cultural Precinct, 2009a). The webpage describing the cathedral mentions it as “…the heart and soul of the city” and as “…the most visited church in the country” (Cultural Precinct, 2009b, Christchurch Cathedral section, para. 1). The cultural precinct is designed to encourage visitation to sites within the precinct which covers a section of the central city. This means that, as part of the precinct, visitation to the cathedral is actively marketed and encouraged. This, in turn, means increased potential for impacts felt by the worshipping community of the Cathedral.

The worshipping community at the Cathedral can change depending upon the day and tourist numbers. There is, however, a core group of local worshippers who make up the Cathedral worshipping community and who call themselves ‘the Cathedral regulars’. It is this group that was identified as the sample of potential participants for the research.

*The Church of the Good Shepherd, Tekapo.*

The Church of the Good Shepherd sits on the shore of Lake Tekapo, South Canterbury. Opened in 1935, the church was built to the memory of early settlers to the region, particularly local run holders (Lovell-Smith, 2002). The church holds a Book of Remembrance which contains a list of the original Mackenzie run holders. These factors
make the church, not only a place of worship, but also a considerable historical site for the region and indeed New Zealand.

The church is built in a location surrounded by incredibly beautiful scenery. Indeed, the church is “…arguably one of the most photographed of New Zealand’s buildings” (Lovell-Smith, 2002, para. 1). The church was constructed to support the idea of “…making visible and framing the glory of God’s creation…” (Lovell-Smith, 2002, para. 6) with one of the main features of the interior being “…the panorama of the lake and mountains, visible through the plate glass window above the altar” (Lovell-Smith, 2002, para. 6).

The Church of the Good Shepherd is a “…major tourist attraction” (Lovell-Smith, 2002, para. 8). Many ‘package tours’ catering for tourists include the site in their itineraries (simple internet searches found that most South Island tours included the church in their trips), and the site is also marketed as a destination for package wedding celebrations. Through my own experience of the site and through discussions with other visitors, researchers and the current Minister for the church, observations and experience shows that most tourists to the site stay only for a short time as part of a through trip. Tekapo sits on the main inland North-South highway and the Tourism New Zealand mapping tool ‘Tourism Flows Model’ identifies 1,827,000 tourists travelling in the South Island directly through Tekapo (New Zealand Ministry of Tourism, 2009). While these figures indicate travel in both directions and the travel of domestic and international tourists, they are nevertheless potential visitors to the church. Further, popular travel guidebooks and readily available tourist brochures mention the church as one of the highlights of the Tekapo region. The factors mentioned above encourage tourist visitation to the site.

The church is part of the co-operating parish of Fairlie (Tekapo Tourism Ltd, 2009) with services held at the church once a month during winter and fortnightly during the summer months. While the Church of the Good Shepherd is owned by the Anglican Church, it is an inter-denominational church with services held by other Christian faiths. It is the local Anglican worshippers that formed the group from which participants for the research would come. This is because this group administer the place and was therefore the most readily available to be contacted by myself.
3.4.3 Establishing participant contact

Potential participants were recruited differently at each study site. At the Christchurch Cathedral it was intended that a notice would be placed in the monthly newsletter asking for research volunteers. However, the key informant did not do this and instead emailed the group of the Cathedral ‘regulars’ whom she considered may be interested in participating. In her email, the key informant briefly outlined the research and asked potential participants to contact her if they were interested in being involved. The details of those who were interested were then passed on to me and I in turn made contact with the participant. I am mindful of the limitations of this approach to recruiting participants, however, once I became aware of the change in recruiting method, the group had already been contacted.

At the Church of the Good Shepherd a notice was put in the parish newsletter. This notice briefly outlined the research and explained that participants were being sought. Participants contacted me directly using contact details included in the notice. I also attended a church service so that participants could approach me directly. I identified myself at this service during the ‘community time’ which usually occurs during the service and which involves the congregation introducing themselves.

In order to be involved in the study, participants needed to fit the participant profile. Once it was clear that the potential participant fit the required profile, an interview was arranged. This profile included being over eighteen years of age, being able to easily converse in English (this point was to ensure that ethical considerations, such as anonymity, were understood by the participant), and consider one of the two case study sites to be their main and regular place of worship. Instead of determining or defining ‘regular place of worship’ myself, I preferred that participants decided on this point. This allowed participants to be involved no matter how regular their worship, so long as they considered the site their sacred place. This also meant that the study included a diverse range of ‘visitation frequency’ among the participants making for a diverse sample. Further, I consider that impacts may be felt should the participant visit once a day or once a year.

3.4.4 Interview details

3.4.4.1 Interviews

Interviews for both sites were conducted over a period of three months, from November 2009 until January 2010, with most interviews conducted during November and December 2009. In
total, thirteen people were interviewed at the Christchurch Cathedral and seven were interviewed at the Church of the Good Shepherd. Of these, four participants at the Christchurch Cathedral answered staff questions with the remaining answering the personal questions and two participants answered both staff and personal questions. At the Church of the Good Shepherd, two participants answered the staff questions while the remaining answered the personal questions with one participant answering both. All participants were interviewed individually with the exception of one husband and wife couple from each site being interviewed at the same time, though they each answered questions individually.

For both sites interviews were conducted at either the participant’s home or at a location convenient to both researcher and participant. All interviews with Christchurch Cathedral participants were conducted within Christchurch City and all interviews with Church of the Good Shepherd participants were conducted in Tekapo. Most (18/20) interviews were voice recorded (with the permission of the participant) with hand-written notes taken for the remaining two. Participants were given a small gift at the end of the interview, as a gesture of appreciation for their time and energy. This gift was given at the end of the interview and without the participant’s prior knowledge. This was done in order to eliminate the possibility that participants perceived it to be a coercive measure to ensure their participation or that the gift may influence participant responses.

Gathering the specific age of participants was considered unnecessary considering the aims of the research. Therefore, the age of participants was gathered within ‘brackets’. The age of participants ranged from 46-75+ years with most participants belonging to the 56-65 (seven participants) and 66-75 (seven participants) year old brackets. I am mindful of the older age of the sample of participants. This sample, however, is reflective of the general age range of regular congregation members of both sites, as reported by congregation members and staff. Indeed, it was suggested by members of the worshipping community of the sites that congregations are aging meaning that the research sample was indicative of the general trend in age of the regular worshipping communities. Eleven women and nine men participated.

### 3.4.4.2 Mapping

Participants who answered the parishioners set of questions were also asked to complete two mapping exercises. At the start of the interview participants were given two maps and asked to mark where they felt the sacred place was. The first of the two maps was a floor plan of their sacred site, the second was a map of the site including an area of landscape surrounding the site (see appendix C for copies of these maps). Maps were sourced from archives and
Google Earth images, though the floor plan map for the Church of the Good Shepherd was
sketched by myself owing to no map of this site being readily available. The participants were
instructed that if they believed the sacred site extended beyond the boundaries of the first map
to then move on to the second and if they believed the sacred place extended beyond the
boundaries of the second map to tick a box found on the map. Participants were provided with
highlighters to mark.

The purpose of the sacred place mapping exercise was to get a tangible idea of ‘where’ the
sacred place is and therefore where tourists ‘enter’ it. Also, maps showing the sacred place
could be compared with the second mapping exercise.

The second mapping exercise was completed at the end of the interview. Participants were
given a fresh set of the same maps used for the first mapping exercise. Upon these maps
participants were requested to mark where they felt it was appropriate for tourists to go.

The purpose of the acceptable tourist access mapping exercise was to obtain a tangible idea of
where participants, as opposed to church officials, considered it appropriate for tourists to go
within the sites. Also, these maps were then able to be compared to the maps showing
participant’s view of the sacred place.

Some participants required reiteration of the fact that the research was interested in their
personal opinion as opposed to the church’s definition, or rules, as to where the sacred place is
and where tourists are allowed to go. The researcher is mindful that some responses,
particularly regarding where it is appropriate for tourists to go, may be based on respondent’s
perception of where the church has deemed sacred or defined where tourists may or may not
enter.

3.4.5 Observation and photography details

3.4.5.1 Observation

Both participant observation and ‘unobtrusive’ observation were completed at the sites. This
was done in order to compliment other data collection techniques and to triangulate data.
Observations focused on visitor volumes, movement and behaviour at the sites as well as the
reactions of worshipers using the site. Four observation days were completed at each site,
incorporating scheduled services (participant observation) and non-service times (unobtrusive
observation). Observation days included between two and four separate sessions, lasting around an hour per session. The location of the researcher during the sessions alternated between inside the site and outside and also at varying places within or outside the site. One day at each site included solely observing a scheduled service with no other observation. Three of the four observation days took place during the summer tourist season while one observation day was completed during the winter tourist season, at both sites. During non-service time observations I wrote brief notes whereas during service time observations notes were written following completion of the worship service.

The diversity in observation time within the day (between 9am and 7pm at each site), location inside and outside - as well as different points within or outside these locations - and time during the tourist season allowed for me to gather a rich picture of the sites as well as note any changes in local usage and, importantly, any changes in tourist number, movement or behaviour due to these factors. Also, the complimentary nature of observing both scheduled services and non-scheduled worship times was valuable. This allowed me to gain an understanding of any differences between the different worship ‘types’ (scheduled or personal) regarding the impacts created by tourists to the sites. Observations were also completed over a range of days of the week in order to capture traditional Sunday use along with weekday use.

I was mindful, both before and during my observations, of the potential for my presence to impact others’ experience as well as the data I collected (Brotherton, 2008; Cole, 2005). During all observation I attempted to be as discrete as possible. I noted that, during observations inside the sites, but outside of scheduled service times, my presence may well have altered visitors behaviour at the sites, and therefore what I observed to be ‘normal’ tourist behaviour, and impact upon worshipper experience. Visitors may have considered me to be praying or participating in another form of worship meaning they altered their behaviour accordingly. This, however, would be the case also if I was a member of the local worshipping community meaning that any alterations in visitor behaviour due to my presence would be the same as if I was a regular worshiper. My presence, and any alteration to observed visitor behaviour are considered, therefore, to be ‘real’. Indeed, changes to tourist behaviour upon noticing my presence in the site is a notable observation in itself.

### 3.4.5.2 Photography

During participant observation sessions photographs were also taken. Photographs were taken in order to highlight the physical location and layout of the sites, the number of visitors to
each site as well as visitor movement around and within the site. For ethical reasons, photographs were taken so as to make it difficult to identify individuals, however, if this was impossible, the faces of individuals within reported photographs are pixilated to protect privacy. Photographs were taken over a diversity of the days of observations (Sunday and a variety of weekdays) so as to capture variations in time during the week, during the day and period within the tourist season. The permission of church officials was obtained prior to photography of the sites and no photographs were taken during scheduled services.

### 3.5 Data analysis

#### 3.5.1 Interview analysis

Notes from interviews which were not voice recorded were immediately re-written to ensure they were understandable and clear. Voice recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim. All participants were offered the option of reviewing the notes of their interview in order for them to feel they had ownership over their contribution. Those who accepted this offer were sent a copy and replied with any alterations, deletions or additions. These changes were included in the final notes used for analysis. All interview participants had an opportunity within which to alter or withdraw their contribution. A ‘cut-off’ date was necessary, however, so that the data could be analysed. Participants were informed of this and a date suitable to both interview participant and myself was agreed upon.

Interview transcriptions were printed and physically cut and pasted onto large sheets of paper. This physical method of organisation was chosen over a method completed on computer as it better suited my learning and working style. For ease of organisation, participant responses to individual questions were grouped (i.e. pasted) together onto each sheet of paper. Each response was identified by an ID number associated with the participant from whom the response came. This meant that participants and responses could easily be matched if need be. This was an effective method of organisation which also allowed for comparison of responses between participants at each site as well as between sites.

Coding of responses was achieved using different colour highlighters. Responses were reviewed and coded to relevant emergent themes. These themes emerged during the transcription process as well as during review of responses for coding. Other relevant information and responses that did not fit into the emergent themes were also noted and ‘flagged’ for analysis.
Once coded, individual question responses were analysed between participants within a site as well as across the two sites. Patterns and themes were again considered. Themes were also analysed against other participants within the site and between the two sites. Other relevant information and responses that did not fit into themes were also analysed for patterns and consistency. See appendix D for an example of the analysis sheets.

The data analysis was also verified. In order to do this, a colleague who has also studied social science at the postgraduate level confirmed that the raw data I had allocated to each theme was consistent and appropriate. This was accomplished by my reading to her, each of the interview quotes I considered as supporting each theme. Validity was high as the colleague agreed with every example of participant response supporting the themes.

3.5.2 Map analysis

Maps received for individual questions at each site were combined onto a single map of the same area. The markings of individual participants were transferred onto the map using a different coloured highlighter for each participant. This allowed me to easily compare and contrast participant markings while still knowing which participant created which marking. The mapping exercise data was analysed separately for each exercise (i.e. sacred place and areas of acceptable tourism access) as well as for each site. Once the sites had been analysed individually they were then compared against each other.

The maps concerning where the sacred place is were analysed to consider where participants had marked the sacred place to be. Maps were considered on an individual level as well as compared to other participants of the site. Where participants had marked was also related to the features of the site, the surrounding landscape and where visitors to those places are currently allowed access. Markings for this question were also compared to comments made by participants during interviews.

The maps concerning where participants felt it was appropriate for tourists to go were analysed to consider where participants marked as appropriate. Maps were considered on an individual level as well as compared to other participants of the site. These markings were compared to the areas currently open to tourist access, to comments made by participants during interviews and also to the areas where participants deemed the sacred place to be.
3.5.3 Observation analysis

Immediately after observation sessions, notes were re-written, clarified and expanded upon. These notes were read by myself and considered against the content of participant interviews and mapping exercises. Once themes became clear through analysis of interview data, these themes were then considered during re-analysis of the observation notes and any theme supporting observations identified. Similarly, any contrasting data was identified, where, for example, my observations countered what was suggested during interviews.

When analysing observation notes, the time of day, time within tourist season, weather, and service/non-service situation were also considered. The observations made during scheduled service times were particularly noted as many of the impacts reported by interview participants occurred during these times. Observations were compared against each other, at the same site, as well as to the other case study site.

3.5.4 Photo analysis

Photos were considered in relation to observation notes, participant interviews and mapping exercises. Photo content was particularly analysed for number of visitors, position of visitors and their behaviour. These considerations were taken into account for photos taken both inside and outside the sites. Similar to observation notes, the content of photos was considered in relation to time during the tourist season, weather and whether it was the time of a scheduled service or not. Photographs were compared against others at the same site, but taken during different sessions, as well as those taken at the other case study site.

3.6 Chapter summary

This Methods chapter has covered the research approach, specific data collection methods, research process and data analysis. The research approach section involved a description of the study being ethnographic in nature which necessarily employed qualitative research methods. The concept of reflexivity was also discussed. Following this, the specific data collection methods employed in the research were outlined. These include semi-structured, in-
depth interviews with members of the worshipping community, including a mapping exercise and participant and ‘unobtrusive’ observations, including photography of the sacred places. The chapter then described how the raw data would be analysed, including analysis of interview transcriptions, completed maps, observation notes, and printed photographs.
Chapter 4
Results

4.1 Introduction

This chapter consists of four sections. First, a definition of sacred place is created by using the results of the first mapping exercise and interview data. The results of the maps upon which participants marked where they felt the sacred place is are reported. Also, interview responses regarding the meaning of the sacred place for participants are also reported. These two sets of data combine to define exactly ‘where’ the sacred place is and the meaning the place has in the lives of participants. Second, an important finding which emerged from the data is reported upon. This finding relates to a distinction interview participants made regarding those who come to their sacred place. The ‘tourist’ / ‘visitor’ distinction, as defined by participants, is explained. Third, the impacts which emerged during analysis of interview data are described. These impacts are first listed in a table explaining each impact’s positive, negative and ‘neutral’ or ‘grey-area’ aspects. This table is intended to create a ‘quick-reference’ for the reader. The results are loosely grouped according to whether they regard pragmatic impacts due to tourism or those which regard impacts upon experience. This loose grouping of the impacts exists in order to create structure for the reader. Where applicable, each impact is followed by my own observations and photographs which support the findings. These three types of data (interviews, observations and photos) are included together following each impact so that they may support each other, thereby increasing validity, and so that the material flows easily for the reader. The last section within this chapter relates to tourism development preferences. This section will report upon the results of the second mapping exercise regarding appropriate places for tourists to go, as well as interview data regarding the tourism development preferences of participants.

I was mindful that, when reporting the results of interviews, participants may be personally identified by their responses. Therefore, all participants have been assigned pseudonyms and any quotations which may have identified an individual participant have been omitted.
4.2 Sacred place defined

I felt it was important that research participants had the opportunity to themselves define the sacred place we were discussing. Participants were able to do this via the first mapping exercise and specific interview questions regarding meaning of place. During the mapping exercise, participants were asked to report upon their feeling of where, physically, the sacred place was for them. This exercise shows the ‘boundaries of sanctity’ and, therefore, at which point specifically tourists ‘enter’ the sacred place. Discovering the meaning of place was a key research question. This information provides a greater understanding of the effect of impacts upon the participant as well as why it is necessary to consider the impacts of tourism to and tourists at sacred places. The results of the sacred place mapping exercise and meaning of place questions are reported and briefly discussed in relation to relevant literature.

4.2.1 Sacred place maps – the boundaries of sanctity.

All participants recorded, on a map of their site, the area they felt was the sacred place. The definition of a sacred place, as set apart from the non-sacred, is something that Digance recognises in his 2006 work. Participant’s feelings of the sanctity of the places they marked, i.e. why it was the sacred place, were based on many factors, including practical and symbolic use, history, people, atmosphere and reverence. Shackley’s work relates here, where she covers the range of perceptions of sacred space, highlighting that “…perceived esteem or sanctity discriminates such sites from the profane world” (2001, p. 14). Over all of the maps, for both sites, the sacred place always involved the built structure (the church or Cathedral) and often specific areas within, or certain areas outside of, the building itself. Woodward’s work (2004) acknowledges that the areas adjacent but external to a sacred place may also be considered a part of it. Woodward also acknowledges that management issues can arise when this area is considered sacred by some but is used by tourists “…like any other plaza, with little respect to local custom or the value accorded to that place” (2004, p. 174). Interestingly, though not surprisingly, some participants from the Church of the Good Shepherd also marked the sacred place as the area outside that can be seen from inside the church. The view from inside, through the Altar window extending up lake Tekapo and to the distant mountains, was considered by some as the sacred place (see appendix E for an example of this). Mary, for example, explains, “that little church with the hills behind there is very
special”. The same connection to the exterior of the place was not reported by those at the Cathedral. Some participants at both sites considered all of creation to be the sacred place.

An interesting aspect to arise from the sacred place mapping exercise was that many participants viewed certain areas as ‘more’ sacred or as being of a different ‘level’ of sanctity (see Appendix F for an example of this). These areas were often certain points or features within the sites and more often than not the Altar (or High Altar at the Cathedral) was seen as more sacred by those who considered there to be different levels of sanctity. Michelle, for example, explains these different levels and states, “I tend to think of the whole interior of the Church is sacred, so, with the sanctuary being the most sacred”. Joseph supports this view when he reports that “there is one place in the Cathedral that everybody knows is the most sacred place….the High Altar”. Ava also speaks of a “different kind of sacredness” for different areas within, or people who visit, the Church. Speaking of these levels of sanctity, she suggests, “no one would sort of disagree that the Altar really is a sacred place because it’s a focus and a symbolism for us as a worshipping community, but then, the next level down is everywhere where people are”. Further to different levels of sanctity, some participants considered that the sanctity of the place changed during different times of the day and with different people at the site. Rosa, for example, explains,

the actual feeling of spirituality of the place is, on certain occasions, it’s more than others….particularly when we’ve got visitors coming through, it’s, and you have to stop them coming in with their food and things like that, it doesn’t particularly, you know, it feels it’s being, not exactly downgraded, but it doesn’t feel so spiritual.

The above statements by participants, from both sacred places, suggest that the boundaries of sanctity, and indeed the levels of sanctity, are fluid as opposed to concrete or defined to specific areas, times or people within and outside the sites. The sacred place, as defined by the local worshipping community, has relevance to where tourists are currently allowed to go, how this effects the impacts felt by the worshipping community and to the management practices used to mitigate negative impacts. The fluidity, or lack of, clear boundaries surrounding a sacred place can create issues for its management, a point that is highlighted in Carlisle’s 1998 work. The definition of where, or what, the sacred place is closely relates to the meaning of place for the worshipping community.
When comparing participant’s sacred place maps with the maps indicating where it is acceptable for tourists to go, both worshipping communities indicated that tourists are acceptable and allowed access to the sacred places, so long as they are kept within certain boundaries. Members of the worshipping community generally consider that the point at which tourists enter the sacred place is when they enter the physical structure of the building, or at least go onto the church grounds. There are certain areas that tourists are currently not allowed to go within the sites and these correlate with areas where participants marked as not appropriate for tourists to go. However, these places, for example the vestry, are not ones where the local worshipping community may retreat to in order to ‘escape’ tourists and attain a quieter, more peaceful space. These places of potential retreat may be considered ‘back regions’ (MacCannell, 1999) however they are not able to be used by the local worshipping community. It is more likely that the local worshipper will leave the site altogether (as mentioned by some participants and discussed in Section 5.4) and use a different site as their local place of worship, partake in a different style of worship or not worship at all. This point leads onto the issue which arises when a site is ‘irreplaceable’ and not able to be substituted by another site. For example, if a sacred place is a specific physical location, such as a sacred mountain or grove with certain sacred attributes, it may be impossible for worship to take place at a site other than the specific sacred place itself.

The areas marked as regions where locals wish for tourists to not go are all areas (unless they are currently ‘work’ areas and therefore behind locked doors) which are on display or open for access constantly, as part of the sacred place. These areas, therefore, are not able to be ‘saved’ as back regions, for example, one of the side chapels at the Cathedral, or the Altars at both sites. Other areas that may be secured as back regions for use by the local worshipping community are few, particularly at the Church of the Good Shepherd where the physical structure of the building involves no areas other than the small, square inside of the church. There are no options of areas that the local worshipping community may turn into back regions within the sites. This may mean that any back region creation must occur off-site, leaving the sacred site itself as a front region available for consumption by tourists. This may not be an issue for those from the worshipping community who feel that the sacred place involves all of creation, however, it may indeed be an issue for those who consider the sacred place to be the building itself meaning that to worship and encounter God requires the physical structure of the building now turned ‘front region’ for tourists.
4.2.2 The meaning of place.

One of the questions interview participants were asked was based on the meaning of place. This aspect of the interview was designed to ascertain what the place meant to the worshipping community and the importance of the place within their lives therefore indicating how the impacts of tourism to their sacred place relate to the lives of the place’s regular worshippers. Participants were asked what the place meant to them, what it meant in their life. Responses were varied though many focused on personal spirituality and history. Olivia, for example, stated that her sacred place, “puts the spiritual balance in….and you try and live your life by better principles…some source of guidance and worship and thanksgiving”. Joseph explains succinctly when he states that, for him, the place means “everything”. Some participants specifically mentioned the concept of place when they responded, Nathan, for example, stating that “it’s a special place that focuses on spirituality which is important to me….it encourages me to think about the larger issues of life, take you out of yourself”. Hannah also suggests the importance of the specific sacred place when she states, “it centres my faith, my worship, I need to, sort of, be there to be contemplative and to reflect upon the things that are important to me”. Hannah’s statement clearly identifies that the place itself is specific and necessary for her reflection and worship time. The centrality of the place is also identified by Michelle when she suggests her sacred place is “a home and it’s a cog in the community”. Jacob, further explains the diversity of the meaning of place when he remarks it is a “place of retreat, reassurance, history, an oasis in the hectic city”. Jacob mentions the aspect of history which is also suggested by others. This historical component may be broadly focused, as suggested by Maria when she suggests the Cathedral “means history, you know, New Zealand history, Christchurch history, it means a continuation of religious history, it’s just got such a wonderful feeling, healing feel to it”. This historical feeling can also be on a personal level, as suggested by Mary when she talks of the Church of the Good Shepherd, “it’s something that I’ve always associated with Tekapo….after forty years of holidays and families and things, it’s rather special”.

Clearly, the meaning and the definition of a sacred place varies considerably from person to person. The definition of where exactly the sacred place is and its meaning in one’s life is extremely personal and specific to individuals. For many, the place is a bounded, specific area and one which is deeply and inextricably rooted in their personal and spiritual life. Impacts, therefore, felt by participants due to tourism at those specific places, may indeed be deeply felt, at a spiritual, as well as day-to-day or pragmatic level.
It is important to note, also, that the meaning the sacred place has for members of the worshipping community is likely to be different to that of the tourists who visit. While ‘visitors’ (as defined by the worshipping community) may have a similar focus to that of the worshipping community, according to the worshipping community the ‘tourist’ group attaches more profane meaning to the place (discussed further in Section 4.3). This distinction relates to the previously mentioned literature surrounding the interface between the sacred and the profane (Shackley, 2005) and the opposing “…modalities of social conduct” (Shoval, 2000, p. 253) that is tourism and religion. Tourists to the sacred place may ascribe a very different meaning to it than do the worshipping community.

4.3 Tourists or visitors?

Perhaps the most unexpected, though not unsurprising, result to come from data analysis is that the worshipping community considers there to be two distinct groups of people who come to the place. Most participants perceived there to be a distinction between the two groups and the terms offered by participants are ‘tourists’ and ‘visitors’. Jacob succinctly states this when he suggests, “there’s a difference between visitors at service and tourists” while Mark concurs “there is a bit of a distinction between the two groups”. A thorough explanation of the difference between tourists and visitors to the sacred places is offered by Olivia. She explains of,

two groups, there are tourists who come to have a look and they’re passing through and there’s a second group of people who are visitors, who are visiting the town and like to have, use the place for some sort of worship and those visitors could be on a bus as well but if they’re able to, they would like to spend some time worshipping in the Church or coming to a service or, but there are a number of people who just walk in and out, maybe want to get a photograph, it really, it’s just a building and a place to stop, it’s on the tourist maps and so it’s their ‘must do’ and the guides, obviously on the bus trips, have mentioned it, there are others who do just stop for a quick look, that are freelance travellers, but I put them in as the tourist group and then I put some of the others as the visitor group because they do spend time using the Church for their own individual worship.
Olivia’s quote suggests two separate groups visiting the site, with different motivations and behaviours. While Olivia distinguishes tourists from visitors based upon motivation and behaviour, others also recognise a religious or spiritual distinction between the two groups. For example, Michelle states,

I put them in two sections, there’s the ones who are the pilgrims and then the others who just see it as an icon, they just know that it has a beautiful picture out of the window, and they’ll come in and take a photo and go out again.

Similarly, Paul suggests that,

you get Christians, Christians who are practicing Christians that will come in and sit down and sit for a while, might be the only church they go near in a three month tour and then you get the non-Christians, the Asians, all though some of them are very devout Christians, but you know, walk in and push their way out, not at all interested.

Again, the religious or spiritual motivation of some tourists to the sites is questioned by Benjamin when he mentions the difference between the two groups. He suggests,

it’s the ones that come in and go click, click and straight back out the door again I don’t think they are there for any particular religious reason, but the campervans and rental cars and that, that are going through, I think they’re a different kettle of fish, they really are coming because they, I think they’re coming more because they want to, because they could just drive straight past if they didn’t want to come to the church, the bus ones stop because they have to because it’s part of the, it’s part of the route isn’t it, yeah, so there probably is a difference between those two, two groups of people.

Nathan also recognises a difference between the two groups when speaking of those tourists who attend a worship service and those who do not,

interestingly enough, those tourists that come out to the tea or coffee have been there for worship, not to look at the building, you know, and they’ve been part of the worship service so it’s a natural flow on into coffee and tea so it’s different than those tourists who just come in and wander round and have a look.
Nathan and Hannah further define the tourist/visitor distinction when they state,

Hannah: the visitors who come for a service they are obviously people who go to church somewhere else so they are quite intent on coming to church, even, although they’re not in their home ground and, yeah, they’re very different aren’t they,

Nathan: yeah, the tourists are those people who’ve been told, Christchurch, right, you need to visit the Antarctic Centre, the Museum, the Gardens, and the Cathedral and it’s almost as if they’re ticking them off.

Hannah goes on to explain the tourist group as “sometimes they just go in and look up and look down and come out and say ‘it’s a beautiful place’ and they’ve done it within about 10 seconds”. Ava further suggests, “some people are there purely for worship while maybe others are more interested in the funny clothes that the people are wearing, taking the service, you know, it’s just different reasons that people are in”. Ava’s definition again is based upon the tourist’s motivation of visit. The clear distinction that the local worshipping community makes between tourists and visitors undoubtedly has an impact upon their perception of both groups and possibly upon the impacts they create. Through analysis of interview responses it was clear that generally visitors are welcomed and appreciated at worship services. To reiterate, for example, Mary states, “the ones that come to the service, I think it’s great”. The worshipping community sees this group as adding richness to their own experience as well as the visitor’s experience (as explained below in Section 4.4.3). The difference in the two groups, and the implications of this distinction, are discussed further in Section 5.2.

4.4 Tourism impacts

4.4.1 Introduction

This section discusses the impacts that emerged during data analysis. Each impact is briefly discussed and direct quotes are provided as examples of participant responses. These quotes are supported by my own observations at the sites as well as photographs to illustrate certain points.

Seven impacts emerged during analysis and these are common across both staff and parishioners of the sacred places as well as across both case study sites. Within table 4.1
(below), the positive, negative and ‘grey area’ aspects of each impact are considered. Stating these aspects highlights the complexity of the situation that exists for sacred places and their managers and caretakers. An individual impact may have both negative and positive aspects and different people may consider different aspects to exist. Within and following the table, impacts have been listed including those which relate to pragmatic aspects of the place and then those which relate to the experience at the place. The impacts are grouped this way in order to create flow for the reader. Furthermore, tourism research often deals with either practical/physical or experiential impacts meaning searches for these impacts are easily completed within the present study. Furthermore, practical or experiential impacts relates to carrying capacities, that is, practical impacts relate to physical carrying capacity and experiential impacts relate more readily to social carrying capacity.

It is important to consider that, as mentioned earlier, many participants consider there to be a difference between ‘tourists’ and ‘visitors’. This distinction will have undoubtedly had a bearing on the responses made by participants, depending on whether they were considering tourists or visitors. At times I attempted to ascertain which group respondents were speaking of, however, this was not always possible. This is because ascertaining this would have interrupted the flow of the interview and, furthermore, this trend in the data was only clearly evident towards the end of the interview process and following rigorous data analysis. In the following sections, where the tourist/visitor distinction may have a bearing on the reported impacts, a brief discussion is offered.

Table 4.1 Reported impacts as a result of tourism at the sacred places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practical/Pragmatic related impacts</th>
<th>Positive:</th>
<th>Negative:</th>
<th>Grey area:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Benefit</td>
<td>Money available for maintenance, development, mission work, staff wages.</td>
<td>Commercial activity in sacred places impacts upon spirit of place. May be considered an inappropriate mixing of sacred/profane or spiritual/commercial realities.</td>
<td>Complexity of situation where increased tourist numbers = increased finances but also increased need for tourist amenities and potential for negative impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to place or worship service</td>
<td>Changes may make the place more safe/comfortable for</td>
<td>Changes may move the focus of the place away from one of worship</td>
<td>Changes may be required anyway and not necessarily due to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical impact to the site</td>
<td>Mitigation work may make the place more safe/comfortable for worshipping community.</td>
<td>Repair/maintenance costs borne by the place. Mitigation work may move the site in the direction of tourist attraction and/or alter its spirit of place.</td>
<td>Alterations to the place, in order to mitigate physical impacts may actually improve it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience related impacts</td>
<td><strong>Positive:</strong> Avenue to evangelise, as encouraged in The Bible.</td>
<td><strong>Negative:</strong> Possibility of tourists rejecting faith as they are ‘on holiday’. Tourist does not associate spiritual change to the place.</td>
<td><strong>Grey area:</strong> Effectiveness of attempts to evangelise not necessarily known immediately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for mission</td>
<td>Positive experience for tourists. Sacred place is successful in evangelising.</td>
<td>Spiritual experience may not be known to sacred place managers. Tourist may align with a different faith/religion.</td>
<td>Tourists may have a spiritual experience at the place but not attribute it to the place itself or its associated religion, yet, the place has contributed resources towards the tourist experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for spiritual experience within tourists</td>
<td>Behaviour may be an avenue for education of tourists regarding their behaviour.</td>
<td>Tourists may consider that behavioural norms do not apply to them as they are not religious adherents of the place. Offensive for the worshipping community. Alters spirit of place.</td>
<td>Tourist may not be open to education regarding their behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate behaviours of tourists</td>
<td>Increased ‘richness’ to the experience of the worshipping community. More people involved in worship services.</td>
<td>Potential for crowding. Increased numbers of tourists may mean local worshippers stay away.</td>
<td>Increased numbers can mean more positive impacts but also more negative impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased numbers at the place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

worshipping community. Tourists may feel more welcome at the place. towards that of tourist attraction. Costs of changes are borne by the place. Changes may alter the site’s spirit of place. tourism.
**4.4.2 Practical/pragmatic related impacts**

The below impacts are those which were reported by the worshipping community and which relate to practical or pragmatic aspects of tourism to, and tourists at, the sacred places. These impacts include the financial benefit of tourism to the place, changes to the place or worship services and physical impacts towards the site.

### 4.4.2.1 Financial benefit of tourist visitation

The financial benefit of tourists to the sacred places is recognised as a positive impact to arise from their visits. As was mentioned earlier in the literature review, many sacred sites face the constant pressure of a lack of financial resources. This position is recognised by many respondents as well as the potential for funds to be gained from tourist visitation to the sites.

This consideration is exemplified by one participant stating, “the visitors do bring income….but we need that in order to keep the place running” (Matthew). Another respondent identified the same impact when explaining that the money tourists donate “all adds to this huge cost of running the place and you can’t get away from the fact that money is necessary to keep up a place like that” (Rosa). Meredith specifically recognises the financial position of the church, its consequential reliance upon tourist donations and the fact that these donations help keep the site open, she states,

> they’re in a tough place, I know they’re in a tough place and it costs a lot of money to keep this place going and I really like it to be open and I like it to be so welcoming to people and it might not be if they didn’t have the money that they have.
Some respondents seemed reserved when mentioning the financial aspect of tourist visitation to the sacred places. This hesitation regarding the financial contribution that tourists may make is seen clearly in the following two responses regarding tourists to the sites. Joseph, for example, mentions “it’s a horrible answer, but it’s true, we need their money”. Hesitation in mentioning tourist’s financial contribution is also seen with Benjamin stating “the finance, dare I say it, but that comes into it too”. Hesitation when mentioning the financial aspect of tourist visitation may be linked to one of the main beliefs of the Christian worldview upon which the two sites are based. Christian belief suggests that these places be open and welcoming to visitors. Therefore, the fact that money is collected from their visit, even as a donation, may be uncomfortable for some respondents to acknowledge. Michelle mentions this when she remarks on tourists giving a set amount, as instructed by external tour guides, as opposed to what they wish, she explained she felt it was better that tourists,

put in what they feel like they wanna put in, I think it’s a lot better and I believe it’s scripturally better as well….people should give cheerfully and willingly and not be treating it like a venue where you have to pay to go in.

While many respondents recognise that the financial benefit of tourist visitation may contribute to the maintenance and general operations of the two sacred sites, some also recognise that these funds may be used for mission work. Olivia, for example, suggests that a positive aspect of tourist visitation is the “donations they make and that, so that makes, you know, God’s work more achievable”. Ava also suggests that “we rely on them for a lot of our income, to support the ministry here”.

The photos below show donation boxes at both sites, situated in places where tourist flows are high, optimising potential for visitors to make contributions.
Financial contributions can be made at the Church of the Good Shepherd via two separate donations boxes. One outside (above) and another inside the Church itself.
Financial contributions can be made at the Cathedral via two separate donations boxes, both inside the Cathedral.

A positive impact to come from tourist visitation to the sites therefore is the financial contributions they can make. While some members of the worshipping community may feel uncomfortable about receiving financial benefit from welcoming visitors, these are received as donations at both sites and may therefore be gifted at will by those visiting. These contributions may then be used for the general operation and maintenance of the sites as well as specific work of the places.

**4.4.2.2 Changes to the place or worship services**

Another impact reported by participants was changes to the service or place due to tourist visitation. Staff participants were best placed to report upon changes to the services they provided at the sites, in order to accommodate and welcome tourists. Benjamin, for example, states, “we cut and build the service to accommodate the visitors”. Elizabeth, also reports that “when I’m preaching I keep that in my mind, that there are going to be people there that come from, well, often away from home too and they might be feeling lonely”.

As well as services, the place itself is altered in order to accommodate or manage those who are not part of the regular worshipping community. These changes would not exist if tourists did not visit the sites in such large numbers. For example, Luke states that,

we now have audio tours in six different languages, our entry brochure’s in eight different languages and we now have, we’ve boosted up product in our gift store here and I think our signage and all that stuff, we try to improve that….there are two donations boxes, we’ll, we only ever used to have one.

This quote not only shows the changes to the place due to tourism, but also the way that the site is managed in order to maximise the financial contribution that tourists may make towards the site. Another strategy used to manage tourist movement around the same site, as well as optimise their financial contribution while there, is reported by Rosa; “we let people in through the front door and then they have to go out through the shop, we have a, the one-way door there”. These measures would not be in place if there were not such large volumes of tourists visiting the place.

The photograph below shows how signage manages the flow of tourists at the Cathedral so that they exit via the Visitors Centre, as mentioned above by Rosa.
Guides and volunteers at both case study sites are also used to welcome and manage the tourists that visit. Matthew explains this when he states, “our sides people, all volunteers are trained to welcome them and at the same time to make sure they just don’t go wandering around with a camera”. Guides and volunteers can also alter the place slightly in order to manage tourists and their behaviours, Olivia emphasises this when she states that “when Benjamin’s on doing guiding, he usually puts a CD on and it’s interesting how that keeps the, just the wee bit of background music keeps things quiet”.

Other management techniques are employed in order to minimise impact from tourism at the sites as well as ensure a positive experience for tourist and local worshipper alike. Olivia reports on the discretionary management of photography at one of the sites and states, there are times when you’re better not to have photography in the church because it’s just such a jam up while you’ve got, everyone’s trying to, get out of the road saying I want to get some photos, it just takes so long that being able to have the discretion of putting that sign up at busy times and not have photographs where at other times when it’s quiet, allow people if they want to take a photograph, that’s fine.

Thomas also speaks of prayers being said once an hour, at one of the study sites, in order to remind tourists that the site is a sacred place and working church. “On the hour somebody will go into the pulpit and there’ll be a prayer said” (Thomas). My observations of the Prayers on the Hour showed that around half of the tourists in the place at that time stopped and took notice of the prayer being said. Many tourists, however, did not stop walking, talking or taking photographs. Again, this raises the question of whether these tourists do not understand the prayer time, what is expected of them during it, or whether they simply do not wish to alter their behaviour. Thomas supports this observation when he states, “I notice some people who are walking around, it has no effect whatever, they just keep on walking.” As mentioned by participants, and reported on in section 4.4.3.2, however, those tourists who do not stop to pray/reflect during the Prayer on the Hour may well still have a spiritual experience at the place. The only issue with their lack of alteration of behaviour arises when this impacts other’s ability to reflect/pray at that time.

Notices and signage are also employed at both sites. These are aimed at directing tourist flows and managing tourist behaviour. Ava explains this when she states,
what we do is try to restrain where that tidal movement is, just by putting a notice halfway down the naves, saying if you’re not coming to the service, you know, it’d be great if you stayed back behind this notice….we do try and keep people away from taking photos of services and that’s during the week as well, so we have, we position volunteers just so that they will, softly keep people from seeing the services as a spectator sport, and taking photos of them.

Observations at both case study sites showed that management techniques are used at various places around the site. As mentioned by participants, these are employed in order to manage tourists and mitigate negative impacts. These management techniques are effective to varying degrees, though certainly the reported signs, volunteers, guides and other changes to place and service would not exist if tourist numbers to the sites were not so high. Examples of signage and other tourist management techniques are shown below.

The sign below is placed outside the Church of the Good Shepherd during scheduled services. The sign shows how ministry is extended towards tourists as well as asking for their respect during services.
Another sign and barrier inside the site limits tourist access to the Altar and asks for respect of the sanctity of the place.
The interior of the Church of the Good Shepherd faces towards the window shown below meaning this sign, to be read from the outside, aims to minimise the impact of tourists outside upon those worshipping inside.
The signage below, from the Christchurch Cathedral, asks for quiet and the absence of photography during services. This sign is placed in certain areas inside the Cathedral when services take place.

![Image of signage](image)

**4.4.2.3 Physical impact to the site**

The physical impact to the sacred place sites was another issue reported by participants. The negative impact of wear and tear of the sites and the grounds surrounding them was highlighted. Benjamin and Michelle both highlight the physical impact of tourists when they state that “there’s more than, more than normal wear and tear on the grounds and that type of thing” (Benjamin) and “at non-service times I think it’s nice to have it open to the public but the wear and tear on the grounds and the upkeep of the church….is a demand” (Michelle). Mary also highlights a specific issue at the Church of the Good Shepherd when she states that “sometimes the floor can get very, very, very, very wet and it’s a bit of a concern”. These sites would undoubtedly have less wear and tear if the number of tourists was less than current levels.
Changes to both places have occurred, in order to mitigate impacts on the physical fabric of the sites. However these changes may not necessarily be positive. Benjamin highlights this when he states,

they have footpaths around and they have mowing around and that was mainly because of the tourists because they were just walking over the grass and that was just burning off….I think to a certain extent by putting the paths and everything in they may have actually taken away a bit of the character of the place.

Again, as is the case with changes to the place and services mentioned above, these changes to the physical site, and the effects of those changes, would not be necessary if tourists did not visit the places in such large numbers. Other reported physical impacts include tourists toileting on the grounds of the Church of the Good Shepherd, litter and increased maintenance needs related to increased wear and tear. These impacts are related solely to tourist visitation at the sacred places and, as mentioned above, this then impacts further upon local worshipper’s experience and the spirit of place. Interestingly, participants from the Church of the Good Shepherd reported more physical impacts than at the Christchurch Cathedral. This may be due to greater involvement of the worshipping community in maintenance of the Church of the Good Shepherd whereas the Christchurch Cathedral employs a caretaker meaning the Cathedral’s worshipping community has less firsthand experience regarding this impact.

As may be seen in the photograph below, alterations to the site in order to manage tourists are not always effective. Here, tourists can be seen walking on the grass as opposed to the set paths. As mentioned above by Benjamin, this can create physical impacts on the church grounds.
4.4.3 Experience related impacts

The following impacts are those that relate to people’s experience at the sacred place. This experience may be of those within the local worshipping community or may be of the tourist/visitor. These impacts, as reported by the worshipping community, include an opportunity for mission work, an opportunity for spiritual experiences within tourists, inappropriate behaviours exhibited by tourists, increased numbers at the place and the effects of tours, large groups and crowding.

4.4.3.1 Opportunity for mission

Tourist visitation to the sacred places was seen as an opportunity for the active mission work of the Church. Possibilities for mission work and evangelism were considered to be present with those who visit but who are not part of the regular worshipping community. This potential impact, centred around the tourists themselves, was mentioned more so among respondents who were staff, though other respondents recognised this also. Mark identifies the potential for ministry among tourists when he states, “I actually find that the whole ministry to tourists is very valuable, and is especially an unique opportunity for the church….the ministry with tourists could be actually developed a lot more”. Another two
respondents succinctly support this when stating, “the point of it is about mission, it is about evangelism” suggests Matthew, when speaking of tourism to the place, and, “it’s a place for mission, it’s an opportunity to evangelise people” suggests Michelle, when speaking of the place itself.

Some respondents who also believed there was opportunity for mission towards tourists saw this as part of their ‘job’ as Christians. For example, “it’s our job to create that space, for whoever, and if that’s a tourist from Vietnam, or Norway, or wherever, great” stated Matthew, and,

in the Bible we are supposedly told by Christ to evangelise the world….it’s part of our unwritten job to present Christ as a living God, a loving God….and if people come in and respect that or even say ‘wow, I had fun talking to that guy, oh, he’s a Christian, hmmm,’ and if they get that feeling, jobs done (Joseph).

The belief in mission towards tourists was firmly held. Mark supports mission work when he, for example, stated, “I think the church has got a responsibility to share the gospel”. This statement clearly shows that the belief structure upon which these sacred places are based influences the views of respondents regarding tourist visitation to their sites. Joseph further highlights this when, regarding tourists to the place, she states,

a non-Christian or an un-committed Christian and a person who is committed to Christ would answer that in two different ways, some people would say, ‘oh, they get in the way, we like what’s going on here but we don’t want to be interrupted’, but there a large body of us who regularly worship here who welcome anybody, for any reason.

This quote also illustrates the influence of the Christian beliefs that the worshipping community hold regarding tourists to the place. Joseph goes on to state that welcoming tourists during service times is “part of our Christian life”. It seems the worshipping community’s Christian beliefs influence the acceptance of tourists to the place.

4.4.3.2 Opportunity for spiritual experience for tourists

Closely related to the belief that tourists to sacred sites is an opportunity for evangelism and mission work is the belief that tourists to the sites may have a spiritual experience. This impact, on the part of the tourists, is distinct from the aforementioned possibility for mission
impact as evangelism towards tourists seems to be an active task of particularly the staff of the sacred sites. The difference in the focus of these two impacts is highlighted in a statement by Matthew,

it’s not so much opportunity for us to make new disciples for Jesus, which is, you know, we’re about Christ centred mission, it is about if they come in to this place, as I said earlier, and they have a kind of ‘oh wow’ experience then that, for me, is them being touched in some way, if you like, by the Divine.

This quote shows that while the sites may partake in the active mission towards tourists to the place, there is also opportunity for tourists to have a spiritual experience simply by being there. Michelle gives another example of this when stating, “for some people it can be a place of, a place where they can come and maybe get some spiritual comfort”.

Some participants also recognise that tourists use the place for their own worship, outside of scheduled services. Observing tourists using the place in its ‘intended’ manner was a point that participants specifically mentioned as being a positive impact occurring from tourist visitation to the sites. For example, Benjamin stated,

they come in and they’ll go and squat in the corner or sit in the corner or something like that and start praying, and you know, they might spend five, ten minutes, they might spend half an hour there doing that and that to me is what it’s all about, that’s what the church being open is about, that’s for the tourists to come in and those that want to, that want to spend some time.

Benjamin’s suggestion is clearly supported by Elizabeth of the other case study site. It is clear that Elizabeth also believes it is important to have the sacred place open for the use of tourists for spiritual reasons when she states that people,

find it’s a lovely place to be and find some peace and some chance to be able to sit on their own, quietly, that’s happened a lot that I know of so it does sort of give you reasons why it should be open as a tourist destination.

Speaking of the massive volume of tourists who pass through the sites, Olivia recognises that, nevertheless, some of those visitors use the place for spiritual reasons. “There’s hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of people go through that are just going through, but out of all of that, some people do take the time to use it for their own, to meet some of their own needs”
The recognition that, of the many hundreds of tourists that visit the sacred places each day, some use the sites for their own spiritual needs was an observation that I made also. During observation sessions, I would notice some tourists taking time to sit, reflect or pray. While the numbers of these worshippers was far smaller than the total number of tourists through the sites, and their stays were often short in duration, these people did seem to use the sites for their intended purpose as a place of worship.

A participant from the Cathedral elaborated on the point that tourists use the place for their own spiritual needs and suggested that tourist’s enjoyment of the place as a worship centre added to his own experience. Thomas suggested that “if I talk to somebody there and they’ve really enjoyed it and they think it’s a wonderful, and yes we’ve enjoyed the service, I think they’ve gained something from it, and that encourages me”. Thomas’ statement shows that not only is the spiritual experience for tourists recognised as a positive impact of their visitation, but also, their experience, in turn, enhances that of the local worshipper.

While many participants suggested that the sacred sites create an opportunity for a spiritual experience for tourists, many also highlighted that this impact may occur without anyone’s knowledge. Thomas states this succinctly when speaking of tourists being at the place and saying “it’s very hard to know the effect it has on people”. Benjamin also suggests this when stating,

while I’d say you get your ordinary [tourist] coming in that’s click, click, click, and taking the photos, there’s that other percentage that come in that you know that are using the church for what, I suppose we would think it’s there for, but we can’t take away that those people coming in that are going click, click may at a later time have a wee think about it.

This quote shows again that of the many tourists who come to the place, some may have a spiritual experience and that this experience may impact them later in their life as opposed to being instantly recognised while at the site itself. The potential for tourists to be impacted by the site, on a spiritual level, is not necessarily understood by the staff, managers or local worshipping community of the place.

Supporting the claim that the spiritual experience had by tourists at the place may not be understood by others is also expressed by Luke. He states,
even if they come and look at the architecture and go away and you ask them ‘how was that?’, and they say, ‘nice building, love the sculpture and the stained glass’, and maybe years later they may reflect on that visit too in a way in terms of their life’s spiritual journey, so, to say that it should only be available for people who are there for worship, I think, is very arrogant and assumes things about people that may not necessarily be true or accurate.

It is clear, then, that respondents believe that the potential for tourists to have a spiritual experience at the sites, while being there in a tourist capacity, cannot be underestimated. Indeed, it cannot be assumed that tourists who visit the site as merely a ‘tourist attraction’ do, or will, not gain from the experience on a spiritual level. The suggestion that we may not know the impact that visiting a sacred place has for tourists has implications for tourism research in this area. It seems that research into this facet of sacred place tourism would benefit from longitudinal studies in order to capture the possible effects that visiting a sacred place has for tourists in the long term.

4.4.3.3 Inappropriate behaviours of tourists

The worshipping communities identified specific actions and behaviours of tourists which they considered inappropriate. These behaviours were seen as inappropriate by participants of both case study sites, though the behaviour may have manifested slightly differently between sites due to site layout, size and physical structures involved.

Photography

Participants most commonly reported that an inappropriate behaviour displayed by tourists at the sacred place was photography. This behaviour was seen by participants of both sites as a negative impact from the presence of tourists. Michelle explains this and suggests specifically how photography impacts the site itself and her experience at it,

I wouldn’t go down there for my own private personal worship, I tried that once and no….for prayer times I found it annoying because people would come in, they’d, they would see you sitting in the pew praying, they would be quite respectful, but it was the camera clicking, the constant camera clicking….and then, then you’d hear somebody talking or whispering or something like that and it just wasn’t, you don’t get that total, sacredness or quietness or sanctity that you would in another place.
This quote clearly highlights that this participant feels the behaviour of tourists, specifically in this case photography, impacts upon the sacredness of the place and indeed her experience of it. Michelle also reported inappropriate behaviours associated with photography when tourists want to get a ‘perfect shot’. She reports,

“I’ve seen the odd photographer take the Cross away and I don’t like that….if you get tourists and they start jumping up and down and doing this and this and whatever else they want to do in front of the Cross cause they’re being disrespectful of it.

Thomas supports Michelle when he suggests that photography upsets worshippers by stating, “the greatest scourge is photography, particularly flash photography, when services are being held, and that really does upset a lot of people”.

Michelle further identifies that it is not only the noise of cameras at the sites but also the inconvenience they feel in being told to move out of the way of tourist’s photographic opportunities. Michelle states, “sometimes they ask you to move because they want to take a photo of the church and that can be a little irritating, especially if you’re talking to someone”.

Another aspect of photography being an issue at sacred sites is the need for the management of restrictions on photography. Meredith identifies this when she states,

sometimes on Sunday mornings, you’re not supposed to take pictures during the services and I’ll be at the back and people will be hovering there with their cameras, you know, ready to take a picture and I have to go up and put a piece of paper in front of their camera and tell them no, that they can’t do that but they’re welcome to come back later and then, most people will say fine, and they’ll put their camera away, and other people will sneak around and get their camera out and then, you know, and they’ll keep trying to, keep trying to take pictures during the service and that’s a bit of nuisance.

Meredith highlights that some tourists disregard the request for no photography, an action also witnessed by others at both case study sites. Meredith’s quote also suggests that it is mostly during services that photography is disapproved of. This was the trend throughout the feelings of most participants regarding photography.
Interview participants not only expressed a disapproval of much of the photography that occurs at the sites but some also explained the difference it makes when photography is not allowed. These suggestions of the places without photography highlight the impact that photography has on the places when it does occur. For example, Michelle states,

we had a time when there was no photography allowed in the church which was a decision made by our committee, and it was really quite, it was really quite good because you would come into the church and you would see men and women praying in the church, four or five pews deep, both sides, that I think instantly changes the atmosphere….I thought it was more effective as a church than what it is now, just inside, just to keep it more, sort of, sacred.

Photography at the sacred places, as suggested by this participant, therefore impacts not only the experience of the local worshipping community but also the sanctity or ‘spirit’ of the place. My own observation within the sacred places was that photography, and the noises that come from photography, was constant. At one stage, while sitting quietly in a corner of one of the sites, a tourist stood less than a meter from me and took around eight photographs of the same shot. He then left but, a few minutes later, again came back for more photos of the same shot. Due to his standing so close and me sitting down his presence felt uncomfortable. The noise of his camera, and his dropping something loudly next to me, was, I felt, distracting to my train of thought and the quiet of the place.

One participant, from the Christchurch Cathedral, suggests a reason behind the amount of photography at tourist attractions, which can then lead to negative impacts. She explains,

I think in the days when you had a camera and you had to pay for every photograph, you know, when you had the little role of film or something like that, people would take meaningful photographs whereas now they just flick, click away and treating [the place], as I say, more of just, well, it’s [a] backdrop (Rosa)

Rosa makes an interesting observation which could be the basis for valuable future research. Certainly, the ease with which photos may be taken and deleted using digital cameras means that more photos can be taken and therefore, as mentioned in my observations above, more potential for the impacts of photography to be felt by local worshippers.
Below is the photograph much sought after by tourists to the Church of the Good Shepherd – the view from inside the church, through the altar window and across Lake Tekapo. Tourists wishing to get this same photograph can cause crowding inside the church and management issues for church staff if tourists are adamant to get their desired shot while the place is closed for service or other reasons.

4.4.3.4 Noisiness and specific inappropriate behaviours

Another commonly mentioned inappropriate behaviour was the noise levels created by tourists at the sites. Isabella succinctly states this when she says that “tourists annoy the peace and quiet”. Olivia goes further to explain that,

> during the church service, sometimes it’s the noise levels, the talking outside the window, summer, hot summer day you’ve got the windows open….it’s just they talk and sometimes the buses hoot their horns, in the mid summer time or in the winter time they keep their engines going for the air conditioning and so it’s those things that you hear, those noises that, if you took the church and put it somewhere else, if it wasn’t a tourist attraction, it would be very, very, quiet.

The above quote mentions having windows open and buses hooting their horns. These are features of the Church of the Good Shepherd site which would not be an issue at the Cathedral
due to the Cathedral’s size and location. These site features, however, mean that the impact of tourist noise at the Church of the Good Shepherd is greatly increased. Unsurprisingly, the issue of outside noise was mentioned more at The Church of the Good Shepherd than at the Cathedral. During observations I also noticed that noise was more of an issue at the Church of the Good Shepherd due to its size and layout. Tourists could be heard inside both sites, however, creating a constant background noise, sometimes very loud. While tourists were generally hushed inside the sites, the number of tourists, and the simple increase in people inside the places, created increased noise levels and a consequent distraction.

The noise level of tourists at the sites, while seen as inappropriate and distracting, was understood by many participants. Many participants considered that the tourist behaviour was due to a lack of understanding by tourists that the place is a sacred one and therefore the necessary behaviours at it. Michelle mentions this when speaking of how tourists at the place impacts her own experience at it, “they can detract, they can be noisy outside, they can stand and laugh outside the windows, if they’re particular groups or particular culture, but they don’t know it’s a sacred place and to be quiet”. The impact that noise from tourists creates is obviously one relating to the physical size and layout of the site as well as the knowledge and understanding of tourists to the site.

**Wandering tourists**

Another commonly mentioned behaviour seen as inappropriate by local worshippers was tourists coming in and out of the site, or a worship service, during scheduled worship times. The following quotes exemplify this and explain how participants feel about the behaviour. Thomas, for example, says,

> if they start wandering up the side aisles we don’t like it because that is, has a disruptive impact on the service….it can be a bit disruptive, yes, there’s no point and it is, it does upset a lot of people, the ones that come in during the service and, sort of, don’t show the respect that they should.

Elizabeth mentions the same impact on her experience when she speaks of tourists, “coming and going like a railway station down the back, and I guess I’m a bit frustrated that some people come in and wander around and, at the back, and sit down for a few minutes then they leave”. The comments by both Thomas and Elizabeth show that tourist movement during a service can have a disruptive impact on their experience. Rosa further states disapproval with this behaviour when she suggests,
to me personally it can distract your train of thoughts a bit when there are
people getting up and walking in and out….because then, I think well, why do
d they come in, like going to the Circus to see an act or something, rather than
an act of worship.

This quote clearly shows that some local worshippers feel that many tourists are not there for
worship reasons but instead to witness something more like a show. Furthermore, this quote
raises the question of whether local worshippers themselves feel like the ‘actors’ in that show
or Circus. This feeling of being ‘on show’ would no doubt have a further impact upon the
experience and feelings of the local worshippers.

While many participants mentioned management of tourists during services, Michelle speaks
specifically of how she attempts to minimise the disruption of tourist movement during
services,

if I’m on the door, if they’re coming in, if they’re late and they want to come
then they have to stay for the whole service, because that, I just feel that
interrupts the sanctity and sacredness of the service with people just drifting in
and out all the time.

This quote outlines the restrictions Michelle places on tourist movement during service time
in an attempt to minimise disruption to the service. The quote also describes the impact she
feels ‘people just drifting in and out’ has on the service. Sanctity and sacredness are vital
aspects of religious worship and to have this interrupted would consequentially impact upon
the experience and feelings of those worshipping at that service. My personal observations
during services at the sites support the impacts suggested above. I observed tourists coming
into service after it had started, causing the Minister to stop and wait for the newcomers to be
seated. While these tourists were welcomed as part of the service, their coming in late was
indeed a distraction.

Similarly to being distracted by people coming and going from services, many participants
reported that they considered it inappropriate that other tourists not involved in services be
walking around while they are conducted. When asked about inappropriate behaviours of
tourists, Nathan spoke of tourists,
coming in and not respecting other people’s rights during a service, for it to be
a quiet space, I mean, people come in and they stand there quietly but it’s
when they sort of walk all over the place and, that, they can be distracting.

This quote shows how noticing tourists walking around during services can be distracting for
local worshippers. Similarly, at the other case study site, Benjamin reports that,

I have bounced out of my seat a couple or three times when I’ve been sitting in
the church and somebody’s been poking their nose through the window, I’ve
reared out of my seat and shot outside and had a bit of a rark up but, yeah, so it
annoys me from that, from that stage, yeah, that people do poke their nose
through, through the window they sort of, I suppose they’re sort of invading
my space or my time, at the service.

The above quote not only highlights that this participant was impacted enough to act, but also
that, in terms of the impact upon his experience, he feels that the tourists invade his space or
time during worship.

In terms of the effect of this impact upon the experience of local worshippers, Paul and
Kristin, from each of the case study sites, both explain this. Paul states,

if you’re trying to work out what the Vicar is, or Minister is, what his line of
thought is between the reading that he’s had from the Bible and the service
and you get someone at the window, you know, doing this, [peering in].

Kristin suggests that being distracted by tourists “just means that instead of being in the
service, if you like, I’m in a different place, yes, my mind goes to, yeah, my mind is present
to them rather than to what’s going on”. Generally, when referring to impacts felt during
scheduled worship services, participants at the Church of the Good Shepherd reported that
tourist noise and movement outside the building was an issue. Participants at the Cathedral,
however, more often reported that tourist noise and movement inside the building was an
issue. This trend is unsurprising considering the size and layout of the church buildings as
well as the surrounding landscape that tourists have access to; the Church of the Good
Shepherd has windows that tourists may walk close to, the same height as a person, whereas
the Christchurch Cathedral does not. Also, the main doors of the Cathedral are left open
during scheduled services, while at the Church of the Good Shepherd they are closed. Again,
my personal observations at the sites showed the above comments to be true with distractions
caused at both sites by the presence of tourists inside and outside the buildings during scheduled worship times. Below is a photograph from the Church of the Good Shepherd. It shows the Altar window which the whole of the inside of the Church faces towards. As shown in the photo, tourists can be clearly seen walking past. This causes distraction and irritation to worshippers, particularly during service times. The closeness of the tourists to the building, as also shown in the photo, explains the ease at which their noise may be heard by worshippers inside.

The local worshipping community of both sites identified further tourist behaviours which were perceived as inappropriate. While not mentioned regularly by other participants from the sites, these behaviours are outlined briefly here due to their potential impact on the sacred places and the experiences of worshippers at the places. Mary, for example, reports of tourists “throwing cigarettes and tissues and sometimes the Asians have a very short holding capacity and they can rush behind the bushes [to go to the toilet] and you get a bit brassed off with that”. At this site, the stated bushes are not far from the church building itself and also open to other visitors walking nearby. The report, of tourists toileting at these bushes is quite alarming.
Some participants also reported tourists eating inside the sacred sites. Not only is this an issue of cleanliness, but also an issue of respect. Rosa states,

if we catch them in time we ask them to eat outside because, you know, we feel it’s disrespectful and we don’t want a mess in there, but sometimes you can’t do that and they’re already in and walking around eating, that annoys me, but I can’t do anything about it.

Eating inside the sacred places is especially an issue at the Cathedral. The main building within the Cathedral complex is considered tapu (Maori sacred state) meaning to eat food within this area desecrates this tapu status.

Some tourists are determined to enter the sacred sites, even if they are closed for certain events, meaning staff or other worshipers need to deal with their behaviour. Benjamin reports on this when speaking of,

the odd bolshy one [tourist] that basically demands to come into the church when there’s a service on, or more particularly when there’s a wedding….I had a bit of a disagreement with one lady down there one day and she was determined that she was going to get into the church, even though there was a wedding on and her parting shot was, ‘well, in England we’re allowed to go, anybody can go to the weddings in England’….and you sort of, you can’t turn around and say, well, you’re not in England now, sling your hooks and get on your bike’, you can’t, so the odd one rubs you up but it’s not worth worrying about.

This statement clearly shows that tourists may not understand, or indeed care, that the site may be closed for other religious purposes. The statement also indicates that Benjamin had to manage the tourist even though she may have behaved inappropriately towards him.

Another impact identified by participants comes from the interaction between local worshippers and those from cultures different to their own. These other cultures may exhibit cultural norms and behaviours not understood by the local community, thereby causing misunderstanding or even offence. This offence and misunderstanding has the potential to be seen as a negative impact of tourists at the sites. For example, Matthew states, “our volunteers are great people but they sometimes find the cultural ways of other countries hard to deal
with, so they can get a little bit edgy”. While these cultural differences can be a source of interest and learning, they also create the potential for conflict, as exemplified above.

4.4.3.5 Increased numbers at the place

A very common theme to come from interview and observation data was that tourists increase numbers at the sites as well as enrich the sacred site and the experience of local worshippers. This impact was spoken of in terms of a general increase in numbers of worshippers at the site as well as an increase in the diversity, ‘life’ or richness of the places and the experiences encountered at them.

More people at the place

Tourism to sacred places obviously brings a general increase in the number of people to the sites. The same is true for the two research case studies. Matthew explains the situation well when explaining the percentage of tourists to regular local worshippers, “in the summer we’ll have congregations four, five hundred, and half of those will be visitors, tourists”. Mark, in a light-hearted manner, also suggests that “if the tourists weren’t there, there might be no congregation”. Tourists to the places simply increase numbers worshipping and this was seen as positive by the worshipping community.

An interesting dimension to the current attendance situation, in relation to tourist visitation to the sites, is that generally congregation numbers are otherwise decreasing. Participants from both sites explain this, as well as how an increase in worshippers due to tourists assists the deficit of locals. For example, Joseph suggests that,

the majority of people who sit at a service on a Sunday are usually about forty years old and upwards….in this Cathedral we are an aging, sorry the regular people who visit are an aging population so we welcome young people with open arms.

Mary supports this when she states that “it’s the same with all the churches, the numbers are going down, there’s not the young…if it wasn’t for the visitors it would be a bit sad”. Tourists clearly add numbers to the sites’ congregations, as well as a diversity of age. Ironically, however, the large volumes of tourists also keep some local worshippers away (discussed in Section 5.4.2), meaning, if tourists did not visit in such large numbers, the congregation may indeed be larger, made up of members of the wider local community.
Relating to the tourist/visitor distinction made by participants, those who came to the site and who were involved in a worshipping capacity were welcomed. The following participant highlights this and suggests that their presence, not only increases numbers at the place but also ‘increases’ the experience,

we get between five and ten locals coming along and probably between fifteen and twentyfive tourists to a worship service at any one time, so without the tourists it would, it would be a pretty sparse sort of experience but in actual fact the tourists enrich that….I think it helps us to keep our view of the church to be much more than just a little local group.

It seems, from the above quotes, that tourists who join worship services – visitors, by definition of participants - are generally welcomed due to the fact they increase numbers at service and also for their impact on local worshipper’s experience at the place. This impact is further identified below.

**Increase in the ‘richness’ of the place**

Many research participants reported a positive impact from tourists to the place being that they increase the richness of the place or worshipper’s experience at the place. This richness comes in the form of meeting a variety of people from different countries and backgrounds. Elizabeth highlights this when she states, “I think for me it’s given me a broader, you know, richness of my work cause I meet up with so many different people, so it’s lovely”. Meeting people from different countries is similarly recognised as a positive impact. Mark recognises this when he states, “it’s like being an international church in a small context”, as does Michelle when she speaks of tourists and says “they bring the world to me and that’s exciting”.

The diversity of tourists visiting the sacred places is acknowledged and built into worship services. For example, Maria reports that “on the Sunday morning tourists from all nationalities are welcomed in, you know, a number of languages, and I think that makes the Cathedral multinational, you know, we have so many different nationalities come in”. The Cathedral clearly embraces the different nationalities that attend service by welcoming them in different languages.

Participants were clear and often concise about their feeling that tourists to the sites increased the richness of the place. For example, Joseph succinctly states, “it makes it more alive, without a doubt”, as does Maria, “I think it’s essential, it’s a living place, it’s not just a
monument”. Speaking of the same case study site, two other participants also support this when they state, “it makes it something more than it would be otherwise, it adds a richness to it” suggests Meredith, and, speaking of his experience at the place, Thomas suggests, “it enhances it because it means it’s a living, dynamic place”. These participants are sure of their feeling that tourists to the sites increase the dynamism, life and richness of it and indeed their own experience at it.

An alternative way to consider what tourists bring to the place in terms of richness is to consider the same situation if the tourists were not there. Meredith suggests this when she states,

I just think it’s great that, you know, you can get people off the street, you can get people from different religions, it’s just a very, sort of, ecumenical type of place, and I really enjoy that, but if it was restricted to people who all looked and thought the same I wouldn’t be able to tolerate it, so it’s that, it’s the diversity and richness that I love and part of that is the people who come in from the outside.

Meredith clearly recognises that the richness of the place can be attributed to the visiting tourists. Benjamin and Thomas further highlight that tourists bring in a diversity of people which adds to the otherwise regular group whom they are already acquainted with. Benjamin, for example, compares a case study site with another church he attends and suggests,

you go to Fairlie and you go to the church there on a Sunday and you go there six months later and it’s just the same people there, it’s like Coronation Street, it just, it doesn’t change, it doesn’t change, you know, but it does here.

Thomas also reports that “after the service there’s coffee, anybody can come in and have coffee and as a matter of fact I do, I usually try and find visitors….I don’t want to talk to all the others, I know them”. Clearly, tourists to the sites not only increase numbers but also the diversity of people whom the local worshipping community can interact with.

The positive aspect of tourists adding richness to the place is expressed more deeply in terms of local worshippers meeting people from very diverse, and sometimes conflicting, religions and backgrounds. Rosa, for example, suggests that,
it’s great because you meet people from all the different countries….there’s so much in the press these days and so many things going on where Muslims are painted as the bad guys and we’re painted as the bad guys to them so, but, it is great to meet people from different countries when they come in, and different religions.

Elizabeth also emphasises this, as well as the way that this sort of experience enriches her overall experience at the place. She mentions that,

another young man who was a Muslim and he was a refugee and he was, he came in to talk to a, find a Priest and I happened to be around and, yes, he was, it’s interesting that he came here, not to a Mosque, that was another experience that I really enjoyed, his contact, and I’ve lost touch with him now, but he was from Afghanistan, but those sort of things really enrich, you know, my life because I learn something about people from a completely different world than what I live in.

It is clear from the above quotes that the local worshipping community feels that a positive impact to come from tourist visitation is that they enrich the place and the worshipping community’s experience at it. This richness comes from the diversity of people, backgrounds, cultures and religions that tourists inevitably bring to the place.

4.4.3.6 Tours, large groups and crowding

Many participants mentioned that tour groups and large groups of tourists were overwhelming for the sites and consequentially impacted their experiences at them. Elizabeth explains this impact when she states,

if a big groups comes in, more than say four, or if you get even half a dozen or eight people together they make quite an impact because they come in all together and the people down the back must hear, well you do cause I’ve sat in the back row and you do sort of wonder what’s going on.

Elizabeth goes on to mention the impact she feels from these groups by stating, “the tour groups, I would say, when there’s a group of people come on mass….sometimes when they come on mass it’s a wee bit overwhelming”. The issue of tour groups is of particular concern at the Church of the Good Shepherd. This is because of the small size of the site compared to the large number of tourists visiting. Certainly, while undertaking observations at the Church
of the Good Shepherd, I noticed the immediate and intense impact that a tour group of thirty plus arriving at the site together has on the place. The density of people inside and around the site altered the experience and ‘spirit of place’ more so when compared with a ‘lighter’ stream of tourists not in a tour group. The issue at the Church of the Good Shepherd, however, is that tour groups arrive at the site very often during peak times of the day and of the season.

The photograph below indicates the impact that a tour group can have on the small site of the Church of the Good Shepherd. This photograph shows only one tour group and some independent tourists at the site, however, during observations I witnessed up to seven tour coaches at the site at once meaning far larger numbers of tourists than shown in this photograph.

The coaches used by tour groups are another aspect which can impact upon the site and experiences at it. Participants acknowledged that the noise of tour coaches and vehicles was an issue related to the number of tours and coaches at the places. The issue of vehicle noise is, again, particularly an issue at the Church of the Good Shepherd considering the short distance from the car park to the church itself and the number of coaches visiting the site per day.

The photograph below illustrates the number of coaches that can be at the site at once as well as the close proximity of the coaches to the church. Further coaches can also be parked at the
site, as well as a short distance down the road at ‘the dog’ monument, thus meaning the potential for even more tourists at the place.

Compare this scene with the photograph below, of the church before any tourists arrive, and one is given a clear indication of the change to the place which occurs due to tourist visitation.
While, as mentioned above, tourists and visitors to the place increased numbers at services and enriched the experience of members of the worshipping community, there is a point where ‘more tourists and visitors’ becomes ‘too many tourists and visitors’. This is particularly the case when tours and large groups visit the sites. The issue of crowding is explained well by Michelle when she speaks of assisting with a service and stating,

if you wanna go and do something in the church like the flowers or something like that, that’s a bit of a hassle, and setting up the altar and having to get from the vestry up the aisle and put all the little things out and there’s people all in the aisle and you’ve gotta say ‘excuse me please’.

Mary and Paul also mention this when they speak of moving around the site and state,

Mary: trying to get in the door, actually more often trying to get out the door, but sometimes, chhoooooowwwww, and we haven’t collected up the hymn books….if it’s Communion, you’ve got the Communion cup and those bits and pieces to pop away and the candles and you kind of fight your way down the aisle in the, and back out again,

Paul: it’s pretty awkward at times if you are taking the collection plate into the vestry to add up, you’ve got to push your way through people coming towards you, you know, so it, it takes away the whole atmosphere that you’ve just been enjoying, there’s real conflict I think,

Mary: particularly this time of year, between November and February, March.

This quote mentions the alteration that the presence of a large volume of tourists can have on the experience just attained during a worship service, as well as the awkwardness that local worshippers have to endure. Further, this quote mentions the aspect of seasonality and the associated increase in tourist numbers during that time. Observations at the site confirm the situation suggested by Mary and Paul. I observed a queue ten people long waiting to get inside the church. Also, at a different time, while inside the church, I could not get out to leave due to the number of tourists in the aisle. I had to jostle and inch my way out, bumping into others as I went. It was an uncomfortable and crowded exit. The feeling of crowding may also be compounded at the Church of the Good Shepherd. This place is small and has only one door and aisle. This means that tourists are more concentrated in a small area and the local worshipping community does not have any other space within the site to ‘escape’
and gain solitude. At the Cathedral, while tourist numbers are equally high, there are small, somewhat separate, areas where one may gain more solitude and quiet if desired.

The photograph below indicates the crowding that can occur at the Church of the Good Shepherd. The single, narrow aisle means that with large numbers of tourists at the place crowding easily occurs.

The photo below is of the Christchurch Cathedral. This photo shows that, while there are also large volumes of tourists to the site, in contrast to the Church of the Good Shepherd they are more ‘diluted’ in the larger space of the Cathedral. Tourists at the Cathedral do not feel as many as at the Church of the Good Shepherd (as witnessed during observations) as they are less concentrated here. If desired, the local worshipping community of the Cathedral have greater opportunities to ‘escape’ the large volumes of, and noise created by, tourists by using one of the side chapels or quieter areas within the place.
Similar to the aspect of seasonality, peak tourist times of the day are reported by Benjamin. Benjamin suggests that the short time period in which the bulk of tourists visit the church is the main factor in the issue of crowding. He states,

I don’t have a problem with the number of tourists, great problem with the number of tourists going through, I have a problem with the number of tourists going through between about eleven o’clock and two o’clock, if the buses could stagger their times between nine and five, and we just had a steady throw because there’s nothing worse than when you get three buses outside the church and another two outside the dog, you’ve got what, forty on a bus, you know, how many have you got all trying to, and all of a sudden you’ve got three loads of bus, three truck loads, bus loads of people trying to get in the church at the one time, and I think that detracts, that’s distracting for the people, because of those ones that are coming in off the buses and that may want to spend a bit if time….for them, because, you know, you may get half, half of those people are, want to come in and spend a bit of time, you know, just a couple of minutes, and they can’t because there’s another two bus loads trying to get in the door behind them and they’ve got to get in and get out so it
is also annoying for them as well, so to stagger the times, you know, I know
you can’t limit the number of buses but if it was staggered over a longer period
of time because between about, yeah, eleven till two.

During observations of the sites a definite peak in tourist numbers was witnessed during the
middle of the day, paralleling that reported by Benjamin. At these times I measured a coach
pulling into the Church of the Good Shepherd car park every ten minutes (over a one hour
period). This means huge numbers of tourists at the site, or it’s near surrounds, during peak
times. Olivia supports this observation when she states, “in the summer, you can be there
guiding and really not have time to turn around, it’s just constantly people coming off buses,
twenty-five, forty, fifty people at a time coming, queuing up to come in and out”. It is
unfortunate, therefore, that worship services are scheduled within the peak time meaning that
the potential for impact upon the worshipping community is increased. This peak time of day,
meaning large volumes of tourists to the Church of the Good Shepherd site, is due to its
location along a main travel route between two major tourism destinations. Tekapo township
is located at a mid-way point between Queenstown and Christchurch, on the main inland
highway of the South Island. This makes Tekapo a convenient stopping point for tours and
travel services which may leave either destination in the morning and arrive at Tekapo
between the hours of eleven-am and two-pm, the peak time described by Benjamin above and
observed by myself. This means that the geographical location of this sacred place, coupled
with the schedules of many tours and travel services, impacts upon the volume of tourists at
the site and consequently the potential for crowding and decreased carrying capacity.

The large volume of tourists visiting the sites, particularly the Church of the Good Shepherd,
was reported as having a negative impact on the experience of the local worshipping
community. The inability to mix and mingle with fellow worshippers after a service is
recognised as a negative aspect of high tourist volumes. Michelle suggests this when she
states,

the biggest problem I find in trying to develop a local fellowship is with that
church down there is that once you’re outside then you, most people disperse
straight away, and we don’t have that fellowship feeling, unless, we try to, in
the evenings, stay inside for more but, during the day it’s very hard to do
because people are waiting to come in, they’ve waited a whole hour from half
past eleven to half past twelve so you feel you can’t stand in the church talking
to someone but as soon as you go out and you think ‘oh, I want to catch up
with Mary, from down the road’, there’s all these tourists there and you can’t find her and that’s my personal negative about worship down there.

For this participant, an important aspect to the worship service – the opportunity for fellowship with other worshippers – is decreased due to the number of tourists at the site. This issue may be particularly pertinent to the Church of the Good Shepherd as services are held only once a fortnight, or month, meaning the opportunity for fellowship and ‘church community creation’ is already slight.

4.5 Tourism development preferences

This research, so far, has considered participant’s definition of sacred place and how they feel tourism to those places impacts upon the place and their experience at it. It was important, therefore, to next discover how participants felt about tourism development at their sacred place. Participants reported on their preferences via the second mapping exercise. This exercise gathered participant’s perceptions of exactly where, within the sacred place, they felt it was appropriate for tourists to go. Participants also reported on their tourism development preferences via specific interview questions regarding the topic. There is added value in the results of this section regarding tourism development preferences in that it may be used to inform management and development suggestions for each of the sites. These results will be briefly reported upon and discussed in relation to relevant literature.

4.5.1 Appropriate tourist access maps – the boundaries of acceptable tourism.

When asked where they felt it was appropriate for tourists to go, everyone marked areas where they felt tourist access was and was not acceptable. Everyone, except one person, stated that the Altar (High Altar at the Cathedral) is an area not acceptable for tourists to have access to. Speaking of the boundaries of tourist access, Paul states, “I don’t think it’s appropriate for them to go beyond the rail”. The rail that Paul speaks of is that which separates the Altar from the rest of the church. The Altar areas deemed inappropriate for tourists relates specifically to those areas considered sacred, and indeed most sacred, by participants when commenting in the first mapping exercise. The sacred place is also the place not appropriate for tourist access.
The main difference between participant’s maps was the distance from the Altar that they felt was acceptable for tourist access. Participants from both sacred places also marked areas that were not acceptable for tourists due to pragmatic reasons, for example, vestry areas. See Appendix G for an example of this mapping exercise.

Unsurprisingly, and similar to the results of the sacred place mapping exercise, participants from the Church of the Good Shepherd placed more emphasis on areas outside the church as ones they considered not appropriate for tourists to go. These areas relate to their potential to increase impacts felt by participants and, again, this may be explained due to the area’s relationship between the outside and inside environments at this site (see Appendix H for an example of a map indicating this). The example of the view through the altar window from the pews inside may again be used (refer to photograph in section 4.4.3.3). Olivia explains this when speaking of where she feels it is most appropriate for tourists to be during services. Olivia suggests, “nothing’s wrong with people down a level taking photographs looking up but it’s when they actually stay on the level of the church and they’re often the ones that call out, you know, ‘turn around and smile’”. At the Church of the Good Shepherd, tourists ‘down a level’ cannot be seen from inside, however, if they are closer to the Church, and therefore higher on the landscape, they can be seen, thus increasing their negative impact on the service and worshipper’s experience. Olivia’s comment is supported by Michelle who states,

I don’t mind if they go in front of the Altar window, I don’t have a problem with that but I do have a problem with people, oh, and this is a distracting thing, they stand in front of the window and take, sometimes photographs that aren’t appropriate, looking back in.

Olivia and Michelle’s observations may be a starting point for the management of the disruption caused towards local worshippers when they see tourists outside the Altar window.

The photograph below shows how the land in front of the Altar window at the Church of the Good Shepherd slopes downwards. As mentioned by Olivia, tourists could be restricted access and only allowed in the area ‘down a level’ meaning they could not be seen by those worshipping inside the church.
4.5.2 Tourism development preferences.

Preferences for the development of tourism at the sacred places were different at each site. Overall, when asked, participants from the Church of the Good Shepherd felt that the number of tourists to the place could not expand any further. For example, when asked if she would like to see more or less tourists to the place, Isabella, suggested, “the church wouldn’t cope with more tourists”. At the Cathedral, however, participants generally wished to see more tourists to the site. Meredith suggests this when she states, “yeah, I’m always for more people to come here”. Three separate participants from the Cathedral simply and succinctly answered the same question by stating “more” (Nathan, Hannah and Kristin) while Joseph went further to say “more, full stop”. The difference in response between participants from the Church of the Good Shepherd compared to the Cathedral may, again, have to do with size and layout of the sites, that is, the carrying capacities of the place, as well as the current level of tourism development, management and controls that occur at the sacred places.

When asked about non-religious events occurring at the sacred places participants had mixed responses. Some participants were positive about more events taking place, some suggested it depended on what type of event occurred and some did not wish to see more events at the
sites. Joseph made an interesting comparison which relates easily to MacCannell’s (1999) work regarding front and back regions, Joseph suggests,

it’s pretty heavy during the tourist season which is what, from about November through till April, and that way sometimes we get a bit scratchy because the place is just so crowded all the time, I don’t think it’s a problem but, you know, it’s like inviting people to coffee in your own home and then finding that about three hours later there are a few more people coming in that you don’t know, and all of a sudden your house is full and you’d wish they’d go home.

The final interview question pertaining to tourism development preferences focused on the development of new or existing visitor centre facilities. The general feeling at the Church of the Good Shepherd was that the church should be left in isolation on the landscape. Any visitors centre development would need to be away from the church building itself. Further to this, participants suggested that any development would need to be spiritually focused, a place for fellowship and community gathering. Michelle, for example, states that any visitors centre development would need to be,

a place of worship, a place of fellowship with a cup of tea for the church people….if it was a spiritual visitors centre yes, but if it was just one that’s to sell cups with the church of the good shepherd on, no, I don’t think so, but if it was selling Bibles and Christian books and things like that, yes, I would support that.

Mark also suggests the preference for spiritually focused tourism development when he states, “I think the emphasis would be, for my point of view, that we extend the ministry side, you know, that includes things like hospitality, a place where people can meet if that’s what they need”. Similarly, at the Cathedral, participants were supportive of development of the current visitor centre, as long as it was ‘sympathetic’ to the Cathedral and its function as a place of worship. Meredith, for example, suggests that any development would need to be “a little more representative of the values that the Cathedral tries to put across”. These statements from the worshipping communities of both sites suggest that they would prefer that commercialisation and commodification at the places be kept to
a minimum. This finding is in line with Johnston (2006), Shackley (2004b), Universitas Udayana and Francillon’s (1975) work surrounding the commercialisation of sacred places, as well as that found in the Bible (Mark 11: 15-17).

As deduced from the findings of the mapping exercise and interview responses it seems, therefore, that generally members of the worshipping community of the Church of the Good Shepherd would not like to see any further increase in numbers of tourists visiting the site. Furthermore, any general tourism development would need to encompass a spiritual focus. Members of the worshipping community at the Cathedral, however, were generally keen for an increase in the number of visitors to the place and, as at the Church of the Good Shepherd, further tourism development would need to have a spiritual focus. At both sites, it seems that visitors, as defined by participants, are welcome and the preferred group compared to tourists. Further to this, while participants considered that tourists were acceptable in certain areas, they also believe there are clear boundaries of where it is acceptable and not acceptable for tourists to go. These boundaries of acceptable tourism, as well as a preference for visitors as opposed to tourists, may inform community led tourism management and tourism development at the sacred places.

4.6 Chapter summary

This chapter has presented the results of the study which emerged from the various data collection methods. First the sacred place was defined by the worshipping community. This definition included their perceptions surrounding where the sacred place was, as reported in the mapping exercise, and what the place meant within their life, as reported during interviews. Next, the chapter presented the results surrounding the tourist/visitor distinction that members of the worshipping community consider exists. This distinction, though unrelated to specific objectives of the study, was an important and noteworthy finding. The specific impacts of tourism to the sacred places, as reported by the worshipping communities, were then presented. These impacts include those focused on pragmatic aspects of tourist visitation: financial benefit, changes to the place or services, and physical impacts to the place and those impacts focused on the possible experiences at the place: opportunity for mission work, opportunity for spiritual experiences within tourists, the inappropriate behaviours of tourists, increased numbers at the place and tours, large groups and crowding. Lastly, the
chapter covered the tourism development preferences of the worshipping communities, again, based on the mapping exercise and interview responses.
Chapter 5
Discussion

5.1 Introduction

Chapter Five will critically discuss the results found in chapter Four, relating current theory and literature to the results in order to shed light upon the findings. Firstly, however, the chapter will discuss the distinction the worshipping community made between tourists and visitors. This discussion is important as it frames how the worshipping community views those who come to their site, how the worshipping community interacts with them and potentially the impacts these people create. Where possible, literature and theory which relates to, or speaks of, sacred places specifically is used within this discussion chapter. Where no such literature exists, the general literature relating to the topic under discussion is instead used. This selection of literature is used in order to keep the discussion relevant and specific.

5.2 Tourists and visitors

5.2.1 The tourist/visitor dichotomy

While previous literature has offered varying typologies of tourists (Leiper, 2004, provides a good overview of key typologies), the tourist/visitor distinction made by the worshipping community of the two sites is a valuable finding regarding sacred places specifically. The distinction offered by the worshipping community classified those visiting based on their motivation, the potential for interaction with the local congregation and within worship services, as well as understanding of the site’s religion, its guiding principles and codes of conduct and behaviour.

Many studies regarding tourist behaviour look at general tourist behaviour over the entire period of travel, for example, ‘high activity’ tourists, compared with ‘low activity’ tourists (Moscardo, 1996, cited in Leiper, 2004). These studies create typologies of tourists surrounding the types of activities they generally engage in while travelling. This distinction is different to that offered by the worshipping community when creating a typology surrounding those who come to their place. The worshipping community’s classification of
people as either tourist or visitor is based instead on the individual and specific behaviours exhibited while at the sacred place. Examples of these are attending a service or engaging in photography while at the site determining which group the worshipping community classified the person in to. We must acknowledge that the purpose of the above mentioned studies is to create general typologies. The distinction made by the worshipping communities surrounding tourists and visitors is therefore different, and consequently extremely valuable because of this difference, as it sheds further light on these distinctions. There is also value in this distinction as it creates a specific typology surrounding those who go to sacred places. Aside from claims made by researchers such as Shackley (2004a, see below) surrounding a distinction between different types of sacred place tourists based on motivation, there is, as far as I am aware, no typology of sacred place tourists based upon the behaviours they exhibit while at the site. This typology is valuable as it gives an indication of those who may exhibit inappropriate behaviours and those who are less likely to. Marketing and management efforts may then be focused upon those who are less likely to create offence or upon educating and managing the behaviour of those who are.

The behaviours exhibited at the sacred place may be linked to the focus of, or motivation for, tourist’s visitation. A quote by Shackley (1999, p.107) highlights this relationship accurately, she reports,

The spectacular dances attract photographers who are intrusive in their quest for a perfect shot; flash photography is often frowned upon. Many local people feel that photographing religious ceremonial is inappropriate, yet for the visitor getting a good photograph may be the motivation for his visit.

Tourist motivation, it seems, can lead to inappropriate tourist behaviour.

The worshipping community also based their tourist/visitor distinction upon motivation. Specifically regarding sacred sites, Finny, Orwig and Spake (2009) speak of the different motivations surrounding travel to sacred places and Shackley (2004a) offers a distinction similar to that offered by the worshipping community. Shackley’s distinction is valuable as it is specific to sacred places while other typologies, still valuable, are instead general in application. Shackley (2004a, p. 227) suggests,

visitors to sacred sites may be divided into two basic groups; those whose primary purpose is to gain a religious experience (including pilgrims) and the
potentially far larger group of those whose major motivation is visiting an element of the Europe’s religious heritage.

This distinction offered by Shackley is based upon motivation of visit and is similar to the worshipping community’s. Shackley’s 2001 work also notes that many tourists come to a sacred place not because it is sacred but because it is famous. This clear motivation is different to those who may come to the places within the present study specifically in order to attend service or spend time engaging with the local community or the spiritual life of the place. While some members of the tourist group may ‘end up’ being involved in the site in this way, the intention of the tourist group, as Shackley suggests also, is more secular in nature.

Relating the results of this part of the study to Cohen’s 2003 work, it would seem that the ‘tourist’ group, as defined by worshippers, is in line with Cohen’s ‘tourism’ motivated group while the ‘visitor’ group, as defined by worshippers, is in line with Cohen’s ‘religious’ or ‘religious-tourism’ group. Tourists and visitors, like those defined in Cohen’s work, have different reasons for going to the sacred place. Further relating the definitions offered by the worshipping community to Cohen’s 2004 work, the ‘tourist’ group is similar to Cohen’s ‘recreational mode’, ‘diversionary mode’ or ‘experiential mode’. These three modes of tourist experience include low motivations of searching for meaning and high levels of pleasure and fun seeking. ‘Visitors’, on the other hand, may align with the ‘experimental mode’ and ‘existential mode’ which hold higher levels of searching for meaning involved in the tourist experience. Comparing the results of the worshipping community’s typology with that of Finney, Orwig and Spake (2009), ‘tourists’, as defined by the worshipping community, are most similar to Finney, Orwig and Spake’s ‘lotus-eaters’ while ‘visitors’ are most similar to their ‘pilgrims’ or ‘seekers’ types.

Cohen’s work recognises that there may be changes between modes of experience within a single trip and this point is mirrored by Smith who suggests that there are “…multiple and changing motivations of the traveller…” (1992, p. 4). Nolan & Nolan also assert that “…there is no obvious dichotomy between pilgrims and tourists: Many fall into the range of intermediate categories” (1992, p. 69). These points may offer critique of the typology created by the worshipping community and suggest that a traveller can move between the tourist and visitor groups defined by the worshipping communities. Olsen similarly critiques tourist typologies and states that “…visitors to religious sites cannot simply be labelled as pilgrims or tourists, as their motivations and previous experiences are not uniform” (Olsen, 2006, p. 107).
This suggestion reflects the notion offered by some members of the worshipping community that some people, otherwise classed as a tourist, may indeed have a spiritual experience at the sacred place, but we, and indeed they until perhaps a later date, do not recognise it. The tourist, motivated by pleasure and fun (for example, Cohen’s ‘recreational mode’) when visiting the sacred place, may, at a later date, consider their experience to be more in line with a spiritual one (for example, Cohen’s ‘existential mode’). Participants in the current study, however, created this distinction in order to summarise their interaction with those who came to the place, their behaviour while there and including consideration of their perceptions of tourist motivation. It seems that the worshipping community does indeed consider a dichotomy between those who come to the place. The worshipping community considers those who are not part of their regular worshipping community to fall into either the ‘tourist’ category or the ‘visitor’ category. Therefore, the definition, or typology, offered by the worshipping community is not as complex as the others offered above. For the worshipping community this tourist or visitor distinction is satisfactory.

The important point within the tourist/visitor distinction is that it is offered by the worshipping community of the sacred places. Previous definitions and analyses have often been from the position of the tourist. There is therefore value in the definition offered by the worshipping community particularly as it is they who interact with these people and they who experience the impacts that may be created by different tourist types. Within the research, patterns emerged surrounding the tourist/visitor distinction and the different impacts reported by the worshipping community.

We cannot assume that the tourist group necessarily creates negative impacts while the visitor group creates positive impacts. However, there is a strong pattern within the data suggesting that those who wish to more than superficially engage with the site and its regular worshippers and clergy, that is, ‘visitors’, may well be more likely to be educated towards appropriate behaviours at the place or be open to this learning while at the site. The visitor group was often described by the worshipping community as being Christian, wishing to engage with the community of the place or having a spiritual focus to their visit. This description places visitors as very similar to members of the regular worshipping community. Furthermore, the worshipping community more often discussed visitors in relation to positive aspects of tourist visitation to the place and members of the worshipping community reported that the focus of this group closely resembled the meaning of place offered by themselves. For example, visitors were reported as attending services and worshipping community gatherings and wishing to know more about the place’s history and associated religion.
Those who visit may have an understanding of the appropriate rules of behaviour, dress and norms associated with the place because of their existing knowledge of the religion or faith upon which the place is based. Further to this, if the visitor is not a part of the associated faith or have an understanding of it, their desire to engage with the community of the place shows a willingness to learn these norms, rules and codes. This willingness may equate to an increased sensitivity within the visitor group surrounding behaviours and actions that may be deemed inappropriate.

Visitors may be contrasted to the more secular ‘tourists’ whose visits are, again as illustrated by participants and observed by myself also, shorter in duration and seem to be focused more on the place as a tourist icon or as a building of architectural or historical merit. This difference is illustrated in a member of the Cathedral worshipping community speaking of inappropriate behaviours at the place and stating, “really they’re just, it’s another tick on the box of the things that they’ve been [to], the Christchurch Cathedral, so they come in talking loudly, take a couple of pictures and then, then walk out” (Rosa). Rosa’s quote clearly shows that tourists wish to engage with the site or the worshipping community on a more superficial level than do visitors. The motivation of the tourists and visitors is also reported as different.

As suggested, the different focus or motivation of tourists, compared to visitors, may well be linked to their behaviour. In the case of many, however, this behaviour is inappropriate. This difference in motivation may lead to a lack of understanding, and indeed discourage increasing understanding, surrounding appropriate behaviours at the places. The data showed a clear pattern which suggests that tourists, while welcome and seen as a potential avenue for mission work, are more likely to exhibit the inappropriate behaviours reported by locals and therefore less likely to be tolerated by local worshippers. Visitors, who are more likely to understand or be open to the sacred place belief structure and norms and therefore appropriate behaviours, are less likely to create negative impacts towards the local worshipping community and more likely to create the positive impacts reported above. As one of the participants suggests, when speaking of the inappropriate behaviours of tourists, “it’s mainly through them not being familiar with real and imagined code of behaviour that a church has” (Ava).

During interviews, the worshipping community did not overtly state that they preferred the presence of visitors over tourists. However, data patterns are based on participants speaking many more times of how they appreciated or enjoyed the presence of visitors (for example, in attending a service) than they did the presence of tourists. Furthermore, participants’ remarks
regarding ‘tourists’ was often within the context of what they would otherwise, by their own
definition, have termed a visitor. For example, the participant remarked favourably on the
presence of a ‘tourist’ attending a service, however, a tourist attending a service would indeed
be a visitor, as defined by the worshipping community. The data, therefore, shows a clear
pattern which suggests that tourists are more often associated with negative impacts at the
places whereas visitors are more associated with positive impacts. Again, the worshipping
community was more motivated to engage with, was more receptive to, and held in a more
favourable light, visitors as opposed to tourists. This pattern is supported by the fact that the
focus of visitor’s at the place is similar to that of the worshipping community.

This pattern would benefit from testing via empirical or more in-depth theoretical, research.
Unfortunately, the in-depth investigation of this was outside the scope of this project.
Furthermore, this distinction between tourists and visitors did not emerge clearly until the end
of data collection and following data analysis meaning that further investigation of this point
during the study was impossible. Further research may also evaluate the places that
participants consider acceptable for tourists and visitors to go, as was considered in the
present research’s mapping exercise. Differences in the places acceptable for tourists may be
different to those acceptable to visitors; visitors may well be allowed further into ‘back
regions’ (MacCannell, 1999) than tourists. Within the scope of this research, however, it must
suffice to say that participants identify this clear tourist/visitor distinction and a pattern exists
surrounding the worshipping community’s view of these two groups as well as participant’s
potential interactions with them and the impacts that these people create while at the sacred
sites.

Concerning the distinction offered by the worshipping communities and bearing in mind the
data patterns discussed above, sacred sites may specifically market towards the different
groups in order to further specific goals related to them. For example, the tourist group may
be focused upon with regards to the ‘opportunity for mission’ work completed through the
sacred place. The visitor group may be focused on in order to maximise the ‘increase in
richness’ of the place. Focused marketing and management techniques based on the above
findings may well create more positive benefits for the sacred places as well as for those
visiting from outside the church community.
5.2.2 Equal gazes?

When considering Urry’s theory of the gaze, the worshipping community’s determination that some visitors are ‘more than’ tourists, takes this group past that of simple ‘gazers’ (Urry, 2002; 2005). Urry suggests that tourists consume a place by gazing at it, however, the visitors described by the worshipping communities of these sacred places go further than merely gazing at the place and the various aspects involved in it. While the tourist group does indeed gaze at the place, consuming it as a spectacle or tourist attraction, the visitor group becomes engaged with the place, and for a temporary time a part of it. Visitors do this, for example, by attending worship services and gatherings of the local worshipping community; Visitors go ‘beyond the gaze’. This point aligns with one of the major critiques of Urry’s gaze, that there are those who go beyond a simple gaze and engage further with the place. Furthermore, if the patterns described above are proven correct via further research, these visitors are incredibly valuable at the place as they facilitate and create the positive impacts identified.

The work of Perkins and Thorns (2001) and Cloke and Perkins (1998) suggest that the gaze of tourists may also involve the body and nature. Sacred place visitors too may engage their body (through participation in scheduled worship services and other events of the local worshipping community) and, further to this, their spiritual self. As Perkins and Thorns suggest, “…the gaze does not fully encapsulate tourists’ experiences” (2001, p. 199). Both Perkins and Thorns (2001) and Cloke and Perkins (1998) argue that tourists may go ‘beyond the visual gaze’ and this assertion paves the way for another; that tourists also go beyond the visual gaze when they participate in the spiritual dimensions of a sacred place. Perkins and Thorns suggest that the tourist experience “…incorporates ideas of active bodily involvement: physical, intellectual and gazing” (2001, p. 186). However, it may be further argued that this theoretical development should also include spiritual involvement. The visitor group identified in the present study do indeed go beyond a visual gaze upon the sacred places. These visitors, however, also go beyond a physical involvement in the place, as described by Perkins and Thorns (2001); their experience also involves spiritual dimensions. This argument, led by the worshipping community’s definition of visitors, supports the notion that “…the contextual nature of the tourist experience – where and how tourism occurs and is experienced – is centrally important to its interpretation” (Perkins and Thorns, 2001, p. 193) This argument is not to say that all people who visit the place experience it ‘beyond the gaze’, but that some, in the case of this research, those defined as ‘visitors’, may. The degree to which these visitors also consume the place is worthy of further debate, though this is outside the scope of the present discussion.
5.3 Impacts

Each impact will now be discussed in relation to relevant literature and previous studies.

5.3.1 Financial benefit

The possibility of financial contributions to be made by visitors, whether they are a curious tourist or a pilgrim, is a pragmatic reality that sacred sites around the world acknowledge and which has been reported in previous literature (Baedcharoen 2000, cited in Olsen & Timothy, 2006; Beals & Woodward, 1996; Digance, 2003; Duff, 2009; Lawson et al, 1998; Olsen, 2006; Olsen & Timothy, 2006; Shackley, 2001, 2002, 2005, 2008). While the reality of the financial benefit of tourist visitation was often met with slight embarrassment or hesitation by interview participants, the necessity of funding in order to maintain and develop sacred sites is undoubted.

Unlike other tourist attractions which may have greater access to funds or which can easily charge for entry, sacred sites seldom have much money and creating large pools of funding is not the core purpose of sacred site existence (Shackley 2001, 2002, 2008). This financial position was suggested by interview participants and is supported by Shackley, “…sacred sites were not created for economic reasons, nor is the generation of income the major reason for their existence” (2001, p. 79). While not the stated reason for welcoming tourists and visitors, Olsen (2006) acknowledges that opening sites to tourism may be a financial necessity and Beals and Woodward (1996) further recognise that this necessity may be particularly so given decreasing numbers within congregations. Certainly financial contributions from tourists and visitors were welcomed and encouraged at various locations around both the Christchurch Cathedral and the Church of the Good Shepherd. An interesting situation arises, however, where, though sacred sites gain financial resources from tourist visitation, they may then also feel pressure to provide amenities for tourists. Sacred sites most certainly also need to deal with, and pay for, physical impacts upon the site which have been created by tourists. An example of this is the provision of visitor toilets in order to prevent defecation around the site, or the need to clean the site regularly due to high tourist numbers. The cost of this maintenance and service provision needs to be met by the sacred site but can be ‘paid for’ by visiting tourists. This creates a tricky situation for sacred site managers and caretakers as
increases in tourists may bring negative impacts but they also bring financial contributions, contributions which may be needed to deal with the increased number of tourists.

Interestingly, no interview participants mentioned the economic contributions made towards the wider community and economy as a result of tourism to the sacred sites. This multiplier effect is something that Shackley (2001) highlights in relation to sacred sites, while Simmons and Fairweather (2005, p. 266) recognise that any broader economic gains, on a national level, due to tourism must be “…seen against the costs borne by small local communities…” While the wider local and national community may also benefit financially from sacred sites positioned as tourist attractions and icons, it must be acknowledged that, like other host communities, the local worshipping communities of the sacred places may bear negative impacts of that visitation. This is something that Shackley (2001) goes on to identify, including that sacred sites can often be liabilities rather than assets, particularly in a financial sense.

Neither of the sites considered in this study charge for entry (although donations are encouraged), though there is potential for this to occur if deemed necessary by church authorities. An interesting paradox emerges, however, when tourists are charged for entry into a sacred site. While the ethical and pragmatic dilemmas associated with charging entry to sacred sites may be acknowledged, further to this, tourists who pay to enter a site (as they would another type of tourist attraction) may then feel they have certain rights surrounding behaviour and access whilst at the site. For example, tourists who pay to enter a sacred place may then feel they have the ‘right’ to photograph worshippers, even though this may not be allowed at the place and many local worshippers believe this to be an invasion of space and privacy (as noted above in section 4.4.3.3). This feeling among tourists may occur when a donation is made upon entry as well as in the case of a fixed entry fee. This area of study could be the basis for valuable future research.

Any consideration of financial contributions made by tourists must consider the theory that tourists consume places they visit (Urry, 2002). Tourists consume the site by gazing upon it (Urry, 2002) but also by making financial contributions, whether these are framed as a donation or an entry fee. Similarly to Urry, Robinson suggests that “the economic benefits of tourism are, however, the result of a fundamental process by which expressions and forms of environmental and cultural capital are traded” (Robinson, 1999, p. 1). If tourists are trading the environmental and cultural capital of a site in exchange for a donation, we must take note of how the local worshipping community feels about their cultural and environmental capital,
specifically capital which has such important meaning in the lives of worshippers, being
turned into something which is traded and therefore consumed, and how this consumption
impacts the place and its meaning for local worshippers. The tension this relationship may
create is recognised by Mark, a member of the local worshipping community when he states,

   oh yes, there’s always a tension, partly because, and also you see the church
   benefits from the tourism financially….so the commercial side of it, if you
   like, the business side, and the spiritual side, they can compliment each other
   but they can also create a bit of a pull against each other.

Whether tourists consume the site in terms of Urry’s (2002) conception of ‘consumption by
gazing’ or consumption by the exchange of good/service/experience for money, these sacred
sites are reduced to an exchangeable, tradable thing. Cohen’s (1988) work is helpful here,
where he expands the debate surrounding the commercialisation of cultural products and its
effect on the authenticity and meaning of these products. This debate, first ignited by
Greenwood, originally suggested that as aspects of culture are reduced to commodities they
consequently lose their authenticity and meaning (Greenwood, 1977, cited in Cohen, 1988).
Cohen, however, argues that this theory is over generalized and suggests that
“….commoditization does not necessarily destroy the meaning of cultural products…” (1988,
p. 371) but instead can support and strengthen their use or place within the culture. When
applying the above theories to the sites within the present study, one could argue that tourists
exchanging money for a visit to the sacred places, coupled with their gazing upon the place,
means they consume and commodify the site and its objects and services, changing it from a
sacred place of spirituality and worship to a profane place of touristic activity. Members of
the worshipping community commented on the potential change to the meaning or spirit of
place surrounding the financial contributions issue. For example, as Michelle stated, “people
should give cheerfully and willingly and not be treating it like a venue where you have to pay
to go in”.

Some tourists may choose to consume the place as a sacred site, thereby recognising and
respecting its sanctity, behaving appropriately and attempting to minimise impacts upon the
local worshipping community, however, there will also be tourists who chose to consume the
site merely as a tourist attraction. Shackley identifies this difference in consumption when she
writes of the consumption of Uluru (Ayres Rock, Australia), and speaks of some tourists
“…who may prefer to consume the landscape in quite a superficial way” (2004b, p. 67).
Indeed, a participant in my study spoke of his sacred place and identified that “when there’s
no services on it really is a tourist attraction” (Thomas). This participant’s comment hints at tourists, and indeed others, viewing the place as merely something to be consumed as opposed to a place to be revered, held sacred and used for sacred purposes. The meaning of the place for these tourists is quite different to those among the local worshipping community.

The Bible suggests that no financial exchanges take place in God’s temples (Mark 11: 15-17) yet worshippers acknowledge that, “financially, the church would probably have to fold if it wasn’t for the tourists….that holds the whole parish together” (Mary). This is a complex debate and thus situation for sacred site managers and caretakers. The best outcome must be based upon each site’s specific situation, consultation with the local worshipping community and an in depth consideration of the nature and impact of financial contributions made towards the site. This result, and the analysis which suggests that the commercialisation and consumption of place occurs, links with the finding which identified that many participants considered their sites should remain sacred sites first and foremost. This finding is reported and discussed in section 5.4.4.

5.3.2 Changes to the place or worship services

Changes to the sacred places, and their worship services, in order to accommodate tourists were highlighted at both case study sites. This is unsurprising considering at least some changes are often made at sites in order to try and manage tourist flows and behaviour and mitigate inappropriate use or negative impacts arising from their visits. Changes were reported as having occurred towards both the physical structure of the sites as well as the worship services held at there. These changes were solely for the benefit, or management, of tourists who visit.

Changes to religious festivals, rituals and events has been reported by tourism authors, again, Shackley has completed the most writing on the topic (1999, 2001), however, Kang (2009) also mentions changes to temple festivals in China that have accompanied increases in tourist visitation and changes in local politics. Shackley explains, in relation to different religious and cultural festivals and events, what the worshipping community of my two case study sites had identified. Speaking of traditional Buddhist dances in the Himalaya, Shackley notes that “‘Ethnic’ or ‘tribal’ dances staged for visitors are frequently simpler and shorter than the original forms since the visitor is appreciating the performance at a purely visual level” (1999, p.101). In another piece of writing, Shackley warns that “there is legitimate cause for concern
when the requirements of non-worshipping visitors affect the production of this kind of ceremonial in an attempt to make it more ‘relevant’ or understandable” (2001, p. 21-22).

While the changes made to ‘ethnic’ dances will be different to those made to worship services at my two case study sites, alteration of the original, for the benefit of touristic consumption, nonetheless occurs, begging the question, ‘what is changed’ and ‘what is lost’? The ‘what is lost’ question coming from the argument discussed earlier which suggests that tourist consumption and the commercialisation of places, objects and events can degrade their meaning (Beals & Woodward, 1996; Greenwood, cited in Cohen, 1988; Johnston, 2006; Shackley, 2004b, 2001). Further to this, Urry argues that “through the often active consuming of certain services the place itself comes to be consumed” (2005, p. 22). By this argument, therefore, the sacred places involved in this study are themselves being consumed as tourists attend and gaze upon worship services, whether they are participating in the service or not.

The effect of this was barely mentioned by participants at either case study site, however, Shackley, notes the potential effect when reporting on monastic festivals and masked dances in Nepal, Bhutan & north India and states, “their popularity as visitor attractions has resulted in modification of traditional practices, decreased local interest and participation, and increased commercialisation and economic exploitation” (1999, p. 95). Further to this, she notes, “…any alteration of ritual in order to please guests alters the cultural legacy of the hosts by modifying the transmission of a shared aesthetic and collective identity” (Shackley, 2001, p. 52) and that changes to sacred rituals or events “…blurs the distinction between the sacred and the profane” (Shackley, 1999, p. 102). This could mean, therefore, that changes to worship services at the places, in order to accommodate tourists could translate to a ‘modification of traditional practices, alteration of cultural legacy, a blurring of the distinction between the sacred and the profane and a modification of the transmission of a shared aesthetic and collective identity’.

Further to this, increases in commercialisation of and at sacred sites can lead to desecration. This is suggested by Johnston, when he suggests that “…desecration happens within the first moment of commercialisation” (Johnston, 2006, p. 116). Arguably, the sacred place is turned into profane space in the process of accommodating tourists who consume the worship service (as well as other aspects of the place) and ultimately the place itself. Cohen (1988) further identifies that ceremonies and rituals may be subjected to commoditization (an example at the

---

1 Urry’s writing speaks of ‘service’ in terms of tourism services, however, this same concept (and thus word) is used here to mean ‘worship service’. This use of the word interchangeably is based on the idea that worship services are one of the services (Urry’s definition) of sacred sites.
case study sites is the selling, or exchange, of postcards of the place or CD’s of the site’s choir music) while Valentine (2001) also suggests that the landscape may be commodified, this being particularly relevant at the Church of the Good Shepherd as the surrounding landscape forms a part of the internal space of the church. Cohen (1988) goes on to note that often this is initiated not by the local community of the place but by outsiders, this situation leading to the potential for further conflict. This is supported by Olsen (2006) when he identifies the many stakeholders (for example, the case study sites involve: worshippers, clergy, local government, donation contributors) that may influence how religious sites function; it is not likely to be solely the decision of the worshipping community and/or the sacred place managers and caretakers. While a certain level of commodification in regards to the sacred has occurred for centuries (Olsen, 2003, cited in Olsen, 2006), for example the creation and selling of rosary beads or flower offerings at sacred sites, the important factor for worshipping communities is how they feel about this commodification, how it impacts them, how much input they have in the process and whether it is they who receive the benefits of it. While Cohen does go on to argue that commodification and “…the emergence of a tourist market frequently facilitates the preservation of a cultural tradition which would otherwise perish” (1988, p.382), issues of authenticity and the control and benefit of the tourist market arise out of this statement and, again, the argument of the potential of the desecration of the sacred emerges.

Modifications to the physical structure of the sacred places, as identified by interview participants, have also been reported in the literature. Unsurprisingly, signs and physical barriers are used at sacred places as they are at other tourist attractions. These alterations to the place aim to manage tourist behaviour and their access to certain areas. My observations at the sites identified several signs, indicating and requesting certain actions and behaviours that were encouraged, or discouraged, of tourists while at the place. For example, a sign at the Church of the Good Shepherd which reads, ‘this is a place of worship, please treat it with respect’ (a photograph of this sign can be found in Section, 4.4.2.2). This sign hangs from a rope which cordons off access to the Altar area. Ropes and barriers are also used at the Christchurch Cathedral, in order to direct the movement of people, particularly during periods of high visitation such as at Christmas time. The use of signs and barriers in order to manage visitor behaviour has been reported at other sacred sites (Nolan & Nolan, 1992; Olsen, 2006; Shackley, 2004b).

The effectiveness of signage upon visitor awareness and behaviour was investigated by Espiner (1999) with regards to tourists visiting moderate-high risk natural areas. Espiner’s
study found that appropriate language and content are necessary for signs to be effective. The study also suggests the use of illustrations in order to convey messages to the broadest range of visitors as this removes misunderstandings created by language barriers. Signage at sacred places may benefit from increased use of pictures or diversity of language.

Another example of alterations to the place in order to control tourist movement is the use of one-way doors at the main entrance of the Cathedral. These doors allow people access into the Church, but they must then exit via the Cathedral gift store (see section 4.4.2.2 for a photograph of a sign directing tourists to exit via the gift store). These main doors are also where Guardians (guides) are stationed in order to welcome and assist visitors. The one-way door system, coupled with encouraged exiting via the gift shop not only manages the flow of tourists around the site but also encourages their spending at the store. Thomas identifies this when he reports, “we very cleverly now don’t let them walk out again, they’ve got to go out through the visitors centre shop”. Management of the flow of tourists around the building also increases its physical carrying capacity (Shelby & Heberlein, 1986), this in turn potentially decreasing feelings of crowding. Further to these techniques, guides are used at both sites, these people employed (though many are volunteers) to welcome people, provide information and advice on, and control of, tourist behaviour. Again, Thomas provides an example of how this relates to behaviour management at his sacred place when he speaks of tourist behaviours, “the sides people [guides] at the back have a specific job to try and keep it under control, to create some sort of respect”. These management techniques and changes to the place may also work towards decreasing physical impacts to the sites.

5.3.3 Physical impact to the site

It is unsurprising that physical impacts to the sacred places were reported by interview participants and also other tourism authors. Carlisle (1998) and Shackley (2001) have both reported physical impacts including theft, vandalism, litter and pollution, accidental abrasion of artwork, handling of artefacts, erosion of the physical fabric of the sites and flash photography leading to artefact and structural deterioration. Specific impacts will vary depending on the site, its physical layout and construction and the level of access of tourists to specific areas or artefacts.

These impacts and general wear and tear that is over and above the normal (non-touristic) use of the site need to be covered financially by the sacred sites. The Cathedral identifies this in
some of its marketing and information panels at the site as well as within the local community, stating the daily cost of keeping the Cathedral open and maintained and encouraging donations towards this.

While these physical impacts were identified by the worshipping community, few mentioned the further impact that these have upon the site’s spirit of place. One participant, however, did mention this when he stated, “I think to a certain extent by putting the paths and everything in they may have actually taken away a bit of the character of the place” (Benjamin). The paths mentioned by Benjamin were installed in order to minimise the impact of tourists walking on the grassy areas surrounding the Church of the Good Shepherd and are unlikely to have been installed if the site did not receive such large volumes of visitors. Any impact to the site, whether put in place by management in order to mitigate physical damage to the sites or whether created directly by tourists, has the potential to alter the spirit of place as it alters the site’s physical fabric. Another example of this is provided by Michelle (of the Church of the Good Shepherd) when she spoke of tourists removing the Cross from the Altar so they could obtain an unobstructed photograph through the Altar window and down Lake Tekapo. This behaviour was seen as inappropriate and has the potential to alter the spirit of place considering the important symbolism of the Cross and its position on the Altar. Another report at the same site was of tourists toileting near the church building, this action undoubtedly altering the site’s spirit of place. The demand for the management of these impacts is outlined by Olsen (2006, p. 109) when he states, “managers therefore face major challenges in maintaining a sense of place while catering to the needs and expectations of both pilgrims and non-pilgrim tourists and preserving the site’s physical integrity”. Managers of sacred places have many factors that need to be balanced, visitors, impacts, as well as the needs of the place and its worshipping community.

5.3.4 Opportunity for mission

A central tenet of Christianity is mission. Mission may be understood as activities and work which aims to spread the word of God and encourage others to accept God into their lives. Mission is encouraged in the Bible (for example, Matthew 28:16-20, Luke 10: 1-12, Romans 10: 14-15) and by Christian Church organisations (for example, The Anglican Communion, 2011), missionaries travel the world in order to spread the word of God and missionary buildings and convents are set up around the globe as centres for mission work. Many
interview participants, particularly staff members, and previous literature has recognised the opportunity for mission which exists in tourist visitation to sacred places (Keeling, 2000; Nolan & Nolan, 1992; Olsen, 2006, 2009; Shackley, 2005). Interview respondent Matthew simply states that allowing tourist access to sacred places is about mission: “the point of it is about mission, it is about evangelism”. Interview participant Joseph relates this point directly to the Bible when he says “in the Bible we are supposedly told by Christ to evangelise the world….it’s part of our unwritten job to present Christ”. Olsen supports the idea of mission when he writes “religious site caretakers, depending on their organisational goals, may wish to engage in proselytizing efforts, viewing all non-believing visitors as potential converts…” (2006, p. 109). Shackley, within her 2005 work, recognises this opportunity also. Considering that mission is encouraged in the Bible, and the Christian faith encourages spreading the word of God as Jesus did (The Anglican Communion, 2011), it is unsurprising that both previous literature and the findings of my research have found that the opportunity for mission is recognised and undertaken at both the Christchurch Cathedral and the Church of the Good Shepherd, two Anglican, Christian sacred sites.

The opportunity of ‘evangelism via tourism’ is arguably increasing considering the Western World’s growing secularisation (Reisinger, 2006; Shackley, 2004a). This rise in secularisation, as well as increasing rates of tourism, may provide greater opportunities for sacred places to convey spiritual messages and spread messages of faith and religion. It is interesting that considering increasing secularisation there is also growth in spiritual tourism (Reisinger, 2006) and visits to sacred sites (Olsen & Timothy, 2006; Shackley, 2008); the numbers of people within church communities are dropping (Shackley, 2008) while the numbers of people partaking in spiritual tourism is increasing. Shackley (2002) suggests that within an increasingly secularised world, people are using their holiday time to gain a ‘quick-fix’ of spirituality and ‘slices of the numinous'. Olsen & Timothy (2006) also suggest that there has been an increase in people searching for answers to life’s questions, with potential answers available through visiting sacred sites. These situations, may well be a valuable opportunity for sacred places to partake in their mission work, albeit from a different angle than previously imparted. As Reisinger (2006, p.155) suggests, “…tourism marketers may need to respond to the increasing human need for spirituality”, so too may sacred site managers and caretakers.

If sacred sites wish to partake in mission work towards those who visit their place (as well as focusing on certain tourist types) it may be valuable for them to focus on ‘the quest’ (Digance, 2006, p. 37; see also Smith, 1992 for a discussion on ‘the quest in guest’) element involved in
secular tourist’s motivation to travel. If, as Digance and other authors (for example, Shackley, 2005) suggest, many tourists are partaking in travel in order to search out meaningful experience in our increasingly meaningless and secularised world, sacred sites could offer their religious and spiritual views (mission) as a ‘spiritual destination’ towards which these tourists may travel. Tapping into the ‘quest’ within tourists may be a valuable opportunity for mission work. This focus may then assist tourists or visitors with having a spiritual experience at the place, this being another impact identified by research participants.

5.3.5 Opportunity for spiritual experience for tourists

Previous tourism literature has considered the possibility of tourists having non-religious, spiritual experiences while travelling (for example, Sharpley & Jepson, 2011), some literature suggesting strong similarities between tourism and religion and religious pilgrimage and ‘tourist pilgrimage’ (Vukonic, 1996, cited in Reisinger, 2006, p.151). This literature, however, speaks not in regards to sacred sites specifically (though they may be mentioned) but considers that tourist journeys are similar to pilgrim’s spiritual journeys; tourism is a sort of secular pilgrimage. “The tourist is a kind of contemporary pilgrim…” suggests Urry (2002, p. 9). Interview participants did not recognise this relationship, though they did speak of tourists having spiritual experiences at the sacred sites. While it is most likely participants spoke of spiritual experiences in the sense of a religious spiritual experience as opposed to a secular tourist ‘spiritual’ experience, nevertheless, interview participants identified that a form of spiritual experience may occur due to visiting the place, whether tourist motivation for visiting the place was religious or not. Andriotis (2009) and Belhassen, Caton & Stewart (2008) and Eade (1992, cited in Shackley, 2005) have noted this possibility also, as well as Shackley when she states, “…even the tourist with no religious motivation may experience something of the numinous…” (Shackley, 2001, p. 139).

Interview participants also mentioned that it cannot be assumed whether tourists to the sacred sites do or do not have some form of spiritual experience as a result of their time at the place, and indeed we may never know the impact that a visit to a sacred site can have upon the person who visits. The spiritual impact of visiting a sacred site may not be recognised by the tourist/visitor until days, weeks, or years in the future. Even within studies which specifically consider different tourist group’s experiences at sacred sites (for example, Andriotis, 2009), these cannot capture the scope and intensity of the experience for those who visit the sacred
site unless they are consistent and continuous over a long period of time. Furthermore, the nature of a tourist’s spiritual experience at the place could be vastly different for each person considering that notions of spirituality and ‘a spiritual experience’ can be so vastly different and, as identified above by the worshipping community, the meaning of sacred place can also be very diverse.

Cohen (2003), Shackley (2001) and Smith (1992) have all noted that tourists may visit sacred places for a variety of reasons including secular and religious motivations as well as a mixture of the two, yet all may have a spiritual experience with the nature of this final experience depending on the tourist’s motivation and cultural background. Digance (2006) supports this also. A spiritual experience at a sacred place may be regarded as an authentic experience of it (since this is the original reasons for the place’s existence) and sacred site managers must recognise that, as with spiritual experience, there is a broad array of tourists’ understanding of an authentic experience (Belhassen, Caton & Stewart, 2008). Cohen (1988, p. 383), for example, suggests, “the breadth of such authentic traits necessary to satisfy the tourist will, in turn, depend on the depth of the touristic experience to which each individual tourist aspires”.

However, Cohen (1988, p. 383) goes on to note that “since most rank-and-file tourists do not aspire to much depth, a few traits of a cultural product which appear “authentic” will in most cases suffice for its acceptance as an “authentic” product”. According to Cohen, sacred site managers may therefore assume that many tourists wish only for a hint of a spiritual (authentic) experience, either within themselves or the existence of the spiritual ‘out there’. In this case, the ideal situation exists at my two case study sites where many tourists can take a glimpse of the spirituality of the place, or take a moment to glimpse it within themselves (and this may certainly be the case considering, particularly at the Church of the Good Shepherd, the high volumes of tourists who visit only briefly as part of scheduled tours), whereas others who wish for a deeper, more authentic experience may stay and participate in worship services and other rituals. Indeed, these different experiences align with the worshipping community’s definition of tourist and visitor. Cohen’s argument, however, lacks the perspective, or perhaps belief, of interview participants who suggest that tourists may have a spiritual experience thanks to visiting the place, it just may not be clearly evident at the time of visitation. For example, as noted earlier, Luke states,

    even if they come and look at the architecture and go away and you ask them ‘how was that?’, and they say, ‘nice building, love the sculpture and the stained glass’, and maybe years later they may reflect on that visit too in a way in terms of their life’s spiritual journey, so, to say that it should only be
available for people who are there for worship, I think, is very arrogant and assumes things about people that may not necessarily be true or accurate.

Shackley supports this when she acknowledges that some tourists may only wish for quick glimpses of spirituality but that these experiences too, can be a “…none the less significant, encounter with the numinous” (2002, p. 350). Shackley realises that while it is tempting to suggest that people in today’s increasingly secularised and time-poor world may desire ‘quick-fix’ spiritual experiences, these experiences may too be significant and authentic.

While differing motivations and desired outcomes of tourists may influence their experience of the place, we must consider, too, if the differing motivation and ‘angle’ which brings tourists to the places has an effect on their behaviour while there and thus, upon the regular worshipping communities of those sites.

5.3.6 Inappropriate behaviours of tourists

It is unsurprising that interview participants spoke of, and I witnessed, inappropriate behaviours exhibited by tourists visiting the sacred places. The inappropriate behaviour of tourists has been reported in general by previous authors, as well as specifically in regards to sacred sites (McIntosh & Johnson, 2005; Price, 1994; Reeves, 1994; Shackley, 1998, 2001, 2004b; Universitas Udayana & Francillon, 1975). An array of inappropriate behaviour has been recorded within previous literature, however, photography, noise, certain specific behaviours and large groups being the most widely reported by participants within this research. These specific behaviours will be covered later, but first, a general consideration of why tourists may, wittingly or unwittingly, exhibit inappropriate and offensive behaviours while visiting sacred places.

Interview participants, supported by previous literature on the subject, suggest that the reason for inappropriate tourist behaviour lies in their lack of understanding or knowledge surrounding what is appropriate at the sacred places. Considering many tourists do not belong to the religion of the place they are visiting (Shackley, 2001), they may simply not know the rules of behaviour which govern the place. Inaccurate and misleading marketing and tourist icon status of sites, which places them as tourist attractions as opposed to working sacred sites, can also mislead potential tourists and influence their behaviour at the sites (Timothy and Boyd 2003, cited in Olsen & Timothy, 2006; Shackley, 2001). Interview participant Michelle suggested this when she stated, “…they don’t know it’s a sacred place and to be
quiet” and this is supported in the literature by Jackson and Henrie (1983, cited in Shackley, 2002, p. 348) and Shackley, (1999, 2001). Shackley, for example stating, “if a sacred site becomes a tourist attraction its visitors are unlikely to be drawn exclusively (or sometimes at all) from the religious tradition to which the site belongs. Such visitors may be unaware of its customs and rules of behaviour” (2001, p. xv). This lack of knowledge and understanding may be described as cultural distance or a culture gap and may exist between the tourist and the ethnic culture of their destination but also between the tourist’s own ‘religious culture’ and that of the religion to which the sacred place belongs. Nolan and Nolan (1992), Shackley, (2001) and Vukonic (1996) mention the impact this distance has upon tourist understandings (or more accurately, lack of understanding) which then manifest as inappropriate behaviours. Shackley (2001, p. 13) further considers that differing perceptions of sanctity are central to the inappropriate behaviours exhibited by tourists at sacred sites and the consequent tension that arises from these inappropriate behaviours. She suggests,

the perception of sanctity is central to this idea since sacred space exists only for those who know its characteristics and the reasons for its delineation. This is at the root of many problems associated with the management of sacred sites. Although such sites are recognised as sacred by their worshippers, who behave accordingly, tourists may not perceive the site as sacred and behave in an inappropriate manner, creating tension.

This highlights the distinction between sacred and profane space and activity. While sacred places are inherently sacred, when open to tourism which is essentially a profane activity, differences in appropriate behaviour, dress and noise levels have the potential to create conflict between different users, in the case of this study, the worshipping community and tourists.

Further to a lack of understanding on the part of tourists and differences in understanding surrounding the sacred and the profane, tourists may feel that, if they do not belong to the religion or belief system associated with the place they are visiting, they therefore do not need to abide by the religion’s rules, traditions or codes of conduct while in the sacred place (Shackley, 2002). Shackley (2002, p. 348-349) states, “many contemporary visitors are unaware of such unwritten rules and feel that, if they are not believers, they should not be subject to the same rules”. Some tourists may simply not care about the rules and traditions of the place or they may choose not to educate themselves regarding what is and is not appropriate at the sacred places. This raises the question of whether it is the responsibility of
the tourist to educate themselves regarding appropriate behaviour at sacred places (or indeed any place which may be different to their own) or whether it is the managers of sacred places who should educate those who come. Shackley’s 2004b article suggests that increases in education and understanding regarding sacred places, encouraged by sacred site managers and caretakers, will lead to decreases in inappropriate behaviours.

Many Christian sacred sites are open to visitors, due to the worldview upon which they are based stipulating openness, hospitality and evangelism. Other traditions and religions however, may hold sacred sites as essentially closed places, only open at certain times of the year, to those who have reached a certain age, certain levels of knowledge or who have been through certain rites of passage (Johnston, 2006; Price, 1994). “Few visitors to Indigenous sacred sites arrive through cultural protocol” suggests Johnston (2006, p. 116). As Johnston notes, tourists to these sites are unlikely to have been through necessary rites or hold particular knowledge and are therefore unprepared for entry. This may mean that their impact, as a result of simply entering the site or because of behaviours done whilst there, may be even greater than at sites which are welcoming of visitors, as Christian sites are.

The tourist activity of photography, and its potential to cause offence has been documented within tourism literature (Beals, & Woodward, 1996; Chalfen, 1979; Shackley, 1999, 2001). This offence often coming from the tourist’s desire to gain a particular shot of the sacred place (or objects and events at the place) while the local worshipping community consider this to be inappropriate in terms of timing or that it is simply inappropriate to photograph the particular place, object or event. Shackley (2001, p. 35) provides a good example when she explains,

photographing worshippers is often seen as an invasion of privacy….There has been considerable adverse publicity about the offence given to local people by tourists trying to photograph the ‘burning ghats’ alongside the river Ganges in Varanasi, where deceased Hindus are cremated. This is seen as not only insensitive but also downright sacrilegious.

Again, tourists simply may not understand the religious significance or sanctity of a place, object or event, thereby inadvertently causing offence, they may choose to not educate themselves about what may be inappropriate photographic material or they may simply choose to ignore signs and suggestions which attempt to educate or restrict them. Interview participant Hannah identifies tourists ignoring signs and regulations when she reports,
“they’re not allowed to take photos, some people sneak taking photos”. Shackley (2001) also identifies that inappropriate photography by tourists may lead to complete or partial bans at sacred places, this is already the case at both the Christchurch Cathedral and The Church of the Good Shepherd where photography is not allowed during scheduled services (at the Christchurch Cathedral) or at the discretion of church guides (at The Church of the Good Shepherd).

Photography can be a central element in tourist’s visits to places and indeed the most commonly used and efficient way of documenting and celebrating travels. However, results from this study and the writing of other tourism authors indicates that what may be a perfect or unique shot for the tourist may well be highly sensitive for the host community. Chalfen, (1979) supports this when stating that many tourists face conflict when attempting to capture an ‘authentic’ view. Further to this, an irony of the situation, as described by Urry (1995, p. 176), is that as tourists attempt to ‘capture’ environments, their presence, particularly when in large numbers, actually spoils the environments they are attempting to frame within photographs.

As noted earlier, some participants indicated that the presence of photography at the site means they altered their worship at the place, including avoiding worship altogether. Thus, tourists have altered the very place they wish to gain an authentic view, and photograph, of. I further witnessed during observations of the place, large numbers of visitors congregating inside the tiny church in order to look at and photograph the beautiful view out the altar window, up Lake Tekapo. The reality, however, is that many tourists congregate outside the window, as well as inside the building, meaning that photographs need to be well timed in order avoid capturing other tourists in photographs. Moreover, not only do large numbers of tourists potentially spoil the environment they are trying to capture, they may also Altar the spirit of place due to their presence (Shackley, 2001), intrude into the lives of the local worshipping community when photographing (Urry, 2002) and degrade the sanctity of the place by consuming it via photography (Urry, 2002). The impact upon local worshippers is an alteration of the spirit of place at their sacred site and alteration to their experience of the place as a direct result of their being distracted and photographed by the gazing, consuming tourist.

The noisiness of tourists at the sacred places was reported often by interview participants and has also been reported in tourism literature (Beals, & Woodward, 1996; Shackley, 2001), Shackley using the term “noise pollution” (2001, p. 48) to describe the effect. High levels of noise may come from tourists talking loudly but may also simply come from large numbers of
tourists congregating at a site, this noise causing distraction and irritation for those within the local worshipping community (my own observations; Shackley, 2001). Olivia identified the noise issue when she stated, “the tour bus drivers with their noisy vehi[cles], you know, tooting on the horns to get their crowds back in….shouting out or, you know, loud voices calling”. It is clearly not only voices that create inappropriate noise levels at the sites but also other noisy aspects of tourist visitation. The issue of noise has been reported as also occurring at Mount Sinai where the loud stereos of tourists climbing the Mountain interrupt the silence of monastic life of Monks in the nearby monastery and at Westminster Abby where the Abby clergy, in order to mitigate noise levels and regain some of the spirit of place, have instigated an initiative called ‘Prayers on the hour’ (Shackley, 2001). This initiative was recently instigated at the Christchurch Cathedral also, whereby a member of Cathedral clergy reads a prayer each hour in order to remind tourists that the place is one of worship and sanctity and to give all visitors an opportunity to reflect and pray. My observations of the prayers at the Cathedral were that some tourists ignored the prayer and continued walking, talking and photographing, while some stopped, sat down and reflected or prayed for the time. Clergy from the Cathedral and other interview respondents mentioned positive outcomes of the initiative.

Another inappropriate tourist behaviour mentioned frequently by interview respondents and linked closely with noise levels is tourists coming and going from worship services as well as tourists wandering around the site while worship services are conducted. The noise associated with this movement and the distraction that the movement causes leads to worshippers feeling personally distracted and annoyed and to the service being disrespected and interrupted. Speaking, for example, of tourists coming and going from the service, Maria expressed, “you get a bit annoyed I guess, when it’s the middle of a service and people have come in and, or they get up and go out in the middle of a service, I think oh, couldn’t they just sit for another few minutes”. Similarly, speaking of the distraction of tourists who are not involved in the service yet still walking around the site, participants Nathan and Hannah suggested,

Hannah: I don’t like it if they’re wandering around, they’re not, there’s not showing the respect for the people who are worshipping

Nathan: that’s when it becomes intrusive, and most of the time it doesn’t become intrusive but it has to be managed.
While this issue has not been widely expressed in the literature, it was mentioned briefly by Beals and Woodward (1996) when speaking of a frequently visited church in Harlem, USA, Rev. Calvin Butts of Abyssinian Baptist Church, one of Harlem’s most politically powerful ministers. Butts complains that tourists plant their feet on the pews and the balcony railings. Once, he says, a group of 70 European tourists had to be told to remain seated when they started to leave the service just before the collection plates were to be passed.

Not only is this tourist movement distracting for the worshipping community, it does not allow for the worshipping community to expand and welcome the tourists into the community as they miss parts of the service. Also, tourists leaving the service prior to its end means that the previously discussed impacts of financial contribution, mission and spiritual experience for the tourists may not occur meaning not only does the church miss out but the tourist also. This impact also clearly shows the differing time-frames that tourists and the worshipping community would generally operate under; worshippers commit a certain block of time to their visit whereas, perhaps constrained by a coach tour or other schedules, tourists may have shorter times to commit to visiting the place.

The worshipping community also felt they were ‘on show’ when being observed by passing tourists. This feeling within the destination community links clearly with Urry’s (2002) suggestion that tourists gaze upon the places they visit. Urry’s argument also suggests that members of the local worshipping community are part of the tourism ‘product’ (Urry, 2002). While the worshipping community has indicated that ‘being on show’ is a negative impact resulting from tourist visitation to the place, it is valuable to know their feelings around it so that mitigation measures may be instigated.

Another tourist behaviour deemed inappropriate at the sacred places was associated with large groups and organised tours. Interview participants mentioned that large groups can be overwhelming when they visit the sites, their large numbers flooding the relatively small spaces that the sacred sites occupy. As mentioned earlier, Elizabeth suggests this when she states, “the tour groups, I would say, when there’s a group of people come on mass…sometimes when they come on mass it’s a wee bit overwhelming”. This is particularly the case at the Church of the Good Shepherd due to its small size, layout and the very large numbers of tourists who visit the site. This feeling of ‘overwhelming’ relates to the social
carrying capacity for the place being exceeded (Glasson, Godfrey & Goodey, 1995; Shelby & Heberlein, 1986). This point is covered in more depth below, in Section 5.3.7.

Exacerbating the crowding issue are peak times of the day (and year) when tourists come to the places meaning their numbers are concentrated and crowding (discussed below in Section 5.3.7) becomes even more of an issue. While much has been written on crowding at recreation and tourist sites, little has been mentioned regarding the impact that tours and large groups has upon sacred sites. The exception is Shackley (2001) who mentions this and also suggests the further impact of tour group leaders and coach drivers creating noise when attempting to gather their groups before departing a site. This was mentioned by some members of the worshipping communities and certainly was witnessed by me during observation sessions. Again, this is particularly the case at the Church of the Good Shepherd where the car park for the site is in very close proximity to the building itself, and to the worshipping community while there.

Tourists dropping litter, toileting at the sites, eating inside the places, becoming irritated if church schedules conflicted with their own, meaning no or limited access, and instances of cultural difference leading to conflict were also mentioned by members of the worshipping community. The offence caused towards the worshipping community by these behaviours can again be put down to cultural distance and a lack of understanding or knowledge on the part of the tourist, leading to disappointment and possibly anger and conflict. As with the other inappropriate tourist behaviours discussed above, these behaviours, particularly if they lead to conflict with church authorities or local worshippers, can also lead to the destruction of the spirit of place and ultimately the experience of the local worshipping community. This conflict has been explained by Horn (1996) when she integrated conflict theory and sense of place in order to explain the social impacts of tourism and suggested that tourists and the local community are involved in a type of resource conflict.

The inappropriate behaviours discussed above were reported as leading to distraction and interruption and feelings of annoyance, disrespect and irritation for members of the local worshipping community. The inappropriate behaviours of tourists would undoubtedly impact the spirit of place at the sacred sites, something that Shackley has suggested also occurs at other sacred places visited by tourists. “…the behaviour of fellow visitors martially affects the nature of the individual visitor experience as it modifies the ‘spirit of place’ of the site” (Shackley, 2001, p. 35). Olsen (2006, p. 107) supports Shackley, and also acknowledges the lack of knowledge on the part of tourists when stating,
many visitors today, even if they view a site as sacred, are unaware of the accepted codes of behaviour in hallowed settings (Shackley, 2001a) and may not realise that loud talking, photographing pilgrims who are praying or meditating, and acting disruptively distracts worshippers and dilutes the sense of sanctity and calmness.

Olsen goes on to note that, “this sense of place is critical to providing an atmosphere of worship and meditation for those who wish to communicate with the divine” (2006, pg 106). Tourists who exhibit inappropriate behaviours may negatively impact upon other’s ability to worship at the site. Inappropriate photography, high levels of noise, tourists coming and going from scheduled worship services as well as wandering around during them, tours and large groups of tourists and inappropriate behaviours exhibited by tourists can degrade the spirit of place which then not only impacts the place itself and the experience of the local worshipping community, but potentially also, and somewhat ironically, the experience of the tourists themselves (Shackley, 2001). As mentioned above, Urry (1995, p. 176) suggests this when speaking of photography, whereby tourists spoil the very thing they are trying to capture. The same may be said of a site’s spirit of place, that is, tourists, who come in large numbers and with potentially damaging behaviours, degrade a site’s spirit of place - the very thing that may attract tourists to it.

Urry’s theory of consumption suggests that tourists consume the environments, places, objects, events and services they come into contact with when engaged in tourism (2002). Tourists ‘gaze’ upon these aspects of tourism, thereby consuming them, and they prefer to gaze upon that which is different to their norm (Urry, 2002). Urry suggests this when he states, regarding tourism, that “…one key feature would seem to be that there is difference between one’s normal place of residence/work and the object of the tourist gaze” (Urry, 2002, p. 12). Urry’s suggestion that tourists prefer to gaze upon that which is different to their own, creates the potential for greater impacts occurring from their visitation to sacred places. As has been mentioned above, many tourists exhibit inappropriate behaviours while at the sacred places and these behaviours stem from the tourist’s lack of knowledge or concern for appropriate behaviour while at the site. Therefore, if tourists are more likely to seek out places, objects and experiences that are different to what they know, there is greater opportunity that they do not understand the normal codes of behaviour and appropriate ways of being when in contact with the place, object or experience. This may then lead to greater opportunity for cultural distance and negative impact for the local hosts, in this case, the worshipping community. Further to this, Urry, when speaking of MacCannells work, suggests
that “...the gaze of the tourist will involve an obvious intrusion into people’s lives which would be generally unacceptable...” (Urry, 2002, pg. 9). In searching for an authentic view of that which they wish to gaze upon, in this case the sacred places of their destination and the local worshippers at those places, tourists necessarily intrude into the spiritual and worship life of the place’s community. As noted earlier, the sacred places considered in this study hold significant meaning in the lives of the worshipping community. Therefore, intrusion into this aspect of life may be equally, if not more, significant and negatively impacting for worshippers. Moreover, in regards to the significance of the sacred place in the lives of local worshippers, the distraction, irritation, annoyance and degradation of experience discussed above could mean that their ability to truly experience the place and have it be what they wish it to be in their life is decreased. The local worshipping community may well not attain the spiritual benefits they otherwise would if the distraction, annoyance, irritation and degradation of spirit of place and experience due to tourism did not occur.

5.3.7 Increased numbers at the place

A simple impact reported by interview participants, and which I also witnessed during observations, was an increase in the number of worshippers during scheduled services due to the presence of tourists. Nathan explained it well when he stated, “if it was only regulars who were coming...you’d have smaller congregations”. Increased numbers at worship services, festivals and other religious and spiritual events is something that has also been reported in the literature. Shackley, for example, states, “…few sacred sites attract only worshippers, and at most sites those who come to worship, pray or meditate are in a minority” (Shackley, 2001, p. 7). Tourists who attend worship services increase the overall number of worshippers at these events.

Interestingly, however, while many people choose to visit sacred places as tourism destinations, there is also a general decrease in numbers of people attending church as members of the regular worshipping congregation. This decrease in numbers attending services was noted by interview participants and is supported in the literature by Beals, & Woodward (1996) and Shackley (2004a, 2008). Shackley, for example, states, “one of the most interesting features of tourism to religion-based attractions is that visitor numbers continue to increase at the same time that the number of people in regular worshipping congregations decline” (Shackley, 2008, p. 261). With the financial pressures mentioned
above, as well as a desire to share the Gospel, it is not surprising that church authorities and
caretakers are looking towards the potential of visitors and tourists to fill the void left by
dwindling congregations.

The change in dynamics associated with falling numbers of regular, local worshippers and
increasing numbers of tourists to a site leaves open the question of how this change alters the
place and the local worshipper’s experience of it. Regarding place generally, Manzo suggests
that “the effect of other people on one’s experience of a place [is] considerable”. (2005, p. 79).
Shackley, speaking of sacred sites, suggests that large numbers of tourists can have
detrimental effects upon religious or spiritual rituals and festivals. She states, “such large
volumes of visitors change the character of the festival, exclude local people, decrease local
participation and alter the function of the festival as a focus for social cohesion” (Shackley,
1999, p. 96). Universitas Udayana & Francillon (1975) support this also, suggesting that
sometimes increased numbers can be desecrating to a sacred place. Further to the effects on
spirit of place, Cohen suggests that mass tourism has negative effects upon the spirituality
and religiosity of people who live in tourist destinations, that there is “…a weakening of the
local adherence to religion and of the beliefs in the sacredness and efficacy of holy places,
argument was supported at the Church of the Good Shepherd where members of the
worshipping community commented that potential worshippers, who belong to the wider
community of Tekapo, did not attend services or personal worship at the church because of
the numbers of tourists who visit. Mark, for example, reported, “what happens is that some of
the locals see them as intruders, not saying all, but some, and they use it as an excuse for
staying away”. Certainly, there will be impacts upon the spirit of place at, and peoples use of,
sacred sites where there are increased numbers visiting the site and attending worship
services. Shackley mentioned, however, that these increases in numbers of people to sacred
sites is likely to continue; “…whatever the shape of the postmodern world, increasing
numbers of people are going to be looking at sacred sites for some means of defining a more
acceptable reality” (Shackley, 2001, p. xviii). This lends support for the consideration of the
impacts which tourism to sacred places can create for the local worshipping communities and
the management practices which may be required in order to ensure a site’s spirit of place is
maintained.

As described by participants, impacts upon the spirit of place may be a positive increase in
the ‘richness’ of the place or may be a negative increase in feelings of crowding at the site.
Patterns in the data suggest that the ‘visitor’ group, defined by the worshipping community,
increased the richness of the place as these people engaged with the community of the place. Strategies which aim to encourage increased visitation by this group may consequently increase the richness they bring to the place.

As reported above, increases in the number of people at the sacred place can also create a situation where there are more tourists than the site can physically hold or the local worshipping community can cope with before the place and experiences available at it are negatively impacted. The worshipping communities have reported that the high volumes of tourists at the sites leads to crowding, which can then restrict physical movement of worshippers around the place; increased noise levels; detraction from the atmosphere experienced during worship services and a decreased the ability for community fellowship. Overall, crowding at the sites negatively impacts their spirit of place and worshippers use of it. The effect of crowding at sacred sites has been reported by Fish and Fish (1993, cited in Olsen, & Timothy, 2006, Pg 12), Olsen, (2006), and Shackley (2001; 2002; 2004b) and is stated succinctly by Olsen when he mentions “…overcrowding, which can violate a site’s sanctity” (2006, p. 108) in regards to the site’s spirit of place, and Fish & Fish (1993, cited in Olsen & Timothy, 2006, Pg 12) in regards to local worshipper’s experience at the place: “overcrowding leads to the local populations having little room to enjoy their own spiritual environment”. This statement is exemplified in a local worshipper remarking on how her experience is altered by tourists visiting her sacred place: “yes it is, by the number of tourists, yes it is, if there’s too many around, won’t go near it….I choose my times and, or won’t go near it” (Kristin). This worshipper staying away from the place, due to the high volume of tourists, aligns with the coping strategy outlined below, in Section 5.4.2.

The issue of crowding can be exacerbated by the physical size and layout of the place, at the Church of the Good Shepherd this is particularly the case due to its small size compared with the large volume of tourists that visit. This is not such an issue at the Christchurch Cathedral as the place is larger, meaning tourists are ‘diluted’ in the space and there are smaller side chapels where local worshippers can go to ‘escape’ the crowds. As mentioned earlier, the crowding issue is further compounded at the Church of the Good Shepherd by the schedules and itineraries of the many coach and tour companies that stop at the place. Being an ideal mid-way point between Christchurch and other Southern destinations, many tour companies make Tekapo, and the church, a stop-over point. This brings huge increases in numbers to the place particularly during the hours of eleven-am and two-pm as many of the companies and tours operate on similar schedules. This issue is confirmed by Shackley in her article about the sacred site of Uluru: “Crowding is exacerbated by coach company itineraries which take
visitors to the same places at the same time of the day” (2004b, p. 69). Unfortunately, the local worshipping community has no say regarding schedules which create high visitor volumes within a short period of time, thereby leading to increased impacts upon their sacred place.

The idea of carrying capacity (Glasson, Godfrey & Goodey, 1995; Shelby & Heberlein, 1986) is valuable here, this theory suggesting that each environment or place has a level at which visitor use is sustainable but anything over and above that level creates negative consequences for other users or the physical environment involved. Urry, builds on the concept of ‘perceptual capacity’, offered first by Walter (1982, cited in Urry, 2002), which, similar to social carrying capacity, suggests that tourist experiences have perceptual limits which, if reached, equate to a diminished experience. If this concept may be applied to members of the worshipping community also, then the perceptual capacity of my two case study sites, according to members of the worshipping community (and particularly at the Church of the Good Shepherd) seems to have been be reached and overshot.

In situations where a place’s perceptual capacity is exceeded, and the spirit of place and worshipper’s experience of it are thus negatively affected, locals may then come to feel the place is not longer ‘theirs’ (Urry, 1995). Urry suggests that as tourists appropriate a space, it can lead locals “…to feel that they have ‘lost’ their space.” (1995, p. 166). This, coupled with the idea that tourists consume the places they gaze upon, leaves the worshipping community without the place which they have reported as so very important to their spiritual and community life. This may already be the case for some members of the wider local community as interview participants reported people avoiding worship at the Church of the Good Shepherd due to the tourists who visit. The importance of place and the impact of ‘placelessness’ is emphasised by Relph when he states, “if places are indeed a fundamental aspect of man’s existence in the world, if they are sources of security and identity for individuals and for groups of people, then it is important that the means of experiencing, creating and maintaining significant places are not lost” (1976, p. 6).

While increases in the number of tourists to the sacred places can lead to crowding, local worshippers also reported that it led to an increase in the ‘richness’ or ‘life’ of the place. It is undeniable that the local worshipping community mixing with those from other cultures would add richness to the experience at their sacred place. Elizabeth suggests this when speaking of meeting people from other countries and stating, “those sort of things really enrich, you know, my life because I learn something about people from a completely
different world than what I live in”. This positive impact has been discussed by authors who perceive tourism to be a vital link in cross-cultural understanding and even a ‘passport to peace’ (for example, Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006; Moufakkir & Kelly, 2010; United Nations World Tourism Organisation [UNWTO], 1999). The potential of tourism to sacred places to add to the experience of the local worshipping community and tourist alike is expressed in the idea that “tourism is imbued with potential to draw peoples and cultures together in a state of understanding and communitas” (Robinson, 1999, p.2). Lawson et al’s (1998) work also found that residents of the towns studied believed that, similarly to those within the worshipping communities, without tourism these places would be dull.

Tourism, at its heart, brings people of a diversity of cultures, beliefs and worldviews together and nowhere is this diversity more apparent than at sacred sites. Sacred sites may be places where this increased understanding and communitas is even more likely to occur, given their importance in people’s lives and their ability to open people to the world of spirituality, God(s) and that which is beyond the physical and mundane. This same fact, however, holds the mixing of peoples at sacred sites in a precarious position where, if those from different cultures do not come together in a state of mutual understanding and communitas, there is potential for broad and deeply felt conflict. This point has been identified and the notion of tourism as a passport to cross-cultural understanding and peace has been severely critiqued. For example, Robinson (1999, p. 3) states,

while not denying the nobility of such rhetoric and the potential that tourism could play in generating cultural harmony, claims that tourism is a ‘vital force for peace’ (WTO, 1980) are exaggerated and out of step with on-the-ground developments in world tourism – an activity increasingly characterized by conflict.

This, however, is not to deny the fact that many of those within the worshipping communities of my two sacred sites may indeed feel that their experience is enriched by interaction with those from outside of their local, regular worshipping community. In recognising this, however, we must remember that interview participants made a distinction between (as defined by them, refer to Section 5.2) ‘tourists’ and ‘visitors’. These two different groups of people have different motivations and different behaviours at the sites and are likely to therefore add differing levels of richness to local worshippers experience and the possibility to contribute to cross-cultural understanding. This relationship is discussed in Section 5.2.1 and 6.2.1 regarding data patterns.
5.4 Reactions to tourism at sacred places

It is important, within research that looks at tourism and impacts to consider the reactions to tourism that the local community exhibits. Acknowledging the reactions of the ‘hosts’ completes the picture of tourism impacts at the places by telling us ‘what people do about it’. Members of the worshipping community indicated several clear reactions towards tourism at their sacred place. These reactions will be briefly commented upon and related to relevant literature. These results were not an object of the research but emerged as the research was conducted. They are significant, however, and therefore reported upon here. These findings would also be valuable areas of further study.

5.4.1 Positive reaction

Many members of the current worshipping communities of the sacred places reacted positively to tourism to and tourists at the sites. Generally, local worshippers were open to tourism at the places and to the tourists themselves, albeit while also reporting negative impacts which have been discussed above. Again, and as discussed above, this reaction is perhaps unsurprising considering the aspects of Christian faith which encourage hospitality, welcome and evangelism. Specific positive reactions to tourism at the place include, for example, the worshipping community inviting visitors to a cup of tea at the place after scheduled services, or members of the worshipping community sharing information with tourists they may come across. This positive reaction to tourism at the place is in line with Ap & Crompton’s ‘embracement phase’ (1993) where tourism at a place is embraced by the local community. This positive reaction to tourism is often accompanied by a desire for increased tourist volumes. The embracement phase may certainly be linked to the Christchurch Cathedral where many members of the worshipping community, when asked, wished for higher numbers of tourists and fewer participants commented on negative aspects of tourism at the place. At the Church of the Good Shepherd, responses to the same question regarding tourist numbers were mixed and, generally, feelings towards tourist visitation included slightly higher negative reports. This would indicate that members of the worshipping community at the Christchurch Cathedral are in the embracement phase. At the church of the Good Shepherd, however, more members of the worshipping community indicated a position closer to Ap and Crompton’s tolerance phase. While some members of the Christchurch
Cathedral indicated alignment with this phase also, this occurred more so at the Church of the Good Shepherd.

5.4.2 Locals staying away

There were reports of a negative response to tourism at the places being that potential members of the worshipping community were deterred from using the site because of the tourists that visited. This was reported more so at the Church of the Good Shepherd than at the Christchurch Cathedral. As discussed earlier, members of the wider community were reported to avoid worshipping at the sites due to tourism at them. For example, when speaking of negative aspects to tourist visitation, Mark mentions, “for me personally there’s not, but, what happens is that some of the locals see them as intruders, not saying all, but some, and they use it as an excuse for staying away”. Further to Mark’s claim, when asked about changing her use of the site due to tourists, Michelle reports,

I have done, we have done….we used to have a Bible study group here and we used to have a lot of women come to it….but a lot of, the rest of the group didn’t necessarily see that as a place where they could go and worship.

Indeed, these quotes clearly identify that some potential members of the worshipping community change their behaviour due to tourism at the places. These people may choose not to worship altogether, may worship in a different form or at a different location.

The suggestion that worshippers avoided the place due to tourism supports Lawson et al’s (1998) study. Ap and Crompton’s (1993) ‘adjustment’ and ‘withdrawal’ strategies towards tourism are also reflected in the abovementioned reaction. The adjustment strategy involves altering activities in order to avoid crowds of tourists. Members of the worshipping community at the Church of the Good Shepherd mentioned attempting to alter the times of scheduled worship services in order to avoid certain times of the day when tourist volumes were at a peak. Further to this, the finding of the present study which suggests that members of the wider community no longer worship at the place is directly in line with the ‘withdrawal’ strategy identified by Ap and Crompton. Similarly, Dogan’s (1989) suggested coping strategy of ‘retreatism’ also aligns with the reaction of these members of the worshipping community. As the name suggests, ‘retreatism’ involves the resident community avoiding contact with tourists as is indicated by members of the wider Tekapo community not
attending church because of the tourists who visit. Locals staying away from the site indicates that a ‘threshold’ of tolerance has been exceeded. The concept of a tolerance threshold is something that Doxey’s 1975 Irridex model suggests. While Doxey applies his model to an entire community, the concept of the threshold may be applied to individuals also, in this case, those who may otherwise worship at the site, but who currently do not. The concept of a tolerance threshold aligns also with the concept of carrying capacity. It seems the social carrying capacity, within the minds of those who no longer worship at the place, has been breached, resulting in their staying away from the site.

The issue of tolerance thresholds and social carrying capacities being exceeded is important to note. This is because some sacred sites may be unique and irreplaceable. This would mean that, if the social carrying capacity or tolerance threshold for these sites were exceeded, there may be no other place for the local worshipping community to ‘retreat to’. An example of this may be a sacred mountain or grove. In this case the worshipping community may not be able to move to another, similar sacred place and may have to withdraw from worship altogether, alter considerably their form of worship or ‘put up with’ tourist visitation beyond a level they are comfortable with.

The fact that people who feel strongly enough about tourism at the place to warrant no longer using it suggests intense feeling indeed. Unfortunately I could not capture these community members as research participants. This, however, is an area for valuable future research which may highlight this group’s intensity of feeling and specific reactions and behavioural changes because of tourism at the places. Further understanding of this behaviour change would provide a deeper understanding regarding the impacts of tourists to sacred places as well as tourism coping strategies. It is important to note, also, that the exclusion of this group of people may have impacted the results by decreasing the strength or specificity of reported impacts, that is, results may have been stronger and more negatively slanted towards tourism at the places had these people been included. For example, reports of crowding may have been more heavily reported.

5.4.3 Resignation to the situation

Another reaction to tourism at the sites, which was evident at both places, was a general feeling of resignation towards or powerlessness surrounding the situation. It was either explicitly expressed or otherwise inferred that members of the worshipping community are
used to tourism at the site and consider the situation to be ‘just the way it is’. For example, Elizabeth explains, “you just expect them to be around” Mary also comments, “you get really immune to the buses, the noise of the buses” suggesting they have both become ‘used to’ tourism to and tourists at the place. Michelle also states, “you learn to be patient”, suggesting she has developed a tolerance towards tourists at the site. This is something that Benjamin questions within himself when he suggests “we may well have got used to it”. Ava also expresses, “you do develop a bit of a tolerance to them”.

As well as expressing an immunity and tolerance towards tourists at the sites, many participants also expressed feelings of the situation being out of their control. Speaking of the evolution of the Church of the Good Shepherd into being a tourist icon, Benjamin suggests this as normal. He states, “it’s just grown hasn’t it, really, and now it’s on the touristy map and it is, it is classed as an icon….that’s just the way it happens”. Thomas also expresses this sentiment when speaking of the Cathedral being used as an icon and suggesting, “there’s nothing you can do about that”. Ava expresses the same feeling when she speaks of the image of the place being used on tourist memorabilia. She states, that’s part of it….if you’re going to be a tourist centre then that’s part of the price you pay I think, I’m sure that not everybody in the Vatican likes the, you know, the holographic pictures of the Pope you can buy outside St. Peters.

This statement clearly identifies that for some sacred sites which are also regularly visited by tourists, tourist presence at those places is seen as being an expected part of the place and out of the control of the regular worshipping community. Ava, when asked if tourists behave inappropriately, suggests, “yes, regularly but it’s pointless giving up time about them”. Again, it seems that there is a feeling of the situation being out of the control of those whom it impacts. “You just have to accept it” (Thomas) seems to be the attitude of many at the sites.

The tolerance of worshipping communities of sacred places may well be higher when there is an accompanying understanding of the financial contribution that the tourists make. This point is noted by both Shackley (1999) and Olsen and Timothy (2006). These authors suggest that inappropriate behaviours of tourists and other negative impacts may be accepted, even if tolerance limits have been reached, because of the financial gains to be made by allowing tourist access. This creates a complex scenario for sacred site managers and caretakers who must balance tourist access, equating to financial contributions, with the tolerance thresholds of local worshippers.
Both reactions stated above may be easily related to Doxey’s irritation index (1975). Feelings of resignation towards the situation could easily be situated on the Irridex, around Doxey’s suggested points of ‘Apathy’ and ‘Irritation’. As noted, Doxey’s theory is dated and much critiqued, however, support arising from the present study exists. The feelings of resignation towards the situation may also be related to Urry’s (1995) suggestion that locals can come to feel they have ‘lost their place’ due to increased tourism to it. The tolerance and ambivalence exhibited by members of the worshipping community aligns well with the ‘tolerance’ reaction described by Ap and Crompton (1993). This reaction to tourism involves the local community exhibiting ambivalence towards tourism and tourists, while also acknowledging positive and negative aspects to it. This reaction was exhibited by many at the Church of the Good Shepherd, as well as members at the Christchurch Cathedral.

5.4.4 Sacred places first and foremost

Another strong reaction to tourism at the sacred places was the feeling that, although tourists were welcome, the places should remain sacred sites first and foremost. Many examples of support for this belief emerged during interviews. For example, Matthew states that “first and foremost the Cathedral is always a house of prayer and a place of hospitality and welcome”. Similarly, Olivia reports on her frustration when dealing with a rushed tourist while also suggesting the place is one of worship above tourism. She reports,

I heard one person say to the guide, ‘we’ve only got 5 minutes’, you know, ‘I’ve got to get in because I’ve only got 5 minutes, gotta be back on the bus in 5 mintues’, and it didn’t matter what our needs were, they, theirs was 5 minutes and that was it, and that sort of makes you feel as though you, we’ll I’m sorry but it’s, you know, for us first, or it’s for our worship first.

Olivia and Matthew’s statements suggest that the local worshipping community believes the place must be seen and used as a sacred worship site above any other use.

Concerning tourism development at the sacred places, the desire of the focus of the places to be one of sanctity, worship and faith was again revealed. For example, Maria comments, “the church is, very much, comes first, the commercial side is second”. Michelle expresses the same feeling when speaking about the development of a visitors centre and explains that the focus of such a centre should be spiritual. She suggests any development would need to be,
“...a place of worship, a place of fellowship”. Clearly, the focus of the sacred places, and any developments associated with them, must be spiritual or worship based. The above quotes exemplify this, not only in the belief in this focus, but also reporting on tourism development preferences.

The local worshipping community’s belief that the sacred places should remain sacred places over and above tourism interests fundamentally relates to the interface between the sacred and the profane. The worshipping community suggests that some element of the profane world of tourism is acceptable within the sacred sites, but that the places must remain ones of worship and sanctity above any other use. As Olsen (2003, cited in Olsen, 2006) and Shackley (2001; 2008) note, religious places have long involved a commercial element. The level of commercialisation, however, is the point which concerns many sacred place caretakers and managers; high levels of commercialisation can mean an equal loss of meaning (Johnston, 2006; Olsen, 2006). Further to this, as noted earlier, the Bible suggests that the mixing of the sacred and the commercial is not appropriate (Mark 11: 15-17). Shackley (2001) has also noted the complexity of this balancing act for sacred place managers.

The potential for sacred places to become attractions other than centres of worship is something noted by Olsen and Timothy (2006). Commenting on Cohen’s work they suggest, “in many European countries mass tourism has almost completely taken over Christian religious sites, causing these places of worship to cease their normal functions to some degree (Cohen 1998)” (2006, p. 12). Shackley, echoing the remarks of the worshipping community, goes on to suggest that “visiting a sacred site should be an essentially spiritual experience, uncontaminated (as far as possible) by technical and commercial realities” (Shackley, 2001, p. xviii). Leask notes this also as well as pointing out the complexity of the situations sacred places face. He states, “…the wide range of stakeholder interests relating to an attraction, be they related to education, revenue generation or conservation, will inevitably lead to conflicting management pressures” (2008). The literature supports the assertion of the worshipping communities, as well as pointing towards the complex task that faces sacred place managers and caretakers.

An element retained when ‘keeping the sacred place sacred’ is the site’s spirit of place. This quality may be retained if a site’s focus remains as a place of worship, however, measures may need to be instigated in order to ensure this. Again, Shackley notes that sacred places “…need to present the visitor with an evocative experience by creating a visitor environment within which the original spirit of place is retained” (2001, p. 181). Shackley’s 2001 work
also suggests measures used among various sites in order to preserve this quality. An example already instigated at one of the case study sites is the ‘Prayer on the Hour’ initiated at the Christchurch Cathedral which aims to ensure this. Tuan (1977) further notes that the preservation of a place can relate to the identity of those involved in it. The preservation of sacred places as foci of worship and spirituality is therefore important as it may relate to the meaning of the place for the worshipping community, their spiritual life and, as Tuan suggests, their identity.

Olsen, (2006) relates the transformation of sacred places away from their original focus to Urry’s gaze. Olsen notes “tourism promotion is critical in changing religious sites into tourist places, as the symbolic meaning of place can be transformed into sites to be gazed at (Urry, 1990) rather than sites of worship and contemplation” (Olsen, 2006, p. 112). Tourism promotion and the consumption of sacred places via the tourist gaze moves the sites away from ones of sanctity and worship. Shackley (2001, p. 187) furthers this by speaking of sacred places and noting,

when their activities extend into the contemporary business-related world, roles get confused and the visitor is unable to place a spiritual and temporal perimeter around the site, and becomes confused since the site no longer represents a space apart from the everyday world, but merely an extension of it.

The changes to place noted above are in line with remarks offered by the worshipping community. The sacred places, the worshipping community assert, should remain places of worship and spirituality as opposed to commercial centres focused on elements other than those of a spiritual nature.

The above assertion that the place must remain a sacred place first and foremost may also be related to the literature which suggests that cultural values can be strengthened or revived via tourism. Dogan's work (1989) suggests that a reaction to tourism may be ‘revitalisation’ whereby the local community’s culture is revitalised due to interest by tourists. While, traditionally, Dogan's work speaks of local handicrafts or ceremonies, the same may be said of the desire to maintain a sacred place as just that. Members of the local worshipping community, like members of local cultures visited by tourists, may take greater pride in their place, and indeed the religion it is based upon. This may translate to a wish to strengthen the history, meaning and traditions of the place by having it remain a sacred site. Furthermore,
suggested again by Dogan, the local community may be partaking in the coping strategy of ‘boundary maintenance’ regarding the place by suggesting it remain a sacred site.

5.4.5 A diversity of reactions

An important point that Ap and Crompton note is that “…at any time there may be a diversity of reactions to tourism in a community, and that these reactions will be manifested by different behavioural strategies” (1993, p. 49). According to AP and Crompton’s assertion, the local worshipping communities of a sacred place may hold differing reactions to tourism at the site and therefore, differing coping strategies towards tourism. It is clear, from the reactions to tourism outlined above, that as Ap and Crompton suggest, there exist within the worshipping communities of these sacred sites, differing reactions to tourism and therefore differing coping strategies. As Dogan (1989) suggests, the reactions and coping strategies enlisted by different members of a community depend on various factors. The consideration of which is, unfortunately, outside of the scope of this research.

Both sacred places used as case studies within this research have already instigated management procedures and other measures in response to tourism at the sites. Some of these have been reported upon and discussed already. For example, changes to worship services or the use of music in order to remind tourists that the place is indeed a sacred one and to retain a spirit of place are already used at the sites. Further management techniques may be enlisted in order to mitigate negative impacts and indeed negative responses to tourism at sacred places and retain a focus within the sites as places of worship and sanctity.

5.5 Chapter summary

This chapter has provided a discussion of the results of the research. First, the clear distinction between tourists and visitors offered by the worshipping community was discussed, incorporating theory and literature. Next, each impact identified by the worshipping community was discussed in relation to relevant theory and literature. Lastly, a brief description of the worshipping community’s reactions to tourism at their place was offered. Following this, the reactions were also discussed in relation to appropriate literature.
Chapter 6
Limitations, Suggestions and Conclusions

6.1 Introduction

The previous chapters have presented the results of the research and discussed these results in relation to relevant literature and theory. This final chapter offers concluding remarks in order to reiterate the findings of the study and to highlight its contribution. The chapter then offers sacred place management suggestions specific to the case study sites but potentially applicable elsewhere. Finally, the chapter acknowledges the limitations of the research and offers recommendations for future research surrounding the topic.

6.2 Concluding remarks

The below list of conclusions are offered in order to reiterate the research findings. These conclusions are based on the results of the interviews, sacred place observations and photographs and mapping exercises as well as a reflection of these in relation to the relevant theory which has been offered above.

6.2.1 Research contribution

The findings of this research make valuable contributions towards our understanding of tourist typologies, tourism impacts and tourism at sacred places. These contributions will be briefly discussed.

Beyond the gaze
This research has produced the valuable finding that members of the local worshipping community, the ‘host’ community, consider there to be a difference in the types of tourists who visit their sacred place. ‘Visitors’ come to the place for spiritual reasons, are more open to the meaning behind the place and are more likely to participate in the spiritual or
community activities of the place. ‘Tourists’ however, have more profane motivations, they visit the site for its icon or attraction status, for less spiritual reasons and are less likely to engage in spiritual or community activities at the place. This finding is similar to other tourist typologies surrounding sacred sites, however, it is different in that the typology, unique in that it is defined by the worshipping community, includes only two types of tourist.

This research confirms a few key points found in other studies surrounding this finding. First, that, as much literature suggests from the perspective of the researcher or tourist, the host community also defines into different groups those who visit. Therefore, we may conclude that definitions of tourist typologies may be based on host perceptions as well as upon those of the tourist or upon academic theory and analysis. Furthermore, the perspective of host communities in this regard is perhaps one of the more relevant and important perspectives to consider as it is they who feel the impacts of these people to their place. Second, with this understanding in mind, sacred places may be better managed and financial resources better concentrated so that positive benefits may be optimised and negative impacts mitigated. For example, increasing the richness of worshipper’s experience, as mentioned above, may be better facilitated in light of this finding. Lastly, this finding has relevance to the continuing debate surrounding the tourist gaze. The gaze of the ‘tourist’ group indeed aligns with Urry’s original assertion that tourists consume places via their visual gaze and physical presence. However, the ‘visitor’ group goes beyond this gaze and is engaged in the sacred place and its local worshipping community on a level greater than the more superficial gaze of the tourist. The finding that visitors go ‘beyond the gaze’ certainly aligns with the critiques of Urry’s assertion and goes further, however, to argue that the gaze may involve spiritual dimensions also. Further research and discussion opportunities lie in the analysis of the level of consumption of the place, its services and sanctity by this visitor group.

Patterns within the data

The strength of this research’s contribution lies in the patterns which emerged in the data and the specific impacts identified by the worshipping community. The data produced strong patterns which suggest that, within the eyes of the worshipping community, tourists are more closely related to negative impacts while visitors are more closely related to the positive impacts of tourism to the sacred places. Furthermore, the focus of the visitor group while at the place closely aligns with the meaning that the place has for members of the worshipping community. The worshipping community is more open to, engage more with, and regard in a more positive light visitors as opposed to tourists. These patterns would benefit from further research focused on these definitions and relationships. This further research holds valuable
knowledge and understanding surrounding visitation to sacred places and how impacts from these visits may be best managed.

Further contributions of this research lie in the impacts clearly identified by the worshipping community, the boundaries and meaning of the sacred place as described by the worshipping community, the worshipping community’s reactions to tourism, and their preferences for tourism development.

### 6.2.2 Impacts identified

The research identified specific impacts that the worshipping communities reported surrounding tourism to, and tourists at, their sacred place. These impacts include:

- **Financial contributions.** Sacred places are often in financial need and these contributions may be made by tourists and visitors. Attaining a balance of sensitive commercial venture, which may acquire revenue, and retaining the site’s ‘spirit of place’ and focus as a sacred place is a complex balance to attain.

- **Changes to the place or worship.** The sacred places investigated altered the place and it’s services slightly in order to accommodate tourists. Physical changes include the use of signs, barriers, guides and altering tourist flow. Worship services included changes such as alterations to content or halting services as tourists wish to join in.

- **Physical impacts to the place.** Increased numbers at the place and visitor behaviour impact the physical fabric of the sites. Physical impacts include, for example, litter and increased wear and tear on the sites. The resources required to maintain and repair these impacts is borne by the sacred place management and caretakers.

- **An opportunity for mission work.** Worshipping communities of the places saw tourism as an avenue through which evangelism and mission work may occur. This work aligns with suggestions of mission and evangelism found in the Bible.

- **An opportunity for tourists to have spiritual experiences.** Tourists may have a spiritual experience while at the sacred place or due to their sacred place visit. The spiritual value of the trip may not be recognised until long after the tourist has left the place.
- Tourists exhibit certain inappropriate behaviours while at the sacred places. These suggest specific management needs and may inform management activities. Inappropriate behaviours may often occur because of gaps in the understanding of tourists. The dissemination of accurate information regarding appropriate behaviours at the places may help to minimise inappropriate behaviours. This information dissemination would then work together with signage and other management techniques already used at the sites, for example, guides and guardians.

- Increased numbers to the places. This equated to increased numbers at services when numbers of local worshippers are falling as well as an increased richness to the experience of local worshipers. The worshipping community reported tourists and visitors contributing towards their positive experience. Optimising contact between the ‘visitor’ group (as opposed to the ‘tourist’ group) would lead to increases in this positive experience for members of the local worshipping community.

- Tours, large groups and crowding are an issue. Tours and large groups to the sacred places overwhelm the sites and their worshipping communities. Furthermore, crowding was experienced by members of the worshipping communities, particularly at the smaller Church of the Good Shepherd. This crowding is related to the physical and social carrying capacities of the sites being exceeded.

- In response to these impacts, the worshipping communities enlisted certain reactions and strategies in order to cope with tourism at their sacred place. These reactions and strategies included, positive reactions, staying away from the sacred place, resignation towards the situation and developing tolerance regarding it and strong feelings that the place should remain a sacred place first and foremost. When related to literature explaining similar reactions within other host communities, understanding these reactions and strategies can provide an indication of how reactions may change over time and what management techniques need to be employed in order to ensure an increase in positive reactions.

### 6.2.3 Meaning of place and the boundaries of sanctity

- The meaning of the sacred place is very different for different people. This meaning may influence how tourists are perceived as well as the perception of impacts held within the worshipping community. Furthermore, because sacred places are an important aspect in the
lives of worshippers, impacts may be felt at a deep spiritual or personal level. Research into the social impact of tourist visitation to these places therefore has value. This value surrounds the understanding that may be gained regarding impacts at sacred sites and how these can be incorporated into sacred site management in order to minimise negative impacts.

- The belief structure upon which the two case study sites are based no-doubt impacted the findings of the research. Christian belief is one which embraces those outside the faith, holds central evangelism and mission work and welcomes with hospitality those who are not regular worshippers. Different sacred places, however, will be based on different belief structures. Many of these beliefs, and therefore places, do not allow open-access for non-believers and indeed access is quite restricted, often to those who are of a certain age, knowledge or who have been through particular rites of passage. Undoubtedly, participant responses regarding tourism to and tourists at other sacred places would be different to those encountered at the two Christian case study sites. Observations, management techniques and the mapping exercises are also likely to be different. The present research, therefore, has value in identifying the impacts of tourism to built Christian sacred sites as well as identifying methods for which research of a similar nature may be applied at different sacred places.

- The boundaries of the sacred place are fluid. ‘Where’ the sacred place is may be different for different members of the worshipping community. This perception has a bearing on where tourists enter the sacred place and where the worshipping community may ‘retreat’ to. This also has an influence on the perception of impacts identified. Management suggestions therefore must be place specific and not assume that a sacred place is in certain areas, or bound within physical structures.

- The research identified that many within the worshipping community feel there are different ‘levels’ of sanctity within the sites. Some areas within, or parts of, the sacred places are ‘more’ sacred than others. These different levels may be used to inform appropriate tourist access where the ‘more’ sacred areas within the sites may be restricted to tourists thereby minimising negative impacts.

- The consumption of these sacred places by tourists (via, for example, their gaze, participation in services, photography) changes them from places of worship and sanctity to ones of the profane activity of tourism. The site’s spirit of place is altered via this consumption and the place itself is consumed.
6.2.4 Tourism development

- The two local worshipping communities had different preferences for tourism development at their sacred sites. Both groups, however, wished for any development to have a spiritual and mission focus. Participants were adamant that the sacred sites must remain sacred sites ahead of touristic use. Furthermore, patterns within the data suggest that the worshipping community would prefer increased numbers of the visitor group as opposed to the tourist group.

- Considering the abovementioned impacts and reactions towards tourism to, and tourists at, the sacred places, any touristic development needs to focus on the spiritual aspect of the place and of a spiritual experience for those who visit.

- There is a limit to the number of tourists that the worshipping community feels is acceptable and there is a limit to the number of tourists that the physical structures of the places can hold. The concepts of social and physical carrying capacity are valuable in regards to these findings and future research to assess the carrying capacity of the sites would be valuable.

6.3 Recommendations for sacred site management

The perceptions and feelings shared by worshipping communities offer key points for consideration regarding sacred place management. The following section suggests site specific management options which may contribute to decreased negative impacts from tourism to the place, as well as working towards maintaining the site’s ‘spirit of place’, a point noted as important by Shackley (2001), Horn (1996) and Olsen (2006). These recommendations are considered in relation to, and based upon, literature regarding sacred place management as well as the findings of the study. The management suggestions for the Christchurch Cathedral, damaged in Christchurch’s February earthquake, are offered on the knowledge of the situation at the Cathedral prior to the earthquake and on the assumption that the situation would again be the same at the site once reconstruction has occurred.
6.3.1 Management suggestions for both sites

Certain management techniques exist which may apply to both sacred sites in an attempt to mitigate negative impacts from tourism to the place.

First, the current use of guides and guardians, whether paid or volunteer, seems to be a management technique that works well. People in these positions can provide information and advice to tourists regarding site history and significance, appropriate behaviour and other necessary information as well as manage inappropriate behaviour. If possible, a greater number of guides/guardians at the sites during scheduled service times may help with decreasing the impact caused by tourists wandering around the sites and distracting congregation members while they worship.

Second, and related to the use of guides and guardians for tourist management, the use of signage and physical barriers at the sites may also mitigate impacts felt by the worshipping community. This is particularly the case during scheduled service times. Signs in the language of the common groups of tourists who visit the sites would help to convey important information as well as appropriate behaviour of tourists while at the place. While it is impractical to have signs in the language of every tourist to the places, the major tourist groups could be covered on key signage and further languages covered in brochures or leaflets. This already occurs to a degree at the Christchurch Cathedral. With changing tourist groups, however, it is important to monitor the demographics of those who visit and alter the conveyed information accordingly. This information may be gathered from external sources and agencies such as Tourism New Zealand. Signs maximising the use of illustrations would also assist management.

Physical barriers are also an extremely effective means with which to manage the flow and position of tourists. Ropes and other temporary and removable structures may be positioned so as to restrict tourist access to certain areas. This technique is currently used at both sites. At the Church of the Good Shepherd, for example, it is a successful technique for keeping tourists out of the Altar area. These barriers would be particularly useful for areas which were highlighted as sacred – and particularly those highlighted as ‘most’ or ‘more’ sacred – by participants during the mapping exercise. For example, the Altar or high Altar is an area considered sacred or most sacred by participants. This area is one which, if not already cordoned off, could easily be restricted to tourists with the use of ropes and barriers. Specific
placements of barriers at each site are discussed below. It is suggested that the placement and use of signs and barriers is initially monitored in order to ensure effectiveness and suitability.

Third, the managers of the sacred sites could focus marketing strategies towards the group that research participants described as visitors. Patterns within the data suggest more favour from the worshipping community towards this group. Visitors are more likely to understand appropriate behaviours therefore decreasing the likelihood of inappropriate or offensive behaviours occurring by this group.

Fourth, worship services may be scheduled outside of peak tourist times. While some participants suggested closing the sites to tourists during service times, many, particularly the staff who were interviewed, did not agree with this measure. An alternative management strategy is to hold services for the regular worshipping congregations outside of those times where there is likely to be high levels of tourists visiting. This will mean fewer tourists visiting the site during services and, therefore, less opportunity for negative impacts from tourist visitation. It is likely that visitors who genuinely wish to attend a service at the site will continue to attend as they still have an opportunity to do so. The worshipping community would need to be consulted regarding this measure to ensure altered service times are acceptable.

Fifth, an increase in information and education given to potential tourists to the sites is necessary. Various media and tour companies need to convey more and accurate information about the sites. This is supported by interview participants such as Mary when she suggests, “there’s a lot of mis-information” and Olivia who goes on to suggest education as a solution when stating, “I think if you’ve got the co-operation of the guides and they’re clued up they can help alleviate that kind of problems”. Shackley (2004b) supports this also. The information conveyed should include the fact that the sites are working sacred sites as opposed to tourist attractions. Also, information surrounding appropriate, respectful behaviour, tourist ‘no-go’ areas and requests for tourists to avoid scheduled service times unless they intend to attend as a worshipper should be conveyed. This information, and other points that church management wish to convey, could be distributed through guide books, tour companies and specifically coach tour leaders and guides, via accommodation businesses who advertise the places and websites which mention the sites. Increasing information and education about the sites, and the appropriate behaviour while visiting, would mean that tourists are better informed and thus more likely to behave appropriately and less likely to partake in behaviours that produce negative impacts for the local worshipping community.
6.3.2 The Church of the Good Shepherd

There is support for tourist management at the Church of the Good Shepherd. This is suggested by one participant when she states, “I think it’s a matter of managing the tourists more than blaming, saying we don’t want tourists” (Olivia). The management of tourists, as opposed to cessation of their visits, seems to be a wise solution to tourism at this sacred place, particularly considering the level of income that tourists contribute towards the site. Furthermore, attempting to cease, completely, all tourists to this site would be a complex task indeed.

The use of more permanent, physical barriers outside the church would assist in keeping tourists away from areas where they most distract and irritate local worshippers. Physical barriers outside the main Altar window which allows tourists to walk outside only on the lower level of the landscape would be effective in removing visual impacts as well as minimising noise to those worshipping inside the church. Physical barriers could also be used to direct tourists away from the church building, thus decreasing the potential of impacts from noise and visual disruption. Physical barriers may be constructed so they ‘blend in’ with the building and landscape and also be moveable meaning that the cordoned areas can still be utilised if required. These barriers allow tourists to still appreciate the site while mitigating negative impacts for the worshipping community.

Further to the use of physical barriers is the use of increased signage at the church. Signs may convey simple messages but in different languages and using illustrations so as to capture the understanding of the largest range of tourists as possible. The chosen languages would fit the most common tourist groups that visit the church. These signs would highlight that the place is a living, working church and ask for the respect of tourists. The signs would, like the barriers, be removable in order to minimise impact upon the surrounding landscape and also to accommodate differing uses of the site.

A management technique already used at the church is recommended to be extended in its use. Soft, quiet music played inside the church seems to alter tourist behaviour and decrease the interruption they cause due to noise and inappropriate behaviour. The music seems to convey that the place is a working church and sacred place. The benefit of this management technique is that it would cost little to implement and require no further staff training,
structural development or change at the site. The local worshipping community, however, would need to be consulted as to how this music would impact their personal worship time.

The idea of a footbridge across the river near the church was mentioned by some interview participants. The footbridge would mean that tourists would need to take a short walk to the site if they wished to visit. This is intended to reduce car and coach traffic (and therefore visual and noise pollution) at the site and encourage visitation by only those who truly wished to go, thereby potentially increasing carrying capacity and reducing crowding at the place. This measure may also increase visitor numbers compared to tourist numbers. The footbridge would, however, be a costly venture and require much planning and collaboration with local groups and local council or government bodies. The effectiveness of this management technique would also need to be weighed against the potential loss of income that ‘diverted’ tourists would have contributed towards the church funds. Perhaps an alternative to this option is to remove the car-park at the church. This would mean tourist coaches and other vehicles need to park in the village and those wishing to visit the church must walk to get there (allowances would need to be made for mobility impaired visitors). This may have the same effect as the above mentioned bridge meaning less noise and that tourists need to make a greater effort to get to the place. This may potentially decrease numbers at the place while increasing the proportion of those who are more motivated to go. This measure, however, rests on the physical space available for coaches and vehicles in the village as well as the greater time allowances needed within tour itineraries. The greater time required within tour itineraries could mean, however, that less tour buses include this stop in their itinerary meaning fewer tourists at the place and therefore less impacts, positive and negative, associated with tourists.

6.3.3 The Christchurch Cathedral

Similar to the Church of the Good Shepherd, the Cathedral may benefit from increased physical barriers which direct tourist flow and stop tourist access. Unlike the Church of the Good Shepherd, however, much of the focus of the barriers would be inside the building. During scheduled services, barriers could be placed across the nave, towards the main entrance doors, thereby prohibiting access by tourists who disrupt the service and distract worshippers. The central area, in front of the main doors, could remain open so that worshippers may gain access after making contact with Cathedral guardians. As at the Church
of the Good Shepherd, these barriers would be moveable so that alternative furniture layouts and functions at the place could be accommodated. The benefit of this management technique is that there is little cost involved, in terms of the financial cost of purchasing them or human resource cost in terms of placing them out and taking them in before and after service.

The Cathedral may also wish to play quiet music as the Church of the Good Shepherd does currently. This management technique has had positive results on tourist behaviour at the Church of the Good Shepherd and may also have positive results at the Cathedral.

6.4 Research limitations and future research potential

6.4.1 Future research possibilities

Below is a list of future research possibilities that have emerged from the present study. These suggestions build upon the findings of the present research and may deepen our understanding of tourism impacts at sacred places.

- Further investigation of the tourist/visitor distinction made by the worshipping community would be valuable. More in-depth research surrounding this topic would further understandings regarding tourist typologies and the differing impacts that each group causes. This understanding may then lead to decreased negative impacts for the worshipping community, sacred places and indeed tourists and visitors. This further research may also consider the differing levels of consumption of place that occurs with each group.

- Related to the above, further investigation of the perceived impacts relating to both the tourist and the visitor groups would be valuable. This research could consider questions such as, ‘is either group responsible for specific impacts?’ If findings indicated that certain groups were responsible for specific impacts, mitigation activities could be more effectively undertaken.

- Future research possibility lies in measuring the social carrying capacity of the sacred sites. By undertaking a measurement of the carrying capacity of each site, relating to the experience of the worshipping community, specific, optimum visitor levels may be identified and maintained.
- Future research may also evaluate the places that participants consider acceptable for tourists and visitors to go, as was considered in the present research’s mapping exercise. Differences in the places acceptable for tourists may be different to those acceptable to visitors; visitors may well be allowed further into ‘back regions’. More in-depth knowledge of the acceptable areas of tourist access may again allow for improved management and experience for the local worshipping community.

6.4.2 Research limitations

This research has two main limitations which need to be acknowledged. The first limitation relates to the ability for the research to be generalised and the second relates to the sample of participants within the study.

The first limitation of the study surrounds the ability for the results and conclusions to be generalised. Owing to the aims of the study, as well as the qualitative methods used to gather data, it cannot be assumed that the results of this research apply directly to other sacred sites. Generalisations and conclusions may be made about the two case study sites in question as well as suggestions regarding the possibility of similar experiences at other sites. However, specific statements regarding other sacred places may not be made based solely on the findings of this research. As covered in the discussion section, various members within the worshipping community, as well as other sacred sites, may have different perceptions of the impacts created by tourism to the place. The possibility of these different perceptions relates to the diversity of people who make up the regular worshipping community of the places and the diversity of their experiences while there. While I am confident the sample of participants captured the range of possible perspectives within the wider worshipping community, there may well be varying perspectives within it. The intention of the research was not to make broad statements, but instead to gather a well informed and deep understanding of the experience of participants.

Further to this, it is important to note that the sacred sites of this research are both Christian sacred sites. These places of worship have distinct beliefs, ethics, practices and worldviews upon which the sites are based. Therefore, the use, entry and function of these places, and consequently the impact that touristic use, entry and function has on these places, may well be different to other sacred sites based upon different beliefs, ethics, practices and worldviews. For example, the Bighorn Medicine Wheel, used by many different Native American tribes,
traditionally was not visited unless there was specific need and after much preparation before entering the site (Price, 1994). The worshipping community’s perception of impacts of tourism to this place, when compared to this research’s Christian sacred sites which emphasises open access, will undoubtedly be quite different. It is impossible, therefore, to generalise the results of the present research to other sacred sites which rest on different belief systems.

A second limitation of the research surrounds the sample of participants. The sample of participants was limited in a few areas. Firstly, while the research gathered a good number of participants, the age range was limited. While I attempted to gather a group of participants with a range of ages, generally the average age of those involved in the study was in line with the age of regular congregation members. The older age of regular congregation members was supported by one participant when she stated “I think it’s the same with all the churches....there’s not the young”. It therefore is reasonable to expect a participant sample within an older age range, however, valuable future research may attempt to capture a younger sample of participants.

Secondly, the methods used to recruit participants was limited and also diverged from the intended method. Initially, participants were expected to be recruited via notices in case study site newsletters and site specific media. While this occurred at the Church of the Good Shepherd, at the Christchurch Cathedral potential participants were instead contacted directly by my key contact at the site. This therefore creates a situation where these potential participants may have felt obliged to be involved in the study, thus giving me a pool of participants who may not have otherwise been involved. The method of contacting possible participants that this key contact used also excluded other possible participants from being involved in the study, for example, those who regularly attend services at the site but who are not part of the ‘regulars’ group who were contacted. Furthermore, in regards to notices in the newsletters of the sacred places, this method of participant recruitment may exclude those who do not receive these media or those who disregard them.

Thirdly, and related to the above limitation, it is likely that those people who are particularly interested in a topic will volunteer to be involved in research surrounding it. It is also likely, therefore, and particularly in light of the above mentioned limitation, that only those who are especially passionate about the topic of the study volunteered themselves to be involved. This, therefore, misses those potential participants who are still impacted by tourism to their sacred
site but who do not feel strongly enough about the issue to give their time and energy to be interviewed, as well as those local worshippers who feel no impact due to tourism at the place. Indeed, many potential participants in the study may simply have missed seeing requests for recruitment or could not be interviewed due to other commitments.

Lastly, and importantly, it was outside the scope of the study to attempt to contact those members of the wider local community who no longer worship at the site due to tourism to the place. Some members of the community may have decided to worship elsewhere or stop worshipping altogether due to the effects of tourism at the site. The study therefore misses these people who may well have strong feelings regarding the impact of tourism to the sacred places. This group of people would be an excellent sample to capture in further studies surrounding tourism impacts at sacred sites and, specifically, behaviour change and coping strategies within the local community due to tourism development.

6.4.3 Final comment

The central aim of this study was to investigate the impacts of tourism to, and tourists at, sacred places within Aotearoa New Zealand. In doing so I gained insight into many aspects of sacred places, the worshipping community’s experiences at them and what these places mean in individual’s lives. This insight was a privilege to gather, particularly considering the importance of the places in the lives of many of the research participants. It is essential, that these places be considered by all stakeholders as more than tourist attractions, and perhaps even more than simple sacred places but, instead, as central features of the spiritual life of those who have made it their place of worship, and potentially a place of spiritual experience for those who visit. In today’s increasingly secularised and fast-paced world it is perhaps even more important that there remain places that people can escape to, places which hold peace, sanctity and quiet so that members of the worshipping community, and the wider public, may have places of respite and calm.
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Appendix A
Worshipping community interview guide

CHURCH OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD
INTERVIEW GUIDE:

Briefing/Introduction:
* Just as a reminder, this interview is totally confidential and notes and recordings will be accessible by myself, and possibly my supervisors, only. Any information I record as part of my thesis report will be anonymous and not identifiable to you.

* Also, all questions are voluntary so if there’s one you don’t wish to answer, there is no pressure to do so and you can simply say you don’t wish to answer and we’ll move on.

* Do you mind if I record this interview? (if the participant says ‘yes’, I will let them know that I will likely make notes during the interview).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions:</th>
<th>Probing/expanding Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundaries of sanctity</strong></td>
<td>If you had to highlight where the sacred place is, where would you do so? Where is the sanctity to you? Where are the boundaries of sanctity in your mind?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ As you know, my research is looking at sacred place. So I can better understand where the sacred place is for you, may you please mark on the map, or maps, where you believe the sacred place is…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants use of place:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ How many years have you been part of the regular congregation here at the Church of the Good Shepherd?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ How often do you use, or visit, the Church?</td>
<td>How many times a week or month? (for either worship, work or both)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Do you come mostly for scheduled services or for your own personal worship?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ How do you use the Church?</td>
<td>Do you worship here? Do you work here? Do you volunteer here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ What does this place mean to you?</td>
<td>What does coming to the Church mean in your life? How does it fit in to your life? What would it mean to not have the Church to come to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants contact with tourists:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Who do you see as tourists to the Church?</td>
<td>How would you define a tourist to the Church? Why or how do tourists ‘stick out’ from others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ How much contact do you have with tourists at the Church?</td>
<td>Do you speak with tourists, or bump into them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you notice them while you are worshipping here?</td>
<td>Do you actively seek them out?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you notice the presence of tourists at the Church?</td>
<td>Do you notice tourists during service times or at other times you may be here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel about tourists visiting the Church during service times, e.g. Holy Communion?</td>
<td>Do you think it is appropriate? Do you enjoy tourists visiting during services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How about during non-service times?</td>
<td>Do you think it is appropriate? Do you enjoy tourists visiting between services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel the presence of tourists enhances or detracts from your experience at the Church?</td>
<td>Does the presence of tourists make your experience at the church (time here) better or worse?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you change your use of the Church at all because of the tourists that visit?</td>
<td>For example, do you come less or at different times of the day because of the tourists?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there behaviours which tourists may do at the Church which you feel are inappropriate?</td>
<td>Are there things that tourists do at the Church which you do not like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that the presence of tourists changes the Church in any way?</td>
<td>i.e. the church atmosphere, the feeling here, the church as a place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that the presence of tourists changes your experience at the Church in any way?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do tourists at the Church change your feeling towards the place?</td>
<td>Do tourists change how you feel about the Church? Do tourists change how the Church is a part of your life/what it means in your life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you or would you feel about non-religious events being held at the Church?</td>
<td>Do you enjoy non-religious events? Do you feel it is appropriate non-religious events be held at the Church?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel these events enhance or detract from your experience at the Church?</td>
<td>Do these events make your experience at the Church (time here) better or worse?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you change your use of the Church at all because of the events held here?</td>
<td>For example, do you come less or at different times of the day because of the tourists?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you prefer to see more or less tourists at the Church?</td>
<td>Would you like this? Do you feel this would be a good idea?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you feel about a visitor’s centre being built alongside the Church?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you like to see more or less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ How do you feel about weddings and other ceremonies taking place here where the ceremony members are not part of the regular congregation?</td>
<td>Do you feel it is appropriate that a sacred place be used for marketing the area to tourists?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ How do you feel about the Church being used as an icon for the district and Tekapo township?</td>
<td>Tourist companies actively market the region using the church as a key highlight or attraction, how do you feel about this when these companies and agencies are not associated with the church? Do you think this would be more acceptable under certain conditions e.g. if the church/diocese was to reap benefit from those companies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ How do you feel about the church being marketed to tourists by other agencies and companies but not the church itself?</td>
<td>How do you feel about this sacred place be put on tourist souvenirs such as teaspoons and tea towels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ How do you feel about the Church image being used on tourist memorabilia and souvenirs?</td>
<td>Mark on the map where you believe it is appropriate for tourists to go and those areas where you believe they shouldn’t go…. (participants will be given two different coloured markers for this exercise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Where do you feel is appropriate for tourists to go in this space? Please mark this on the map...</td>
<td>Participants involvement in the tourism industry:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ -&gt; If so, how long have you been involved in the industry?</td>
<td>□ How involved are you in the tourism industry? (either within or outside the Church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ How involved are you in the tourism industry? (either within or outside the Church)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Staff interview guide

Staff questions:

- * Do you worship at the Church/Cathedral as well as work there? (if yes, complete personal questions also)
- * What is your role at the Church/Cathedral?
- * How often do you visit for the role?
- * Do you have contact with tourists as part of your role here?  
  -> If so, what type of contact?  
  -> What form does this contact take?  
  -> How often does the contact occur?
- * How do you feel about tourists visiting the Church/Cathedral?  
  -> Is it an opportunity to extend your ministry?
- * Does the presence of tourists impact your work?  
  -> If so, how?  
  -> Are they a nuisance/do you welcome them?  
  -> Does their presence make your job more/less pleasant; more/less difficult?  
  -> Do you enjoy the contact you have with tourists?
- * In terms of your work role, are there things about tourists being here that you see as positive?
- * In terms of your work role, are there things about tourists being here that you see as negative?
- * Would you like to see more tourism development at the Church/Cathedral?
- * How do you think increased tourism development would impact your role here?  
  -> Do you think increased tourism development at the Church/Cathedral would make your job better or worse?  
    -> In what ways?  
  -> Do you think it would increase your workload?  
    -> In what ways?
- * Have you had any pleasant experiences with tourists?
- * How about unpleasant experiences with tourists?
- * Do you have any kind of relationship or understanding with tour operators?  
  -> If so, what is it?  
  -> How many?
☐ * Do operators provide any kind of financial donation to assist in the upkeep of the church/cathedral?

☐ * Do you feel any tension in the mixing of the spiritual nature of the Church/Cathedral and the commercial nature of tourism?

☐ Demographics –
* Please tell me which age bracket you belong to, from this list.
* Your gender
* How many other places have you worked, within or outside of NZ?

** I am offering for people to read over their transcribed interview notes so they may change, add or delete parts if they wish. would you like me to send you a copy of yours? If so, please write your address:
Appendix C
Examples of maps used in the mapping exercise for both sites.

Church of the Good Shepherd and the surrounding landscape.
edges of this map, please lick this box

If you believe the sacred place extends beyond the
Church of the Good Shepherd - Floor Plan.
Christchurch Cathedral and the surrounding landscape.
edges of this map, please tick this box.

If you believe the sacred place extends beyond the
Christchurch Cathedral - Floor Plan.
Appendix D
Example of data analysis sheets

# How do you feel about this visiting THE CHURCH?

R: It's great, it's like being an international church in a small context. I actually find that the whole ministry to tourists is very valuable, and is especially an unique opportunity for the church because the actual permanent residency in Lake Tekapo would be just a bit less than 400 so, and most of those are, you know, 24/7 so very few actually come to the service, so that the ministry with tourists could be actually developed a lot more.

K: yes, so, how do you feel about people who do kind of just come and take some photographs and maybe leave again? ...?
R: oh, that's fine, because I think it's a starting point, I wouldn't want to deprive them of that, and that can be a spiritual experience too, because the church is actually set in a much bigger context, which is the context of beautiful creation, of nature, whatever you want to call it, and I think that's all part of it, you know. I think the sacred space isn't inside the church, sacred space is much bigger than that, it's really the whole of creation that they can see.

I don't have a problem, myself, I suppose I do, well. I probably do question the number that come in that are really coming in because it's a church and they want to spend some time in the church, or those that are just coming to have a look, but you don't know, you can't, and you can't check them when they're coming in and you can't check them coming out. You don't know what effect just even coming in to the church might have on some of those people that are passing through and thinking, 'wow, perhaps I reconnected with the Church', or something like that or if they never have before or something, you don't know. You don't know what impact you have so, you've gotta set that aside and stop looking at them, I think as tourists, with the big touristy head, although they're visitors, perhaps class them as visitors rather than tourists, and that's a play on words there, yeah, and it's the same, as I say, it's the same as the one's on Sunday night or the 11:30 service in the morning when you're doing it, of the 20 that turn up to the service, you know, really, in reality, how many of those are Anglicans or Presbyterians, you know. If you ask the question, I wonder how many of those are Anglicans or Presbyterians, you know. If you ask the question, I wonder how many of those are Anglicans or Presbyterians, you know.
Appendix E

Map indicating the sacred place at the Church of the Good Shepherd
Map of the Church of the Good Shepherd and its surrounding landscape. In the case of many within the worshipping community of the Church, and as exemplified by the highlighted area on this map, the sacred place includes areas outside the physical structure and particularly the view from the Church, up Lake Tekapo.
Appendix F

Map of the Church of the Good Shepherd indicating different levels of sanctity
• most sacred
• sacred
Appendix G
Map of the Christchurch Cathedral indicating the area acceptable for tourist access.

The highlighted area depicts where it is acceptable for tourists to go. Clearly, the Altar is not acceptable.
Appendix H

Map of the Church of the Good Shepherd indicating the area acceptable for tourist access.

The area outside of the Altar window is considered an unacceptable area for tourists to be, as is the Altar area inside the Church.