

A survey of community attitudes to Akaroa hosting cruise ship arrivals



Jude Wilson & Michael Shone

Lincoln University

July 2013

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Christchurch City Council (CCC) staff in both Christchurch and at the Akaroa Service Centre and *The Akaroa Mail* for their assistance with this project. We also thank all those who gave their time to complete the survey and who were so welcoming of the surveyors in Akaroa.

This research was commissioned and funded by Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism (CCT).

Referencing details

Wilson, J. and Shone, M. C. (2013). *A survey of community attitudes to Akaroa hosting cruise ship arrivals*. Prepared by Lincoln University for Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism (CCT). Lincoln University: Canterbury, New Zealand.

Photograph 1 (Cover) Akaroa boat shed and housing at southern end of town (Jude Wilson)

Table of Contents

- TABLE OF CONTENTS II**
- LIST OF FIGURES III
- LIST OF TABLES..... IV
- LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS IV
- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY VI**
- INTRODUCTION..... 1**
- BACKGROUND..... 1**
- UNDERSTANDING RESIDENTS’ ATTITUDES TO TOURISM 1
- CRUISE TOURISM IN NEW ZEALAND 2
- CRUISE TOURISM IN AKAROA 3
- METHODS 6**
- SAMPLING METHOD AND SURVEY DISTRIBUTION..... 6
- Resident sample* 6
- Postal sample* 7
- District sample*..... 7
- THE QUESTIONNAIRE 7
- DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORTING 8
- RESULTS 9**
- SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS AND CHARACTERISTICS 9
- Q 15 Age*..... 9
- Q 16 Gender* 10
- Q 17 Ethnicity* 10
- Q 18 Employment status* 10
- LIVING AND WORKING IN AKAROA..... 11
- Q 1 Residential status*..... 11
- Q 2 Holiday home owners* 12
- Q 3 Length of association with Akaroa*..... 13
- Q 4 Work in any tourism-related jobs during previous 12 months (respondent only)*..... 13
- Q 5 Work in any tourism-related jobs during previous 12 months (others in household)*..... 14
- Q 6 Contact with cruise ship visitors during work time* 15
- Q 7 Contact with cruise ship visitors during non-work time*..... 16
- Q 8 Impact of contact with cruise ship visitors on quality of life in Akaroa*..... 17
- BENEFITS AND PROBLEMS FROM CRUISE SHIP TOURISM IN AKAROA..... 19
- Q 9 Attitudes towards cruise ship tourism* 19
- Q 10 Benefits to Akaroa from cruise ship tourism*..... 27
- Q 11 Main benefits of cruise ship tourism for Akaroa* 29
- Q 12 Problems for Akaroa from cruise ship tourism*..... 33
- Q 13 Cruise ship issues identified* 35
- Q 14 Actions taken* 44
- ANALYSIS OF FINAL COMMENTS 45
- Akaroa is a ‘tourist town’* 45
- Enjoying the tourists*..... 47
- A community divided*..... 47
- Balancing costs and benefits* 48
- Adapt or ‘get over it’* 50

DISCUSSION	51
CONCLUSION	54
REFERENCES	55
APPENDICES	57

List of Figures

FIGURE 1 AGE DISTRIBUTION BY SAMPLE GROUP (N=315)	9
FIGURE 2 EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF TOTAL SAMPLE (N=314)	10
FIGURE 3 EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY SAMPLE GROUP (N=314).....	11
FIGURE 4 RESIDENTIAL STATUS OF TOTAL SAMPLE (N=316).....	11
FIGURE 5 RESIDENTIAL STATUS BY SAMPLE GROUP (N=316).....	12
FIGURE 6 JOBS WORKED IN BY CATEGORY AND SAMPLE GROUP (N=124)	14
FIGURE 7 JOBS WORKED IN BY OTHERS IN HOUSEHOLD BY CATEGORY AND SAMPLE GROUP (N=91).....	15
FIGURE 8 CONTACT DURING WORK TIME FOR TOTAL SAMPLE (N=310)	15
FIGURE 9 CONTACT DURING WORK TIME BY SAMPLE GROUP (N=310).....	16
FIGURE 10 CONTACT DURING NON-WORK TIME FOR TOTAL SAMPLE (N=311).....	16
FIGURE 11 CONTACT DURING NON-WORK TIME BY SAMPLE GROUP (N=311)	17
FIGURE 12 IMPACT ON QUALITY OF LIFE FOR TOTAL SAMPLE (N=310)	17
FIGURE 13 IMPACT ON QUALITY OF LIFE BY SAMPLE GROUP (N=310)	18
FIGURE 14 OVERALL ATTITUDE SCORES OF TOTAL SAMPLE (N=313).....	25
FIGURE 15 OVERALL ATTITUDE SCORES BY SAMPLE GROUP (N=313)	26
FIGURE 16 IMPACT ON QUALITY OF LIFE BY ATTITUDE CATEGORY FOR TOTAL SAMPLE (N=309).....	26
FIGURE 17 WORK IN TOURISM BY ATTITUDE TO CRUISE SHIP TOURISM CATEGORY FOR TOTAL SAMPLE (N=308).....	27
FIGURE 18 DOES THE AKAROA COMMUNITY BENEFIT FROM CRUISE SHIP TOURISM? (N=301).....	27
FIGURE 19 BENEFITS TO AKAROA BY SAMPLE GROUP (N=301)	28
FIGURE 20 BENEFITS BY ATTITUDE CATEGORY (N=300)	28
FIGURE 21 MAIN BENEFITS OF CRUISE SHIP TOURISM FOR AKAROA (N=730).....	29
FIGURE 22 LEVEL OF PROBLEMS CRUISE SHIP TOURISM BRINGS AKAROA (N=VARIED).....	34
FIGURE 23 CRUISE SHIP ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY MAIN CATEGORY (N=486)	35
FIGURE 24 MOST PROBLEMATIC CRUISE SHIP ISSUES FOR AKAROA (N=486).....	36
FIGURE 25 ACTIONS TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO CRUISE SHIP TOURISM IN AKAROA (N=34)	44

List of Tables

TABLE 1 NUMBER OF CRUISES & PASSENGERS IN NEW ZEALAND (1996/97 - 2012/13)	2
TABLE 2 CRUISE SHIP ACTIVITY IN AKAROA 2008-2013	3
TABLE 3 SAMPLE GROUP DETAILS AND RESPONSE RATES.....	9
TABLE 4 GENDER OF SAMPLE (N=315)	10
TABLE 5 LENGTH OF RESIDENCE OR PROPERTY OWNERSHIP BY SAMPLE GROUP (N=300)	13
TABLE 6 ATTITUDE STATEMENTS ATTRACTING THE MOST AND LEAST ‘DON’T KNOW’ RESPONSES.....	19
TABLE 7 ATTITUDE STATEMENTS 9A, 9B, 9C, 9D AND 9E (ALL GRAPH RESULTS IN %)	20
TABLE 8 ATTITUDE STATEMENTS 9F, 9G, 9H, 9I, AND 9J (ALL GRAPH RESULTS IN %)	21
TABLE 9 ATTITUDE STATEMENTS 9K, 9L, 9M, 9N, AND 9O (ALL GRAPH RESULTS IN %).....	22
TABLE 10 ATTITUDE STATEMENTS 9P, 9Q, 9R, 9S AND 9T (ALL GRAPH RESULTS IN %)	23
TABLE 11 ATTITUDE STATEMENTS 9U, 9V, 9W AND 9X (ALL GRAPH RESULTS IN %)	24
TABLE 12 STATEMENTS ATTRACTING THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF AGREEMENT	25
TABLE 13 ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF CRUISE SHIP TOURISM FOR AKAROA	30
TABLE 14 TOURISM BENEFITS OF CRUISE SHIP TOURISM FOR AKAROA.....	31
TABLE 15 EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS OF CRUISE SHIP TOURISM FOR AKAROA	31
TABLE 16 COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL BENEFITS OF CRUISE SHIP TOURISM FOR AKAROA	32
TABLE 17 ITEMS ATTRACTING THE MOST AND LEAST ‘DON’T KNOW’ RESPONSES TO CRUISE SHIP TOURISM PROBLEMS IN AKAROA	33
TABLE 18 OVERCROWDING AND CONGESTION PROBLEMS	36
TABLE 19 FACILITY AND AMENITY PROBLEMS	37
TABLE 20 BUS-RELATED PROBLEMS	38
TABLE 21 ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS	38
TABLE 22 VISITOR MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS	39
TABLE 23 SUMMARY OF SOLUTIONS SUGGESTED	40

List of Photographs

PHOTOGRAPH 1 (COVER) AKAROA BOAT SHED AND HOUSING AT SOUTHERN END OF TOWN (JUDE WILSON)	1
PHOTOGRAPH 2 AKAROA VILLAGE CHARM - HISTORIC COTTAGE (JUDE WILSON)	5
PHOTOGRAPH 3 CLOSED-UP HOLIDAY HOME (JUDE WILSON)	8
PHOTOGRAPH 4 LETTERBOXES - AKAROA PROPERTIES (JUDE WILSON)	8
PHOTOGRAPH 5 AKAROA TOURIST ATTRACTION - THE GIANTS HOUSE (JUDE WILSON)	14
PHOTOGRAPH 6 ENCOUNTERING CRUISE SHIP VISITORS DURING DAILY LIFE IN AKAROA (JUDE WILSON)	18
PHOTOGRAPH 7 MAIN PUBLIC TOILETS AKAROA (JUDE WILSON)	33
PHOTOGRAPH 8 TEMPORARY PUBLIC TOILETS AKAROA (JUDE WILSON)	33
PHOTOGRAPH 9 REVENUE FROM CRUISE SHIPS AS A FUND RAISING INITIATIVE FOR AKAROA HOSPITAL FACILITIES (JUDE WILSON).....	49

Executive summary

- A questionnaire survey was undertaken in Akaroa in May 2013 to examine community opinions, perceptions and attitudes to cruise ship tourism in Akaroa. A total of 316 respondents from three sample groups were included in this survey (Resident =181; Postal = 85; District = 50). The overall response rate was 56.6%.
- **Sample characteristics:** 75.6% of respondents were aged 55 years or over; 60.3% were female; 98% were European/Pakeha ethnicity; 65% were employed/in the workforce. The Resident sample included people living in the Akaroa Township; the Postal sample were non-resident ratepayers (i.e., primarily holiday home owners); the District sample were people living outside Akaroa township (e.g., in the outer bays), but who considered themselves to be Akaroa residents. The majority of respondents from all three sample groups had an association with Akaroa (through length of residence or property ownership) of ten years or longer. 124 respondents reported working in at least one tourism-related job in the last year, 91 respondents reported someone else in their household working in at least one tourism-related job in the last year.
- **Contact with cruise ship visitors:** 52% of respondents reported either frequent or 'sometime' contact with cruise ship visitors during their work time; 81% reported either frequent or 'sometime' contact during their non-work time. This contact with cruise ship visitors was said to improve the quality of life for 47%, and had 'no impact' for 48% of respondents.
- **Attitudes:** A series of 24 attitude statements was used to measure the attitude of respondents to cruise ship tourism (i.e., to derive an overall attitude 'score'). 52% of respondents recorded a neutral attitude, 25% a negative attitude, and 23% a positive attitude. The Resident sample was more positive about cruise ship tourism than the Postal and District samples. There was a strongly positive relationship between overall attitude and impact on quality of life. There was a weaker, but still positive, relationship between attitude and employment in tourism-related jobs.
- **Benefits:** 89% of respondents thought that cruise ship tourism benefited the Akaroa community; 47% thought that Akaroa benefited 'greatly'. The Resident and District samples were more likely than the Postal sample to report that Akaroa benefits 'greatly'. A strongly positive relationship was found between perceptions of benefits and overall attitude to cruise ship tourism. In an open-ended question 84.4% (n=265) of respondents identified at least one benefit from cruise ship tourism; altogether 730 benefits were identified, many of which were reported multiple times. Main benefits identified relate to: economic, tourism-related, employment, and community and social benefits.
- **Problems:** Respondents were asked to rate, in terms of the level of significance, a number of specific problems/issues relating to cruise ship tourism in Akaroa. The most significant problems (identified from a list supplied) were: strain on facilities and infrastructure, crowding (in public buildings, on footpaths) and traffic congestion. An open-ended question also asked which problems they thought were the most significant. Altogether, 66.1% (n=209) respondents identified 486 problems, many of which were reported multiple times. The main problems identified related to: facilities and amenities, overcrowding and congestion, buses/tour coaches (traffic); visitor management, and environmental issues.

- **Solutions:** Respondents were also asked to provide suggestions about how these problems might be fixed. Although some respondents suggested specific solutions to the problems they identified, the majority of respondents provided relatively 'generic' solutions in that they were perceived to offer a solution to a range of issues raised. For example, limiting cruise ship arrivals was suggested on 80 occasions as a solution to problems relating to: overcrowding and congestion, facilities and amenities, and to reduce 'physical', social, cultural and environmental problems. Other solutions provided by respondents included: relocating the bus waiting area; redistributing monies from cruise ship anchorage/berthing levies; modifying visitor behaviours; and community adaptation.
- **Responsibility for change:** Overall, most of the responsibility for change/'fixing' the problems identified was assigned by respondents to Christchurch City Council. A number of other organisations were identified in respect to specific problems (e.g., Environment Canterbury, the New Zealand Police, the Harbour Master, Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism, Akaroa-Wairewa Community Board, Canterbury District Health Board, cruise ship companies, and tour operators). Importantly, respondents did not always correctly assign responsibility to the most relevant or appropriate organisation or agency.
- **Additional comments:** A large number of respondents provided additional written comments at the end of the questionnaire (53.3%, n=169). This suggests a high level of engagement with the cruise ship 'issue' within the Akaroa community. In some cases, these comments provided a reiteration, expansion or explanation of responses provided earlier in their questionnaire. In many instances, respondents took the opportunity to provide a broad overview of their opinions of cruise ship tourism in Akaroa. Overall, the additional comments provided by respondents related to: Akaroa's role as a 'tourist town'; the widespread enjoyment associated with hosting tourists; concerns around 'a community divided'; recognition of the need to balance costs and benefits; and a call for those who are against cruise ship tourism in Akaroa to adapt, or 'get over it'.

Introduction

Since the 2010/11 Canterbury earthquakes, Akaroa has been hosting the majority of cruise ship arrivals to Canterbury. This amounts to approximately 70-74 days per season, when between 2,000-4,000 persons come ashore between 9am and 4pm when in port. This increased level of cruise ship arrivals has had significant impacts, both beneficial and detrimental, on Akaroa. Attitudes within the Akaroa community to hosting cruise ship arrivals appear to be divided, and has led to public debate in Akaroa about the issue. In response to this situation, Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism (CCT) commissioned this research project to assess the impact of cruise ship tourism on the Akaroa community. The research was undertaken in May 2013 after two 'post-earthquake' seasons in which the Port of Lyttelton was unable to host cruise ships because of earthquake damage. During the 2011/12 season Akaroa hosted 86 ships; while 86 cruise ships were also forecast for the 2012/13 season these were expected to bring more passengers.

Background

Understanding residents' attitudes to tourism

Whilst few studies have specifically addressed the impact of cruise ships on small communities, there have been a number of studies on more general tourism development and its impacts on rural communities. Studies on the social impacts of tourism, for example, have reported negative perceptions around increased noise, litter, traffic, crime, overcrowding and tourism-induced price increases (Rothman, 1978); positives include improvements in local infrastructure (Belisle & Hoy, 1980), increased employment opportunities (Milman & Pizam, 1988) and increased recreational opportunities (Davis, Allen & Cosenza, 1988).

Attitudes and perceptions towards tourism development have been found to be influenced by the distance of residence/dwelling from the tourist zone, the length of one's residence and age. Sometimes attachment to a place or community is related to greater support for tourism (Davis *et al.*, 1988), and sometimes it is related to less support for tourism (McCool & Martin, 1994). Similarly, in some cases residents who have more contact with tourists are positive about tourism (Rothman, 1978), and in other cases they are negative about tourism (Pizam, 1978). In some places, for example, residents living closer to areas of higher or heavy tourism concentration have been found to be more positive about tourism (Belise & Hoy, 1980; Sheldon & Var, 1984). In other cases such residents are more negative than those living farther away (Keogh, 1990).

There is one important area in which patterns appear consistent: that of economic dependency or personal benefits gained from tourism. In almost all cases, economic dependency (e.g., employment in tourism) was positively related to support for tourism and for tourism growth (Glasson, 1994; Husbands, 1989; Lankford & Howard, 1994; Madrigal, 1993; Prentice, 1993; Pizam, 1978; Rothman, 1978). These results suggest that attitudes towards tourism follow some kind of equity or social exchange function (Ap 1990; Lankford & Howard, 1994).

According to Pearce, Moscardo and Ross (1996), however, one striking conclusion that can be drawn from the many surveys of community perceptions of tourism is that there are few consistent relationships or patterns. This point is reinforced in several other reviews of this material (Ap, 1990; King, Pizam & Milman, 1993; Lankford & Howard, 1994; Milman & Pizam, 1988).

A 2003 Lincoln University study examined the impact of tourism on the Akaroa community via a telephone survey (Shone, Simmons & Fairweather, 2003). Over half of the 95 Akaroa residents surveyed indicated a desire to see more tourism in the township. An open-ended question asked respondents to identify benefits of tourism: 83 per cent reported economic benefits; 27 per cent employment benefits; 24 per cent improved facilities for locals; and nine per cent increased cultural interaction. The main problems and concerns reported were: strain on infrastructure (36% of respondents), increased congestion (20%), car parking (18%), rubbish and litter (13%), campervan dumping (10%), dangerous driving (8%), noisy vehicles (6%), seasonality (4%); four per cent of the sample reported no problems with tourism. Akaroa residents were concerned about the impact of tourism on the natural environment, on infrastructure and the potential for the town’s character and village atmosphere/ambience to be lost. There were also concerns, however, that tourist demand could wane in the future and that the seasonal nature of tourism in Akaroa could be exacerbated.

Cruise tourism in New Zealand

The cruise ship industry has exhibited strong growth in New Zealand over the past 15 years. For example, in the 1996/97 season a total of 27 cruises brought 19,400 passengers to New Zealand. By the 2011/12 season, this figure had increased to 121 cruises carrying 173,819 passengers (Market Economics Limited, 2012: ii). This represents an increase over this 15-year period of 809 per cent on the 1996/97 figure (see Table 1). This growth trend has become particularly pronounced since the 2009/10 cruise season, when 109,951 passengers visited New Zealand. Growth in visitation over the two subsequent seasons (i.e., up to, and including, the 2011/12 season) indicates a growth rate of 58.1 per cent on the 2009/10 season (Tourism New Zealand, 2012). This growth is reflective of a global trend, which has seen the cruise sector grow to more than 20.6m passengers in 2011, up more than 106 per cent since 2000 (Market Economics Limited, 2012: 1).

It is expected that this growth in the cruise sector is likely to continue, with larger ships visiting and passenger numbers continuing to increase. Specifically, forecasts for the recently completed 2012/13 season anticipated that 130 cruise ship voyages would bring a total of 205,730 passengers to New Zealand. In addition to these passengers, these ships were expected to also carry a total of 93,000 crew (Market Economics Limited, 2012: 23). This view of the sector appears to be shared by Tourism New Zealand (2013), which notes on its ‘Cruise Sector’ web page that cruise tourism is the fastest-growing of New Zealand's tourism sectors and has considerable potential for future growth.

Table 1 Number of cruises & passengers in New Zealand (1996/97 - 2012/13)

New Zealand’s Cruise Summary				
Year	Number of Voyages	% Change	No. Of Passengers	% Change
1996/97	27	-	19,400	-
2008/09	96	-2.0	118,976	+2.4
2009/10	81	-15.6	109,951	-7.6
2010/11	93	14.8	136,168	+23.8
2011/12	121	29.0	173,819	+27.7
2012/13 (forecast)	130	8.3	205,730	+18.4

In addition to the growth in cruise arrivals to New Zealand, there are also considerable economic benefits associated with the sector. According to Market Economics Limited (2012: ii-iii), cruise ship passengers generated \$411.8m in direct spending during the 2010/11 season. This was anticipated to

increase to \$474.5m in 2011/12 (+15.2%). The direct spend generated during the 2010/11 season generated \$718.6m in total gross output, in turn contributing to \$288.9m to New Zealand’s GDP (in the form of value added) for that period. In addition, the cruise industry sustained, either directly or indirectly, a total of 4,961 ‘employment count’ (as opposed to FTE) jobs. Each passenger who travels on a cruise ship to New Zealand is estimated to generate almost \$1,700 in value added for the economy. In terms of passenger nationality, data obtained from Tourism New Zealand (2012) for the 2011/12 cruise season indicate that 54.8 per cent of cruise passengers to New Zealand were from Australia, 14.8 per cent were from USA, 10.7 per cent were from New Zealand (i.e., domestic visitors), and 7.3 per cent were from the UK.

Cruise tourism in Akaroa

Lyttelton Port of Christchurch was one of the major ports of call for the South Island, and the main Canterbury port, but the port was badly damaged in the Christchurch earthquake in February 2011; as a consequence of this, 29 of the 64 vessels scheduled to berth at the port during the 2011/12 cruise ship season were transferred to Akaroa Harbour for their port visit (Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, 2011). This relocation coincided with the growth in cruise ship tourism to New Zealand reported above; together these events have contributed to a significant increase in the number of cruise ships visiting Akaroa.

Table 2 illustrates the growth in cruise ships arrivals in Akaroa. In the 2009/10 cruise season, Akaroa hosted 8,754 cruise ship passenger arrivals. In the 2010/11 season, this figure had increased to 21,067 passenger arrivals (+140.7% on the previous season). By 2011/12, this figure had grown to 125,667 passenger arrivals (+496.5% on the previous season) (Tan & Summers, 2012). At the time of writing, official cruise passenger data was yet to be released for the 2012/13 cruise season. However, 86 cruise ship arrivals were scheduled for Akaroa in this season, and forecasts suggest that passenger arrivals would be 143,925 (+14.5% on the previous season). At the end of the 2012/13 season there was still considerable uncertainty as to when cruise ships would return to Lyttelton Port.

Table 2 Cruise ship activity in Akaroa 2008-2013

Year	Cruise ship activity in Akaroa 2008-2013			
	Number of ships visiting	Total Crew Arrivals	Total Passenger Arrivals	% Change Passenger Arrivals
2008/2009	9	1,793	4,882	-
2009/2010	8	3,657	8,754	+79.3
2010/2011	16	9,126	21,067	+140.7
2011/2012	86	48,876	125,667	+496.5
2012/2013 (forecast)	86	-	143,925	+14.5

During the 2011/2012 season the Canterbury region received a significant boost from the cruise industry with \$30.2 million worth of value added to the economy (Market Economics Limited, 2012). In Canterbury, 558 direct/ indirect FTE jobs were supported by the industry. The three dominant nationalities to arrive in Akaroa during the 2011/2012 season were: Australia (64.3%), USA (16.6%), and UK (5.5%) (Tan & Summers, 2012). The dominance of Australians amongst cruise ship passengers to Akaroa marks a shift from cruise ship visitors prior to the Canterbury earthquakes (2008/2009) when American passengers (48.4%) dominated arrivals (Tan & Summers, 2012). Prior to the earthquakes, Akaroa hosted a small number of cruise ships - primarily smaller vessels - and this change in nationalities most probably relates to this.

The 2010/2011 Canterbury earthquakes, the closure of Lyttelton Port and the subsequent re-routing of cruise ship arrivals to Akaroa have introduced a new set of visitors to the township. This came at a time when the township was experiencing the effects of the global economic recession and the downturn in international visitors to New Zealand. Christchurch, Canterbury and the South Island had also experienced a significant visitor downturn as a direct result of the Canterbury earthquakes. The earthquakes also affected Akaroa's domestic visitor market (many of whom come from Christchurch) and directly impacted on Akaroa with the closure of public buildings in the township as a result of earthquake damage.

Akaroa is a small township situated within Akaroa Harbour, on the southern side of Banks Peninsula. It is approximately 75 kilometres, or 90 minutes by car, from Christchurch City. At the 2006 Census of Population and Dwellings, the 'usually resident' population of the township was 510 people. In addition to the usually resident population, Akaroa has a large number of non-resident property owners/ratepayers, many of whom own holiday homes. Many of these holiday homes are available as casual rentals (i.e., they may be occupied by people other than the property owners). The township acts as a service centre for the scattered population of the outer bays area of Akaroa Harbour, many of whom work in Akaroa. Akaroa is a popular day trip or short stay destination for Christchurch residents. Akaroa is also known as a destination which draws upon the French heritage of its pioneer settlers and the associated village charm derived from this heritage. Not unexpectedly, given the size and village character of Akaroa, the increase in cruise ship arrivals and passenger numbers has had an impact upon the town's community.

On 8 February 2013 a letter was published in *The Akaroa Mail* newspaper in which a local resident voiced concerns (gathered from discussions with other local residents) about the impact cruise ship visitors were having on Akaroa and the Akaroa community. The author of this letter expressed concerns about: increased traffic on State Highway 75 (SH75) to Christchurch; crowding in the Akaroa shops; exhaust fumes from tour buses; dirty public toilets; and, the impact of significant numbers of cruise ship visitors on residents' attitudes and the character of the town itself. The following edition of *The Akaroa Mail* (22 February) featured an expanded 'Letters to the Editor' section to accommodate a raft of responses from the Akaroa community. Two of these responses supported the first author, adding queues in the Akaroa Public Library for internet usage and potential for environmental damage to the harbour to the list of concerns. They also reiterated concerns around the negative impacts of widespread congestion, air pollution from buses and the impact of cruise ship visitors on the character of the town.

Sixteen of the letters published, however, presented counter arguments. These were predominantly written by a mixture of locals, including business owners and residents directly involved with cruise ship visitors (e.g., ambassadors and tour guides) and other residents; several cruise ship visitors also responded. Amongst the locals, the most frequently reported positive (i.e., mentioned 12 times) of cruise ship tourism was the community pride engendered through showing off and sharing their town with visitors. An equal number of these rebuttals addressed the 'complainers', noting the need for people to "accept change", and expressing the view that cruise ship tourism did not bring any significant problems to Akaroa. Some also noted that none of the cruise ship tourism-related issues were, in fact, new issues for Akaroa in respect of tourism. It was noted that, without cruise ship tourism, Akaroa would be a "ghost town" or a "town of oldies" with considerably fewer services; cruise ship visitors "adding life to the town" and "meeting nice people" also featured strongly as positives. These social and community benefits were noted by almost all of those who responded.

Whilst less prominence was given to economic benefits, these were noted in respect of the post-earthquake and post-recession downturn, were considered important in respect of ensuring economic balance and business survival in Akaroa, as well as being important for employment.

The cruise ship visitors wrote that they were delighted with their warm welcome and about how much they had enjoyed walking around the beautiful town and meeting the locals. One noted that *“small towns like Akaroa need visitors in order to survive”*; another was *“astonished to read after picking up a copy of ‘The Akaroa Mail’ that not everyone in the community welcomed the influx of visitors these huge ships bring”*, pointing out that *“we [cruise ship visitors] are, after all, only folks like yourselves, enjoying the wonders of your magnificent country”*.



Photograph 2 Akaroa village charm - historic cottage (Jude Wilson)

Methods

The research instrument employed in this study was a self-complete mail-back survey questionnaire. The survey questionnaire, designed in conjunction with CCT, focused particularly on those people who live in Akaroa for most of the year, and those who own property in Akaroa, but are generally non-resident. The non-resident respondents were identified with the assistance of Christchurch City Council (to whom they pay property rates) and received a postal survey (Postal sample). The Akaroa Resident sample included residents who derive commercial benefit from cruise ship activity, as well as residents who derive no direct commercial benefit from cruise ship activity. A letter to the editor was published in the 10 May edition of *The Akaroa Mail*, which informed residents that the survey was being undertaken between 15 - 22 May (inclusive). The sampling methods and the survey distribution for each sample group are described further below.

Sampling method and survey distribution

Resident sample

For the purposes of this study the geographic boundary of Akaroa Township, and consequently the qualifier for inclusion in the Resident sample, was based on the township property map supplied by the Christchurch City Council (CCC), and verified by the mesh block units identified in the 2006 Census of Population and Dwellings.

Surveyors went door-to-door within Akaroa Township; any property at which residents were present was given a survey pack. This pack included an information sheet, a survey form and a reply paid envelope for return. Where possible surveyors tried to establish which properties were occupied full time (i.e., rather than being holiday homes). While in many cases it was obvious that particular properties were holiday homes (e.g., they looked closed up, see Photograph 3), surveyors also checked with those residents they did encounter which properties around them had permanent occupants. A second visit was made to all properties that were known to be permanently occupied, or which surveyors were unsure about, and if no one was present on this visit a survey pack (with an additional compliments slip) was left in the letterbox. Any holiday home owners encountered during surveying (i.e., they were in residence at the time) who had not received a survey via the Postal sample were also given a Resident survey. A letter to the editor was inserted in *The Akaroa Mail* on 24 May informing residents that they would be able to collect a survey pack from CCC Akaroa Service Centre, if for any reason they had not received a survey. These additional survey packs were available until 31 May. This letter also served as a reminder for those who had not returned their surveys.

Altogether, 286 surveys were distributed to Akaroa residents by the methods described above. One person from each household was asked to complete the questionnaire. In order to ensure a good cross section of the Akaroa community, a randomised sampling mechanism was employed which asked that the questionnaire be completed by the person in the household who was 18 years of age and over, and had the next birthday. The survey was self-complete and, as noted above, a reply-paid envelope was provided for return. Three residents declined to take a survey pack - two because of eyesight and hand-writing difficulties and one who was 'not interested'.

Postal sample

Initial examination of the CCC non-resident ratepayer database identified over 900 property owners, although in some instances multiple owners were listed for single properties. The database was filtered to remove these multiple owners, and then further filtered to include only those with Canterbury addresses. This left 447 non-resident property owners, and a sampling framework selected 200 respondents from this. The rationale for sampling only 200 non-resident ratepayers was so as not to 'swamp' the resident survey with this sub-sample of the Akaroa community; based on the 2006 Census data it was expected that, at most, only 315 households would be eligible for surveys in the Akaroa Township itself. A survey pack was posted out to this sample by CCC on 8 May, one week before the resident survey began. The survey pack contained: an information sheet, a survey form, and a reply-paid envelope. No reminder was sent for the Postal sample, although some may have subscribed to *The Akaroa Mail*.

District sample

A third sample group was added during the fieldwork after it became apparent that a large proportion of the Akaroa workforce resides either just outside the township boundaries or in the other small settlements dotted around Akaroa Harbour. A number of Akaroa residents who also lived just outside the township boundary or elsewhere in the district, but who considered themselves Akaroa residents also contacted the research team to ask to be included in the research. Surveys were distributed to this District sample by hand (i.e., to any business people or workers encountered in Akaroa during the Resident surveying period) and a number of survey packs were also left at the CCC Akaroa Service Centre from 15-31 May. The notice inserted in *The Akaroa Mail* on 24 May alerted District residents that survey packs were available if they wished to participate. Altogether, 72 District surveys were distributed.

We acknowledge that this 'self-selected' sample group may potentially bias the survey results, particularly as some of these respondents were economically dependent on Akaroa (i.e., they worked in the town) or were those most keen to 'have their say' (i.e., often expressing the strongest views). To isolate any potential bias, however, the majority of results are reported by sample group.

The questionnaire

The questionnaire design was informed by the previous Akaroa resident survey undertaken by Shone *et al.* in 2003. In addition, attitude scales used in social impact of tourism research were incorporated into the questionnaire (Haley, Snaith & Miller, 2005), as were a number of questions addressing the specific issues facing Akaroa. These were identified by CCT and through a review of the letters published in *The Akaroa Mail*. Key questions in the questionnaire focused on measuring community attitudes to cruise ship tourism, identifying impacts (positive and negative) associated with, or attributed to, cruise ship tourism and the identification of both development and mitigating strategies. The survey consisted of a mix of closed and open-ended questions. Respondents were given the opportunity to make any further comments they wished at the conclusion of the survey. The same survey was distributed to the Resident and District sample groups; the Postal survey included an additional question in the introductory section which asked about holiday home occupation and ownership, but was otherwise identical. A copy of each survey, the research information sheets and the survey letters inserted in *The Akaroa Mail* can be found in the Appendices.

Data analysis and reporting

The data from all surveys were entered into a Microsoft Excel spread sheet and all numerical data transported to SPSS 20 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) for statistical analysis. Open-ended questions were coded to facilitate some basic statistical analysis and these data were also analysed and then coded for key themes and types of responses. The data were analysed for frequencies and results are presented in this report by sample type for the majority of the analysis. The rationale behind this recognised the differing relationship of each sample group with both Akaroa and cruise ship visitors, and in order to minimise any potential sample bias within the 'self-selected' District sample (as noted above). Further analysis details are included with the results to each survey question.

Because of the differences in sample group size all results are reported in percentages, unless otherwise stated. In all instances $n = \text{the number of respondents answering that particular question}$ and, where appropriate, further explanation is provided as to the missing responses. Some respondents, for example, were not required to answer some questions in the survey (e.g., if a respondent indicated 'no benefits' from tourism in Question 10 they then skipped to Question 12); in other instances respondents either chose not to answer, or they missed questions, or parts thereof.



Photograph 3 Closed-up holiday home (Jude Wilson)

While the door-to-door method of survey distribution employed was successful, the nature of the Akaroa residential townscape presented some significant challenges.

As Photograph 3 shows many holiday homes were closed-up and able to be discounted as non-residential properties; for properties around which there was uncertainty, however, it was often difficult to leave surveys as letterboxes were separate to the property and there was no indication as to which belonged together (Photograph 4).



Photograph 4 Letterboxes - Akaroa properties (Jude Wilson)

Results

The survey results are presented in three sections; a fourth section presents an analysis of the additional comments provided by the survey respondents:

1. Sample demographics and characteristics
2. Living and working in Akaroa
3. Benefits and problems from cruise ship tourism in Akaroa
4. Analysis of additional comments

Sample demographics and characteristics

Altogether, 316 respondents answered the survey, which represents an overall response rate of 56.6 per cent (Table 3). As might be expected, the 'self-selected' District sample had the highest response rate (69.4%) of the three sample groups.

Table 3 Sample group details and response rates

	Surveys distributed	Completed surveys	Response rate*
Resident	286	181	63.3%
Postal	200	85	42.5%
District	72	50	69.4%
TOTAL SAMPLE	558	316	56.6%

*An additional 11 surveys - 9 Resident, 1 Postal and 1 District - were returned after the cut-off date for analysis: if included these would have increased the response rates to 66.4%, 43% and 69.9% respectively.

Q 15 Age

Altogether, 75.6 per cent (n=194) of the total sample were aged 55 or over and just under half the total sample (49.6%, n=156) were aged between 55 and 74 years. There was some variation in the age distribution by sample group: the Resident sample was slightly more evenly distributed across all age groups; the Postal sample had a larger proportion of respondents aged 55-74 years; and, the District sample had a larger proportion of respondents aged 55-64 years (Figure 1).




Figure 1 Age distribution by sample group (n=315)

Q 16 Gender

Overall gender distribution was 60.3 per cent female and 39.7 per cent male, with slightly fewer males in the Resident sample and slightly more males in the District sample (Table 4).

Table 4 Gender of sample (n=315)

Sample group	Male (%)	Female (%)
Resident	38.3	61.7
Postal	40.0	60.0
District	44.0	56.0
TOTAL SAMPLE	39.7	60.3

Q 17 Ethnicity

Altogether, 315 respondents answered this question with 98 per cent (n=309) reporting European/Pakeha New Zealander ethnicity; four respondents in the Resident sample reported Maori ethnicity and one reported ‘other’ ethnicity (with no further details); one respondent in the District sample was Maori.

Q 18 Employment status

Just over one third (34%) of the total sample were not in the workforce, slightly over half were either self-employed (28%) or employed full time (24%) and 13 per cent were employed part time. Only one per cent of the sample was unemployed (Figure 2).




Figure 2 Employment status of total sample (n=314)

There were some variations in employment status by sample group (Figure 3). These were, in part, age-related. The slightly older Resident and Postal sample groups, for example, had very similar distribution across the employment status categories with the exception of more part time workers in the Postal sample. In comparison, the slightly younger District sample had more people working full time and more people self-employed, and a correspondingly lower proportion not in the workforce.




Figure 3 Employment status by sample group (n=314)

Living and working in Akaroa

These questions explored each respondent’s level of attachment to Akaroa and the amount of contact or engagement they had with the cruise ship visitor segment. It included questions on each respondent’s residential status, holiday home ownership and visitation, employment in tourism-related jobs, contact with cruise ship visitors during work and non-work time and impact of this contact on their quality of life in Akaroa.

Q 1 Residential status

Sixty-one per cent of the total sample reported being permanent or full time Akaroa residents, 31 per cent were non-resident property owners and only one per cent were temporary Akaroa residents. Twenty-two respondents (7%) reported an ‘other’ residential status (Figure 4).




Figure 4 Residential status of total sample (n=316)

As expected, the majority of respondents (90.1%) in the Resident sample were permanent or full time Akaroa residents and the majority of respondents (95.3%) in the Postal sample were non-resident property owners. A small number of non-resident property owners (7.7%) were encountered in Akaroa during the survey period (primarily holiday home owners who were at their property) and were included in the Resident sample and 3.5 per cent of the Postal sample reported living in Akaroa on a full time or permanent basis (Figure 5).




Figure 5 Residential status by sample group (n=316)

The District sample was almost equally split between those who lived in Akaroa full time (52%) and those who answered ‘other’ (40%); a further eight per cent reported being non-resident property owners. As noted in the sampling methods, this sample group was self-selecting and surveys were distributed to anyone encountered working in Akaroa (but not resident within the township itself); anyone interested was also able to collect a survey from the CCC Service Centre in Akaroa. The majority of respondents who recorded ‘other’ as their residential status provided some explanation of their circumstances (e.g., “I work in Akaroa, but live in Duvauchelle”); those who provided no explanation simply indicated that they lived in Akaroa permanently, and most likely lived just outside the township boundaries.

Q 2 Holiday home owners

Altogether, the sample included 97 holiday home owners; 79 of these were surveyed in the Postal sample (five Postal sample respondents indicated that they were not the owner of a holiday home) and a further 16 were encountered ‘on the ground’ in Akaroa during the Resident survey sampling. Two of the District respondents reported being the owner of a holiday home.

Holiday home owners were asked how many nights they had spent in Akaroa during the 2012/13 cruise ship season (13 October - 5 April). For the 94 respondents who provided some occupancy details, the minimal number of nights stayed was zero and the maximum was 182; the average (mean) length of stay was 38 nights, the median stay was 30 nights and the modal stay was 20 nights.

Q 3 Length of association with Akaroa

Residents were asked how long they had lived in Akaroa; holiday home owners asked how long they had owned property in Akaroa. Most of those who lived outside Akaroa, but who had a close relationship with the Township or Akaroa area (i.e., the District sample) indicated how long they had lived in the area. Years of residence or ownership reported by the total sample (n=300) ranged from three months to 87 years; the mean was 18.7 years, the median was 14 years and the mode was ten years. Results by sample group are shown in Table 5.

Table 5 Length of residence or property ownership by sample group (n=300)

	Resident sample (n=170) Years lived in Akaroa	Postal sample (n=84) Years owned property	District sample (n=46) Years lived in Akaroa area
Range	3 months - 87 years	9 months - 60 years	6 months - 45 years
Mean	19.1 years	18.8 years	17 years
Median	12 years	15.5 years	16 years
Mode	3 years	10 years	10 years

Although the most frequently reported length of residence in the Resident sample was only three years (i.e., the mode), overall these data show that the majority of respondents in all three sample groups had a relatively long association with Akaroa:

- In the Resident sample, 62.4 per cent of respondents reported having lived in Akaroa for ten years or longer;
- 76.2 per cent of the Postal sample had owned property in Akaroa for ten years or longer; and,
- In the District sample, 73.9 per cent of respondents reported having lived in either Akaroa, or the Akaroa area, for ten years or longer.

Q 4 Work in any tourism-related jobs during previous 12 months (respondent only)

Respondents were asked to indicate if they had worked in any tourism-related jobs (from a list provided) in the previous year. Multiple answers were possible. Across the total sample, 124 respondents (39.2%) reported working in at least one tourism-related job: 26 of these respondents reported working in two tourism-related jobs and seven respondents reported working in three tourism-related jobs in the previous year.

In the Resident sample, 88 respondents reported working in at least one of the jobs listed; 18 of these respondents had worked in two jobs and five in three jobs: altogether 111 jobs were reported. In the District sample 31 respondents reported working in at least one of the jobs listed; eight of these respondents had worked in two jobs and two in three jobs (altogether 41 jobs). Only five respondents in the Postal sample had worked in any of the jobs listed. Figure 6 shows the employment reported, by job category and sample group.




Figure 6 Jobs worked in by category and sample group (n=124)

As Figure 6 shows, there were some differences in the employment profile (i.e., the job types) of the Resident and District samples. In the Resident sample, accommodation accounted for the largest percentage of jobs (28.8% of jobs) followed by hospitality (24.3%) and tourism attractions (20.7%). In the District sample, tourism retail accounted for the largest percentage of jobs reported (26.8% of jobs), followed by other retail (19.5%) and tourism attractions (19.5%). Two out of the five jobs reported by the Postal survey were in accommodation.



Photograph 5 Akaroa tourist attraction - The Giants House (Jude Wilson)

Q 5 Work in any tourism-related jobs during previous 12 months (others in household)

This question was identical to Question 4 except that it asked about others in the household working in any of the jobs listed. Multiple answers were possible. Across the total sample, 91 respondents (28.8%) reported that someone in their household worked in at least one tourism-related job; 14 of these respondents reported that someone had worked in two tourism-related jobs and a further four respondents reported that someone in their household had worked in three of the listed jobs during the last year (Figure 7).




Figure 7 Jobs worked in by others in household by category and sample group (n=91)

In the Resident sample, tourism attractions accounted for the largest percentage of jobs (31.2% of the 77 jobs reported) followed by hospitality and accommodation (both 22.1%). In the District sample, hospitality accounted for the largest percentage of the 26 jobs reported (26.9% of jobs), followed by other retail (19.2%) and accommodation (15.4%). Two out of the six jobs reported by the Postal survey were in tourism attractions.

Q 6 Contact with cruise ship visitors during work time

Slightly over half of all respondents (52%) reported coming into contact with cruise ship visitors either frequently or sometimes during their work time; three per cent reported rarely coming into contact with cruise ship visitors, and 45 per cent had no contact with cruise ship visitors during work time ('N/A' was also an option for this question) (Figure 8).




Figure 8 Contact during work time for total sample (n=310)

As might be expected, the majority of contact was reported by Resident and District sample. A relatively high proportion of respondents reported coming into frequent contact with cruise ship visitors during their work time (44.6% and 64% in the Resident and District sample groups, respectively); this reflects the fact that many jobs in Akaroa are in the hospitality and service sector.

Just over one-third of the Resident sample (35.6%) reported having no contact during work time which reflects the age of the population and the high proportion of people no longer in the workforce (Figure 9).




Figure 9 Contact during work time by sample group (n=310)

Q 7 Contact with cruise ship visitors during non-work time

Respondents reported more contact with cruise ship visitors during non-work time, with more than four-fifths of the total sample reporting either frequent (39%) or sometime (42%) contact, and only one-fifth reporting rare (11%) or no contact (8%) (Figure 10).




Figure 10 Contact during non-work time for total sample (n=311)

When compared to work time contact, there was not as much variation by sample group, although the percentage of the Postal sample reporting frequent contact (22.6%) was only half that of the Resident and District sample groups (both 44.9%). For the Postal sample, contact was more evenly spread across all levels of contact although this sample group had the highest percentage of 'sometimes' contact (45.2%) (Figure 11). There was no statistical relationship found between amount of contact and the number of nights spent in Akaroa during the cruise ship season for the Postal sample.




Figure 11 Contact during non-work time by sample group (n=311)

Q 8 Impact of contact with cruise ship visitors on quality of life in Akaroa

Altogether 91 respondents (29%) reported that their contact with cruise ship visitors either improved or significantly improved their quality of life, 149 (48%) reported no impact and 45 respondents (15%) reported that contact with cruise ship visitors either reduced or significantly reduced their quality of life. The remaining 25 respondents (8%) reported no contact or N/A. Six respondents did not answer the question (Figure 12).




Figure 12 Impact on quality of life for total sample (n=310)

Over half (55.4%) of the Postal sample, just under half of the resident sample (46.9%) and 40 per cent of the District sample reported that contact with cruise ship visitors had no impact on their quality of life (Figure 13). The District sample respondents were much more likely to report that contact with cruise ship visitors significantly improves or improves their quality of life (20% and 22%, respectively, compared to 12.4% and 17.5% of the Resident sample and 4.8% and 15.7% of the Postal sample). A reduced or significantly reduced quality of life was reported by the Resident and District samples (17.5% and 18%, respectively); only six per cent of the Postal sample reported a negative impact on quality of life.




Figure 13 Impact on quality of life by sample group (n=310)



Photograph 6 Encountering cruise ship visitors during daily life in Akaroa (Jude Wilson)

Benefits and problems from cruise ship tourism in Akaroa

This section of the survey asked about respondents' attitudes to cruise ship tourism in Akaroa and included: a general attitude question, two specific 'benefits' questions (one closed and one open-ended) and two 'problems' questions; the first identifying Akaroa-specific issues and the other an open-ended question asking respondents to identify what they considered to be the most significant problems caused by cruise ship tourism in Akaroa.

Q 9 Attitudes towards cruise ship tourism

The first question in the section (Q 9) presented respondents with 24 statements about cruise ship tourism. These statements were adapted (to focus on cruise ship tourism) from a set of scale items developed in other tourism research to measure the social impacts of tourism development (see, for example, Haley *et al.*, 2005). Respondents were asked to indicate on a five-point Likert scale from '1=strongly disagree' to '5=strongly agree' for each statement provided. These data are presented in graphical form (with the percentage reporting each attitude shown); the mean score for each item is also reported. A higher mean score indicates a high level of agreement with that attitude statement. The statements represented 13 positive (in shaded boxes, graphed in red) and 11 negative impacts (graphed in blue); the results are presented in Tables 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 below.

The number of respondents answering each statement is also shown (in the box on the left); the missing responses represent either those who selected the 'Don't know' option or who missed that statement completely (i.e., the corresponding line was left blank in the survey form). Whilst the number of missing answers were consistent across all statement items (i.e., between 3 and 9 respondents missed each item) there was considerably greater variation in the number answering 'Don't know' to the individual items (see Table 6 for statement items attracting the most and least 'Don't know' responses). The four statements attracting the most 'Don't know' responses all described negative impacts which were not particularly relevant in respect of cruise ship tourism in Akaroa; the least 'Don't know' responses represented two positive and two negative impacts and were all issues of relevance to Akaroa (noted in the newspaper letters and addressed elsewhere in the survey).

Table 6 Attitude statements attracting the most and least 'Don't know' responses

Statements attracting the most 'Don't know' responses		
h	Cruise ship tourism development increases local council rates	n=73
t	Tourism businesses are too politically influential in Akaroa	n=46
o	Cruise ship tourism increases the amount of crime in Akaroa	n=43
e	Cruise ship tourism unfairly increases property prices in Akaroa	n=31
Statements attracting the least 'Don't know' responses		
b	Cruise ship tourism increases traffic congestion in Akaroa	n=1
m	Akaroa should become more of a cruise destination	n=1
o	Cruise ship tourism negatively affects the character and charm of Akaroa	n=2
p	When I talk to other residents I am positive about cruise ship tourism	n=2

Table 7 Attitude statements 9a, 9b, 9c, 9d and 9e (all graph results in %)






<p>Q 9a. <i>The benefits of cruise ship tourism outweigh the problems</i> (n=303)</p> <p>Mean = 4.06</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>4.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>7.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>9.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>32.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>45.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	4.6	Disagree	7.9	Neutral	9.6	Agree	32.7	Strongly agree	45.2
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	4.6												
Disagree	7.9												
Neutral	9.6												
Agree	32.7												
Strongly agree	45.2												
<p>Q 9b. <i>Cruise ship tourism increases traffic congestion in Akaroa</i> (n=308)</p> <p>Mean = 3.65</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>5.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>13.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>16.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>36.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>26.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	5.8	Disagree	13.6	Neutral	16.9	Agree	36.7	Strongly agree	26.9
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	5.8												
Disagree	13.6												
Neutral	16.9												
Agree	36.7												
Strongly agree	26.9												
<p>Q 9c. <i>I feel that I can personally influence decisions about cruise ship tourism</i> (n=281)</p> <p>Mean = 2.56</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>23.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>24.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>14.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	23.1	Disagree	24.6	Neutral	32	Agree	14.2	Strongly agree	6
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	23.1												
Disagree	24.6												
Neutral	32												
Agree	14.2												
Strongly agree	6												
<p>Q 9d. <i>Cruise ship tourism improves the Akaroa economy</i> (n=299)</p> <p>Mean = 4.38</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>1.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>28.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>58.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	1.3	Disagree	4	Neutral	8	Agree	28.1	Strongly agree	58.5
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	1.3												
Disagree	4												
Neutral	8												
Agree	28.1												
Strongly agree	58.5												
<p>Q 9e. <i>Cruise ship tourism unfairly increases property prices in Akaroa</i> (n=279)</p> <p>Mean = 2.01</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>27.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>49.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>17.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>1.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	27.9	Disagree	49.3	Neutral	17.8	Agree	4	Strongly agree	1.1
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	27.9												
Disagree	49.3												
Neutral	17.8												
Agree	4												
Strongly agree	1.1												

Table 8 Attitude statements 9f, 9g, 9h, 9i, and 9j (all graph results in %)






<p>Q 9f. <i>Cruise ship tourism development improves the quality of life for residents</i> (n=302)</p> <p>Mean = 3.23</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>10.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>18.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>23.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>32.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>15.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage	Strongly disagree	10.6	Disagree	18.5	Neutral	23.2	Agree	32.5	Strongly agree	15.2
Response	Percentage												
Strongly disagree	10.6												
Disagree	18.5												
Neutral	23.2												
Agree	32.5												
Strongly agree	15.2												
<p>Q 9g. <i>Long term planning will help to control the negative impacts from cruise ship tourism</i> (n=298)</p> <p>Mean = 4.13</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>5.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>49</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>36.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage	Strongly disagree	2	Disagree	5.4	Neutral	7	Agree	49	Strongly agree	36.6
Response	Percentage												
Strongly disagree	2												
Disagree	5.4												
Neutral	7												
Agree	49												
Strongly agree	36.6												
<p>Q 9h. <i>Cruise ship tourism development increases local council rates</i> (n=233)</p> <p>Mean = 2.61</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>8.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>42.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>14.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>2.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage	Strongly disagree	8.2	Disagree	42.1	Neutral	33	Agree	14.2	Strongly agree	2.6
Response	Percentage												
Strongly disagree	8.2												
Disagree	42.1												
Neutral	33												
Agree	14.2												
Strongly agree	2.6												
<p>Q 9i. <i>Cruise ship tourism should play a vital role for Akaroa in the future</i> (n=305)</p> <p>Mean = 3.87</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>6.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>7.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>9.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>42.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>33.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage	Strongly disagree	6.9	Disagree	7.9	Neutral	9.5	Agree	42.6	Strongly agree	33.1
Response	Percentage												
Strongly disagree	6.9												
Disagree	7.9												
Neutral	9.5												
Agree	42.6												
Strongly agree	33.1												
<p>Q 9j. <i>Local government should restrict cruise ship arrivals in Akaroa</i> (n=301)</p> <p>Mean = 2.48</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>30.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>29.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>18.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>9.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage	Strongly disagree	30.2	Disagree	29.6	Neutral	12	Agree	18.9	Strongly agree	9.3
Response	Percentage												
Strongly disagree	30.2												
Disagree	29.6												
Neutral	12												
Agree	18.9												
Strongly agree	9.3												

Table 9 Attitude statements 9k, 9l, 9m, 9n, and 9o (all graph results in %)






<p>Q 9k. Cruise ship tourism increases recreational opportunities for residents (n=290)</p> <p>Mean = 2.88</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>13.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>22.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>24.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>9.7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	13.1	Disagree	30	Neutral	22.4	Agree	24.8	Strongly agree	9.7
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	13.1												
Disagree	30												
Neutral	22.4												
Agree	24.8												
Strongly agree	9.7												
<p>Q 9l. Cruise ship tourism negatively affects the character and charm of Akaroa (n=306)</p> <p>Mean = 2.54</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>42.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>13.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>14.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>10.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	19	Disagree	42.8	Neutral	13.7	Agree	14.1	Strongly agree	10.5
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	19												
Disagree	42.8												
Neutral	13.7												
Agree	14.1												
Strongly agree	10.5												
<p>Q 9m. Akaroa should become more of a cruise ship tourism destination (n=310)</p> <p>Mean = 3.17</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>14.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>21.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>14.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>31.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>18.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	14.5	Disagree	21.6	Neutral	14.2	Agree	31.6	Strongly agree	18.1
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	14.5												
Disagree	21.6												
Neutral	14.2												
Agree	31.6												
Strongly agree	18.1												
<p>Q 9n. I would support a local tax levy for cruise ship tourism (n=285)</p> <p>Mean = 3.26</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>13.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>19.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>16.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>30.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>20.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	13.3	Disagree	19.3	Neutral	16.1	Agree	30.9	Strongly agree	20.4
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	13.3												
Disagree	19.3												
Neutral	16.1												
Agree	30.9												
Strongly agree	20.4												
<p>Q 9o. Cruise ship tourism increases the amount of crime in Akaroa (n=265)</p> <p>Mean = 2.16</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>25.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>44.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>7.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>1.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	25.3	Disagree	44.9	Neutral	20	Agree	7.9	Strongly agree	1.9
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	25.3												
Disagree	44.9												
Neutral	20												
Agree	7.9												
Strongly agree	1.9												

Table 10 Attitude statements 9p, 9q, 9r, 9s and 9t (all graph results in %)










<p>Q 9p. <i>When I talk to other residents I am positive about cruise ship tourism (n=307)</i></p> <p>Mean = 3.87</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>2.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>10.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>16.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>38.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>31.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	2.6	Disagree	10.1	Neutral	16.6	Agree	38.8	Strongly agree	31.9
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	2.6												
Disagree	10.1												
Neutral	16.6												
Agree	38.8												
Strongly agree	31.9												
<p>Q 9q. <i>Cruise ship visitors should pay more for their purchases in Akaroa (n=307)</i></p> <p>Mean = 1.81</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>36.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>50.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>10.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>1.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>1.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	36.5	Disagree	50.2	Neutral	10.4	Agree	1.6	Strongly agree	1.3
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	36.5												
Disagree	50.2												
Neutral	10.4												
Agree	1.6												
Strongly agree	1.3												
<p>Q 9r. <i>Cruise ship tourism reduces the quality of outdoor recreation (n=295)</i></p> <p>Mean = 2.25</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>23.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>46.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>15.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>9.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>4.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	23.7	Disagree	46.1	Neutral	15.9	Agree	9.8	Strongly agree	4.4
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	23.7												
Disagree	46.1												
Neutral	15.9												
Agree	9.8												
Strongly agree	4.4												
<p>Q 9s. <i>Cruise ship tourism improves the appearance of Akaroa (n=300)</i></p> <p>Mean = 3.09</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>11.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>34</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>9.7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	11.3	Disagree	22	Neutral	23	Agree	34	Strongly agree	9.7
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	11.3												
Disagree	22												
Neutral	23												
Agree	34												
Strongly agree	9.7												
<p>Q 9t. <i>Tourism businesses are too influential politically in Akaroa (n=260)</i></p> <p>Mean = 2.77</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>30.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>16.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>7.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	10	Disagree	35	Neutral	30.8	Agree	16.9	Strongly agree	7.3
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	10												
Disagree	35												
Neutral	30.8												
Agree	16.9												
Strongly agree	7.3												

Table 11 Attitude statements 9u, 9v, 9w and 9x (all graph results in %)

<p>Q 9u. Cruise ship tourism provides good jobs for Akaroa residents (n=292)</p> <p>Mean = 4.02</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>2.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>6.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>13.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>41.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>36.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	2.7	Disagree	6.2	Neutral	13.4	Agree	41.4	Strongly agree	36.3
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	2.7												
Disagree	6.2												
Neutral	13.4												
Agree	41.4												
Strongly agree	36.3												
<p>Q 9v. Cruise ship tourism leads to more litter in Akaroa (n=290)</p> <p>Mean = 2.84</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>6.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>36.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>28.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>24.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>4.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	6.6	Disagree	36.2	Neutral	28.6	Agree	24.1	Strongly agree	4.5
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	6.6												
Disagree	36.2												
Neutral	28.6												
Agree	24.1												
Strongly agree	4.5												
<p>Q 9w. Akaroa should try to attract more cruise ship arrivals (n=305)</p> <p>Mean = 2.99</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>17.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>21.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>21.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>23.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>16.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	17.7	Disagree	21.3	Neutral	21.3	Agree	23.3	Strongly agree	16.4
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	17.7												
Disagree	21.3												
Neutral	21.3												
Agree	23.3												
Strongly agree	16.4												
<p>Q 9x. Local government should control cruise ship tourism in Akaroa (n=292)</p> <p>Mean = 3.05</p>	 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Response</th> <th>Percentage (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strongly disagree</td> <td>12.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>23.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutral</td> <td>21.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>31.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly agree</td> <td>10.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Response	Percentage (%)	Strongly disagree	12.3	Disagree	23.6	Neutral	21.6	Agree	31.8	Strongly agree	10.6
Response	Percentage (%)												
Strongly disagree	12.3												
Disagree	23.6												
Neutral	21.6												
Agree	31.8												
Strongly agree	10.6												

While the mean scores shown alongside each of the statement graphs indicate the level of overall agreement with that particular statement, caution is needed in interpreting these results, particularly when the mean scores fall in the middle range. Statements 9h and 9l, for example, have a similar mean scores (2.61 and 2.54, respectively) and yet their graphs indicate a quite different distribution of agreement.

Overall, the positive statements attracted higher levels of agreement than did the negative ones; mean scores higher than three were recorded for only two of the negative statements, compared to eight of the positive statements. Table 12 shows the four positive and two negative statements recording the highest level of agreement; the percentage of respondents reporting that they

'strongly agreed' with each statement is also shown. These figures clearly show that a majority of respondents (58.5%) strongly agree that cruise ship tourism improves the Akaroa economy and almost half (45.2%) feel that the benefits outweigh the problems. Agreement was much weaker in respect of the negative statements with just over a quarter of respondents (26.9%) strongly agreeing that cruise ship tourism increases traffic congestion.

Table 12 Statements attracting the highest level of agreement

Highest level of agreement		
	Mean score	% strongly agreeing
Positive statements		
Cruise ship tourism improves the Akaroa economy	4.38	58.5
Long term planning will help control negative impacts from cruise ship tourism	4.13	36.6
The benefits of cruise ship tourism outweigh the problems	4.06	45.2
Cruise ship tourism provides good jobs for Akaroa residents	4.02	36.3
Negative statements		
Cruise ship tourism increases traffic congestion in Akaroa	3.65	26.9
Local government should control cruise ship tourism in Akaroa	3.05	10.6

A calculation of each respondent's mean overall score (i.e., for all statement items) was undertaken with the negative items on the scale 'flipped' to standardise ranking scores. Each respondent was assigned to one of three groups depending on their overall score:

- The 'negative' group included those with a mean score of less than three;
- Those with a mean score of four or over were 'positive'; and,
- All those with mean scores of three were 'neutral'.

This calculation showed that slightly over half of the total sample were neutral with respect to their attitudes towards cruise ship tourism, whilst a quarter were negative and slightly under a quarter were positive (Figure 14).




Figure 14 Overall attitude scores of total sample (n=313)

Analysis by sample group shows that the Resident sample were more likely to have an overall positive attitude (30.9% were positive compared to 16.5% and 20% of the Postal and District samples, respectively), while respondents in the District sample were more likely to have a negative attitude (32% were negative compared to 23% and 18.8% of the Resident and Postal sample, respectively). Respondents in the Postal sample were much more likely than respondents in either the Resident or District samples to be neutral (Figure 15).




Figure 15 Overall attitude scores by sample group (n=313)

Overall attitude was then tested against a number of other variables, including impact on quality of life and employment in tourism (Figures 16 and 17).




Figure 16 Impact on quality of life by attitude category for total sample (n=309)

A strong relationship between impact on quality of life and overall attitude was found (Table 16). Of those who reported that cruise ship tourism ‘significantly improves’ their quality of life, for example, almost three-quarters (72.2%) had a positive attitude score. In contrast, 88.9 per cent of those who

reported a significant reduction in their quality of life from cruise ship tourism had a negative attitude score.

While the relationship between working in tourism and overall attitude score was not as strong, those who reported working in tourism were more likely to have a positive attitude, and less likely to be either neutral or negative, than those who did not work in tourism (Figure 17).




Figure 17 Work in tourism by attitude to cruise ship tourism category for total sample (n=308)

Q 10 Benefits to Akaroa from cruise ship tourism

Altogether 89 per cent of respondents (n=270) thought that cruise ship tourism benefited the Akaroa community, seven per cent (n=20) thought the community did not benefit at all and four per cent (n=11) stated that they did not know. Of those who thought the Akaroa community benefited, the majority thought it benefited greatly (Figure 18).




Figure 18 Does the Akaroa community benefit from cruise ship tourism? (n=301)

For all three sample groups around three quarters of respondents reported either significant or moderate benefits (i.e., Resident 78.3%; Postal 72.5%; and District 74%). Figure 19 shows that respondents in the Resident and District sample groups were more likely to report significant benefits (53.7% and 45.7%, respectively); respondents in the Postal sample were slightly less positive, although 37.5 per cent reported moderate benefits. Respondents in the District sample were more likely to report no benefits (13%) whereas respondents in the Postal sample were more likely to report slight benefits (17.5%).




Figure 19 Benefits to Akaroa by sample group (n=301)

A significant relationship was found between perceptions of benefit to Akaroa from cruise ship tourism and attitude category. As Figure 20 shows, just over half (50.3%) of those who thought Akaroa benefited greatly had a positive attitude score (with another 48.3% neutral) and, conversely, just over half (51.2%) of those who reported slight benefits were neutral, with the remainder (48.8%) negative. All of those who reported no benefits to Akaroa from cruise ship tourism had a negative attitude score.




Figure 20 Benefits by attitude category (n=300)

Q 11 Main benefits of cruise ship tourism for Akaroa

Those respondents who indicated that the Akaroa community benefited from cruise ship tourism in Q 10 were asked to identify what they considered to be the three main benefits for Akaroa. Altogether, 265 respondents (84.4% of the total sample) identified 730 benefits, many of which were identified multiple times across the sample groups. Several of the respondents who stated there were no benefits in Q 10 went on to list some benefits in Q 11.

The benefits were coded into four broad groups to represent economic, employment, community and social, and tourism benefits. Each benefit reported was coded according to the most appropriate category; some however fitted - and were coded into - multiple categories (e.g., “provide income for many businesses, so creates jobs for locals”). Economic benefits were recorded the most often (253 times), followed by tourism benefits (201 times), community and social benefits (157 times) and employment benefits (119 times) (Figure 21). Figure 21 also shows that economic and employment benefits featured most often as the first benefit listed, whilst tourism and community and social benefits featured more often as the second and third benefits.




Figure 21 Main benefits of cruise ship tourism for Akaroa (n=730)

A wide range of benefits were reported and the benefits data were further coded to reflect sub-categories within each of the main benefits groups. Some individual benefits were coded into several sub-categories. Further details in respect of these sub-categories, the number of times each type of benefit was reported and examples of responses are provided in Tables 13, 14, 15 and 16.

Economic benefits

Economic benefits were noted the most often and these were differentiated according to whether they described: general economic benefits; had a place specific component; identified benefits for a particular types of business; varied in their extent; affected business viability in some way; had an opportunity and development component; and, were beneficial in respect of the nature (i.e., quality) of the business (Table 13).

Table 13 Economic benefits of cruise ship tourism for Akaroa

Economic	Frequency	Explanation - description, details and examples
General	59	Non-specific economic benefits noted (e.g., <i>“good for the businesses, more revenue”</i> and <i>“improves economic activity”</i>).
Place-specific	92	Altogether, 77 respondents specifically mentioned benefits to either the ‘local’ or ‘Akaroa’ economy (e.g., <i>“income for local businesses”</i> and <i>“improves the Akaroa economy”</i>). Fifteen respondents noted economic benefits in respect of the wider area, district or regional Canterbury economy (e.g., <i>“provide income to businesses in the Canterbury region”</i>).
Type of business	80	Many respondents specified which type of business benefited, with the majority noting benefits for retail (n=33), followed by hospitality (n=29) and, to a lesser extent, tourism businesses (n=18).
Extent of benefit	33	The extent of benefits was specified in some way, with 23 respondents noting that there were benefits to ‘some extent’ or that benefits were ‘limited’; only three respondents reported ‘many benefits’. Seven respondents noted ‘trickle-down’ benefits to the local economy or community (e.g., <i>“it must increase the velocity of money in the community”</i>).
Business viability	40	Overall, 40 of the benefits reported related to business viability, with 16 respondents saying something about business remaining open year-round (e.g., <i>“increased income to offset winter downtime”</i>); 12 made general viability comments (e.g., <i>“greatly assists survival of the business area and shops”</i>); seven specifically mentioned viability in response to earthquake impacts, or as being vital in respect of earthquake recovery (e.g., <i>“softens the impact of downturn in tourism in Canterbury since the earthquake”</i>); and, five respondents noted that, prior to cruise ship visits, businesses in Akaroa had struggling (e.g., <i>“keeps local business going and the town alive - two years ago was quiet and some shops were closing”</i>).
Opportunity and development	11	A number of responses related to increased business opportunities and potential for development (e.g., <i>“creates opportunity for new business and development”</i> and <i>“extra retail business opportunity”</i>).
Nature of business	5	Five respondents commented on the economic impact with respect to the quality of local businesses (e.g., <i>“keeping our local shops and businesses up to standard”</i>).

Tourism benefits

The second most reported main category of benefits related specifically to the tourism sector, and was further coded into two sub-categories. The first of these included benefits associated with a boost to tourism (i.e., a measurable increase in the number of visitors) or associated with the current appeal of Akaroa as a tourist destination. The second sub-category included comments relating to Akaroa’s profile as a tourism destination (Table 14).

Table 14 Tourism benefits of cruise ship tourism for Akaroa

Tourism	Frequency	Explanation - description, details and examples
Boost to tourism and current appeal	123	Altogether, 123 of the benefits reported referred to a boost in tourism numbers or provided some commentary on the current visitor experience in Akaroa. Of these: 53 noted that cruise ship visitors either have, or will in the future, visit Akaroa as independent tourists (e.g., <i>“visitors love coming and say they will return and stay for a few days”</i>); 26 commented that cruise ship visitors are able to experience the beauty and charm of Akaroa as a destination (e.g., <i>“shows off Akaroa to large group of people”</i>); 24 referred to a tourism ‘boost’ but did not provide any specific details; 16 thought that cruise ship visitors broadened visitor types to Akaroa (e.g., <i>“enhances the flavour, character and mix of visitors - I just love it!”</i>); and four mentioned Akaroa’s current gateway role in respect of Canterbury tourism.
Profile	139	A large number of benefits were reported in respect of Akaroa’s future profile with 61 comments relating to the exposure brought by cruise ship tourism, free publicity and promotion for Akaroa and the value of word of mouth recommendations (e.g., <i>“promotion of Akaroa as a holiday resort”</i> and <i>“advertises Akaroa through word of mouth by visitors off ships”</i>). Altogether, 47 respondents mentioned that cruise ship tourism had specifically raised the profile of Akaroa and put the town ‘on the map’ (e.g., <i>“puts Akaroa on the world map”, “puts Akaroa on the tourism map”</i>). A raised tourism profile was also mentioned specifically in respect of New Zealand (13 respondents), Christchurch and Canterbury (12 respondents) and Banks Peninsula (6 respondents).

Employment benefits

The employment benefits reported (the smallest category of benefits) were further coded into: those which specifically referred to the number of jobs; those which made some differentiation in who those jobs were for; and those which commented on specific types of jobs (Table 15).

Table 15 Employment benefits of cruise ship tourism for Akaroa

Employment	Frequency	Explanation - description, details and examples
Number of jobs	58	The majority of employment benefits related to the creation of more jobs, or the sustainability of current employment levels with no further details provided.
For whom	50	Altogether, 32 respondents noted that more jobs were created for locals or for the resident population (e.g., <i>“residents in Akaroa having jobs”</i>) and 13 respondents identified the value to Akaroa of enabling employment for young people, teenagers or young adults (e.g., <i>“young families can stay here and work”</i>). Three respondents noted that more jobs attract more people and two specifically mentioned voluntary jobs (e.g., as cruise ship ambassadors) for older people in the community.
Types of jobs	20	Of those who reported employment benefits through the creation of more jobs, however, 20 also noted that these were often specific types of jobs: ‘some’ or ‘limited’ jobs were noted by 11 respondents; seven respondents specified ‘seasonal’ jobs and two mentioned ‘good’ jobs.

Community and social benefits

Community and social benefits were further coded into three sub-categories: benefits which impacted on the 'mood' of the town; those which made specific reference to people (including residents, visitors and increased numbers of people in a more general sense); and, those which specifically identified benefits in respect of facilities and amenities (Table 16).

Table 16 Community and social benefits of cruise ship tourism for Akaroa

Community and social	Frequency	Explanation - description, details and examples
Mood of town	64	Altogether, 64 benefits were reported that described impacts on the mood of the town: 24 of these were general comments about mood, ambience or taking 'pride' in showing off their town (e.g., <i>"sense of pride for residents"</i>); 34 responses used the words 'alive' 'buzz' or 'vibration' (e.g., <i>"making the town feel alive"</i> and <i>"the town comes 'alive' with a buzz"</i>). Six respondents specifically mentioned enjoying seeing the cruise ships in the Akaroa Harbour.
People	46	Twenty-eight respondents reported enjoying and benefitting from meeting people from different countries and cultures (e.g., <i>"sharing lives with people from different countries"</i> , <i>"brings a great cultural mix to a small insular town"</i> and <i>"enjoy talking to people"</i>). Thirteen of the 'people' comments referred to the impact of having more people in the town, although respondents did not always specify if they meant locals or visitors (e.g., <i>"social diversity"</i> , <i>"brings people in"</i> and <i>"extra people, especially younger, give heart and spirit to the town"</i>). Five comments referred to visitors being 'happy' people.
Facilities and amenities	54	An improvement in the quantity, range or quality of facilities and amenities in Akaroa were noted as cultural and social benefits 54 times. Examples include: <i>"improvement of local facilities to cater for the tourists, e.g. toilets, wharf improvements"</i> ; <i>"improved town maintenance by CCC"</i> ; <i>"the shops benefit from them which means they stay open"</i> . A number of these comments were future-oriented (e.g., <i>"helping Akaroa to grow into a town of the future"</i> and <i>"long term [cruise ship tourism offers] the chance, via increased revenue, to improve Akaroa's infrastructure"</i>).

Q 12 Problems for Akaroa from cruise ship tourism

In Question 12 respondents were presented with a list of problems from cruise ship tourism specific to Akaroa. These were identified by CCT and had been highlighted in some of the letters to the editor published in *The Akaroa Mail*. Respondents were asked to indicate on a five-point Likert scale from '1=no problem' to 5=very significant problem' for each option provided. The scale results (in percentages) for the total sample are shown in Figure 22. The *n=number* alongside each problem indicates the number of respondents answering this item: in some instances respondents missed individual items in the question; in others they selected the 'Don't know' option. Whilst the missed responses were consistent across all items (i.e., between 6 and 10 respondents missed each item), there were considerable variations in the number of respondents who recorded 'Don't know' (see Table 17 for items that attracted the most and least 'Don't know' responses). Two out of the three issues which attracted the most 'Don't know' responses were to do with the public toilets, which are perhaps not used by many respondents; the third - displacement of other visitors - is also not an issue that impacts on many respondents.

Table 17 Items attracting the most and least 'Don't know' responses to cruise ship tourism problems in Akaroa

Most 'Don't know' responses		Least 'Don't know' responses	
Lack of cleanliness in toilets	n=71	Crowding on footpaths	n=2
Displacement of other visitors	n=60	Traffic congestion in Akaroa	n=2
Lack of access to public toilets	n=45	Lack of parking for locals	n=5

As Figure 22 shows, strain on facilities and infrastructure (36.8% reported this as either a very significant or significant problem), crowding in public buildings (36.1%), crowding on footpaths (33.2%) and traffic congestion (31%) were identified as being the most significant problems; crowding on footpaths and traffic congestion also attracted the least 'Don't know' answers (Table 17).




Photograph 7 Main public toilets Akaroa (Jude Wilson)



Photograph 8 Temporary public toilets Akaroa (Jude Wilson)

Figure 22 Level of problems cruise ship tourism brings Akaroa (n=varied)



Q 13 Cruise ship issues identified

Question 13 asked respondents to identify up to three cruise ship-related issues which, in their opinion, are the most problematic for Akaroa. In addition to identifying problems, respondents were also asked to suggest how each of these problems might be fixed, and by whom. The question was open-ended and generated a significant amount of data. All responses were entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, and the problems were coded and analysed similar to the benefits data collected in Question 11. The issues/problems are presented first, followed by suggested solutions and perceived agency responsibility for implementing changes.

Altogether, 209 respondents (66.1% of the total sample) identified 486 cruise ship issues, many of which were identified multiple times across the sample groups. These issues were coded into five main categories: overcrowding and congestion; facilities and amenities; bus-related issues; visitor management; and, environmental issues. Each issue reported was coded according to the most appropriate category. Facility and amenity issues were recorded the most often (137 times), followed by overcrowding and congestion (121 times), buses (119 times), visitor management (66 times) and environmental issues (43 times) (Figure 23). Although respondents were not asked to rank these issues in order of significance, it is of note that over half the reports of both overcrowding and congestion and environmental issues were the first issue reported (56% and 54% respectively).




Figure 23 Cruise ship issues identified by main category (n=486)

As noted above, respondents were asked to identify up to three cruise ship-related issues they considered to be the most problematic for Akaroa: altogether 215 problems were identified as *Issue 1*; 158 as *Issue 2* and 113 as *Issue 3* problems (Figure 24). There was some variation in the proportion of problems from each category reported within each issue: overcrowding and congestion and environmental problems dominated as a first issue (31%) and then declined (19% and 21% of *Issue 2* and *Issue 3*, respectively); environmental problems had a similar representational profile across the issues reported, albeit in smaller proportions (i.e., 11%, 10% and 4%, respectively). Facility and amenity issues increased: from representing 25 per cent of *Issue 1* problems; 27 per cent of *Issue 2* problems; and 36 per cent of the problems reported as *Issue 3*. Buses and visitor management were more evenly distributed (although both were reported more often as *Issue 2* problems).




Figure 24 Most problematic cruise ship issues for Akaroa (n=486)

Further coding within the five main issue categories was undertaken in order to identify more specific details of each problem and the results of analysis are presented in the tables below. Because many problems and issues fitted - and were coded into - multiple sub-categories, the frequencies do not equal those reported for the main categories.

Overcrowding and congestion problems

Overcrowding and congestion dominated as the first issue reported, and was the second largest group of issues and problems reported overall. The specific examples reported were split between those which affected Akaroa generally (i.e., the town as a whole), and those which identified specific locations or crowding issues within the township (Table 18).

Table 18 Overcrowding and congestion problems

Overcrowding and congestion	Frequency	Explanation - description, details and examples
Akaroa overall	74	Overcrowding and congestion as a result of too many visitors in the town at once was noted by 46 respondents, and was often related to multiple ship arrivals (e.g., “when three ships arrive on same day”). Twenty-eight respondents specifically reported crowding and congestion on footpaths (e.g., “too many people walking for narrow footpaths”).
Within Akaroa	51	Other crowding and congestion comments specified particular locations within Akaroa where crowding and displacement was an issue. The library and computer/wifi access was noted by 22 respondents (e.g., “taking over space and wifi time from locals”) and congestion in retail and café premises by 15 respondents (e.g., “congestion in cafes” and “access to the Post Shop, which is in the same building as the Information Centre”). For the local population, displacement was also reported in the harbour and around the wharf area (7 respondents); a further seven respondents noted displacement of other visitors.

Facility and amenity problems

Facilities and amenities attracted the highest number of comments overall, with some quite specific issues and problems noted. These were coded into four main sub-categories with two primarily affecting visitors and the visitor experience (i.e., toilets and facilities and amenities for visitors) and two affecting the local population (i.e., township and wharf issues). Further details are provided in Table 19.

Table 19 Facility and amenity problems

Facilities and amenities	Frequency	Explanation - description, details and examples
Toilets	49	Toilet were specifically mentioned 49 times as an issue: 25 respondents either simply wrote <i>"toilets"</i> or <i>"toilet facilities"</i> commented on their location or general appearance; 15 respondents specified that there were not enough toilets to cope with visitors numbers (e.g., <i>"shortage of toilet facilities"</i>); nine commented on the cleanliness of the toilets although this issue was not always directly cruise ship related (e.g., <i>"toilets could be cleaner all year round"</i>).
Facilities and amenities for visitors	43	Of the 43 facility and amenity comments, 14 respondents noted the continuing closure of public buildings such as the Museum and the Gaiety Hall; six thought there were not enough attractions or specific visitor services in Akaroa; and, three respondents specifically mentioned a need for more free wifi zones around the township. The other 20 comments covered a wide range of other facilities and amenities including ATMs, seating, signposting, sheltered areas and walkways.
Township issues	37	Altogether, of the 37 comments made more generally about the township 15 related to its overall appearance, litter and the inability to cope more generally with large numbers of visitors (e.g., <i>"the town area is looking tired and dirty"</i> and <i>"impact on infrastructure - roads, local environment and capacity to cope"</i>). A further 14 respondents specifically identified facilities and amenities were perceived to need attention in the township (e.g., water shortages, sewerage issues and the hospital being closed). Eight respondents questioned how much of the cruise ship revenue is reinvested in Akaroa (e.g., <i>"the community more generally (as opposed to local business) needs to feel more benefit"</i> and <i>"the council not putting money back into community"</i>).
Wharf	17	Wharf-related issues were mentioned 17 times: the majority of these comments were about wharf facilities (e.g., <i>"lack of adequate berthing space"</i> , <i>"uneven surface on the wharf"</i> , <i>"lack of shelter near the wharf"</i>) and congestion on the wharf. Several respondents also noted issues with the cruise ship tenders (e.g., <i>"speed of tenders in the harbour"</i> and <i>"noisy transfer boats"</i>).

Bus-related problems

The bus problems identified could be split into those which generated traffic issues (i.e., for other drivers) and those which impacted on the township in other ways (e.g., parking) (Table 20).

Table 20 Bus-related problems

Buses	Frequency	Explanation - description, details and examples
Traffic	88	The most frequently mentioned bus-related issue was in respect of increased bus and coach traffic on SH75 (43 respondents) and the condition of the road (9 respondents). A common theme in these comments was the difficulty passing buses on this road (e.g., <i>“causes holdups on SH75”</i> and <i>“coaches getting in the way on SH75 to Christchurch”</i>). A further 36 respondents reported issues with increased traffic more generally, including traffic issues within Akaroa township (e.g., <i>“traffic movement through Akaroa from buses”</i>).
Impact on township	58	Another set of bus-related issues addressed bus parking in Akaroa and included comments about the lack of space for bus parking and congestion as a result of large numbers of buses (40 respondents). The noise and exhaust fumes generated by waiting/idling buses was noted by 18 respondents.

Environmental problems

Environmental problems were almost equally divided between physical (i.e., impacts of cruise ships on the Akaroa Harbour) and social and cultural issues (i.e., impacts on the community) (Table 21).

Table 21 Environmental problems

Environmental	Frequency	Explanation - description, details and examples
Physical - harbour	23	The environmental impacts on the harbour were noted by 23 respondents: 13 respondents mentioned disturbance of the sea bed or impact on the underwater habitat; four specifically noted impacts on marine life; six were concerned about fuel pollution from ships.
Social and cultural	23	Altogether, 16 respondents commented in some way about the impact the cruise ship issue was having on the community and on the empowerment of the community to respond (e.g., <i>“division in the community”</i> , <i>“embarrassing letters in the paper”</i> , <i>“lack of certainty where it will all end”</i> and <i>“disenfranchised local community”</i>). Seven respondents noted the impact of large numbers of cruise ship visitors on the town itself (e.g., <i>“loss of unique, quiet atmosphere”</i> and <i>“crowds destroy the appeal of Akaroa”</i>).

Visitor management problems

A wide range of visitor management issues were reported and these were further coded into four sub-categories: visitors walking on the road; other visitor behaviour problems; issues around visitor exposure and safety; and, concerns around the quality and management of the visitor experience (Table 22). It is of note that almost half of these issues affected visitors and the visitor experience, rather than Akaroa residents per se.

Table 22 Visitor management problems

Visitor management	Frequency	Explanation - description, details and examples
Walking on road	20	The most common visitor management issue was around cruise ship visitors walking in the road (e.g., <i>“people walking on road not footpath”</i> and <i>“visitors standing in middle of road obstructing traffic”</i>).
Other visitor behaviours	15	Other negative visitor behaviours noted included: <i>“too many visitors leaving Akaroa”</i> and, conversely, <i>“too many visitors staying in Akaroa”</i> ; <i>“shoplifting”</i> ; issues with currency exchange (e.g., <i>“passengers often don’t have New Zealand currency”</i>); some Akaroa businesses missing out (e.g., <i>“passengers are not aware of shops along Rue Lavaud”</i>); and, <i>“lack of respect for Akaroa and its residents shown by ship tourists”</i> .
Visitor exposure and safety	14	Altogether, nine respondents noted issues associated with the availability of hospital or wheel chair facilities for visitors (e.g., <i>“not enough medical facilities with the closure of the local hospital”</i>). Five respondents commented on visitors’ safety and exposure in respect of the weather (e.g., <i>“passengers unable to return to ship”</i> * and <i>“lack of shelter on and near the wharf, leading to the risk of hypothermia if the weather changes”</i>).
Quality and management of experience	16	A range of comments were made about the quality and management of the visitors experience in Akaroa more generally. These included issues around the upkeep of the town and increasing commercialisation (e.g., <i>“Akaroa presents itself badly to all visitors”</i> and the <i>“first view of Akaroa is commercialism”</i>). Others noted issues with <i>“overstretched facilities and services”</i> and the <i>“professionalism of locals and businesses”</i> . The impact of the negative attitudes of some locals on visitors was also noted.

*Visitor safety and exposure relates to Akaroa’s capacity to cope with unforeseen events. Some of the examples reported related specifically to an incident during the last season, when passengers were unable to return to their ship because of bad weather, and had to be accommodated overnight in Akaroa.

Solutions

Although some respondents suggested quite specific ways in which particular issues could be addressed, the majority of solutions provided were somewhat generic, in that they were perceived to offer a solution to a range of the issues raised. Limiting cruise ship numbers, for example, was suggested on 80 occasions as the solution to overcrowding and congestion, in respect of many of the facility and amenity problems, and as a way to reduce both physical and social and cultural environmental impacts identified. Table 23 presents a summary of solutions and their relevance in respect of each main issue category; further explanation of the data in the table is provided below.

Table 23 Summary of solutions suggested

Solutions suggested	Facilities and amenities	Overcrowding and congestion	Buses	Visitor management	Environmental
Facilities and amenities (n=134)					
Fixing/reopening of existing public buildings	✓✓			✓	
New - e.g. walkways, shelter, toilets, parking areas	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓✓	
Adding/improving tourist facilities e.g., info centre	✓	✓		✓✓✓	
Better facility maintenance	✓✓	✓		✓✓	
Changing access (& pricing) e.g., wifi	✓✓	✓✓✓		✓	
Wharf repairs & usage (access)	✓✓✓	✓✓		✓	✓
Control numbers visiting (n=86)					
Limit ships (n=80)	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓		✓
Ban ships (n=6)	✓	✓✓			✓
Bus control (n=65)					
Reschedule or limit bus numbers (n=10)		✓	✓✓		
Move buses & change driver behaviour (n=55)		✓	✓✓✓		
Money allocation and use (n=27)					
Varied charges	✓✓	✓✓✓		✓	✓
Direct reinvestment	✓✓✓				✓✓✓
Introduction of levies	✓✓✓				✓✓✓
Change tourist behaviour (n=26)					
Maximising tourism benefits				✓✓✓	✓
Educate re street behaviour		✓		✓✓✓	
Community adaptation (n=26)					
Change local behaviour (n=17)	✓✓	✓✓✓		✓	✓✓✓
Local attitudes (i.e., "get over it") (n=9)	✓✓	✓✓			✓✓✓
Others					
Pollution monitoring & harbour regulation (n=15)		✓			✓✓✓
Don't know, or not sure what the solution is (n=14)		✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓
No solution, or "not all that much of a problem" (n=11)		✓✓✓	✓	✓	
✓✓✓ = solution suggested often	✓✓ = less often suggested				
	✓ = some suggestions				

The largest number of solutions suggested by respondents related to the repair or re-opening of public buildings, the provision of more facilities and amenities (some for tourists and some for locals), better maintenance of existing facilities and amenities (particularly public toilets), and the introduction of some controls over the use of, and access to, public amenities such as free wifi. These solutions were particularly noted in respect of the facility and amenity, visitor management and overcrowding and congestion problems. Examples of specific solutions included: *“doubling the size of existing toilet [facilities] - [that] would be helpful for other busy times as well”*; *“ideally supply wifi town-wide, or in one or two other locations”*; *“council prioritising getting things open”*; and *“separate the Post Office and Information Centre or [have] cruise ship people use a separate Post Office”*).

Controlling the numbers visiting Akaroa (by limiting cruise ship visits) was noted most often by respondents as the solution to overcrowding and congestion, and slightly less often in respect of facility and amenity issues. It was also noted a few times in relation to bus-related and environmental issues. Examples of specific solutions suggested included: *“[it’s] simple - restrict times they can come”*; *“stagger arrival dates so less congestion”*; and, *“reduce number and size of ships, [there] should not be two or three ships on one day”*.

The most common solutions to the bus-related problems reported were the relocation of the bus waiting/staging area and changing driver behaviour on SH75 (e.g., *“keep buses at slipway area until they are called for loading”* and *“[have] buses stay by recreation ground until needed, [have drivers] turn off engines until [they are] about to leave”*). While the Recreation Ground at the northern end of town was proposed most often as an alternative bus parking area, a number of respondents were in favour of keeping buses out of Akaroa completely, and using a ‘park and ride’ system (e.g., from Robinsons Bay or Duvauchelle). There were also some suggestions about limiting the number of buses or ensuring that all buses leaving Akaroa were full (e.g., *“pool the use of buses so that each coach is filled and used fully”*). While these bus solutions were quite specific to the bus issues raised, some were also suggested in response to overcrowding and congestion issues.

Changes in the allocation of the levies collected from cruise ship companies were most often suggested as a solution to facility and amenity issues. While the majority of these suggestions related to the direct reinvestment of (existing) cruise ship levies to the Akaroa community, there were also some suggestions that additional Akaroa-specific levies might be instituted (i.e., a local arrival tax of some sort). Differential pricing (i.e., for locals and visitors) was suggested as a solution to overcrowding and congestion issues (particularly with respect to the library wifi). Direct reinvestment of cruise ship levies to Akaroa was suggested as a solution to the community environmental issues (i.e., as a means of *“placating the disenfranchised community”*).

Modifying tourist behaviours (particularly tourists walking in the street) was most often reported as the solution to visitor management issues, but was also noted in respect of overcrowding and congestion. A number of suggestions provided regarding the maximisation of cruise ship benefits for Akaroa also involved visitor management (e.g., in respect of the loss of business from visitors leaving Akaroa, or encouraging those who stay in Akaroa to visit the northern end of the township); this was also noted a few times as a solution to the community environmental issues.

Community adaptation was suggested by respondents most often as a solution to the perceived issues of overcrowding and congestion, and to a lesser extent as a solution for facility and amenity, and visitor management issues. This included residents changing their own behaviour patterns so as

to avoid busy times in shops and cafés, and so on. Addressing local attitudes - rather than actions - was presented as a solution to the 'social' environmental issues outlined in Table 21 (e.g., as a means to get the community to "*recognise the benefits of cruise ship tourism for Akaroa*"), and to a lesser extent to facility and amenity, and overcrowding and congestion issues.

There were also a number of specific solutions suggested in respect of the harbour; most related to environmental issues (and the need to monitor water quality and impacts on the sea bed), although a few also noted a need to regulate the number and movement of boats (in most cases cruise ships, but also other water and wharf users) in the harbour as a means to solve overcrowding and congestion issues (and particularly the displacement of locals).

A number of respondents identified problems and/or issues only (i.e., they did not add any details as to ways to remedy these or indicate whom should do so): on 14 occasions, however, respondents indicated that they did not know the solution to the problem they had identified; on 11 occasions they reported that there was 'no solution' to that particular problem, or that it was "*not all that much of a problem anyway*". The unsure or 'don't know' responses were fairly evenly spread across all problem categories, with the exception of those which focused on facility and amenity issues. The 'no solution' responses primarily related to overcrowding and congestion on footpaths and around the end of the wharf, alongside limited mention of visitor management and bus-related issues.

A number of the solutions posited were not able to be coded according to the categories identified in Table 23. These could be grouped into three topic areas, with the majority addressing division in the community and ways to minimise the impacts (on local users) of increased activity around the wharf. The third set of solutions related to tourism business changes that might better facilitate, or improve, the visitor experience in Akaroa (e.g., "*employing more staff in business premises*"; and, "*CCC should restrict the number of tourism representatives at the wharf-end*").

Responsibility for change

Overall, the responsibility for solving the majority of issues identified above was assigned to CCC, with a range of other organisations and individuals also noted in respect of specific issues (e.g., ECan, Police, Harbour Master, CCT, Community Board, Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB), shipping companies and tour operators). It was notable that the two tourism-specific organisations, CCT and Akaroa District Promotions (ADP), were mentioned infrequently by respondents. It was also notable that responsibility for change/mitigation was not always assigned correctly by respondents. That is, often the wrong agency was perceived to have jurisdiction over a particular issue or problem. Further details are provided below for each group of solutions identified in Table 23.

As might be expected, CCC was the agency identified as being responsible for addressing the majority of facility and amenity issues. Some shared responsibility, however, was suggested in respect of: re-opening public buildings (e.g., combined efforts of CCC and EQC); providing new facilities (some involvement of private business); and controlling access to, or providing more extensive, free wifi (primarily by CCC, but with the potential for communications companies to contribute in some way and shipping companies to fund). Private business involvement was also identified in respect of more banking facilities and some tourist facilities; the latter were also deemed in part to be the responsibility of ADP and the local business association. Although most respondents identified the CDHB in respect of responsibility for medical facilities and the provision of wheelchairs, a number of respondents thought that the cruise ship companies should take more responsibility for this. While the CCC was almost universally held responsible by respondents for the provision of toilet facilities, a

number of respondents also thought that local community groups (e.g., Lions and Jaycees) might have a role in this.

Responsibility for control over the number and scheduling of ships visiting Akaroa was perceived to lie equally with the shipping companies themselves (e.g., Princess Lines etc.) and with CCC; a few respondents also attributed some responsibility to Environment Canterbury (ECan), tourism booking agents and Cruise New Zealand. Overall, however, a considerable number of respondents indicated that they were uncertain over whose responsibility this was, noting, for example, that it lay with *"whoever has the power?"* or with *"whoever decides the schedules"*. A considerable number of respondents also attributed responsibility generically to *"tourism authorities"*, *"local government"* and *"local authorities"* (without specifying who exactly they meant).

A wide range of options for responsibility were suggested with regard to better management of buses including: the bus companies, tour operators and their drivers; the New Zealand Police, the traffic department and 'traffic management'; New Zealand Transit Agency (NZTA) (for SH75 issues) and CCC parking wardens (for parking control in Akaroa); and CCC (for the creation/provision of new parking zones in Akaroa and more generally across all bus-related issues).

While most respondents correctly identified the CCC as the body in charge of allocating funding to the Akaroa community (across a wide range of public facilities, amenities and services), many respondents also indicated their uncertainty around the amount of money cruise ships generate for CCC and, in particular, how much of that money was reinvested directly to the Akaroa community. Several respondents indicated that the solution to increasing the 'returns' to Akaroa was the responsibility of *"Akaroa council, not CCC"* suggesting a preference for more local engagement with governance than is perceived to occur under the auspices of CCC. The introduction of varied fees for internet use in the library (i.e., charging visitors but not locals for internet usage) was the responsibility of the CCC.

In respect of stopping visitors walking in the street, responsibility was attributed to the CCC (with better pedestrian management through signage, or active management - e.g., *"employ a Town Crier"*) and to Cruise New Zealand and the cruise ship companies (through education of the visitors). Some respondents were of the opinion that the responsibility for visitor management lay with *"everybody"*. Maximising tourism benefits from cruise ship visitors was the responsibility of a range of tourism organisations, including the cruise ship companies and Cruise New Zealand, the *"tourism information people"*, CCT, ADP and tour operators. Modifying tourist behaviours - in respect of maximising tourism benefits - was also perceived to be the responsibility of CCC (through better signage to the northern end of town) and CCT (via the provision of the shuttle service).

Whilst responsibility for modifying local behaviours was perceived to lie with the locals themselves, there were some suggestions that this might be encouraged or assisted by the provision of more detailed information on cruise ship visits - and particularly the timing of tour buses departing Akaroa - for residents. Responsibility for this was perceived to lie with the tourist information centre, the New Zealand Police and CCC. To a lesser extent, CCC was also deemed responsible for modifying resident behaviours (e.g., *"persuading locals to leave their vehicles at home"*).

Responsibility for the various harbour and environmental issues was assigned generically to 'government agencies' and 'qualified companies' (for monitoring harbour pollution), and more specifically to 'the local council' or 'the city council', 'the Regional Council' and the Harbour Master.

Only one respondent mentioned any shipping company responsibility in respect of potential environmental issues. The various wharf issues were perceived to be the responsibility of the Harbour Master, the Lyttelton Port Authority (sic) and CCC.

Responsibility for improving the visitor experience for cruise ship passengers - and particularly staffing issues experienced by some many businesses - was perceived to lie with ADP (through giving businesses more information on the number of visitors they might expect cater to) and CCC (by building affordable accommodation for seasonal workers).

The majority of those who reported division in the community as a problem did not provide any solutions or responsibility for remediation. The few respondents who suggested ways to change (or appease) perceived negative community attitudes, simply called for greater community engagement and discussion around the various cruise ship issues. While this survey was noted as a useful step in the right direction, there were also calls for greater involvement and facilitation of community discussion by CCC and the Community Board.

Q 14 Actions taken

Question 14 asked respondents if they had been concerned enough about cruise ship tourism in Akaroa to take some form of action. Thirty-two respondents (11.4%) reported taking action of some type. Respondents were asked to provide further details of these actions and the results are presented in Figure 25 (one respondent gave no further details and three reported more than one action). Of the 12 respondents who reported writing to the newspaper, six indicated that they had written in support of cruise ship tourism, three were against it, and the other three did not specify their position (although their survey data suggests they may have presented a balanced view).




Figure 25 Actions taken in response to cruise ship tourism in Akaroa (n=34)

Analysis of final comments

Interest in the survey - and the strength of many respondent's opinions - was evidenced by the fact that more than half of all respondents (n=169, 53.5%) provided some additional comments at the conclusion of the survey. Many respondents wrote a full page of comments; some typed up extra pages and attached them to their returned survey form. This level of response can be interpreted as indicative of the high level of engagement with the cruise ship tourism 'issue' in Akaroa. The number of respondents writing additional comments varied by sample group: 62 per cent (n=31) of respondents in the District sample provided additional comments, followed by 55.8 per cent of respondents in the Resident sample (n=101); a smaller percentage of comments came from the Postal sample (43.5%; n=37).

The nature of the comments provided also varied by sample group. In some cases these comments provided a reiteration or expansion of data already provided in response to open-ended questions in the survey proper, or offered an explanation of responses to closed questions. In many instances, however, respondents took the opportunity to provide a broader overview of their perceptions and opinions of cruise ship tourism and its impact on Akaroa. These comments were analysed thematically by sample group, independent of the survey analysis. As such, whilst this analysis revisits a number of issues, perceptions and opinions that emerged in the survey data, it also highlights some broader comments on Akaroa's role as a 'tourism town' and concerns around the impact of the cruise ship debate on the Akaroa community.

The additional comments are discussed under five broad headings:

1. Akaroa is a 'tourist town'
2. Enjoying the tourists
3. A community divided
4. Balancing benefits and problems
5. Adapt or 'get over it'

Akaroa is a 'tourist town'

For many of the Resident sample respondents, cruise ship tourism in Akaroa simply represents another set of visitors to what has always been a tourist town. It was recognised that tourism (in all its forms) brings economic benefits, employment and supports a wide range of community services that a town the size of Akaroa might otherwise not have. As one respondent noted:

"As a community we either recognise the relationship between tourism and the community it supports or we close the shutters and put up a sign 'Visitors not Welcome', opting instead for a gated community of xenophobes shunning youth, while cataloguing their experiences of hip replacement, multiple bypasses and diabetes".

While many thought that cruise ship tourism has been a 'Godsend' for Akaroa, in response to the downturn in tourism resulting from the global economic recession and the Christchurch earthquakes, there were some concerns around whether cruise ship tourism is the 'best' type of tourism for Akaroa. The displacement of other visitor types by cruise ship visitors was a concern for many, with some specifically noting a negative impact on accommodation providers. These comments reflected a wide range of opinions, however, including: *"Akaroa can remain a tourist town without the cruise ships"; "could promote non-cruise ship days for [other] visitors who prefer a quieter Akaroa"; "I think*

that ADP [Akaroa District Promotions] are concentrating on the cruise ships to the exclusion of other visitors"; "[people] can still enjoy Akaroa as a holiday destination even with cruise ship visitors"; and that the "cruise ships actually attract other visitors to Akaroa".

Amongst the 'positives' noted with respect to cruise ship visitors was the raised profile (e.g., "let's keep them coming in - they are great for Akaroa's profile") and exposure for Akaroa as a tourism destination through "a very cheap and easy form of marketing". It was noted that a lot of cruise ship visitors are Australian and are thus "more likely [than other nationalities] to return as independent tourists". These responses suggested that a majority of respondents were in favour of attracting increasing numbers of tourists to Akaroa. Some 'quality issues' with respect to cruise ship tourism were raised, however, including a desire to attract 'higher-end' (and higher-spend) cruise ships and potential issues with the current delivery of tourism services (e.g., "the touts on the wharf-end make Akaroa look like a poor quality tourist town"; "worried about an increase in junk shops catering to low spending cruise ship visitors"; "concerned about shops selling nasty cheap souvenirs made in China").

Some of the cruise ship tourism concerns related to a perceived lack of control over visitor numbers, and the feeling that the current numbers of cruise ship visitors were overwhelming the town. Some, however, thought that cruise ship visitors were no different to other visitors and that, pre-recession, Akaroa was just as busy with other visitors. At the other extreme, another respondent noted that "now Akaroa has opened its doors, the cruise ships will be unstoppable and this type of tourism is the worse sort and not what Akaroa needs". Overall, it was recognised that "everywhere in the world has problems in holiday resorts". A number of the tourism problems reported were not cruise ship specific: many of the parking issues reported related to non-cruise ship visitors and campervan issues were mentioned by several respondents; likewise, one respondent noted that small traffic inconveniences are a "natural and normal part of living in a tourist town".

The District sample respondents expressed a similar range of viewpoints with regard to the importance of tourism for Akaroa. There were concerns that "tourism needs to be sustainable and that we are not putting all the eggs in 'the cruise ship' basket"; others thought that "it is nonsense that Akaroa would fold without cruise ships" and that "cruise ships are a 'golden egg' for the survival and prosperity of Akaroa". Although they lived outside the town, one District sample respondent acknowledged their close association with Akaroa commenting that "[having] too many cruise ships [visit] is reducing the amenity and enjoyment of the town for many"; another was of the opinion that "locals need to share Akaroa - it is no longer only the supply centre for an isolated rural community, but a tourist destination".

Some commented that Akaroa could better cater to cruise ship tourism (e.g., "Akaroa businesses should make more effort for cruise ship visitors"); others expressed this in more general terms, noting that "tourism is Akaroa's future" and "[Akaroa] needs to keep evolving to stay a viable tourism destination". The Postal sample respondents, in particular, identified a number of visitor services and facilities that could enhance the visitor experience (e.g., "I would like to see more interesting shops for the visitors"; "[I am] embarrassed by the inexperience and lack of professionalism in the Akaroa service industry"; "paint symbols on the footpaths to guide tourists around"). Some of these suggestions possibly reflect the Postal sample's own status as visitors in Akaroa: one Postal sample respondent, for example, called for "more involvement of locals in organising activities for visitors (e.g., tennis, croquet, bowls, organised walks and tours around Banks Peninsula)". A number of

District sample respondents called for the town to be “tidied up” and “beautified for visitors” with “the rubbish cleared from alongside SH75, hanging baskets, fixing the burned out bakery, putting up bunting to welcome visitors”. A Postal sample respondent (who owned a tourism business in Akaroa), however, expressed broader concerns around tourism development, commenting that “[I am] aware of the fine balance between Akaroa au naturel and Akaroa overdeveloped”.

Whilst a large number of respondents from all sample groups commented on the continuing closure of the earthquake-damaged public buildings, their re-opening was seen in terms of an improved visitor service by the Postal sample respondents, whereas many of the District and Resident sample respondents noted this in respect of its impact on the community (e.g., “[we] need the public facilities open to foster community spirit in the town”). Although many of the facility improvements suggested by the Resident sample respondents were visitor-focused (e.g., improved toilets, clearer signage, improved wharf facilities, a tidier town), these would also contribute to an enhanced living environment for the resident population.

Enjoying the tourists

Respondents from all three sample groups talked about personally enjoying the cruise ship visits: this included both seeing the ships in the harbour and meeting the passengers during their shore visits. Many of Resident sample respondents were ‘proud’ to show off their beautiful town, noting that they were “lucky to be able to share our beautiful town” and that “I love my town and am happy to share it”. Several District sample respondents, however, alluded to the community issues engendered by cruise ship tourism, noting that “Akaroa residents should be proud that people want to come to their town, despite their own behaviour”. A number of Resident sample respondents also noted they are welcomed by residents in other destinations when they themselves travel, and commented that Akaroa residents should do the same for their visitors.

The other common theme - noted by both Resident and Postal sample respondents (but not by any District ones) - was the added vibrancy brought to Akaroa by cruise ship tourism (e.g., “makes Akaroa exciting and busy at times - Akaroa is boring in the winter”; “nice to see the town busy”). A number of Postal sample respondents reported enjoying the vibrancy of cruise ship days when “the town feels alive and if it has a future”. Several of the Resident sample respondents had worked as volunteers during the cruise ship season and commented on how much they had enjoyed this role - enabling them to show off and share their town, as well as to meet interesting people. For many respondents, filling up the town with visitors contributed to the maintenance of its human footprint, whilst ‘showing off’ their town was an important means of fostering community spirit.

A community divided

While a large number of respondents reported personally enjoying the cruise ship visits, many also recognised that hosting cruise ships had impacted on the Akaroa community. Resident sample respondents, in particular, expressed concerns over the division in the community that had emerged during the cruise ship season:

“This issue has divided the community. Those with business interests in cruise shipping have adopted the moral high ground - they are helping Canterbury tourism/local business/bringing employment - and any public discussion has been quashed as selfish and inconsiderate”.

“Everyone has an opinion - it [cruise ship tourism] helps some greatly and others just get annoyed over stupid things”.

“There is a lot of short-sighted opposition to cruise ships - they add vigour and colour to the local scene”.

“I fully support cruise ships coming - why should a ‘vocal’ few feel they should have Akaroa to themselves”.

Respondents acknowledged that this survey was useful in establishing an inclusive and representative understanding of a wide range of opinions. Some of the District sample respondents, however, expressed concerns over the representativeness of the survey, especially as they were not initially included in the sampling framework (i.e., they were neither Akaroa township residents nor non-resident ratepayers). Several respondents were concerned that the survey had potential to *“further divide the community”*.

One issue noted by respondents from all sample groups was the lack of knowledge and hard data on the benefits and costs (especially to the environment) of cruise ship tourism (e.g., *“there has been little research on benefits - this survey is a start, but hard facts need to be known”*). There was also a call for more public engagement and involvement (e.g., *“this [survey] is an excellent first step, but we need more consultation, information and public meetings to have our say and feel our concerns are being acted on and listened to”*).

Within the Resident sample group there was considerable criticism of ‘complainers’ (e.g., *“the complaining locals do not seem to comprehend what tourism brings them”; “the complainers are a slap in the face to all the volunteers”; “the people who complain want it all for themselves”*). In contrast, both the District and Postal sample respondents were more concerned about the tangible impacts of cruise ship tourism on Akaroa; some Postal sample respondents, however, commented on the impact of cruise ship visits on townspeople and the need to protect what makes Akaroa ‘special’. Postal sample respondents also noted that - as non-resident ratepayers - they were not in Akaroa all the time and were thus impacted less; some also noted that their holiday homes were located away from the town centre where cruise ship visitors tended to congregate.

In contrast, some Resident sample respondents reported an *“unwanted social effect on the village - no time and space to chat and greet [each other]”* with the result that *“some locals have become unwelcoming to visitors”*. As noted above, however, the majority of respondents were happy to share their town with visitors and enjoyed meeting visitors.


Balancing costs and benefits

Despite many respondents taking the opportunity to reiterate the range of issues and problems arising from cruise ship tourism measured (and identified) by the survey proper, the concluding comments suggest that a majority of respondents were of the opinion that the benefits of cruise ship tourism outweigh its costs. Economic and employment benefits were widely recognised but, once again, the exact nature of these varied by sample group. The Resident sample respondents, for example, focused on attracting young people to the town; the District sample respondents took a broader view, specifically noting benefits for the Christchurch and Canterbury area; and, the Postal sample respondents had a more general perception of benefits accruing to locals, other visitors, themselves (in respect of their own Akaroa experiences) and the wider Canterbury region.

The greatest concerns - expressed by respondents from all three sample groups in these additional comments - were around the (potential) environmental impacts on Akaroa Harbour and a need to

control the number of ships visiting. Again, the perceived impacts of these issues reflected the nature of each group’s association and engagement with Akaroa. Postal sample respondents, for example, were most concerned about “*restricting the number of ships so as not to spoil or lose the unique qualities of Akaroa*” (once again reflecting their own visitor status in Akaroa). Another Postal sample respondent noted that “*these unique qualities are important for holiday home owners*” and that “*Akaroa is a haven for Cantabrians who are here [in Akaroa] before, during and after the cruise ship season*”. In contrast, many District sample respondents reiterated their concerns about buses, particularly in respect of travel hold-ups on SH75 (which impacted significantly on their own transport behaviour). Overall, the Resident sample respondents were much more concerned about crowding and congestion in the town (and in the ways in which this impacted on their own lives). Also, as noted above, the division of the community - over cruise ship tourism - was a concern.

Respondents from all three sample groups, however, raised the issue of the equity of these benefits and costs: as one Postal sample respondent noted, “*the benefits and impacts vary for different groups of people*”. This was associated by some with a need for research on the “*way the total economic ‘cake’ has been sliced*”. For Postal sample respondents there was concern that, whilst visitor services and facility maintenance was costing them as ratepayers, as non-residents they did not reap any benefits. Resident and District sample respondents were more concerned that the money collected from cruise ship levies was being swallowed by the CCC ‘communal pot’ and ‘lost’ to Akaroa.



Photograph 9 Revenue from cruise ships as a fund raising initiative for Akaroa hospital facilities (Jude Wilson)

Respondents from all three sample groups suggested that cruise ship companies should not only pay higher anchorage fees, but that more of this money should go direct to the Akaroa community in order to upgrade and maintain services. The focus for the Resident sample respondents, however, was on local community services (e.g., for fixing/replacing the hospital and paying for other community projects, better beach maintenance and improved sewerage and water amenities). In contrast, for the other two sample groups the focus was on funding improvements to visitor services. The Resident sample respondents also expressed a desire for greater transparency in respect of the collection and use of cruise ship levies, noting that *“they [residents] would be happier if they could see this direct reinvestment in the community”* and that *“Akaroa residents would feel that they were getting something back for their friendliness and tolerance”*.

Adapt or ‘get over it’

Overall, a range of arguments were suggested in support of cruise ship tourism in Akaroa (e.g., cruise ship tourism is not year-round [in Akaroa]; cruise ship visitors are in Akaroa for fewer hours, and have less impact than many other types of visitor; it has, and it does, bring overall benefits. A common solution to the issues created by cruise ship tourism - suggested by respondents from the Resident sample - was for residents to either adapt to accommodate cruise ship tourism and its impact on their lives, or to simply *“get over it”*. Other comments in this vein included: *“[cruise ship tourism brings] overall benefits and no lasting impacts - locals just need to adapt”*; *“locals can adapt their own behaviours - it is not every day”*; and, *“they [cruise ship visitors] are not in town for long - locals just need to adapt”*.

Respondents from the other sample groups were also critical of the residents’ attitudes and the focus on cruise ship tourism. One District sample respondent, for example, noted that *“locals know they have to adapt during non-cruise ship days as well - they have always had to, and general holiday makers are worse in some ways, holiday home visitors are not the best visitors financially either”*. One Postal sample respondent commented that *“there needs to be compromise and Akaroa needs to wake up and move forward”*. Another noted that *“cruise ship tourism is an opportunity for Akaroa - it has made businesses viable and cruise ship tourism should be encouraged”*.

While tourism was widely perceived to be vital for Akaroa’s on-going prosperity, the ‘future’ of cruise ship tourism in Akaroa was less clear. As one District sample respondent noted *“[we] need more investment in Akaroa to help it cope [with cruise ship tourism] but that needs clarity around future visits”*. Another commented that *“cruise ships have been dumped on us - it has been vital - but other visitors are now returning and [I] prefer them”*. One Resident sample respondent thought that *“[the] cruise ships coming was something no one could predict”*, another added that *“we are being taken advantage of in the name of expediency”* and, another was of the opinion that *“having so many visitors is a disaster for a small town - when the ships return to Lyttelton the damage will have been done”*.

Discussion

Taken together, the results of this research indicate that despite the recent increase in cruise ship arrivals the Akaroa community (in its broadest sense incorporating the township and Akaroa district residents and non-resident ratepayers) holds a largely favourable opinion of cruise ship tourism. The survey results, for example, showed that 89 per cent of all those surveyed thought that cruise ship tourism benefited the Akaroa community and more than half of these thought it benefited greatly. The identification of a wide array of tourism benefits, in particular, suggests that the majority recognise the value of, and enjoy the diversity that tourism brings to Akaroa. Alongside this, however, respondents also identified a range of issues and problems arising from cruise ship tourism. Interestingly, the majority of respondents did not rate any of the previously identified issues as being particularly significant.

The attitude statements also portray a community with relatively balanced views, albeit with some more strongly held both in favour of, and against, cruise ship tourism and its impacts. While primarily neutral, attitudes across the statements presented tended towards a positive viewpoint. Further, 183 respondents were able to identify both benefits and problems in the open-ended questions, whilst 84 reported benefits and no problems, and 26 identified problems, but not benefits. Only 23 respondents were not able to identify either benefits or problems. While many also acknowledged benefits that extended well beyond Akaroa (i.e., to the wider Christchurch and Canterbury region) there was widespread recognition of the range of problems and challenges associated with hosting large numbers of visitors in a small community.

While some tangible cruise ship-related issues were identified (along with clearly articulated solutions), for many respondents there was also a great deal of concern around the impact of the growing cruise ship debate (and its public manifestation) on the community itself. This research shows that the Akaroa community is highly engaged with the cruise ship 'issue'. This high level of engagement is likely to have been reinforced, at least in part, by respondents' length of attachment with Akaroa Township and surrounding area. The majority of respondents across all three sample groups reported at least a decade of association – expressed as either residence or property ownership - with Akaroa.

In respect of the survey itself, this high level of engagement with the cruise ship 'issue', and attachment to Akaroa, was manifested in a number of ways. First, a large number of Akaroa respondents commented to the surveyors that they had read the survey introduction letter placed in *The Akaroa Mail* and that they had been expecting - and, in some cases, 'looking forward to' receiving - their survey forms. Second, the response rate for the survey was very high for a community survey of this type, and there was a negligible refusal rate. The response rate for the Postal sample, which might ordinarily be expected to provide a much lower response (given the postal delivery with no follow-up reminder, and that these people were actually non-resident) was also unusually high. Third, a significant amount of supplementary and/or additional written material was provided by respondents in the survey, both in the open-ended questions in the survey proper and in the final additional comments section.

This research also raises questions around the identification of 'community'. Whilst the Akaroa Township boundary provided a definitive sample capture for the pre-defined Resident sample, the on-the-ground reality was that many Akaroa 'residents' lived outside these arbitrary lines. These people, along with many of the working Akaroa population (who lived in other settlements around

the Akaroa Harbour) constituted the District sample, which was added during the research fieldwork. From a scientific sampling perspective this was not ideal, but the inclusion of the District sample group added valuable perspective to the research findings. Importantly, this shows that 'community' extends beyond geography to incorporate social connectedness. All three sample groups were *highly* connected to Akaroa.

The high level of connection, noted above, may relate to the unique character of the town and the diverse ways in which each of the three sample groups engage with the township. The District sample results provide clear evidence that the impact of cruise ship arrivals extends beyond the boundaries of Akaroa Township. A much higher percentage of the District sample (than the Resident sample), for example, reported working in tourism-related jobs in Akaroa. Also, for many questions asked in the survey, this self-selected sample group was found to hold the strongest opinions (both positive and negative) about cruise ship tourism in Akaroa. In part, given Akaroa's position as a service town for the surrounding bays, and the district population's economic dependence on Akaroa (in respect of both business interests and employment opportunities) this is understandable, but it may also reflect issues surrounding visual and access amenity that affect this District population in particular.

The high proportion of retirees in the Akaroa resident population, and the small town (village) setting fosters a high level of both incidental and purposeful (i.e., through acting as welcome 'ambassadors' to cruise ship visitors) contact with cruise ship visitors; the amount of free time available to retirees also potentially contributed to the amount of attention given to survey completion. For the Resident sample, sharing their spaces with visitors is not a new phenomenon. The sudden arrival of large numbers of cruise ship visitors, however, has presented some new challenges.

Despite their non-resident status, the Postal sample is also highly attached to Akaroa. A large proportion of the Akaroa rate-paying community are non-resident holiday home owners, many of whom have a longer association with the town than those permanently resident. These holiday home owners reported spending an average of 38 nights in Akaroa during the cruise ship season, which suggests a potentially high level of contact with, or awareness of, cruise ship visitors in the town.

The emergence of cruise ship tourism debate (through letters in the local newspaper) has impacted on the cohesion of the Akaroa community as whole, and highlights lines of potential fracture within the community. Associated with this is the finding that one of the issues (or problems) resulting from cruise ship tourism in Akaroa is its impact on community cohesion. The negative attitudes of some people were specifically identified by many respondents as one of the problems. Respondents, however, were much less able to provide solutions to these more abstract, complex and emotive community issues than they were for many of the more tangible issues raised. Greater community involvement in decision-making and a desire for more transparency of process were most commonly posited as ways in which this issue might be addressed. While this might empower the community, the reality is that the tourism-related issues experienced by Akaroa residents would likely remain substantively unchanged.

Contrary to other social impact research in tourism, increasing numbers of tourists in absolute terms does not appear to be the issue in Akaroa, but rather the particular pattern of visitation as manifested by cruise ship visits is more significant. Patterns of tourist visitation across a range of

destination types are typically 'seasonal', insofar as there are usually discrete and identifiable periods of high and low demand. This seasonality is also evident in Akaroa and is largely historical. While cruise ship tourism has brought some new challenges for Akaroa and its residents, a significant proportion of the issues identified in this survey are merely the latest manifestation of issues which have featured previously in Akaroa as a result of significant peaks in visitor numbers over the summer period. Cruise ship visitors, however, can often exacerbate capacity issues during these times of peak demand. Interestingly, a number of respondents noted that cruise ship visitors were preferable to other visitor types as they did not create or compound parking issues, they are in the town for a shorter period of time, and their travel itineraries are relatively predictable.

A lot of the cruise ship problems identified focused on the quality of the cruise ship visitor experience (i.e., wanting to improve it), rather than on any negative impacts of cruise ship arrivals on Akaroa residents. The open-ended responses, and many of the final comments, suggest that respondents are proud of their town, and enjoy showing it off and sharing it with visitors of all types. Many of the facility and amenity improvements suggested were visitor-focused, although potentially they would also benefit local residents in their daily lives. The majority of respondents recognise the symbiotic relationship Akaroa has with tourism more generally (i.e., 'that they need tourism and tourism needs them'). In a broader context, Akaroa residents also accept that they are closely connected to the wider Christchurch and Canterbury region, and that Akaroa and the Akaroa community are able to offer something unique in respect of the New Zealand tourism experience.

Many respondents also recognised the vital role played by cruise ship visitors in the Akaroa economy, which has been facing significant challenges as a result of the economic downturn and the impact of the Christchurch earthquakes. The earthquakes had also contributed to a significant economic downturn in Akaroa; ironically it was the earthquakes that also brought cruise ships to Akaroa. There were concerns that the majority of cruise ships will eventually return to Lyttelton Port and, while there was some hope that non-cruise ship visitor numbers would have returned to 'normal' by that time, this was by no means a certainty. Similar findings - i.e., the recognition of benefits and problems, as well as concerns around the future of tourism in Akaroa - were reported by Shone *et al.* (2003). For Akaroa, in respect of cruise ship arrivals there are still considerable destination management and community challenges associated with this uncertainty around future visitation.

Conclusion

This research explored community attitudes to cruise ship tourism arrivals in Akaroa through a survey of the Akaroa community. Three distinct - but intersecting - sample groups were found to make up this community: permanent Akaroa Township residents; Akaroa district residents, many of whom worked in the Akaroa Township; and, non-resident ratepayers who owned holiday homes in Akaroa and who spent considerable amounts of time in Akaroa. While there were considerable variations in the opinions held by respondents from each of the three sample groups, all three groups demonstrated a high level of community engagement with Akaroa generally, and with the cruise ship 'debate' which had surfaced in the community during the last cruise ship season, more specifically. A wide range of economic, employment, community and social and tourism benefits were identified; these were counterbalanced by a number of well-articulated and tangible issues associated with cruise ship arrivals. These included congestion and crowding, specific issues associated with bus traffic in the township, a wide range of facility and amenity issues and environmental and visitor management concerns. Overall, however, a balanced and generally positive view towards cruise ship arrival was prevalent.

References

- Ap, J. (1990). Residents' perceptions research on the social impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17: 610-616.
- Belise, F. J., & Hoy, D. R. (1980). The perceived impact of tourism by residents: a case study in Santa Marta, Colombia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 7 (1): 83-101.
- Davis, D., Allen, J., & Cosenza, R. M. (1988). Segmenting local residents by their attitudes, interests, and opinions toward tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27 (2): 2-8.
- Glasson, J. (1994). Oxford: a heritage city under pressure. *Tourism Management*, (15): 137-144.
- Haley, A.J., Snaith, T. & Miller, G. (2005). The social impacts of tourism: a case study of Bath, UK. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32 (3): 647-668.
- Husbands, W. (1989). Social status and perception of tourism in Zambia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16: 237-253.
- Keogh, B. (1990). Public participation in community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17: 449-465.
- King, B., Pizam, A., & Milman, A. (1993). Social impacts of tourism: host perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20 (4): 650-655.
- Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21 (1): 121-139.
- Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre (2011). *Cruise ships diverted to Akaroa* (Wednesday 28 September 2011). Retrieved on 13 May 2013 from <http://www.lytteltonharbour.info/community-information/community-news/127-cruise-ships-diverted-to-akaroa>
- McCool, S. F., & Martin, S. R. (1994). Community attachment and attitudes toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32 (3): 29-34.
- Madrigal, R. (1993). A tale of tourism in two cities. *Annals of Tourism Research*, (20): 336-353.
- Market Economics Limited (2012). *Economic Impact Assessment of the New Zealand Cruise Sector: Final Report*. Report prepared for Cruise New Zealand by Market Economics Limited. New Zealand: Cruise New Zealand.
- Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1988). Social impacts of tourism on Central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15: 191-204.
- Pearce, P.L., Moscardo, G. & Ross, G.F. (1996). *Tourism Community Relationships*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
- Pizam, A. (1978). Tourist impacts: the social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16 (1): 8-12.

- Prentice, R. (1993). Community-driven tourism planning and residents' preferences. *Tourism Management*, 14: 218-227.
- Rothman, R. (1978). Residents and transients: community reactions to seasonal visitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16: 8-13.
- Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1984). Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Journal of Tourism Management*, 5 (1): 40-47.
- Shone, M.C., Simmons, D.G. & Fairweather, J.R. (2003). *Evolving Community Response to Tourism in Christchurch and Akaroa*. Report Number 34. Tourism, Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC). Lincoln University, New Zealand.
- Tan, R. & Summers, D. (2012). Untitled cruise ship presentation. New Zealand: Cruise New Zealand and IDNZ Destination Management.
- Tourism New Zealand (2012). *New Zealand Cruise Summary June 2012*. Retrieved on 13 May 2013 from
http://www.tourismnewzealand.com/media/885712/new_zealand_cruise_summary_june_2012.pdf
- Tourism New Zealand (2013). *Sector marketing – cruise sector*. Retrieved on 13 May 2013 from
<http://www.tourismnewzealand.com/sector-marketing/cruise/>

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Survey

Resident and District

Page 58

Appendix 2 - Survey

Postal

Page 66

Appendix 3 - Research Information Sheets

Resident and District

Page 74

Postal

Page 75

Appendix 4 - Letters to *The Akaroa Mail*

Page 76

A Survey of Community Attitudes to Akaroa Hosting Cruise Ship Arrivals

This survey is being carried out by Lincoln University, in conjunction with Christchurch City Council and Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism. We are interested in finding out about Akaroa residents' attitudes to cruise ship tourism in Akaroa.

We would like one person in your household to complete the survey. In order to ensure that a good mix of people are represented in this survey, we would like the person who is aged 18 or over and who has the next birthday to complete this questionnaire. You may be assured of your anonymity in this survey, as no identifying information will be collected about you. Collected data will be presented in aggregate form, and no person will be individually identifiable.

Your involvement in this survey is completely voluntary. This questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes to answer. If you choose to participate in this survey, we ask that you return the completed questionnaire by posting it back to us at your earliest possible convenience. We have included a postage paid self-addressed envelope for this purpose.

It is important that all participants in this survey are able to provide informed consent regarding his or her involvement in this research project. As such, the completion and return of this survey will indicate that you consent to these conditions.

SECTION A: LIVING AND WORKING IN AKAROA

This section asks questions about living and working in Akaroa. For each question, please tick the boxes which best reflect your circumstances.

1. Please tick the box below which best describes your residential status in Akaroa. Please tick only one option below.

- | | |
|--|--|
| I live in Akaroa for most of the year | |
| I live in Akaroa on a temporary basis (e.g., seasonal worker) | |
| I am generally 'non-resident' in Akaroa, but I do own property in Akaroa | |
| Other (please specify below) | |

2. If you are the owner of a holiday house in Akaroa, approximately how many nights in total did you spend in Akaroa during the 2012/13 cruise ship season (13th October – 5th April)?

Number of nights =

3. How many years, in total, have you lived in Akaroa? If you have lived in Akaroa less than a year, please indicate number of months.

Number of years =

4. In the last year, have you worked in any of the following jobs in Akaroa? (Includes paid, unpaid and/or non-paid work) Please tick as many options as applicable.

- Restaurants/cafes/eateries/bars
- Souvenir/gift/arts & crafts shops
- Other retail (e.g., petrol station, supermarket etc.)
- Tour guiding/tourist attractions
- Transport (e.g., bus/coach/taxi driver)
- Travel agency/information centre
- Accommodation
- I have not worked in any of these jobs in the last year
- Not applicable

5. In the last year, apart from you, has anyone else in your household worked in any of the following jobs in Akaroa? (Includes paid, unpaid and/or non-paid work) Please tick as many options as applicable.

- Restaurants/cafes/bars
- Souvenir/gift/arts & crafts shops
- Other retail (e.g., petrol station, supermarket etc.)
- Tour guiding/tourist attractions
- Transport (e.g., bus/coach/taxi driver)
- Travel agency/information centre
- Accommodation
- No one else has worked in any of these jobs in the last year
- Not applicable

6. During your work time (includes paid and/or non-paid), how often do you come into contact with cruise ship visitors in Akaroa during the cruise ship season (October – April)? Please tick only one option below.

- Frequently
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never
- Don't know
- Not applicable

7. During your non-work time, how often do you come into contact with cruise ship visitors in Akaroa during the cruise ship season (October – April)? Please tick only one option below.

Frequently	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rarely	<input type="checkbox"/>
Never	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Does this contact with cruise ship visitors (during work and/or non-work time) impact upon your quality of life in Akaroa? Please tick only one option below.

It significantly improves my quality of life	<input type="checkbox"/>
It improves my quality of life	<input type="checkbox"/>
It does not impact on my quality of life	<input type="checkbox"/>
It reduces my quality of life	<input type="checkbox"/>
It significantly reduces my quality of life	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't have any contact with cruise ship visitors	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>

SECTION B: BENEFITS AND PROBLEMS FROM CRUISE SHIP TOURISM IN AKAROA

This section asks questions about your attitudes to cruise ship tourism in Akaroa. Even if you have nothing to do with the tourism industry in Akaroa, we are interested to know your opinion about a range of things relating to cruise ship tourism.

9. On a scale from 1 to 5, please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about cruise ship tourism in Akaroa. For each, please circle the option which best matches your response (1= strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree, DK=don't know)

	Strongly disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly agree 5	Don't know DK
a. The benefits of cruise ship tourism outweigh the problems	1	2	3	4	5	DK
b. Cruise ship tourism increases traffic congestion in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
c. I feel that I can personally influence decisions about cruise ship tourism	1	2	3	4	5	DK
d. Cruise ship tourism improves the Akaroa economy	1	2	3	4	5	DK
e. Cruise ship tourism unfairly increases property prices in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
f. Cruise ship tourism development improves the quality of life for residents	1	2	3	4	5	DK

	Strongly disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly agree 5	Don't know DK
g. Long term planning will help to control the negative impacts from cruise ship tourism	1	2	3	4	5	DK
h. Cruise ship tourism development increases local council rates	1	2	3	4	5	DK
i. Cruise ship tourism should play a vital role for Akaroa in the future	1	2	3	4	5	DK
j. Local government should restrict cruise ship arrivals in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
k. Cruise ship tourism increases recreational opportunities for residents	1	2	3	4	5	DK
l. Cruise ship tourism negatively affects the character and charm of Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
m. Akaroa should become more of a cruise ship tourism destination	1	2	3	4	5	DK
n. I would support a local tax levy for cruise ship tourism	1	2	3	4	5	DK
o. Cruise ship tourism increases the amount of crime in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
p. When I talk to other residents I am positive about cruise ship tourism	1	2	3	4	5	DK
q. Cruise ship visitors should pay more for their purchases in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
r. Cruise ship tourism reduces the quality of outdoor recreation	1	2	3	4	5	DK
s. Cruise ship tourism improves the appearance of Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
t. Tourism businesses are too influential politically in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
u. Cruise ship tourism provides good jobs for Akaroa residents	1	2	3	4	5	DK
v. Cruise ship tourism leads to more litter in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
w. Akaroa should try to attract more cruise ship arrivals	1	2	3	4	5	DK
x. Local government should control cruise ship tourism in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK

10. In your opinion, does the Akaroa community benefit from cruise ship tourism? Please tick only one option below.

It benefits greatly	<input type="checkbox"/>
It benefits moderately	<input type="checkbox"/>
It benefits slightly	<input type="checkbox"/>
It does not benefit at all	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you answered 'it does not benefit at all' or 'don't know', please go to Question 12.

11. In your opinion, what are the three main benefits of cruise ship tourism for Akaroa?

Benefit 1:

Benefit 2:

Benefit 3:

12. In this question, we want you to think about the types of problems which cruise ship tourism brings to Akaroa. On a scale from 1 to 5, please rate the following items according to the level of impact (i.e., **problem) experienced in Akaroa from cruise ship tourism. For each, please circle the option which best matches your response.**

	No problem 1	Slight problem 2	Moderate problem 3	Significant Problem 4	Very significant problem 5	Don't know DK
a. Crowding in cafes and restaurants	1	2	3	4	5	DK
b. Crowding in retail stores	1	2	3	4	5	DK
c. Crowding on footpaths	1	2	3	4	5	DK
d. Crowding in public buildings such as the library and visitor centre	1	2	3	4	5	DK
e. Lack of access to public toilets	1	2	3	4	5	DK
f. Lack of cleanliness of public toilets	1	2	3	4	5	DK
h. Traffic congestion in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
i. Lack of availability of parking for local residents	1	2	3	4	5	DK
j. Increased levels of noise	1	2	3	4	5	DK
k. Increased levels of litter	1	2	3	4	5	DK
l. Other visitors staying away from Akaroa on cruise ship days	1	2	3	4	5	DK
m. Increased strain on facilities and infrastructure in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
n. Other (please specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5	DK

If you don't think cruise ship tourism creates any problems for Akaroa, please go to Question 15.

13. Can you please identify up to three cruise ship-related issues which in your opinion are the most problematic for Akaroa. There is space below for you to identify each problem. If at all possible, we would also like you to suggest how this problem may be fixed, and by whom.

Issue 1: What is the problem?

How can it be fixed?

By whom?

Issue 2: What is the problem?

How can it be fixed?

By whom?

Issue 3: What is the problem?

How can it be fixed?

By whom?

14. Have you ever been concerned enough about cruise ship tourism in Akaroa to do something about it? (e.g., write to a newspaper, contact the council or an MP) Please tick only one option below.

Yes

No

If you answered 'yes', what action(s) did you take?

SECTION C: DEMOGRAPHICS

This section asks questions about your gender, age, ethnicity and employment status. We need this information to check if our sample is representative of the Akaroa population. Please tick the boxes which best reflect your personal circumstances.

15. What is your age? *Please tick only one option below.*

15-19 years	<input type="checkbox"/>	55-59	<input type="checkbox"/>
20-24	<input type="checkbox"/>	60-64	<input type="checkbox"/>
25-29	<input type="checkbox"/>	65-69	<input type="checkbox"/>
30-34	<input type="checkbox"/>	70-74	<input type="checkbox"/>
35-39	<input type="checkbox"/>	75-79	<input type="checkbox"/>
40-44	<input type="checkbox"/>	80-84	<input type="checkbox"/>
45-49	<input type="checkbox"/>	85+	<input type="checkbox"/>
50-54	<input type="checkbox"/>		

16. What is your gender? *Please tick only one option below.*

Male Female

17. What is your ethnicity? *Please tick only one option below.*

European/Pakeha New Zealander	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maori	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pacific Islander	<input type="checkbox"/>
Asian	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>

18. What is your employment status? *Please tick only one option below.*

Employed full-time	<input type="checkbox"/>
Employed part-time	<input type="checkbox"/>
Self-employed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unemployed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not in the workforce (e.g., retired)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please use the space provided on the following page to include any further comments you may wish to add about cruise ship tourism in Akaroa.

Any further comments:

Thank you for completing this survey.

A Survey of Community Attitudes to Akaroa Hosting Cruise Ship Arrivals

This survey is being carried out by Lincoln University, in conjunction with Christchurch City Council and Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism. We are interested in finding out about Akaroa residents' attitudes to cruise ship tourism in Akaroa. This includes non-resident ratepayers.

You have been sent this survey because you are listed on the Christchurch City Council ratepayer data base for Akaroa. We would like one person in your household to complete the survey. In order to ensure that a good mix of people are represented in this survey, we would like the ratepayer of the Akaroa property who is aged 18 or over and who has the next birthday to complete this questionnaire. You may be assured of your anonymity in this survey, as no identifying information will be collected about you. Collected data will be presented in aggregate form, and no person will be individually identifiable.

Your involvement in this survey is completely voluntary. This questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes to answer. If you choose to participate in this survey, we ask that you return the completed questionnaire by posting it back to us at your earliest possible convenience. We have included a postage paid self-addressed envelope for this purpose.

It is important that all participants in this survey are able to provide informed consent regarding his or her involvement in this research project. As such, the completion and return of this survey will indicate that you consent to these conditions.

SECTION A: ASSOCIATION WITH AKAROA

This section asks questions about your association with Akaroa. For each question, please tick the boxes which best reflect your circumstances.

1. Please tick the box below which best describes your residential status in Akaroa. Please tick only one option below.

I live in Akaroa for most of the year	
I live in Akaroa on a temporary basis (e.g., seasonal worker)	
I am generally 'non-resident' in Akaroa, but I do own property in Akaroa	
Other (please specify below)	

2. Do you own a holiday house in Akaroa?

Yes	
No	

If 'yes', approximately how many nights in total did you spend in Akaroa during the 2012/13 cruise ship season (13th October – 5th April)?

Number of nights =

3. How many years, in total, have you owned property in Akaroa? If you have owned property in Akaroa less than a year, please indicate number of months.

Number of years =

4. In the last year, have you worked in any of the following jobs in Akaroa? (Includes paid, unpaid and/or non-paid work) Please tick as many options as applicable.

- Restaurants/cafes/eateries/bars
- Souvenir/gift/arts & crafts shops
- Other retail (e.g., petrol station, supermarket etc.)
- Tour guiding/tourist attractions
- Transport (e.g., bus/coach/taxi driver)
- Travel agency/information centre
- Accommodation
- I have not worked in any of these jobs in the last year
- Not applicable

5. In the last year, apart from you, has anyone else in your household worked in any of the following jobs in Akaroa? (Includes paid, unpaid and/or non-paid work) Please tick as many options as applicable.

- Restaurants/cafes/bars
- Souvenir/gift/arts & crafts shops
- Other retail (e.g., petrol station, supermarket etc.)
- Tour guiding/tourist attractions
- Transport (e.g., bus/coach/taxi driver)
- Travel agency/information centre
- Accommodation
- No one else has worked in any of these jobs in the last year
- Not applicable

6. During your work time (includes paid and/or non-paid), how often do you come into contact with cruise ship visitors in Akaroa during the cruise ship season (October – April)? Please tick only one option below.

- Frequently
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never
- Don't know
- Not applicable

7. During your non-work time, how often do you come into contact with cruise ship visitors in Akaroa during the cruise ship season (October – April)? Please tick only one option below.

Frequently	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rarely	<input type="checkbox"/>
Never	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Does this contact with cruise ship visitors (during work and/or non-work time) impact upon your quality of life in Akaroa? Please tick only one option below.

It significantly improves my quality of life	<input type="checkbox"/>
It improves my quality of life	<input type="checkbox"/>
It does not impact on my quality of life	<input type="checkbox"/>
It reduces my quality of life	<input type="checkbox"/>
It significantly reduces my quality of life	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't have any contact with cruise ship visitors	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>

SECTION B: BENEFITS AND PROBLEMS FROM CRUISE SHIP TOURISM IN AKAROA

This section asks questions about your attitudes to cruise ship tourism in Akaroa. Even if you have nothing to do with the tourism industry in Akaroa, we are interested to know your opinion about a range of things relating to cruise ship tourism.

9. On a scale from 1 to 5, please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about cruise ship tourism in Akaroa. For each, please circle the option which best matches your response (1= strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree, DK=don't know)

	Strongly disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly agree 5	Don't know DK
a. The benefits of cruise ship tourism outweigh the problems	1	2	3	4	5	DK
b. Cruise ship tourism increases traffic congestion in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
c. I feel that I can personally influence decisions about cruise ship tourism	1	2	3	4	5	DK
d. Cruise ship tourism improves the Akaroa economy	1	2	3	4	5	DK
e. Cruise ship tourism unfairly increases property prices in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
f. Cruise ship tourism development improves the quality of life for residents	1	2	3	4	5	DK

	Strongly disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly agree 5	Don't know DK
g. Long term planning will help to control the negative impacts from cruise ship tourism	1	2	3	4	5	DK
h. Cruise ship tourism development increases local council rates	1	2	3	4	5	DK
i. Cruise ship tourism should play a vital role for Akaroa in the future	1	2	3	4	5	DK
j. Local government should restrict cruise ship arrivals in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
k. Cruise ship tourism increases recreational opportunities for residents	1	2	3	4	5	DK
l. Cruise ship tourism negatively affects the character and charm of Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
m. Akaroa should become more of a cruise ship tourism destination	1	2	3	4	5	DK
n. I would support a local tax levy for cruise ship tourism	1	2	3	4	5	DK
o. Cruise ship tourism increases the amount of crime in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
p. When I talk to other residents I am positive about cruise ship tourism	1	2	3	4	5	DK
q. Cruise ship visitors should pay more for their purchases in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
r. Cruise ship tourism reduces the quality of outdoor recreation	1	2	3	4	5	DK
s. Cruise ship tourism improves the appearance of Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
t. Tourism businesses are too influential politically in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
u. Cruise ship tourism provides good jobs for Akaroa residents	1	2	3	4	5	DK
v. Cruise ship tourism leads to more litter in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
w. Akaroa should try to attract more cruise ship arrivals	1	2	3	4	5	DK
x. Local government should control cruise ship tourism in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK

10. In your opinion, does the Akaroa community benefit from cruise ship tourism? Please tick only one option below.

It benefits greatly	<input type="checkbox"/>
It benefits moderately	<input type="checkbox"/>
It benefits slightly	<input type="checkbox"/>
It does not benefit at all	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you answered 'it does not benefit at all' or 'don't know', please go to Question 12.

11. In your opinion, what are the three main benefits of cruise ship tourism for Akaroa?

Benefit 1:

Benefit 2:

Benefit 3:

12. In this question, we want you to think about the types of problems which cruise ship tourism brings to Akaroa. On a scale from 1 to 5, please rate the following items according to the level of impact (i.e., **problem) experienced in Akaroa from cruise ship tourism. For each, please circle the option which best matches your response.**

	No problem 1	Slight problem 2	Moderate problem 3	Significant Problem 4	Very significant problem 5	Don't know DK
a. Crowding in cafes and restaurants	1	2	3	4	5	DK
b. Crowding in retail stores	1	2	3	4	5	DK
c. Crowding on footpaths	1	2	3	4	5	DK
d. Crowding in public buildings such as the library and visitor centre	1	2	3	4	5	DK
e. Lack of access to public toilets	1	2	3	4	5	DK
f. Lack of cleanliness of public toilets	1	2	3	4	5	DK
h. Traffic congestion in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
i. Lack of availability of parking for local residents	1	2	3	4	5	DK
j. Increased levels of noise	1	2	3	4	5	DK
k. Increased levels of litter	1	2	3	4	5	DK
l. Other visitors staying away from Akaroa on cruise ship days	1	2	3	4	5	DK
m. Increased strain on facilities and infrastructure in Akaroa	1	2	3	4	5	DK
n. Other (please specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5	DK

If you don't think cruise ship tourism creates any problems for Akaroa, please go to Question 15.

13. Can you please identify up to three cruise ship-related issues which in your opinion are the most problematic for Akaroa. There is space below for you to identify each problem. If at all possible, we would also like you to suggest how this problem may be fixed, and by whom.

Issue 1: What is the problem?

How can it be fixed?

By whom?

Issue 2: What is the problem?

How can it be fixed?

By whom?

Issue 3: What is the problem?

How can it be fixed?

By whom?

14. Have you ever been concerned enough about cruise ship tourism in Akaroa to do something about it? (e.g., write to a newspaper, contact the council or an MP) Please tick only one option below.

Yes

No

If you answered 'yes', what action(s) did you take?

SECTION C: DEMOGRAPHICS

This section asks questions about your gender, age, ethnicity and employment status. We need this information so that we may describe our research sample. Please tick the boxes which best reflect your personal circumstances.

15. What is your age? *Please tick only one option below.*

15-19 years	<input type="checkbox"/>	55-59	<input type="checkbox"/>
20-24	<input type="checkbox"/>	60-64	<input type="checkbox"/>
25-29	<input type="checkbox"/>	65-69	<input type="checkbox"/>
30-34	<input type="checkbox"/>	70-74	<input type="checkbox"/>
35-39	<input type="checkbox"/>	75-79	<input type="checkbox"/>
40-44	<input type="checkbox"/>	80-84	<input type="checkbox"/>
45-49	<input type="checkbox"/>	85+	<input type="checkbox"/>
50-54	<input type="checkbox"/>		

16. What is your gender? *Please tick only one option below.*

Male Female

17. What is your ethnicity? *Please tick only one option below.*

European/Pakeha New Zealander	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maori	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pacific Islander	<input type="checkbox"/>
Asian	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>

18. What is your employment status? *Please tick only one option below.*

Employed full-time	<input type="checkbox"/>
Employed part-time	<input type="checkbox"/>
Self-employed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unemployed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not in the workforce (e.g., retired)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please use the space provided on the following page to include any further comments you may wish to add about cruise ship tourism in Akaroa.

Any further comments:

Thank you for completing this survey.

To the household member aged 18 or above who has the next birthday

You are invited to participate as a subject in a project entitled: *A Survey of Community Attitudes to Akaroa Hosting Cruise Ship Arrivals*

Researchers at Lincoln University have been commissioned by the Christchurch City Council and Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism to undertake a project to assess the attitudes of Akaroa residents to cruise ship arrivals in the township. You have been selected to take part in this survey based on a targeted sample of every household in Akaroa, whereby the person who is aged 18 years and over and who has the next birthday is asked to participate. Your participation in this project is completely voluntary, and will involve self-completing a questionnaire of approximately 15 minutes duration. If you choose to participate in this survey, we ask that you return the completed questionnaire by posting it back to us at your earliest possible convenience. We have included a postage paid self-addressed envelope for this purpose.

The survey includes questions about living and working in Akaroa, the benefits and problems created by cruise ship tourism in Akaroa, and how to manage the impacts of cruise ship tourism in the future. The survey will also ask a few questions about your demographic characteristics, so that we may check to see if our sample is representative of the Akaroa population.

You are free to refuse to answer any question, and you are not obliged to complete the survey and return it to us. You may be assured of your anonymity in this survey, as no identifying information will be collected about you. Statistical data will be presented in aggregate form only. All completed questionnaires will be kept in a secure location, and in the Lincoln University secure facility once analysis is completed. The data obtained in the survey will be entered into a password protected computer. The results of the project will be presented in a written report to Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism and the Christchurch City Council.

It is important that all participants in this survey are able to provide informed consent regarding his or her involvement in this research project. As such, the completion and return of this survey to Lincoln University will indicate that you consent to these conditions.

The research project is being carried out by:

Michael Shone, Lecturer in Tourism and Recreation, Lincoln University

Email: Michael.Shone@lincoln.ac.nz

Telephone: (03) 325-3838 ext. 8772

Dr Jude Wilson, Senior Research Officer, Lincoln University

Email: Jude.Wilson@lincoln.ac.nz

Telephone: (03) 325-3838 ext. 8611

They will be pleased to discuss any questions or concerns you have about participation in the project. The project has been reviewed and approved by the Lincoln University Human Ethics Committee.

To the household member aged 18 or above who has the next birthday

You are invited to participate as a subject in a project entitled: *A Survey of Community Attitudes to Akaroa Hosting Cruise Ship Arrivals*

Researchers at Lincoln University have been commissioned by the Christchurch City Council and Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism to undertake a project to assess the attitudes of Akaroa residents to cruise ship arrivals in the township. This includes non-resident ratepayers. You have been sent this survey because you are listed on the Christchurch City Council ratepayer data base for Akaroa. We would like one person in your household to complete the survey. In order to ensure that a good mix of people are represented in this survey, we would like the person who is aged 18 or over and who has the next birthday to complete this questionnaire.

Your participation in this project is completely voluntary, and will involve self-completing a questionnaire of approximately 15 minutes duration. If you choose to participate in this survey, we ask that you return the completed questionnaire by posting it back to us at your earliest possible convenience. We have included a postage paid self-addressed envelope for this purpose. The survey includes questions about living and working in Akaroa, the benefits and problems created by cruise ship tourism in Akaroa, and how to manage the impacts of cruise ship tourism in the future. While some of the survey questions may not necessarily be applicable to you as a non-resident ratepayer, we would appreciate it if you could complete as much of the survey as possible.

You are free to refuse to answer any question, and you are not obliged to complete the survey and return it to us. You may be assured of your anonymity in this survey, as no identifying information will be collected about you. Statistical data will be presented in aggregate form only. All completed questionnaires will be kept in a secure location, and in the Lincoln University secure facility once analysis is completed. The data obtained in the survey will be entered into a password protected computer. The results of the project will be presented in a written report to Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism and the Christchurch City Council. It is important that all participants in this survey are able to provide informed consent regarding his or her involvement in this research project. As such, the completion and return of this survey to Lincoln University will indicate that you consent to these conditions.

The research project is being carried out by:

Michael Shone, Lecturer in Tourism and Recreation, Lincoln University
Email: Michael.Shone@lincoln.ac.nz
Telephone: (03) 325-3838 ext. 8772

Dr Jude Wilson, Senior Research Officer, Lincoln University
Email: Jude.Wilson@lincoln.ac.nz
Telephone: (03) 325-3838 ext. 8611

They will be pleased to discuss any questions or concerns you have about participation in the project. The project has been reviewed and approved by the Lincoln University Human Ethics Committee.

Letter to the editor (*The Akaroa Mail*)
Published 10 May 2013

Dear Sir,

We are tourism researchers at Lincoln University, with a particular interest in understanding how destination communities cope with, and respond to, tourism.

We note with interest the volume of letters and range of opinions regarding cruise ship tourism in Akaroa which have been published in recent editions of the Akaroa Mail. The growth in cruise ship arrivals in Akaroa, particularly over the past two seasons, appears to have revealed a number of challenges for the local community in co-existing with large volumes of cruise ship arrivals in the village.

As such, we wanted to make it known that we will be in Akaroa from 15th-22nd May inclusive, conducting a survey of residents' attitudes to cruise ship tourism. The survey asks residents about their likes and dislikes, concerns and opinions relating to cruise ship tourism in Akaroa.

We will be delivering surveys door to door in Akaroa Township. One person per household will be asked to complete and return the survey. If after two call-backs no one is at home, a survey pack will be left in the mail box. For convenience, a return paid envelope will be attached to all surveys.

We are hopeful that Akaroa residents will be receptive to this research, as we believe it is an important first step in addressing any cruise ship 'issues' in Akaroa.

Yours sincerely
Michael Shone and Jude Wilson
Lincoln University

Letter to editor (*The Akaroa Mail*)
Published 24 May 2013

Dear Sir,

We wish to thank all the residents of Akaroa who were so welcoming of us while we were delivering cruise ship tourism surveys last week in the town. We did our best to include every residential address in the survey, and we have been heartened by the warm response to our efforts. We also wish to apologise if for any reason we did not knock on your door, or leave a survey in your letterbox. If any household didn't receive a survey, and would like one to fill out, householders can contact the CCC service centre in Akaroa and they will arrange for a survey to be given out. The survey is limited to one per household, and will be open until Friday 31st May. For those householders whom are yet to complete the survey, we would ask that they do so and then return it in to us at their earliest possible convenience, so that their views may be included in the analysis.

Yours sincerely
Michael Shone and Jude Wilson
Lincoln University