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Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 Interest to pursue the study

Tourism means travelling to other countries and meeting people of various backgrounds. That was my first impression of tourism. If I get myself a job with the tourism industry I will be able to visit many countries outside of the Solomon Islands, I thought. I had very limited knowledge about the impacts of tourism and my perception of tourism was always positive; I considered that tourism revitalises culture, which is good.

My interest to take up this area of study began to develop after completing my undergraduate study in New Zealand and returning to work in a foreign owned hotel in the Solomon Islands. Those nine years with the hotel and our dealings with the local residents changed my early perceptions of tourism. I came to realise that local residents' lack of control of tourism development means that there are no real benefits for the community. Additionally, those interactions with local residents demonstrated their limited knowledge of tourism and how they could use it as a development tool to help their community. This is when I started to wonder if there is somehow I can contribute to the local communities by educating them about tourism, so that they (as resource owners) can also enjoy the benefits of tourism. Thus the question of whether tourism can become a developmental tool for these villages started to become a personal concern and interest. I began to contemplate how these villages can develop tourism by utilising their diverse natural and cultural resources so that the benefits remained in the villages without escaping into foreign hands.

1.2 Tourism and Development

The aim of the emergence of the concept of development was to drive developing nations towards achieving developed status. Countries were divided into two distinct categories: modern and traditional. An early goal of development policies was the achievement of economic growth. The assumption was that economic growth would benefit the entire population through the ‘trickle-down’ effect (Scheyvens, 2002). Tourism was highly regarded as a developmental strategy for economic growth due to its potential for generating macro and micro benefits to host countries. Developing countries could use tourism to yield much needed foreign exchange which would contribute to economic development. Therefore tourism was embraced and promoted by many developing countries, including those nations in the South Pacific region.
Due to the poor economic characteristics of developing countries, neoliberal policies were adopted in an attempt to attract multinational corporations to promote and advance tourism. However along with its fundamental contributions such as bringing in foreign exchange and creating employment opportunities which increased the income of local residents in the community, tourism also brought unwanted impacts (Wall & Mathieson, 2006). The lack of control of tourism by developing countries resulted in negative economic, socio-cultural and environmental consequences. Therefore, criticism began to unfold about the use of tourism as development tool in developing countries. Does tourism really benefit developing countries? According to deKadt (1979) the introduction of tourism into developing countries generated other non-material issues such the interruption to traditional values and attitudes of host countries. For instance, the encounter between Western tourists and host communities resulted in the display of other lifestyles which were not achievable by developing countries. The development of tourism also damaged and destroyed the natural environment. However, of more concern was the displacement of local residents from their traditional land and resources. Local residents were forced to move out from their land for tourism development to take place (Hinch & Butler, 2007).

Therefore, it was recognised that economic growth alone is not adequate to close the divide between developed and developing countries. Even though tourism brings some economic benefits, poverty and unemployment are still increasing in developing countries (deKadt, 1979; Scheyvens & Russell, 2009; Seers, 1969). Because of this, a holistic development strategy, which also aimed to include human development, emerged. Other alternative options as opposed to mass tourism were also considered in order to achieve a result that is consistent with the broad goals of development. This led to the emergence of community based tourism.

1.3 The significance of tourism

Today tourism is a leading industry in the world. According to United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO), tourism has been growing and expanding in the last six decades. By the end of 2013, tourism contributed USD$6990.3bn or 9% to the gross domestic product (GDP) globally. It also boosted employment by 8.9%, effectively creating one in every eleven current jobs. Tourism revenue has also increased from USD$1078 billion in the year 2012 to USD$1159 billion in 2013 (UNWTO, 2014). In the Pacific region, tourism is also promoted by many countries because of its potential to inject foreign exchange into their narrow-based economies (Scheyvens & Russell, 2011). Although South Pacific tourism only represents 0.15% of global international tourist arrivals, this figure is adequate for tourism to become the backbone of the region’s economy (Berno 2007). A report from UNWTO (2014)

---

1 Emmanuel de Kadt – his book Tourism; Passport to Development? was one of the first to question the non-economic benefits of tourism development for developing countries.
also stated that tourism is growing by 5% in the Pacific region by the year ending 2013. However in spite of this increment, tourism is not evenly spread across the Pacific region. Only a few countries, such as Fiji and French Polynesia, have the facilities to attract mass tourism, and thus they account for 50% of the region’s arrivals (Harrison, 2004 as cited in Panakera, Wilson, Ryan, & Liu, 2011).

1.4 Can tourism be an option for Solomon Islands?

Tourism in the Solomon Islands is still at the very early stage of development and has been rated very low compared to other Pacific Island countries such as Fiji, Vanuatu and Samoa. According to the SPTO (2013), visitor arrivals to the Solomon Islands for the year ending 2012 totalled 23,925, accounting for just 1.5% of the total arrivals in the Pacific region in 2012. Although the Solomon Islands tourism industry collapsed during the ethnic crises between the Guadalcanal and Malaita people between the years 1998 and 2003, it is slowly recovering (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006). While tourism is recognised by the government, it has never been prioritised as a development tool for rural communities. Though the contributions from tourism are small compared to other industries such as logging and fisheries, they are still significant in terms of providing employment and income for local residents. According to the Solomon Islands Government (SIG) (2010b) report, the forestry industry (which is the top export of the country) has declined due to unsustainable practices over the years. Thus, one of the key sources of growth identified for the economic recovery of the Solomon Islands is tourism, given its diverse natural, cultural and historical resources. As such, the potential for tourism as a development mechanism for the rural villages is of interest in this study.

1.5 Research purposes and objectives

The main aim of this research is to assess the appropriateness of community based tourism as a developmental tool for rural communities around Gizo Island. This is guided by the following specific objectives:

i. To examine Solomon Islands tourism policies at all levels (national, provincial and local) with a specific focus on Western Province and Gizo Island.

ii. To assess existing and potential tourism developments in the rural communities on Gizo Island

iii. To assess local communities’ knowledge and skills for tourism development and promotion

iv. To examine what type of tourism development (if any) the local residents want to see developed in their community
v. To understand the socio-political structure of the communities in regard to local resources and community developments.

vi. To identify the different types of tourists to Gizo and what types of tourist activities they would like to experience in the rural communities.

And to address the above objectives, the following research questions were formulated.

i. Can tourism become a tool for development in the Solomon Islands?

ii. Is community based tourism the preferred tourism development option for the rural villages around Gizo Island?

iii. If yes, how can the rural villages develop, implement and manage these resources to bring benefits to the local communities?

1.6 Thesis organisation

The thesis is divided into seven chapters: introduction, literature review, contextual facts about the Solomon Islands, methodology, results, discussion, conclusion and future research.

Chapter two provides a review of the literature associated with development and tourism and the rationale for community based tourism as a developmental tool for communities.

Chapter three presents a general background of the Solomon Islands and tourism development within the country. It then concludes with an overview of Gizo and the studied villages.

Chapter four describes the quantitative and qualitative methods used to gather the data for the study.

Chapter five presents the results from the visitors’ survey (quantitative) and the qualitative interviews with the government officers, tourism operators and the local residents of the studied villages.

Chapter six discusses the results and findings from Chapter 5 in order to accomplish the research goals and objectives.

Chapter seven draws conclusions from the findings and the discussion and provides recommendations for future research.
Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The literature reviewed in this chapter presents the platform leading to the research questions and objectives of the thesis. This is divided into seven sections. To enable a wider understanding of the relationship between tourism and development policies, the first part introduces the concept of development. Due to the contentious status of its definition, its evolution is also detailed. Following that is a discussion of the different development strategies by which tourism is contextualised.

Tourism as a tool for development is presented in the second section. A global picture of the fundamental contributions of tourism is first presented. This is then followed by a section on the significant role of tourism in the Pacific Islands. The impacts of tourism on communities are then presented and finally it is asked if the benefits of tourism are really felt by the local communities.

The third section focuses on community-based tourism and its principles. Due to the many constraints faced by local communities to self-develop community based tourism, the role of external stakeholders (the government and non-state actors) are also discussed. The final part of this section looks at the prerequisites for community based tourism, namely community participation and empowerment, and it concludes with the communities’ attitudes and perceptions towards tourism development and its impacts.

Part four presents the background of the Solomon Islands to situate the context of the studied communities. This includes the geographical location of the country, the demography, history, economic status and the socio-political organisation. The main theme in the fifth section concerns tourism in the Solomon Islands. This highlights: the evolution of tourism in the country, a discussion on development and Solomon Islands, the benefits of tourism to the Solomon Islands economy, the tourism infrastructure, attractions, and the tourist market to the country. A discussion on the Solomon Islands tourism policy and strategy is also provided. Finally the responsibilities of the Division of Tourism (DoT) in the Ministry of Tourism and Culture and the Solomon Islands Visitors Bureau (SIVB) are considered.

The sixth section sets the scene for the location of the case-study villages. The discussions in this part focus on the geographical location of the Western Province, tourism and the tourist market in Gizo. Finally, background information relating to the three villages that comprised the case study is presented in section seven.
2.2 Definition of development

The concept of development, what it means and how it is achieved is ambiguous and contested both at the theoretical and political levels. Historically, development ideology was restricted and narrowly focused on the status of developing countries using economic indicators as the means of assessing development. Development equated to economic development, based on the assumption that an increase in Gross National Product (GNP) or Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita would stimulate growth bringing in a positive change in the society (Chenery, 1983). This definition was repudiated by Seers (1969) who argued that in some developing countries, an increase in economic growth did not reduce unemployment and inequality nor eliminate poverty. Thus referring to development as just economic growth was too narrow, in the sense that it failed to acknowledge associated non-economic improvements (Sofield, 2003).

Development has been used descriptively or normatively to view development as a process (means) and condition (outcome) (Goulet, 1992; Sharpley, 2002). The descriptive use of development is found in the various recommendations on development in statistics and policy reports by international aid agencies such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the different academic literatures. The normative usage can be seen in the various criticisms and the introduction of different development paradigms where theorists use value-laden semantics to criticise the various development goals and visions using ethical and political superiority (Goulet, 1992).

In a broader context, development is referred to as a philosophy that originates with Western ideology and practices being imposed on developing countries. Senegal’s former President Senghor expressed this when he said “…no people wishes to commit cultural suicide; by repudiating its history and identity, on the grounds that this sacrifice is the only road to modernity. The “global culture” now in gestation world-wide needs the contribution of African civilisations to counter the economic reductionism still in force in dominant paradigms of modernity” (Goulet, 1992, p. 468).

Moreover, Sharpley’s (2002) description of development is that of both as a process (means) and outcome (condition) while Goulet (1992) viewed development as the vision to achieve a better life that is materially rich, institutionally modern and technologically efficient. He continues to argue that this better life can be achieved through economic planning, propaganda campaigns, social engineering, and sectoral interventions with a view to change values, behaviours and social structures. As such Sumner and Tribe (2008) defined development as a structural transformation of a society which occurs over time, and such change is denoted as ‘good change’.

These changes are specific to developing countries however, all countries undergo some changes over time. In addition, development is not stationary and happens at every level in any society.
including those in the developed world (Sharpley, 2002). Further to that, reality is socially and culturally constructed. Therefore, what is viewed as ‘good change’ may differ according to context.

Rostow (1960) interpreted development as going through a linear evolution of stages of economic growth – traditional, transitional, take-off, maturity and high consumption, while Thomas (2004) described it as having desirable targets for short or long term outcomes. This is what Gore (2000, p. 794) described as “shifting to ahistorical performance assessment”. This narrow definition is reflected in the works of many of the development agencies who measure and assess the outcomes of development in order to achieve their short and long term goals. Such an approach by the development agencies has been criticised as to whether their goals and objectives are purely to serve the interest of the agencies or if it is truly a representation of the communities’ expressions and values (Sumner & Tribe, 2008).

The ahistorical shift according to Sumner and Tribe (2008, p. 14) positioned development as a ‘dominant discourse of Western modernity’. This implies that development is not a social construct discourse which is inherent or objective to the context. There is only one reality and that is development is a Western concept which views developed countries as superior to developing countries. This approach as described below is

How people use particular types of language and imagery to represent themselves and others in particular ways. The focus is on how these images are underlain by, and reproduced through, power relations, and on what their social, political and economic effects are rather than whether or not they are ‘true’...The power to define reality is crucial aspect of power and one of the major means by which certain groups...are silenced and suppressed (Boot et al, 2006, p 12-13 as cited in Sumner & Tribe, 2008, p. 14).

Thus for example, countries with few economic assets are regarded as inferior from a materialistic perspective; likewise countries who still practice subsistence agriculture and lack advanced technology are labelled as traditional societies. Unlike the above definitions which interprets development as a vision of changes and outcomes, this definition emphasises how Western ethnocentric concepts are imposed on developing countries.

Development therefore is not a simple and straightforward concept, as there are various views and interpretations of the definitions that link with different ideologies and assumptions that continuously change over time. While it is sometimes seen as improvements or social and economic changes, development encompasses a wide array of dimensions such as economic, social, political, legal and institutional, engineering and even cultural. And if there is one common word highlighted by all the above definitions, it would be ‘change’.
Relevant to this thesis is the definition provided by Todaro (1994). Todaro’s (as cited in Sharpley, 2002) definition has a broad conceptualisation of development which is not narrowed to economic growth but also includes the human element. Moreover, the definition also takes into consideration the social and cultural values which are important because every culture is unique and development should be defined from a contextual point of view rather than being imposed from outside. Three main values identified by Todaro are sustenance, self-esteem and freedom. According to Todaro, an increase in the availability and distribution of basic human needs equates to sustenance. Self-esteem can only be achieved through a high standard of living, better education, more jobs with higher income, and respecting the social and cultural values. The final objective he refers to is the expansion of economic and social choices so that the community are self-reliant rather than depending on others. The above definition is relevant to this study because it is holistic and is consistent with the goal of using community based tourism as a developmental tool for communities.

As presented above, defining and measuring development is contentious and complicated. Different people and disciplines have their own definitions and perspectives on what development means to them. As such it is better to elucidate this complexity by examining the evolution of the concept of development by looking at its nature, the processes involved and the goals. By doing so, one can also put into perspective the relationship between development and the emergence of community based tourism from mainstream tourism, which is the heart of this thesis. This is discussed in the following subsections below.

2.2.1 The evolution of development

As one reads the literature pertaining to development, it is evident that the concept of development has evolved over the past decades. There have been shifts in ideas, goals and vision as regards to development and how it can be achieved in the context of the relationship between the developed and developing countries. It is also clear that there have been failures in trying to achieve the goals of development both in developed and developing countries, and this is shown in the advent of different paradigms of development (see the discussion in the next section). The emergence of the concept of development shortly after World War II was stimulated by three things: the US Marshall Plan, an optimistic view of the future, and the rising determination of colonies for independence (Sharpley, 2002). The perspective on development during this period focused narrowly on economic growth resulting from the rapid expansion of industrialisation which was seen in the developed countries’ models. Thus it was believed that developing countries must conform to such formulae. Such perspectives however have changed to embrace a more holistic approach to the different processes involved in development in the last decades.
The position of the United States with its international hegemony in the post-World War II period influenced early thinking on the concept of development. Following President Truman’s speech “We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific and industrial progress available for the improvements and growth of underdeveloped areas. The old imperialism-exploitation for foreign profit has no place in our plans. What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair dealing” (Esteva, 2010, p. 1), a new concept ‘under-developed’ was popularised. This was the beginning of a system of classifying countries along a dichotomy of under-developed and developed countries. This gave birth to the notion of Western superiority, as the former were viewed as inferior. Thus development was associated with the shift from under-developed conditions into a developed nation, which could be achieved through economic growth.

After a decade, development failed to produce qualitative changes and improvement to the welfare and standard of living of the people, thus prompting a new direction for development strategies. Economic measurements such as GNP only provided a partial explanation of the concept of development. Given that human potential is difficult to measure purely in economic terms, development must include social aspects, as argued by Seers:

The questions to ask about a country’s development are therefore; what has been happening to poverty, what has been happening to unemployment? What has been happening to inequality? If all three of these have declined from high levels, then beyond doubt this has been a period of development for the country concerned. If one or two of these central problems have been growing worse, especially if all three have, it would be strange to call the result ‘development’ even if per capita income doubled (Seers, 1969, p. 5).

Thus in the 1970s the definition of development was broadened to encompass poverty reduction or eradication, decline in inequality and unemployment. However, as most authors noted, the concern was that these variables were far from achieved in a pragmatic sense (Esteva, 2010; Goulet, 1992; Kimakowitz, 2012). Seers (1969) and Todaro (1977) were amongst other theorists who argued that development should also include a social aspect. Moreover people should not be seen as merely recipients of development; rather, at the crux of it they should be active participants in any development in their society.

---

President Truman was not the first to coin underdeveloped. It was invented by former member of the Secretariat of the International Labour Organisation in 1942, but it was not widely used at that time.
Therefore, for development to materialise people should be at the core of the development process, and in this vein the 1974 Declaration of Cocoyoe stressed that “the purpose of development should not be to ‘develop things but to develop man’. Any process of growth, it added, ‘that does not lead to the fulfilment of basic needs – or even worse disrupts them –is a travesty of the idea of development’” (Esteva, 2010, p. 11). Thus the goal of development expanded its horizon from economic growth to include basic human needs such as food, shelter, clothing, and to social and political needs such as education, human rights and empowerment and self-reliance. Development can only be achieved if all these are done through ‘distributive justice’ or equitable distribution of economic benefits (Esteva, 2010; Sharpley, 2002). The notion of achieving redistributive growth was acknowledged by the World Bank. As it paralleled their previous development strategies carried out on rural communities that were unsuccessful. This was due to the top-down approach taken by modernisation theory and economic growth in combating poverty and high unemployment.

As such, development for developing countries must not be seen as a process of depending on Western countries; developing countries must take control of their own development in their context. To this Goulet (1968) added self-esteem and freedom as dimensions of development. Further to that, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) on Human Development outlined that development should be an expansion of human choices so that people achieve a decent quality of life (Ingham, 1993; Sharpley, 2002). This people-oriented approach to development affirms that the necessities of the poor should be prioritised over economic growth thinking. In tourism this calls for the support of community-based initiatives which promote local participation in the decision making of tourism planning and development in their locality. Community based initiatives are to be promoted instead of mainstream tourism (Murphy, 1985; Scheyvens, 2008).

Towards the late 1970s the neoliberal development approach was criticised for not giving attention to the protection of the environment. This saw the emergence of the concept of sustainable development in the 1980s. The UNDP human development approach claimed that sustainability should focus beyond the environment and that development goals and practices should expand people’s lives and this should be seen through community participation. This participation between the developing countries and various aid agencies must be equitable instead of following a top-down approach. This development strategy emphasised equal opportunity through rational sharing of resources (Gore, 2000). It supports empowering the local community through participation in decision making regarding any development initiatives in their locality. In addition, this alternative paradigm also promotes gender balance, so that everyone is equally represented (Telfer, 2002).

As part of their support for the neoliberal development policy the World Bank and IMF introduced SAP towards late 1970s (Scheyvens, 2008). The structural adjustment programmes (SAP) enforced on
developing countries put the countries in huge debt instead of closing the underdeveloped and
developed dichotomy, and as such poverty was embedded in the countries. This took the form of
loans provided to developing countries on the condition that the recipients would repay later when
their economies were healthy. The main objectives of these SAP policies were to stimulate foreign
investment, and thus market liberalisation, privatisation and deregulation were encouraged. It was
argued that by doing so, the state would intervene less and these investments would be contained so
that economic growth and development would prevail in developing countries. This notion was not
successful because economic growth did not result. Instead these policies continue to deepen the
poor-rich dichotomy, as only foreign investors and wealthy elites benefited while the bulk of the local
population were denied development prosperity. As described in the SAPRI report (2004, p 3),

Equally problematic and debilitating for these countries and their people has been the
impacts of the policies themselves. Without democratic control and over the economic
decisions that so directly affect their lives, the vast majority of citizens have seen the past
generation of policies serve other interests while their own circumstances deteriorate. The
worsening plight of urban workers, farmers and small businesspeople, of women, indigenous
people and the young, of their natural environment and of the productive sectors of the
economy as a whole has been one of the tragic stories of the past two decades.

Thus there is a widespread disapproval with the SAP and a new approach has been taken. The World
Bank and UNDP have supported this approach and in 1996 the Development Assistance Committee
of the OECD outlined the International Development Targets, which were the predecessor to
Millennium Development Goals (Scheyvens, 2008). By the 1990s the global focus of development
centred on poverty alleviation.

2.2.2 The development paradigms

As discussed above, the concept of development and how to achieve it has evolved over the
decades. These changes in the development concept also paralleled various trends in the tourism
industry, as tourism was also considered as a means of achieving development. Therefore, the
discussion below focusses on development paradigms of modernisation, dependency, economic neo-
liberalism and alternative development, following which tourism is contextualised with the
paradigms (Table 2.2.3).
2.2.3 Modernisation

The dominant development paradigm from the 1950’s is that of modernisation, associated with social and economic theory. The theory was created based on three interconnected elements: the non-critical assumption that the West was superior, a pessimistic view that ignored the histories of non-Western countries by measuring their inherent value from a Western perspective, and an assumption that non-Western countries could only develop by getting rid of their ‘backwardness’ (traditions) by applying the Western model (Slater, 2002 as cited in Telfer, 2009). Modernisation theory proposed and positioned two distinct societies – the traditional and modern – on a development continuum, using economic growth to determine their status. The theory characterised traditional societies as having low social and economic status. Political structures in such societies were based on kinship, religious affiliation, regionalism and ethnic identity. By contrast modern society accepted modern values and other institutions which were opposed by traditions (Sofield, 2003; Telfer, 2009).

At the heart of modernisation was economic growth, a belief that traditional societies must acquire economic growth to progress to being a modern society. As Rostow’s (1960) growth model suggested, to achieve modern status all countries must pass through different stages: the preconditions for take-off; take-off; drive to maturity; and, age of high mass consumption. It was argued that the developing countries were still in the first stage. However, this unilineal model is Euro-American based and was not universally applicable to every country around the globe (Telfer, 2009).

Modernisation embraced capital, technology and knowledge as the tools for development. It was believed that once economic growth was achieved it would stimulate a ‘trickle-down’ effect to everyone in the society (Scheyvens, 2002). The increase in access to modern travel at this time encouraged mass tourism to countries with comparative advantages. It was believed that the jobs created by tourism created opportunity for economic development for those small countries with few export commodities. Tourism was highly encouraged as a means for economic diversification and foreign exchange generation, as a bridge to modernisation, and a vehicle for technology transfer (Scheyvens, 2002; Telfer, 2009). Tourism as an economic regional developmental tool was also promoted with the goal that tourism could close the inequality gap on income, employment and well-being of the citizens regardless of which region they belonged to. This prompted the establishment of large resorts and multi-million dollar hotels with the promise to bring in economic returns. However, the negative impacts of tourism were still unnoticed in this era (Telfer, 2002).

The ethnocentric nature of the concept of modernisation has been criticised as being biased and favouring dominant capitalist interests (Sharpley & Telfer, 1999). Development is not necessarily
unidirectional, thus the model exhibited by modernisation will not always suit developing countries. While modernisation proposed that traditional values must be eliminated to become modern, the traditional values and value systems in many developing countries are highly heterogeneous. Finally, traditional and modern values are not necessarily always mutually exclusive. Japan for example advanced into modernisation while still embracing and operating on their traditional values (Sofield, 2003).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Development Paradigm or process</th>
<th>Selected Theoretical approaches, strategies and critiques</th>
<th>Illustrations in Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950s-1960s</td>
<td>Modernisation</td>
<td>Stages of economic growth impulses and trickle-down</td>
<td>Use of tourism to generate foreign exchange, employment, growth poles and promote modern or Western way of life, demonstration effect, evolution of destination resorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 1950s and 1960s</td>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>Neo-colonialism: underdevelopment caused by developed countries&lt;br&gt;Dualism: poverty functional to global economic growth&lt;br&gt;Structuralism: domestic markets, import substitution, state involvement</td>
<td>Critiques of power structures in tourism; multinational tourism industry exploits developing countries; loss of culture; state led tourism development projects as a response to dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 1970s and 1980s</td>
<td>Economic neo-liberalism</td>
<td>Free competitive markets, privatisation, Structural Adjustments: market forces, competitive exports&lt;br&gt;One World: new World financial system, deregulation, globalisation</td>
<td>Global market; rise of multinational tourism operators looking globally for lowest costs of production; of loans for tourism projects on the condition of opening the economy of world trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s and early 1980s</td>
<td>Alternative development</td>
<td>Basic needs: food, housing, water, health, education&lt;br&gt;Grassroots: people-centred development, empowerment&lt;br&gt;Gender: women in development, gender relations&lt;br&gt;Sustainable Development: meeting present and future needs</td>
<td>Sustainable tourism development; CBT; pro-poor tourism; fair trade; ecotourism; alternative tourism; empowerment of women through tourism; local involvement in planning; tourism codes of conduct and ethics; corporate social responsibility in tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s, 2000 and beyond</td>
<td>Beyond the impasse: the search for a new paradigm?</td>
<td>Post-development: rejection of “development”&lt;br&gt;Developmental State Theory: state-led development&lt;br&gt;Civil society and Social Capital: connect citizens and state&lt;br&gt;Transnational Social Movements: movements of, e.g. Environmentalists, indigenous peoples, feminist, peace, etc. Cultural Studies: different world views are accommodated&lt;br&gt;Development and Security: conflict and chaos with state disintegration</td>
<td>Critique of tourism as a “development” tool; state-led tourism development; focus on local communities and the importance of indigenous knowledge; increasing role for tourism NGOs in both service provision and campaigns (local to international) against exploitation; concerns over safety and security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2.3: Linkages between development theory and tourism

Source: After Telfer, 2002; Hettne 2002 cited in Telfer, 2009
2.2.4 Dependency and underdevelopment theory

In the 1960s dependency theory emerged as a direct critique of modernisation theory. Emerging from Latin American countries, the development of the theory was linked to the belief that there was no causal relationship between economic growth in the developed countries and growth in developing countries. Although there are many related theories used to analyse dependency, the underlining issue is centred on the uneven political and economic exchange that happens between the developed and developing countries (Telfer, 2009).

“Dependency is a conditioning situation in which the economies of one group of countries are conditioned by the development and expansion of others” (Dos Santos as cited in Ferraro, 1996). This refers to the relationship between the core (usually the first world or capitalist countries) and the periphery (developing countries). Thus dependency theory postulates that underdevelopment in the third world countries originated from reliance and dependence on Western countries, specifically, that the peripheral (developing) countries were exploited for the expansion of core (capitalist or developed) countries.

According to Frank (1966), this underdevelopment condition was not the result of traditionalism; it was methodically created by imperialist manipulation. Thus simply by participating in the modern capitalist economy developing countries were seen and regarded as being underdeveloped. If this is the case, the peripheral countries should withdraw from the global capitalist system and development. As Sofield (2003) argued, the rapid expansion of industrial growth in the West was supported by imperialist policies towards peripheral countries, demanding that they provide raw materials for the core countries. For example, raw materials such as copra were extracted from the peripheral countries and processed in the core (capitalist countries) – but when the finished product was shipped back to the original country it had become too expensive to afford.

This relationship, which is also viewed as a symptom of colonialism, suggested that the periphery was subject to the influence of the core as the dominant countries play the dominant role in the global economy (Chaperon & Bramwell, 2013). This generated an imbalance of power where the peripheral countries became the victim because inequality was beyond their control. The consequence of such relationships created external control and ownership by which multinational corporations extracted huge profits offshore (Scheyvens, 2002; Telfer, 2009). The core-periphery relationship is not only found between the Western and non-Western countries. It can also occur within a country and is also an important factor in analysing tourism in developing countries. Dependency theory is cited widely in tourism literature in which tourism is viewed as an innovative form of colonialism, by which Western countries exploit the human and physical resources of developing countries. For example, multinational corporations contribute to the problem of leakage. This is when tourists book their
travels with foreign travel agencies, are accommodated in large hotel chains and consume imported foods and drinks. As a result little of the money stays in the local economy because the profits are repatriated overseas. It is at this stage that research on tourism began to realise the negative consequences of tourism development (Telfer, 2009), and the need for appropriate policies to provide opportunities to bridge this inequality for the peripheral nations.

2.2.5 Economic neoliberalism

A call for a new form of modernisation led to the introduction of economic neoliberalism in the 1980s. Though similar to modernisation, economic neoliberalism emphasises market-led growth as opposed to state-intervention (Sharpley & Telfer, 1999). A contrast to the two previous theories which stressed state intervention policies, this theory believes in trade liberalisation with the view that it is important for growth. Thus the key focus of government policies is to promote foreign investment and removal of trade barriers so that the benefits reach every individual in the society through the “trickle down” effect. Neoliberal proponents also gained support as financial institutions such as World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) developed their lending policies in harmony with the theory. Thus eligible recipients could access loans (which would be repaid later) to support the implementation of these economic and structural changes (Scheyvens, 2008).

Developing countries also saw this as an opportunity to promote tourism, thinking it would generate high economic opportunities. However, the approach pursued by developing countries in following this neoliberal paradigm trapped developing countries into a situation where they fell victim to the dependency disease. There was no commitment to autonomy and self-determination, despite these being catchword during that period. Rather than promoting community based development, they took an outward-oriented approach. For instance, instead of using tourism to promote community development, tourism was encouraged to become a source of income, which meant promoting mass tourism instead. As mentioned above, this encouraged dependency by inviting offshore ventures and expertise, environmental degradation, cultural deterioration and inequality (Brohman, 1996; Scheyvens, 2002).

The neoliberal paradigm promotes privatization, deregulation, free trade and market intervention of Western countries as the appropriate global model. This however only adds more fuel to the problems of developing countries. When the state takes a laissez-faire approach, it only encourages more competition from multinational corporations who fight to get a bigger share of the market by taking out huge cost-cutting measures, which impacts on the development of developing countries (Telfer, 2009). This competition between countries meant that developing countries, guided by the neoliberal policies, invited tourism investors through attractive investment enticements, which then failed to acknowledge the broader objectives of development such as poverty alleviation and
regional inequality. Moreover, neoliberal policies failed to address sustainable development and its aspects such as socio-cultural, political, and environmental issues (Civil Society & World Bank, 2004; Telfer, 2002).

2.2.6 Alternative development

The alternative development paradigm evolved as a direct criticism of the Eurocentric, metanarrative, economic models of development seen in the previous paradigms. This theory is more pragmatic and people oriented. First of all, using a bottom-up approach the central focus is on local participation. Local participation is believed to lead to empowerment and local control over decisions in development. Furthermore, the alternative theory also emphasises small scale, locally owned development (Brohman, 1996; Sharpley, 2002; Telfer, 2009).

Development goals were therefore redirected and greater emphasis were placed on the bottom-up approach and on human development, particularly the basic need to address other factors such as infant mortality, disease, literacy, malnutrition and sanitation. The alternative paradigm also recognised the role of women so that everyone is able to participate in community development and become self-reliant. This development strategy gained great support from international and bilateral aid agencies and non-governmental organisations (NGOs). The former advocate for basic needs approach while the latter expanded their policies to advocate for bottom-up approaches. As such, many of them started to work with poor and marginalised communities by providing service delivery (Telfer, 2009). However, there were some criticisms of the participation of NGOs in such community development initiatives. It was questioned as to whether the approach is truly bottom-up or was merely another form of top-down approach which only served to achieve the objectives of the NGO rather than really fulfilling the needs of the poor and marginalised people (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013).

The second component of the alternative paradigm is the concern for ecological preservation, which was becoming a concern in the 1980s. One of the critiques of the previous paradigms was the lack of attention given to the environment. The focus of this alternative paradigm was to design developmental policy that recognised the issues of environmental awareness and conservation. This tension between the environment and development triggered the release of a report ‘Our Common Future’ by the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) in 1987. Thus, to encompass a broader conceptualisation of development the concept of sustainable development emerged and was promoted. The concept promotes a holistic development policy that includes the environmental, economic, socio-cultural and political dimensions. Sustainability refers to “meeting the needs of the present generation without compromising the needs of future generation” (Sharpley, 2002, p. 48). Thus the development discourse included the environmental process, resources
including people), and the economic system. Further to that, empowerment, self-reliance and social justice were defined as major aspects of sustainable development (Telfer, 2002).

Tourism as a tool for development also evolved with the development paradigms (Table 2.2.3) and alternative tourism was linked to alternative development, particularly in the areas of community empowerment and sustainability. One of the main reasons for the emergence of alternative tourism was opposition towards mass conventional tourism because of its undesirable consequences, outward-oriented benefits and the lack of concern about the environment. It was seen that for the most part, mass tourism did not promote empowerment and sustainability. As such, alternative tourism such as ecotourism, CBT, green tourism and indigenous tourism emerged by emphasising sustainability and the empowerment of women to participate in tourism activities (Telfer, 2009).

These forms of alternative tourism promote small-scale, locally owned tourism projects with the effect that the benefits reached the poor and marginalised people in the community. The goal is to retain the benefits within the community yet minimising the environmental disadvantages of tourism. They also aimed to create a healthy host-guest relationship (Krippendorf, 1989 as cited in Scheyvens, 2008), to encourage community participation in decision making in any community development initiatives (Murphy, 1985), and to support the promotion of rational and evenly-spread tourism so that everyone in the community benefits (Scheyvens, 2002).

As previously discussed, tourism as a mechanism for development within the alternative paradigm is also associated with sustainability. In essence, sustainability is not only concern for the environment. It also includes the people and poverty alleviation. This is where pro-poor tourism is used as a development tool to diversify the livelihood choices for poor communities, which is also core to the concept of sustainable development. In addition, it is also attuned with the global fight for poverty eradication, which is demonstrated in the UN Millennium Development Goals (Scheyvens, 2008; Telfer, 2009).

The alternative paradigm focuses on grassroots development and stresses the importance of equity, participation, empowerment and gender-balance. This development strategy also encourages the establishment of alternative forms of tourism to assist the poor through meeting their basic needs. However, there is still some criticism about this development strategy. This includes: the challenge in community empowerment because of the heterogeneous nature of the local communities, and the challenge relating to the definition and execution of the concept of sustainable development (Telfer, 2009).

There have been questions as to whether using tourism as a sustainable concept was able to achieve the wider sustainable development goals and its social impacts or whether it was just empty rhetoric.
used by developed countries to justify a policy because it claims to embrace the environment. It was also argued that the use of ‘sustainability’ by developed countries as a development strategy to achieve environmentally sound development is very touristy focused and tends to ignore the livelihoods of local communities. Local communities use their natural resources to sustain their livelihoods, and therefore promoting such environmental policies for tourism does attract tourists to these environmentally friendly destinations. However, it actually acts as a barrier to development of the local communities (Mbaiwa & Stronza, 2009). For example, sustainable tourism must be culturally and environmentally attractive if it is to succeed, and as such if the communities want to encourage tourism for economic gain they must maintain their traditional cultures and protect the environment. However, in doing so they are hindered from advancing from traditional ways into modernisation, which opposes the goal of development.

Moreover, there is some criticism that these forms of alternative tourism are usually small and therefore the positive returns are also small compared to mass tourism. They are not always successful in reality because of the lack of entrepreneurial skills on the part of the community residents; and in many instances where outsiders become partners with the community the former usually become dominant, which leaves the latter to become victims (Scheyvens, 2008).

The discussion above highlighted the evolution of the development paradigm since World War II from an economic growth standpoint to promotion of sustainable development as supported by the alternative development paradigm. It also presented the role played by tourism as a tool for development over these decades. How the view on mass tourism began with economic benefits and advanced over the years to become a developmental tool that took a more holistic view embracing sustainable development of the environment and the people. As we have seen, tourism has been promoted as a tool for development, in particular with its focus on rural communities who are the resource owners, yet often the marginalised groups. The next section will introduce tourism as a development tool, and will specifically look at why it has been promoted as a developmental strategy for local communities.

2.3 Tourism as a tool for development

Tourism has become an attractive development vehicle for developing countries because of its associated potential benefits both at the macro and micro level. However despite the ability to yield foreign exchange, income and employment, developing countries do not reap the maximum benefits due to leakages into developed nations. Furthermore, the advancement of tourism as a Western phenomenon spawns detrimental consequences. This section provides a brief presentation of the contribution of tourism at the global level. It is then followed by a presentation of the rationale for
tourism in Pacific Island countries. The impacts of tourism are then discussed, and finally a conclusion is made as to whether the community really benefits from tourism.

2.3.1 Tourism and development at the global level

Tourism as a global economic and social phenomenon of modern times remains undisputed; it has become an important economic development mechanism for many developing countries (Scheyvens & Russell, 2009). Since its beginning from developed countries, tourism has now expanded to developing countries, reaching marginalised and poor communities. As a labour intensive industry, tourism became a favoured option for many developing countries who have otherwise limited growth opportunities. This is due to tourism’s potential in achieving sustainability. There are many other benefits and reasons why countries use tourism as a development strategy (Table 2.3.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of development</th>
<th>Potential Positive Contribution of Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>GDP, foreign exchange, employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income, poverty reduction,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/ Cultural</td>
<td>Strengthening local culture, Self-reliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revitalising of crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Management, Protected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Empowerment, Self-reliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom, Image of stability and security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3.1: Potential positive examples of tourism contributing to development.


As the world’s largest industry, tourism has been growing and expanding over the last few decades. Despite economic turbulence such as financial crises, tourism as an export industry has never had any discontinuous growth. International tourist arrivals have steadily increased since the 1950s, and are expected to reach 1.8 billion by the end of year 2030 (Table 2.3.2), according to UNWTO (2014).
The report also pointed out key contributions of tourism to the global economy:

- Travel and Tourism contributed USD$6,990.3bn (9% of GDP) in 2013 and was predicted to increase by 4.3% in the year 2014 and rise by 4.2% to USD$10,965.1bn (10.3% of GDP) by the year ending 2024 (World Travel & Tourism Council, 2014).

- The total contribution of Travel and Tourism to employment in 2013 was 265,855,000 jobs or 1 in every 11 jobs (8.9% of total employment) with an expected increase by 2.5% or 272,417,000 jobs in 2014 and 2.4% increase (436,901,000) by the year ending 2024.

- There was also an increase in international tourism receipts from US$1078 billion in 2012 to US$1159 billion in 2013.

- The Asia and the Pacific region showed the strongest growth with an increase in 6% in arrivals for 2013, followed by Europe and Africa with 5% each.

The above statistics show that the tourism sector is expanding with prospective growth into the future. As such local communities from developing countries could benefit from this opportunity provided by the tourism market, if they utilise appropriate sustainable tourism development strategies. Nevertheless, despite these contributions the link between development and tourism as an effective development strategy is not always easily defined, due to the compounding nature and the challenges of development (as discussed previously) (Telfer, 2002).
2.3.2 Why tourism for South Pacific Islands?

The South Pacific Islands\(^3\) are made up of three distinct but complex and diverse cultural groups: Polynesian, Micronesian and the Melanesians. These sub-regions within the South Pacific vary according to their geographic location, history, economy and socio-cultural background. The Polynesia and Micronesia sub-regions are made up of small islands and atolls which are divided by a huge area of ocean, while the Melanesian countries consist of large islands forming archipelagons. The region is vulnerable to natural disasters such as cyclones, volcanic activity and earthquakes. This is the last region of the world to break free from colonisation, and ten dependent political units still remain among the Micronesian and Polynesian countries. The Melanesian countries are now politically independent but they are still faced with political instability, such as the coup in Fiji and ethnic crises in the Solomon Islands, from time to time (Panakera et al., 2011).

The Pacific Islands have been popular attractions for Western tourists since the first European-Pacific Islands encounters. However it was the improvement of transport and infrastructure, such as the introduction of jet aircraft and airports in the 1960s in the South Pacific that paved the way for mass tourism into countries such as Fiji and Tahiti. At the same time marketing strategies enticed Western tourists to visit the Islands using stereotypical images of Pacific Islands as destinations with white sandy beaches, gently swaying coconut trees, untouched coral atolls and friendly people (Baum, 1997; Harrison, 2003 as cited in Scheyvens & Russell, 2009). Regardless, the flow of international tourists has been inconsistent throughout the region. Although reports by UNWTO and the Travel & Tourism Council 2014 indicated an increase for international visitor arrivals for the Pacific region, the distribution of tourism around the Pacific region is unequally spread (Panakera et al., 2011; Scheyvens & Russell, 2009). For example, figures extracted from SPTO (2014) highlighted Fiji followed by French Polynesia (Tahiti) as the major tourist destinations in the Pacific, while Tuvalu and Kiribati are the least visited destinations with very few tourist arrivals. This is an indication of tourism performance in the Pacific as somewhat variable according to the characteristics of the country.

Despite this uneven flow of tourists to the region, many of the Pacific Island countries are increasingly embracing tourism as an option for economic development. Given their geographical isolation, distance from major tourist markets, few resources and dependence on aid and remittances, many Pacific Islands are leaning towards tourism as an economic growth tool to diversify their narrow economic base (Berno & Douglas, 2007; Panakera et al., 2011; Scheyvens &

---

\(^3\) This thesis uses the term “South Pacific” to refer to the following geographic and geopolitical Island states: Fiji, Samoa, Papua New Guinea, Niue, New Caledonia, French Polynesia (Tahiti), the Cook Islands, Vanuatu, Tuvalu, Tonga, the Solomon Islands, the Marshall Islands, Kiribati and Nauru.
Russell, 2009; SPTO, 2013b). The tourist attractions in the Pacific region can be categorised into three resource groups: natural, cultural and historical tourism products. These vary between the sub-regions4 (e.g. Polynesian vs Melanesian) and even from island to island. Natural attractions encompass the tropical climate, untouched beaches and magnificent coral reefs, and rugged terrain such as in the Solomon Islands. At the core of the cultural attractions are the island states’ diverse and unique cultures including local crafts, custom ceremonies, local lifestyle and living. Finally, the historical attractions consist especially of the remains from the World War II on both land and sea (Douglas, 1996; Panakera et al., 2011).

A special feature of tourism as an export industry is that the tourists come to the destinations. As such the geographical isolation of the islands made them attractive for those tourists who want to visit exotic places and experience authentic cultures and lifestyles. In addition, most Pacific Island countries rely on subsistence agriculture and usually lack the capital to start-up businesses, and therefore tourism is viewed as a less costly business because they could promote their existing resources such as sand, beach and sea (Milne, 1990). Thus when comparing tourism to the main agricultural exports such as copra, cocoa, coffee which have traditionally contributed to the economic development of the island nations, although tourism’s contribution to the region is small – about 0.15 percent of the global international arrivals (Berno & Douglas, 2007), it is significant because agricultural exports are slowly declining (Sofield et al, 2004 as cited in Scheyvens & Russell, 2009). In essence, the tourism industry is the only sector that has experienced sustainable growth in the Pacific over the decades (Scheyvens & Russell, 2009). It is for the above reasons that Pacific Island nations view tourism as a development tool that could inject income into their limited, unhealthy economy (Panakera et al., 2011). Encouraging tourism development does not mean that countries will always benefit however; the promotion of tourism in the nations and in particular the local communities, comes with a cost. Therefore, the following discussion will begin by discussing the economic impacts of tourism, and then will look at the socio-cultural and environmental implications.

2.3.3 The economic impacts of tourism

Since its inception shortly after World War II, development was regarded as economic growth. Tourism was highly regarded as a developmental tool that could produce such results. It was presumed that tourism could be used to expand the economic and social development of poor countries and therefore contribute to closing the divide between the developed and the developing, and the regions. It was also seen as a form of Westernisation and modernisation. Therefore tourism

---

4 See Berno & Douglas (2007) for further discussions on the differences between the sub-regions.
was regarded as a development vehicle that could generate foreign exchange for developing countries (Wall & Mathieson, 2006).

One of tourism’s immediate benefits was in terms of employment, both at the national and local level. As a labour intensive industry, tourism could create job opportunities for people in the community to improve their quality of life through increased income. The direct jobs resulting from tourism are in restaurants and hotels. But tourism relies on both tangible and intangible goods and services, which are usually provided by other suppliers. Therefore, indirectly tourism also creates jobs and provides income for those in the manufacturing sector, agriculture (food), souvenirs and handcrafts and so forth (deKadt, 1979).

Another economic benefit of tourism is increased income for the government. Tourists need visas to visit some countries, tourism investments and businesses need licences to operate. Additionally, the different capital characteristics between developed and developing countries mean that as tourism expands more capital (which the local economy would not be able to generate) is injected into the economy to improve infrastructure and promote other developments such as construction of large hotels (Mihalic, 2002). Tourism is also used to diversify the subsistence agricultural economy of most developing countries.

However, such benefits and potential benefits contributing to economic growth particularly in developing countries are not left unquestioned. Can developing countries truly achieve economic growth from tourism? Theoretically, tourism as an economic development tool seems viable. In reality, it is challenging and debatable for developing countries. There are many factors that impede development. These inhibitors could either be external or internal to each country (Brown & Hall, 2008; Telfer, 2009). These factors contribute in many ways to developing countries’ lack of control over tourism development on their land.

From a political economy perspective, factors that obstruct developing countries from benefitting from tourism lie in the economic, political and social organisation of the countries (Lea, 1988). These vary between developed and developing nations, and even within each country. Tourism is a Western phenomenon which requires modern infrastructure to connect the tourists from a tourist generating region to the tourist destination region. The economic characteristics of the developing countries usually lack the capital and human resources to finance the infrastructure and facilities. Thus multinational corporations and other foreign investors step in to provide such infrastructure. This usually means large foreign-owned hotels, going along with which we find profits repatriated back to the developed country (Hall & Lew, 2009). Fiji for example is the top tourism destination in the South Pacific, but following the Fiji government’s tourism policy encouraging foreign investment
most of the resorts are foreign-owned, and thus there is a large leakage of foreign exchange (Scheyvens & Russell, 2011).

Moreover tourists are generally from Western countries, and therefore when visiting developing countries most of them desire those facilities, food and drinks which are similar to what they have at home; but these are usually not available in developing countries. Thus to satisfy the needs of the tourists the tourism operators have to purchase from overseas, contributing further to leakages (Scheyvens & Russell, 2011). Although tourism creates job opportunities for residents in host countries, most of the jobs related to tourism are menial in nature and tend to be seasonal and lowly paid. The managerial or senior posts are usually contracted to outside expatriates and investors with ‘fat packages’ (deKadt, 1979; Rajotte, 1985). Also to cut down on the cost of wages employers usually exploit locals through divisions such as age, gender, ethnicity and race (Hall & Lew, 2009).

A study by Samy (1985) on tourism and employment patterns at a multi-million dollar resort hotel in Fiji highlighted the following inequality associated with tourism employment: The executive jobs with high social and economic benefits are contracted to expatriate and local Europeans, while the low positions were filled by the locals. In spite of the low wages earned, those at the bottom of the hierarchy worked longer hours than the senior managers, who have better working conditions, salary and housing. Gender discrimination was also common inside the workplace. There are some jobs which are restricted by sex. For example, only females can occupy the position of reservations or accommodation clerk. Other jobs such as reception/front office, laundry and switchboard recruited more women than men. Ethnic discrimination was also present where a certain ethnic group were given more privileged positions in the tourism industry than the other. According to Berno and Douglas (2007), even after twenty years since the study by Samy (1977) was conducted, little had changed.

Moreover, providing employment to marginalised groups such as youths and women helped decreases economic dependence on the head of the family. However, in doing so it goes against the structure of many traditional cultures (deKadt, 1979). A study by Niukula (1985) on the impacts of tourism on the community of Suvavou (Fiji) provided such evidence. The advent of tourism has changed the role of family members in the village. Traditionally, it was the women who were responsible for domestic chores and especially preparing dinner for the family. The increase in tourism changed this role as the women went to the market to sell their goods and returned late in the evening. This caused disagreement with their husbands who thought that their wives were using such strategy to escape their roles. This often resulted in conflicts between couples.

As previously mentioned, using economic growth as an indicator of development gives really just a partial view of development. The assumption that the use of mass tourism as a developmental tool
would benefit the population through the ‘trickle down’ effect is not happening. The lack of control of tourism by host countries has not only created more inequality but also dependency on outside powers. For example tourism is the top economic sector for Fiji yet as tourism grows and expands, the poverty rate also increases (Scheyvens & Russell, 2011). Tourism merely contributes to the uneven benefits between the rural and urban communities. This can be seen in Fiji (Scheyvens & Russell, 2011). Because of this some authors have described tourism as a type of “cultural imperialism” or “neo-colonialism” (Bianchi, 2002).

The discussion above has demonstrated that the economic benefits of tourism are promising, however, there are also associated negative consequences, especially for developing countries. During the early introduction of mass tourism as a development tool, these adverse impacts were accepted as the cost of development. It was not until the 1970s that studies began to show socio-cultural impacts of tourism which were seriously considered to challenge development policies (Hall & Lew, 2009). Development is not only about economic growth, other dimensions (Table 2.3.1) are also an integral part of development, because countries have different socio-cultural and political organisations. Tourism as a phenomenon where different cultures come into contact should be examined in the context of where it occurs (Berno 2007). Tourism also depends on both tangible and intangible resources which encompass socio-cultural, environmental and human elements. As such, the use of tourism as a developmental tool must also consider the broader implications. Hence the next discussion is on the socio-cultural impacts of tourism. However, prior to that, host-guest contact is presented to understand how and why the socio-cultural impacts of tourism occur.

2.3.4 The tourist-host encounter

There are direct and indirect changes induced by tourism. However, due to tourism’s multifaceted nature, it is quite challenging to distinguish its impact from that of other agents of change. Cultures are not static but change over time and globalisation is expanding. There are circumstances where tourists and tourism are regarded as the ‘scapegoat’ for these socio-cultural changes, specifically when tourism is seen as detrimental by the hosts (Crick, 1989 as cited in Wall & Mathieson, 2006, p. 232).

Many of the early studies on the impact of tourism concentrated on economic factors because of the assumption that economic growth equals development. Therefore tourism as a developmental strategy was engaged in and recommended because of its attractive returns (Wall & Mathieson, 2006). Developing countries therefore welcomed tourism thinking that it would be their saviour; however, it was soon realised that tourism can also be detrimental. It was in this time period that the notion of development was viewed as going beyond economic growth to include other elements, as described in Table 2.3.1. A broader definition was created that embraced the ‘human’ element of a
society. In other words, tourism can be beneficial economically but there are some negative impacts associated with it. Some authors such as Butler (1980) suggested that the impact of tourism depends on the stage of tourism development, and there was less impact at the initial development stage; but as tourism develops so does the impact. Smith (1989) interpreted the impact according to different tourist typologies. A small number of tourists generate a small impact, whereas mass tourists produce a much greater impact (Lea, 1988). Jafari (1973) calls this the ‘cautionary platform’ (Beeton, 2006). However, tourism is an agent of change and does bring about changes that transform the host residents’ attitudes and values (deKadt, 1979).

According to Wall & Mathieson (2006) the socio-cultural effects of tourism are those that result from the various types of social relationships which occur during contact between the tourists and the hosts. There are three possible venues for host-guests encounters: when tourists are purchasing goods or services from residents; when both hosts and guests are in the same location at the same time; and, when there is sharing of information between hosts and guests (deKadt, 1979; Wall & Mathieson, 2006).

The expectations and goals of the tourists and hosts are totally different during these cross cultural encounters. According to Sutton (1967, as cited in Wall & Mathieson, 2006, p. 223) tourists move around, are relaxed, spend freely and enjoy their leisure time by trying to absorb the experience of being in a different setting, while the hosts are relatively static with the goal to cater for the tourists. Host-guest encounters are also determined by the particular people who interact and the conditions where the interaction happens. These can be categorised by four characteristics (Wall & Mathieson, 2006): First of all, the relationship is usually short or transitory and is also considered as temporary. Due to the brief duration of the visit the tourists may want to see and participate as much as possible in the new environment. Secondly, the encounter is regarded as temporally and spatially constrained. The hosts’ reaction to these constraints is to view the relationship as just frivolous.

The third characteristic relates to lack of spontaneity. The relationship between tourists and hosts brings together the informal style of the modern westerner and the traditional style of the local to create an economic activity that results in commercial transactions. This act of hospitality could turn into progressive cash generating activities for the hosts (deKadt, 1979; Wall & Mathieson, 2006). The final feature is the unbalanced characteristics of the tourists and the hosts. On the one hand, the tourists are materially powerful and economically wealthy, while on the other the hosts are knowledgeable about their local cultures and resources; and they often want to exploit the tourists’ wealth through prices (Wall & Mathieson, 2006).
2.3.5 The socio-cultural impacts of tourism

The socio-cultural impacts of tourism refer to the changes in individual behaviours, value systems, family structures and relationships, levels of safety, moral conduct, creative expressions, collective lifestyles, traditional ceremonies and organisations that result from host-guest interactions in tourism (Fox, 1977, p.27 as cited in Wall & Mathieson, 2006, p.220).

The expansion of mass tourism is believed by local residents to affect the moral standards of the community. International tourism is considered to expedite prostitution, gambling and increased crime in the developing world. Though some elements of truth can be found in this, there is growing evidence suggesting that increased tourism as not the primary cause of these things (Wall & Mathieson, 2006). Early studies on tourism development and expansion in Tonga indicated that tourism changed the local residents’ behavioural patterns from the traditional ways and practices. In traditional Tongan society, services were offered to tourists for free with generosity and hospitality. However, as tourism developed and increased the local residents observed tourists’ spending patterns and formed stereotypical attitudes that all tourists are rich. This general thinking misled small boys to charge tourists who wanted to pose with them for photographs (Akau’ola, Ilaiu, & Samate, 1985). Another study on the expansion of tourism in Suvavou village (Fiji) also altered family values and led to undesirable social activities and crime such as described here:

Tension exists between parents and young people because of conflicts of values and behaviour. The young are attracted to tourists’ entertainments in the evenings in the nearby hotels. New style of dress and late night dances worry parents, especially when they result in unwanted pregnancies and trouble for police (Niukula, 1985, p.85).

Although there was a link between increased prostitution and tourism in Bangkok, Harrell-Bond (1978, as cited in Lea, 1988)) also added that prostitution associated with tourism not only involves women. There are reports of male prostitution among young Gambian men with middle-aged Scandinavian women. Some of these relationships led to marriage and the couples returned together to Scandinavia (Lea, 1988). By contrast in Tonga prostitution resulting from tourism was seen as a means of making fast money (Akau’ola et al., 1985).

Direct encounters such as host-tourist interaction are not the only means of disrupting local values and attitudes. Another way which is common among young people is through observation of tourists’ consumption patterns and behaviour. The demonstration effect as it is known is when values, attitudes and behaviours of local residents change to adopt that of the tourists by merely observing the tourists (deKadt, 1979). Adopting foreign lifestyles and ideologies has a dual effect on the society. To adapt and work for things that are lacking is considered as positive, however it is bad when the
local residents just want to copy the wealthy tourists (Wall & Mathieson, 2006). The early study on the impact of tourism on Tonga also showed the demonstration effect operating on the women. Thus for instance, in traditional Tongan society women’s dress was long-sleeved (ta’ovala) and long Sulu (tupena), such as covering the legs and arms. However with the advancement of tourism, many women now imitate the tourists and wear short sleeves and mini dresses (Akau’ola et al., 1985).

One less researched impact of tourism is on the linguistic side. Language changes as a result of tourism. According to White (1974, as cited in Wall & Mathieson, 2006, p. 253), tourism can alter the host language through economic change, the demonstration effect and direct social contact. For example, a study by White on Swiss Canton of Graudunden where Romanish was the first language revealed that there is a high percentage of language decline in areas with high tourism activity compared to areas which have low tourism encounter (Wall & Mathieson, 2006).

However, tourism can also contribute to an increase in the quality of life of the community. For example in Indonesia, a young farmer who caters for tourists by selling his vegetables at an international hotel later built a luxurious house (Hashimoto, 2002). Tourism can also promote intercultural exchange between hosts and guests where they can learn from each other (Lea, 1988). Additionally, tourism host-guest encounters encourage adaptive changes while contributing to the revitalisation and protection of the local cultures. For instance, the arrival of missionaries in the Solomon Islands discouraged traditional songs and dances as a part of the process towards civilisation. However as tourism is developing in the country the customary dances and songs have been rejuvenated to be presented to the tourists (Tanirono, 1985).

Tourism can also damage and cause deterioration of traditional cultures. As tourist demand for traditional arts increases the quality of the work is slowly being degraded. For example, in Tonga traditional mats and large tapa cloths were very attractive to the tourists, though they were used only for special occasions. However with the demand for these crafts from tourists, the producers now concentrate more on quantity, resulting the quality of the craft being lost (Akau’ola et al., 1985). While tourism promotes culture it can also diminish the originality of the culture which therefore loses its values. This can be seen in the traditional dances and festivals which have been modified to suit tourist needs.

### 2.3.6 The environmental impacts of tourism

One of the reasons why tourists are attracted to a destination is its environment. Tourists travel to the developing world because of its untouched environment and the authentic cultures. However, with the expansion of tourism the land has to be cleared for constructing infrastructure for tourism development such as a resort or airport in the Maldives. The impact is not only seen on the physical
environment but it also denies the communities use of the land for their agricultural products. Likewise, natural habitats are also being destroyed (Lea, 1988). Mass tourism can also cause pollution on land, sea and air as a result of tourist activities. The destruction caused by walking on the reefs and the oil spillage from boating and cruise boats are a few examples (Lea, 1988). On a positive note, tourism can lead to conservation of the environment. While local communities can be denied their land for tourism, it also preserves the environment at the same time. This can be seen in the introduction of wildlife parks for tourism (Lea, 1988; Wall & Mathieson, 2006).

### 2.3.7 Does tourism really benefit the community?

As the above section discussed, tourism is a growing industry that contributes significantly to the global economy. Because of the economic, socio-cultural, environmental and political benefits from tourism, many developing countries promote tourism as a development tool to diversify their economy. The Pacific Island countries have natural, historical and cultural attractions, but they are isolated from the rest of the world. Despite this geographical location, Pacific Island states still encourage tourism because tourism as an export industry is unique in a sense that the ‘tourism experience’ is consumed at the destination. Although tourism in the Pacific Islands only makes up 0.15% of global international arrivals, it is sufficient to become the backbone industry for these countries.

Along with the potential for generating foreign exchange, income and employment for the local residents, the cross-cultural encounter between the host and tourist also has some positive benefits and adverse impacts on the host community. The three possible ways this encounter could happen are: during the purchase of tourism product and services by the tourists from the hosts, the presence of both tourists and hosts at the same location and time, and during exchange of information between host and guest. The expectations and aims of these two parties also vary. The tourist is mobile and relaxed while attempting to appreciate the experience of being in a new environment, while the host is stationary with the aim to serve the tourist. Additionally, this relationship between the host and guest is usually transitory, subject to temporal and spatial constraints, not spontaneous, and unequal or unbalanced in that the host is usually materially poor compared to the tourist. As a result of the nature of these interactions, tourism not only brings socio-cultural benefits but also contributes to destruction of traditional values and practices of developing countries. Furthermore, the expansion of tourism also generates environmental problems as land is cleared for tourism infrastructure and facilities. This also results in the displacement of local communities from their land.
Due to these negative impacts of tourism, development policies in the 1970s were designed as measures to mitigate the destruction conventional tourism inflicts on marginalised communities. Since then tourism development strategies have embraced structural networks, the perceptions of community toward tourism, cultural encounters, collaboration, and grass roots development supported by NGOs providing the groundwork for Community-based tourism (CBT). CBT therefore has been regarded as a suitable development model for marginalised communities because its approach is more holistic and includes the economic, socio-cultural, political and cultural aspects of development.

Therefore, for CBT to be sustainable and successful it requires support not only from the government and outside stakeholders, but the community too should be at the heart of the project. A fair and sustainable CBT can only be achieved if the local residents are involved in the tourism development. It is suggested here that the process of community involvement in the decision-making varies between the developed and developing perspectives, where the former is more concerned with individual production while the latter is usually of a collective nature. In addition, community empowerment for local residents is needed to obtain and expand their knowledge and skills to enable change through tourism. Both participation and empowerment are essential characteristics of a sustainable CBT. Following the discussion on CBT, community participation and empowerment are presented as they are crucial to a broader understanding of the relationship between CBT and development.

2.4 Community-based tourism (CBT)

Community-based tourism (CBT) has many interpretations and there is no universal consensus to its definition. Despite the different meanings ascribed to the concept, it is commonly promoted as a form of tourism that can be used as a developmental tool for poor and marginalised communities. Most interpretations of CBT emphasise the following features: community empowerment, environmental sustainability, community participation, local control, ownership and management of CBT projects, and equal distribution of benefits (Kontogeorgopoulos, Churyen, & Duangsaeng, 2013).

According to Tolkach et al (2013), CBT is an alternative form of tourism development with the goal to maximise benefits within the local community through empowerment and capacity building. Community based tourism is usually more sustainable than conventional tourism because it divorces the local communities from the hegemonic grip of the multinational companies and the consortium of affluent elites who are usually at the top or national level (Timothy, 2002a). Furthermore, community-based tourism is usually locally owned, managed and controlled and thus the benefits remain within the community. It is also common for CBT to be informal and small scale businesses that are managed either communally or individually by the local communities. However, whether it is
owned by a single person or collectively by the community, the beneficiaries must be all members in
the community, regardless of whether their participation is active or passive participants. Therefore,
individual tourism businesses should not only stress the profits accrued from CBT, they should be
seen as a means to contribute to the well-being of the community (Giampiccoli & Kalis, 2012).

Community-based tourism is highly recommended for rural communities, but CBT can also be
developed in urban areas. The towns of Soweto and Inanda in South Africa are examples of urban
CBT. Regardless of its location CBT must be established in a context of respect for the local cultures
and lifestyles of the local communities. The goal of CBT must be to encourage community
development that can advance the local residents’ livelihoods (Tolkach et al., 2013). For the purpose
of this study, the definition of CBT is that of Giampiccoli & Nauright (2010, p. 52), that CBT is “ a form
of tourism development that must be initiated, planned, owned, controlled and managed by the
local members towards the achievement of their needs and wishes”.

As discussed previously, the theoretical premise of CBT is associated with the emergence the
alternative development paradigm in the 1970s (Ghasemi & Hamzah, 2014; Telfer, 2009; Tolkach et
al., 2013). The increase in globalisation stimulated the spread of Western tourism into the third
world countries as they were now easily reached with the advent of modern transport. In the early
1960s conventional tourism was highly promoted as a mechanism for development and
modernisation because of its potential for economic growth for developing countries. It was believed
that the growth produced would bridge the gap and therefore developing countries would advance
to become modern countries (Brown  & Hall, 2008). Therefore, the expansion of mainstream tourism
was encouraged through neoliberal policies that promoted the escalation of multinational companies
who established large hotel chains in developing countries. But it was soon realised that mass
tourism brought in a kind of ‘development’ that had undesirable consequences. The foreign
ownership of large tourism establishments only results in profit leakages and dependency for the
developing countries (Brown & Hall, 2008; Scheyvens, 2002) (Zapata, Hall, Lindo, & Vanderschaeghe,
2011).

It is now evident that economic growth through the trickle- down effect did not help to bring
benefits to the marginalised as anticipated; mainstream tourism through mass tourism consumption
predominantly contributed to merely expanding the inequality between the poor and rich. Moreover
mass tourism also lacked consideration of negative environmental impacts on local communities.
Therefore CBT as a development approach emerged as a means to counteract these problems
associated with mass tourism, on what Jafari (1970) regarded as the ‘cautionary platform’. The
emergence of CBT as a development policy is also consistent and promoted in parallel with
sustainable development strategies (Giampiccoli & Kalis, 2012; Scheyvens, 2008; Tolkach et al., 2013).

Despite the fact that tourism can bring potential benefits at both the national and community levels, the development of tourism, as Plog (1979) described, also comes with its own seeds of destruction. For some destinations the benefits of tourism are overridden by the negative consequences accompanied the development of tourism. In other circumstances, the advantages are there, but they are small and slow and controlled by an elite few inside the community (Moscardo, 2008). In an assessment of 329 case studies on tourism development in 92 countries, Moscardo (2005) identified five themes which were associated with the disadvantages of tourism. The five clusters included environmental disadvantages, conflicts between the residents in the community, cultural issues, disruptions to everyday life, and the fifth theme was that of pessimistic attitudes towards tourism and disillusion brought by tourism development. All these, according to (Moscardo, 2008), can be avoided or alleviated with appropriate planning and development strategies. This is particularly important in communities where the population has very little knowledge and understanding of the impacts of tourism. It is for these reasons that the advocates of the alternative development paradigm promote CBT as the preferred tourism model for effective community development.

2.4.1 How effective and sustainable are community based tourism developments?

The implementation of CBT is not always simple and easy. Despite it being highly recommended as an appropriate option for rural development, in reality the success rate can be low. First of all, community based tourism is accused of being small and thus generating very low economic benefits. Second, the income from community based tourism are also marginal because job opportunities created are few. Thirdly, the proposition to create partnerships with outside stakeholders provokes criticism about the short life span of CBT. When such relationships occur the CBT is usually dominated by those external actors (expatriate consultants, government staff, and aid agency personnel) who are knowledgeable both about CBT and decision making processes. This gives the external actors the advantage over the community, and therefore the former usually reap the benefits instead of the communities (Moscardo, 2008; Zapata et al., 2011).

Fourthly, the complexity of the ‘community’ itself can also determine the effectiveness of CBT. Communities come in many forms and scales and also have different functions which change over time (Boyd & Singh, 2003). Despite sharing one thing in common, communities are heterogeneous in nature. As such it is difficult to identify who should participate in the development process because a community can be made up of many different individuals, age groups, sex and ethnic groups who have different views and opinions towards tourism development and its impacts (Blackstock, 2006). This is a major obstacle to broader ‘development’ in many Solomon Islands collective communities
because the land is held by different families and tribes whose opinions and decisions are not always unanimous.

In relation to the above, another challenge is the hierarchy of power that exists inside the community. Every community has its own power structure, and various individuals, groups and classes play different roles and have different influence in the making decisions that will affect the successful outcome of CBT. These various factions do not always behave and think in the same way, and there are certain elites who have dominant power over other residents in the community (Boyd & Singh, 2003; Mair & Reid, 2010). Therefore, even though the community appears to be unified, it would be risky to view it as a single place or entity because the decisions and control over the resources will always be vested in certain individual/s or a small pool of people. In the case of Solomon Islands, the dominance of certain factions can lead to disagreement with other members of the tribes, families and community who then react negatively to development. It is for these reasons that Tosun (2000) stated that CBT can fail when tourism planners and developers ignore the problematic assumptions embedded in the concept of ‘community’.

The fifth reason is the lack of knowledge of and skills for tourism also lead to unsuccessful ventures. Western tourism is a new concept in developing countries, including the Pacific Island countries, thus appropriate education is required for people to make informed decisions. Moreover, residents’ limited knowledge and experience about entrepreneurship are an impediment to successful operation (Berno 2007; Moscardo, 2008; Timothy, 2002b). This is one of the fundamental inhibitors to successful CBT in developing countries. As Okech (2008, as cited in Moscardo, 2008) described, in Africa the lack of understanding about tourism and about their own rights hinder local residents from participating effectively even if ‘participation’ was included in the CBT development. Moreover, lack of knowledge about tourism markets has also deterred local residents from being involved in making marketing decisions (Moscardo, 2006 as cited in Moscardo, 2008).

Finally, most CBT projects are located in the rural areas which are usually difficult to access. Therefore lack of the significant capital needed to provide basic infrastructure such as roads, hospitals and proper water and sanitation for tourists are a hindrance to sustainable CBT (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013).

The above considerations have demonstrated the necessity for communities who want to develop CBT to create partnerships with external stakeholders. These outside actors, including the government and other NGOs, and their roles, are discussed in the next two sections.
2.4.2 The role of the government in tourism

Regardless of the political structure of a country there is always some form of government intervention in tourism. The actions and decisions taken by government affect tourism to varying degrees. Government action in policy formulation can be of two kinds: deliberate actions which favour tourism, and actions which have indirect repercussions for tourism, that may not be supportive of tourism development (Likorish et al, 1991 as cited in Hall & Jenkins, 1995, p. 46).

Understanding the roles of government in tourism is important because it can sometimes avoid or minimise potential problems but other times it can or intensify them. Though significant, the role of the state varies within countries depending on their settings and contexts such as the level of tourism development, the degree of socio-economic development, and the political economic system of the country (Hall, 1994).

The political dimensions of tourism are seen at international, national, regional, community and individual levels. However, the success of tourism depends on the joint effort of all the stakeholders involved. Though the government has the greatest power, it also has its own interests and values which may not be in the best interest of the tourism industry; thus it may go against the desires of the stakeholders (Hall, 2003). While governments support tourism for various reasons (Carson & Schmallegger, 2010; Petrevska, 2012) argued that governments of developing countries primarily promote tourism because it is seen as a development option.

Hall (2003) also pointed out that while governments may make legislation directed to help the tourism industry, other legislation which operates in the same parameters with the industry may constrain the development of tourism. For example, the government may enact a law that allows foreign investors to develop tourism in the country, but other laws governing foreign investment, government taxes or the land act as constraints on the smooth facilitation of tourism development for investors.

A summary of the main roles of government in tourism is provided by Hall (2003) who suggested that the foremost role of the government is coordination. It is important that government coordinates and balances all the tourism roles at all levels to avoid duplication of resources. The second role is planning for tourism development, infrastructure, promotion and marketing to provide for a balance between supply and demand in tourism at all levels. Governments can enact legislation and regulations which may indirectly or directly affect tourism. The fourth role is to serve as the entrepreneur in tourism development to serve the common good and in this case, the government is responsible to provide infrastructure and other public facilities which are not only meant for its citizens but contribute to the enabling of tourism development. For example the government is responsible for building roads, wharves and health centres.
The fifth role of the government is stimulation through providing incentives, sponsoring of research for the benefit of the tourism industry and through marketing, promotion and visitor servicing. The sixth role is that of social tourism where benefits of holidays are stretched to reach everyone in the society including the unemployed and low income households. In other words, the goal of tourism is to make certain that everyone in the community has access to the benefits of tourism (Wall & Mathieson, 2006). The final role is to act as protector of interests and public goods. The government must protect the interests and values of the stakeholders and thus statutory authorities are established to represent the various groups in the policy process, keeping in mind that policy decisions should be careful to encompass all the interests from national, provincial and local community level, in short the interests of all stakeholders within the tourism industry.

2.4.3 Non-state actors in community-based tourism

One of the characteristics of CBT is local ownership and control of the community project, which implies that the community designs and manages the tourism initiative themselves. However, in practice this is often not possible and requires other outside stakeholders for several reasons, including the community’s lack of experience with tourism and entrepreneurship, lack of skills to develop CBT, and networking. Therefore, collaboration between the government, non-state actors and the community is important to transform the economic, sociocultural and environmental resources into tourism practices that will be sustainable (Ruiz-Ballesteros & Brondizio, 2013).

Although many tourism scholars discuss the importance of community partnerships with outside stakeholders, this must be treated with caution to protect the interests of the local community. This is especially important in cases where the government and other NGOs ignore equal partnership and instead become dominant over the local community (Iorio & Corsale, 2013). NGOs are usually not-for-profit organisations and have no links with the state, therefore they are in a neutral position, and better placed to encourage community development. However NGOs should only support and act as facilitators for the community; it is the government who should be the key leading stakeholder in such facilitation processes (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013). There are many ways the government can assist, and these include building roads, marketing and promotion, and capacity building; while the community could benefit from partnership with NGOs in many ways (Table 2.4.4).

2.4.4 Prerequisites for community based tourism- community participation.

Based on the work of Murphy (1985), community participation proliferated in the tourism literature with a general consensus for its role as a prerequisite for sustainable tourism (Cole, 2006a). Local participation can be defined as the capability of local communities to influence the consequences of any development implications that affect them (Drake, 1991). Community participation and
Empowerment is equally important in CBT. This is because when local residents are provided with training opportunities to acquire and expand their knowledge of tourism, they would be in a suitable position to make right decisions that will impact their lives and the community. Making quality decisions also sustains CBT because the benefits will be evenly distributed within the community and the negative impacts of tourism can be avoided. There are two means of participation by the community: Participation through the benefits of tourism development, and through the process of decision-making (Timothy 1999).

Tourism as a service industry relies on the hospitality of the local community. Studies have shown that ignoring community consent and participation results in resentment and negative hostility towards tourists and tourism. Furthermore, the involvement of the community in tourism development also means that the local residents will take pride to be part of the tourism product and therefore render great support of tourism (Cole, 2006a).

Western scholars argue that equal participation is good for the success of CBT, therefore participation in decision making must be gender inclusive. However, this model is only appropriate for developed countries where individual production is a focus; it is not universally applicable. In a collective culture such as the Solomon Islands, it is culturally appropriate for individual inputs to be heard, but the decisions are collectively made by those at the top of the hierarchy or a senior male of a family unit. Moreover, in traditional Solomon Islands society it is culturally accepted for women to be excluded from participation. This is widely accepted because of the cultural norm. Having said that however, such practices are slowly changing due to other reasons such as education. Nevertheless, there are some conservative communities or islands where traditional culture still plays a significant role and in those areas the exclusion of women is still maintained and upheld.

Although integrating participation into tourism planning and development looks straightforward on paper, in practical terms ‘participation’, just like ‘community’, is complicated. As Cole (2006a, p. 96) described it ‘even if definitions were easier, and communities less complex, there are a number of reasons why active community participation is hard to achieve in practice’. This implies that identifying ‘who’ is eligible to participate in the community development is not always an easy ride because of the different power structures, and this can result in division and hostility in the community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information and awareness-raising for</td>
<td>market surveys on tourism potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities</td>
<td>dissemination of information on tourism options for local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>study tours of tourism sites for community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building capacity and increasing confidence</td>
<td>Building confidence of community members in dealing with government officers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>private sector interests and tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training in marketing, management and customer services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publishing books on ‘how-to’ of community involvement in tourism such as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>constructing a cultural village or providing guided tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Bringing people together to work on tourism issues or projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forging partnerships with local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing a representative body for community tourism initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attracting funding for community tourism initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating linkages between communities and existing tourism enterprises, e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communities could supply lodges with produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of responsible tourism within the</td>
<td>Promotion of responsible community ventures to the tourism industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry</td>
<td>Running not for profit tours which have social justice and/or cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exchange element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attempts to transform the way in which interests in the mass tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>industry approach their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awards for responsible tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of responsible tourism among</td>
<td>Information for tourists on ways to support community involvement in tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visitors</td>
<td>Guideline for tourists on how to behave and respect cultural norms in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>destination country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information for tourists on activities/countries to avoid travels because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they violate human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing conservation and development</td>
<td>Supporting ecotourism initiatives as a means of local communities benefiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programmes</td>
<td>from resource conservation initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building capacity so that local communities can be involved in protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>area management or management of wildlife on communal lands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4.4: Strategies of NGOs which support community involvement in tourism

Source: Adapted from Scheyvens (2002)

**Types of participation**

According to Tosun (2006) there are many types of participation process; however the attention given to these concepts has been minimal. Understanding the ‘issue’ of participation is fundamental to achieving positive outcomes from tourism development. Various scholars including Arnstein (1971) and Pretty (1995) have discussed community participation from development studies perspectives, and their models of participation can be applied to any sector of the economy whether
it be agriculture or tourism. Tosun’s (1999) model of participation is more confined to community participation in the tourism sector. A detailed presentation of the different types of participation is provided below (Figure 2.4.5).

![Figure 2.4.5. Normative typologies of community participation.](source: Tosun (2006))

The above model provides a summary of the different forms of community participation at the local, regional and national level (Tosun, 2006). Arnstein’s (1971) eight levels of citizen participation are based on his definition of citizen participation with the degree of power distribution as paramount. These are divided into three groups with those at the bottom denoting manipulative participation, those in the middle are referred to as degrees of citizen tokenism, and at the top of the ladder is those with a high degree of citizen power.

 Pretty’s (2005) model depicts seven levels of participation from manipulative to self-mobilisation, where the latter involves more participation than the former. This model illustrates the power relationships between involvement and control over the development process (Tosun, 2006). The spontaneous participation in Tosun’s (1999) model is parallel to Arnstein’s degree of citizen power and Pretty’s self-mobilisation; however the main focus is on the host community reaching full managerial responsibility and authority. The induced community participation in tourism development by Tosun implies that host communities have a voice in the tourism development process; yet they have limited power compared to external groups and thus have limited chances for their views to be considered and implemented. This corresponds to Arnstein’s degrees of Tokenism.
and Pretty’s middle category of participation. Such types of participation are the most prevalent in developing countries (Tosun, 2006). In such situations participation by host communities means that they can make recommendations about implementing tourism development but the decisions are made by outsiders.

In coercive community participation, participation in decision making by the host community is partial to avoid the chances of socio-political upheaval, which is bad for tourists and tourism development (Tosun, 2006). In this level of participation the host community lacks control over tourism development and thus has little choice to make. This is similar to Arnstein’s non-participation and Pretty’s passive and manipulative participation. This models suggested that there is a relationship between the community tourism development process and participation; however, it varies between countries and cultural backgrounds. Likewise depending on the context there are hurdles that inhibit the smooth facilitation of participation. These are discussed in the next subsection.

**Barriers to community participation**

The concept of community involvement originated from development studies and was applied to and found appropriate in developed countries. It was then modified so that it could apply to community participation in tourism development in developing countries. The shortfall however was the lack of contextual considerations into its practicality (Tosun, 2006). Scholars argued that there are factors that limit community participation hence resulting in unsuccessful tourism development. As Blackstock (2006) argued, the heterogeneous nature of the community implies that there are different levels and power structures existing in it. This suggests that not everyone has equal opportunity to participate in decision making in the community. It is those elites with the higher power who will influence most of the decisions to suit their interests and the powerless will be denied involvement in any decisions. This means they will also be left out of the benefits from tourism. In short the benefits of tourism are reaped by the few people with power who take advantage of the poor and vulnerable.

The community usually lacks knowledge of and skills for tourism, therefore making it difficult to contribute to any tourism development processes that affect them (Timothy 1999). According to Sproule & Suhandi (1998), community participation can be based on factors such as land ownership, gender and kinship. In such cases, community participation is usually low because of the inequality that exists. Tosun (2002) however categorised the constraints to participation in the tourism development process in developing countries into three groups. The nature of tourism public administration, lack of coordination and lack of information are obvious issues in the operational constraints. The structural limitations include: the attitudes of the professionals, lack of expertise,
elite domination, lack of an appropriate legal system, lack of trained human resources, the relatively high cost of community participation, and lack of financial resources. In the final category, cultural limitations encompass the limited capacity of poor people, apathy, and low levels of awareness in the local community. While these factors may hinder participation in the community development process, their particular impact varies between countries and cultural backgrounds.

2.4.5 The role of empowerment in community based tourism

The concept of empowerment stemmed from development studies and it is used as a basis to frame solutions in development policies (Cornwall & Brock, 2005). It is supported by tourism proponents who encourage participatory development and bottom-up approaches in alternative tourism developments (Scheyvens, 2002). As Cole (2006b) proposed, tourism has the potential to empower communities, but the onus of community based initiatives is how to unfold empowerment to the community. According to Wearing et al, (2002) tourism and communities connect in interactive spaces, and it is through these spaces that new powers are formed, placing individuals in hierarchical positions depending on how influential they are in the tourism development processes (Cole, 2006a). This implies that those at the top of the ladder are dominant decision makers while the poor are subjected to them. Participation alone will not produce successful and sustainable tourism.

Nevertheless for community based projects to be effective, the community must be empowered to participate in the tourism development process (Boley, McGhee, Perdue, & Long, 2014; Cole, 2006a; Scheyvens, 1999). According to the World Bank (2002), empowerment is the process where the capacity of an individual or a group is enhanced to make their own choices and then transform them into desirable results. Empowerment from a rural community development and tourism perspective means more than acquiring the ability to define one’s own affairs. It also means the process where the community displays control over issues affecting them (Cole, 2006a). According to Sofield (2003) empowerment can be referred to as a process and a goal. It is a process when the community is involved in the tourism development process, and it becomes an outcome when the community exerts control over the development process to achieve empowerment through decision making and participation.

Based on the work of Friedman, (1992) Scheyvens identified fours forms of empowerment. Economic empowerment encompasses all the positive economic impacts of tourism, which are well covered in much of the tourism literature. When the community exhibits self-esteem and pride in their culture they are psychologically empowered. The third framework is social empowerment. This is the outcome of community cohesion and integrity through development initiatives such as community based tourism. The fourth form is political empowerment. This framework proposes that empowerment is achieved when the concerns and views of all the diverse groups in the community
are represented from the proposal to the implementation stage of the community based initiatives. Sofield (2003) suggested empowerment should equate to transfer of power so that there is a balance in the community. In such instances, empowerment is ‘regarded as a multidimensional process that provides the community with a consultative process often characterised by outside expertise; the opportunity to choose; the ability to make decisions; the capacity to implement/apply those decision; acceptance of responsibility for those decisions and actions and their consequences; and outcomes directly benefiting the community and its members, not directed or channelled into other communities and or their members’. This implies that collaboration between stakeholders in the community is important to strengthen and foster empowerment. Collective inputs from everyone affected in the community creates a high opportunity to tackle the development issues and to achieve a mutual understanding which will enhance the community's capability and control over the development initiative. Empowerment therefore should be regarded as a prerequisite to community participation (Scheyvens, 2002).

2.4.6 Community perceptions and attitudes towards tourism and its impacts

Research on the impact of tourism has been increasing since the 1970s when countries reacted towards the damage associated with mass tourism. This period was what Jafari (1979) called the “tourism advocacy platform”. Since then there has been a growing body of research and literature on residents’ perceptions and attitudes towards tourism development and its impact (Andereck, Valentine, Knopf, & Vogt, 2005; Ap, 1992; Besculides, Lee, & McCormick, 2002; Getz, 1994; Kayat, Sharif, & Karnchanan, 2013; Ko & Stewart, 2002; Lepp, 2007; Türker & Asst Sevgi, 2013).

An understanding of residents’ reactions towards tourism and its impact is important for planning, policy making, marketing and prospecting tourism developments. This is because of the paramount status ‘community’ holds in any CBT. The prosperity of CBT depends on the hospitality of the local residents towards tourists and tourism (Murphy, 1985). As such the success and sustainability of CBT is not merely about minimising the negative impacts; rather it must be actively favoured and supported by the community. Therefore, research into residents’ perceptions and attitudes is useful to assess the appropriateness of tourism development, or prior to development. To determine whether residents favour the establishment of tourism or are pessimistic about it (Harill, 2004; Ribeiro, Valle, & Silva, 2013; Simão & Môsso, 2013).

Moreover, host-guest relationships may be altered as a result of the residents’ perceptions and attitudes towards tourism development and its impact. Thus by transmitting what is “perceived” by the residents and their attitudes, a basis is provided to comprehend the resident’s judgments about the tourism process and the reasons why they approve of, or dislike tourism (Simão & Môsso, 2013).
In tourism, residents’ perceptions of attitudes towards tourism are psychological tendencies which explain whether they support or disagree with tourism development following their assessment (Simão & Môsso, 2013). It is important to take note of the residents’ perceptions in tourism development because most of the unwanted consequences of tourism are inflicted on the community and the residents are in the appropriate situation to point out which impacts are good for them and to object to the undesirable ones. Ap (1992) argued that perceptions are good predictors of attitudes, as residents do not have knowledge and fixed attitudes, yet they put meanings on objects.

According to Getz (1994) attitude is “a state of mind of the individual toward a value” and as an “enduring predisposition towards a particular aspect of one’s environment” (page 247). He further added that attitudes, as opposed to opinions, are slow to alter; and they are strengthened by perceptions of belief and reality associated with profound values and even associated with behaviour. Moreover, he also explained that researchers categorised attitude into three features: (a) the cognitive, which is concerned with beliefs and perceptions; (b) the affective, which includes likes and dislikes, and is focused on evaluation; and (c) actions and expressed intent, which are reflected in the behavioural sphere.

Several pieces of research have used residents’ attitudes towards tourism to evaluate the suitability of tourism for a community, and in doing so have drawn conclusions to say that positive reactions from residents are good signs showing that tourism has met its social and cultural requirements in the community (Lepp, 2007; Türker & Asst Sevgi, 2013). However, Lepp (2007) argued that such intuitive understanding requires thorough assessment into the relationships between residents’ attitudes and the different elements that influence such reactions, such as hosts’ attitudes or perceptions. Also, subject to the various issues confronted, residents’ reactions towards tourism development and impact can be numerous and varied, and at different occasions and these residents’ responses can be individual or communal (Kayat et al., 2013). Residents’ perceptions and attitudes towards tourism can be determined by the level of impact inflicted on them either individually or collectively; and further to that, the perceptions will depend on the residents’ expectations, experiences and values, which are context based (Tosun, 2002).

One of the early studies on understanding residents’ responses towards tourism and its impact is that of Doxey (1975). Doxey’s irridex model on the relationship between hosts and guests is presented in four stages: euphoria, apathy, irritation and antagonism. According to Doxey, residents’ perceptions and attitudes change over time with the development of tourism. At the beginning the residents will welcome tourism; however as it expands over the years, the undesirable effects will cause them to have negative responses. He also argued that these responses are unidirectional
(though this varies across communities). To understand the effects of tourism, Smith (1978) developed a seven stage model of tourist typologies: explorer, elite, off-beat, unusual, incipient mass, mass and charter tourists. According to Smith, development can be evaluated through the different types of tourists and their effects on the host community which will influence the hosts’ responses (Tosun, 2002). Butler (1980) explained the host-guest relationship using a six stage model: exploration, involvement, consolidation, stagnation and decline or rejuvenation. According to Butler, residents’ responses are influenced and determined by the development, and so positive responses were apparent in the early stages of development; however negativity becomes evident towards the stagnation stage. This has been criticised by others who argued that such a model is not universally applicable to other destinations, and tourism destination in a community is not always linear as there are other contributing factors (Tosun, 2002). Bjorklund & Phlibrick (1972, p 8 as cited in Wall & Mathieson, 2006) analysed cross-cultural interactions of two or more groups through an attitudinal framework (Figure 2.4.8).
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**Figure 2:** Host/Attitudinal/behaviour responses to tourist activity

This framework proposed that residents’ attitudes and behaviours towards tourism development and impact can be classified into positive, negative, active and passive. This implies that residents have several responses at certain times or when they are facing certain circumstances. The response of people in each of the group does not necessarily need to be uniform; thus for instance the people who are involved in tourism may aggressively promote tourism, while those who are not involved may highly oppose the initiatives and the changes such development will bring (Wall & Mathieson, 2006). Likewise, residents can fall into any of the quadrants at any given time. The model tolerates heterogeneity and flexibility in the collective and individual responses to tourism in the community.

There are several factors that affect or influence residents’ attitudes and perceptions towards tourism development and impacts, and there has been considerable research done on this area of tourism in the past decades (Simão & Môsso, 2013; Wall & Mathieson, 2006). These factors include socio-economic elements such as ethnicity, level of household income, educational level, residential areas, the length of time spent on the location, or they could be demographic characteristics such as age or gender. Other factors may include cultural variations and the stage of tourism development in the community.

While some authors have argued that there is a relationship between gender and attitude towards tourism and that females tend to support tourism development rather than the opposite, a study by Mason and Cheyne (2000) on gender proved this wrong. Another study by Lepp (2007) on residents’ attitudes towards tourism in Bigodi (Uganda) showed that residents’ attitudes were positive towards tourism because they trusted that it would improve their agricultural markets, provide income, create community development and bring good fortune. The intensity and magnitude of the negative consequences of tourism development differs across places and can depend on several factors such as the characteristics of the place, the activities and the behaviours of the residents and the tourists (Andereck et al., 2005; Ribeiro et al., 2013).

A study by Ryan & Montgomery (1994, as cited in Mason & Cheyne, 2000) found that communities with high tourism activities supported tourism; however, there are still negative perceptions towards tourism. Carpenter (1994, as cited in Mason & Cheyne, 2000) also stressed the fear held by residents over their perception of the impact that tourism will have on their community. Some residents are of the view that the development of tourism will contribute to their lack of control over ecological conservation. Another study showed that local residents who have stronger attachment to community also have both positive and negative perceptions of tourism development. There are some studies which show that local residents who reside longer in a community are more aware of the impact of tourism and tend to have more negative perceptions (Mason & Cheyne, 2000).
Several studies on economic effects have indicated a positive perception towards tourism because it provides employment, investment and brings profits to entrepreneurs (Liu & Var 1986). Although negative perceptions of tourism stem from its contribution to the increment of the prices of goods and services, there is a positive perception that tourism contributes to an improved standard of living, income, tax takes, and attitudes towards work (Haralambolous and Pizam 1996). Thus, given these different reactions towards tourists and tourism, there are no everywhere-valid conclusions because things can vary according to the context and other factors (Sharpley, 2014).

2.5 Chapter summary

The literature reviewed in this chapter has provided the foundation to position and contextualise the current research objectives. The concept of development has no universal definitions as it varies across disciplines, people and contexts. The emergence of developmental policy was aimed at closing the developed-developing dichotomy which existed after the Second World War; at the same time countries in the south were also going through a decolonisation process. Countries in the North were regarded as superior to those in the South. The former were seen as modern and the latter as traditional and backward. The early definition of development is tied to economic growth, using the GDP as the yard-stick. By this measure developing countries had to achieve economic growth to attain 'developed' status. But with development also viewed as advancement into modernisation, economic growth failed to achieve the goals of developing countries. Unemployment and poverty have not declined, and inequality is advancing. Economic growth is unable to measure the non-material aspects of the human element and it was argued that humans should be active participants of development. So new policy strategies were developed which included human elements such as basic needs, socio-political needs, human rights, empowerment and self-determination. This alternative policy strategy also takes into consideration ecological preservation, and thus promotes sustainable development.

Tourism was regarded as a developmental mechanism for developing countries because of its potential to bring in foreign exchange and other economic benefits. However, the lack of control of tourism development by developing countries means that it results in other economic, socio-cultural and environmental consequences. As such the question remains as to whether tourism really benefits the local communities. Community-based tourism emerged as a developmental strategy where communities’ input and opinions are part of the planning, development and implementation of tourism. By participating in the affairs affecting them, communities are able to make informed decisions to mitigate negative effects and maximise benefits and their retention in the community. By making good decisions communities can control tourism development, and therefore achieve sustainability and be self-reliant. Thus it is important to consider local resident’s attitudes and
perceptions towards tourism and its impact as this also determines a fruitful CBT. However, in many instances, the local communities do not have the knowledge and skills needed for successful tourism and also they lack the financial resources. As such, to be fully empowered to participate effectively in tourism development, it is common for communities to create networks with outside stakeholders. These external actors must only act as facilitators and not as partners and owners of the tourism ventures; only in this manner can the community benefit from tourism.

The next chapter will put the case study into context by introducing the country (Solomon Islands) and the case study settings.
Chapter 3 The Solomon Islands

3.1 Introduction

The research for this thesis used Gizo Island in the Solomon Islands as a case study on community-based tourism. As such this chapter presents background information on the Solomon Islands to contextualise tourism within the country, the Western Province and Gizo Island, where the field work was done. Demographic, socio-political, historical and economic information about the Solomon Islands is outlined, followed by a discussion on the evolution and development of tourism in the country. The discussion continues with a consideration of the contribution of tourism to the Solomon Islands economy and the tourism infrastructures and attractions of the country. The concluding section focuses on tourism policies and strategies and concludes with the functions of the government authorities responsible for tourism.

3.2 Solomon Islands on the map

The Solomon Islands is a small country lying east of Papua New Guinea and about 1860km north east of Australia (Figure 3.2). It is the third largest archipelago in the South Pacific, stretching over 27,500 sq. km of land. Located at 5˚12’’ degrees latitude and 154˚162’’ degrees longitude in the Pacific Ocean, the Solomon Islands is a tropical country with an average daytime temperature of 29 degrees Celsius (School of Travel Industry and Management, 1990). The country consists of six (6) main Islands and more than 930 small islands. The big islands are Choiseul, Malaita, Santa Isabel, Guadacanal, North New Georgia and Makira. The small islands are mainly atolls and raised coral reefs, with more than 300 of the small islands uninhabited.
Figure 3.2.0: Map of the Solomon Islands
Source: www.google.map.nz
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3.2.1 Demography

The Solomon Islands is one of the countries in the Pacific region with a high population growth. With an annual growth rate of 2.7%, the estimated population of the country was 515,780 in the year 2009 census (http://www.spc.int/prism.country/sb/stats/). About 45% of the people are under 15 years old and a median of 20 years which rates the Solomon Island population as one of the youngest in the region (https://data.un.org/CountryProfile.aspx). The majority of the population is Melanesian, making up about 95% while Micronesians, Polynesians and Chinese make up a small minority. There is a small percentage of the population who still hold onto traditional beliefs however, the Solomon Islands is overall a conservative Melanesian country with Christianity as the main religion (Sofield, 2003). Additionally, more than 80% of the estimated population lives in rural areas and relies on subsistence agriculture and fishing for survival and livelihood. English is the official language, however Pijin is the common and widely spoken language between the different islands. There are more than 60 local languages and dialects, which also vary from island to island (www.investsolomons.com.sb).

3.2.2 History

It has been suggested that the history of the Solomon Islands has had an indirect effect on community participation and development. The Solomon Islands was discovered in 1568 by Europeans in 1568 when the Spanish explorer Alvaro de Mendana arrived. After that traders came, and then the missionaries and the British colonisers. Prior to the country gaining Independence in 1978, trade and agriculture in the form of plantations were the means of economic development for the British administrators (Sofield, 2003). Tourism was not seen as an appropriate option for development (Douglas, 1997). The Solomon Islands became a British Protectorate in 1893 under the Pacific Order in Council 1893 (Foukona, 2007). Based in Suva, Fiji Islands, the Western Pacific High Commissioner administered the country through a centralised power structure (Wolfers, 1983 as cited in Sofield, 2003). In 1896, Charles Woodford became the first Resident Commissioner and was posted at Tulagi - the first protectorate capital of the Solomon Islands. The capital was later shifted to Honiara in Guadalcanal after the Second World War. The employment of Solomon Islanders as government officials (but only in the minor ranks) came into force in 1922 when the “Native Administration Regulation’ was announced (Sofield, 2003). During the protectorate period, the British imposed their own legislation; yet they failed to acknowledge and integrate the pre-existing

---

5 Pijin, also known as Solomon’s Pidgin, is an English-based creole spoken in Solomon Islands. It was brought into the country in the 19th Century by Solomon Islanders who went to work in sugar cane plantations in Queensland. Since then it has developed into a distinct language and become a lingua franca of Solomon Islands. Despite the absence of a standardised grammar and orthography it is becoming common as a first language for many Solomon Islanders.
cultural system of the many islands that make up the Solomon Islands. The country therefore was under three systems: British legislation, local values and practices, and principles from the Christian missions. Despite their existence together in the communities, there are some situations where they come into conflict and do not agree with each other. As Sofield (2003) alluded to, this may pose challenges to the participation of local communities and individuals in any development initiatives, regardless of whether there are sound policies or schemes to guide and enhance development.

3.2.3 Political profile

There are two levels of formal government in the Solomon Islands: national and provincial. The third level, which is informal, is found in the villages. However, the link between the formal and informal governance is not clearly stated (Bennett et al., 2014). At the national level, the Solomon Islands adopted a Westminster democratic parliamentary system with the Queen of England as the head of state. She is represented in the country by the Governor General of the Solomon Islands. The national government is headed by the Prime Minister who is democratically elected into Parliament every four years with the Members of Parliament (MPs). There are fifty MPs who represent their respective constituencies in the Parliament (www.investsolomons.com.sb). The Prime Minister then chooses the members of Cabinet who will hold ministerial portfolios. The Ministers are assisted by their Permanent Secretary (PS).

The Provincial Governments were established in the Solomon Islands Constitutional Law under the Provincial Government Act of 1981, re-enacted in 1997. The Act empowered each Province to elect politicians to form a Provincial Assembly to represent the central government in the respective provinces (SIG, 2014). There are nine provinces and the provincial members are elected every four years representing each of the provincial wards in the rural villages.

Informal governance can be witnessed at the village or community level; it includes the traditional leadership systems and the churches. Each village or community has their own leadership structure which spells out the roles of the leaders in the community or clan. Chief is the highest title in the villages, and this position is acquired by displaying certain desirable characteristics (such as excellent knowledge on kastoms, genealogy and land issues) rather than inheritance (Bennett et al., 2014).

---

Kastom(s) is a pijin word that refers to shared tradition, but can be used to refer to contemporary ideas and institutions grounded on indigenous principles and concepts. It is not synonymous with the English word ‘custom’. See Keesling, 1982
Chiefs are elected by the villagers and there are others who are from landholding tribes. When there is more than one tribal chief in the village, a paramount chief become the overall leader. The role of the chief is to look after the welfare of the villagers, and this includes resources on both land and in the sea. The chiefly system however, varies from island to island, as do the effects of Christianity.

The role of the churches in the villages is also an important part of the informal governance system in the Solomon Islands. Churches are also influential in decision-making at the village levels. The missionaries' teachings and doctrines were opposite to the local cultures, and hence introduced cultural change. For example, the Solomon Islands traditional clothing made of tree-bark was deemed to be not appropriate by missionaries and so they introduced modern clothing into the communities (Tuza, 1987). Despite all this, traditional kastoms and practices, the Church, and the Westminster governance system exist side-by-side in the Solomon Islands. Although Church leaders are common in the villages they are not as influential as the chiefs. In addition, churches today have taken on some minor service delivery roles through health facilities such as clinics and schools.

3.2.4 Economic profile

The economy of the Solomon Islands is rated as one of the poorest in the Pacific. According to a report by the World Bank, the Solomon Islands performance in the areas of public services standards, governance effectiveness, quality regulation and ‘rule of law’ has been regarded as 'poor' since 1998 (Govan, Schwarz, Harohau, & Oeta, 2013). Despite an increase in the GDP per capita of 3.2 % in the year 2013, the unfavourable global conditions indicated a future decline (www.mfat.govt.nz). Moreover there is a lack of dynamism within the economy and as such the financial systems are undeveloped with little capacity to facilitate entrepreneurial activity. Regardless of the attempts to transform the economy, the increase of systemic exploitation leads to high costs for businesses, which hinders long-term investment (World Bank, 2012). The country’s major export earnings come from logging, fish, copra, cocoa, palm oil and most recently gold. While logging provides 60% of the total earnings, the Solomon Islands remain a largely aid-dependent country with New Zealand the biggest aid donor (www.cbsi.com.sb). In considering the economic future of the Solomon Islands, the World Bank report predicted declining returns from logging due to unsustainable practices. It said that prospective sources of economic growth could possibly come from vibrant smallholder agriculture, natural resources industries (such as tourism), a mobile internal workforce, and international partnerships (World Bank, 2012).
Traditional Solomon Islands society is not governed by centralised political or administrative structures. The land and the tribe are significant to the community and are connected to ancestral gods. These three elements are intertwined. They show a person’s identity and reflect a person’s heritage (Sofield, 2003). The three aspects of land, tribe and ancestral gods are inseparable because the land is usually inherited from the patrilineal or matrilineal ancestors with specific land belonging to a tribe, and the ancestral gods linked to a tribe. The land has a very significant role in the cultural system of the country. Land not only provides a means of survival through agricultural production but also holds economic, social and political importance (Brown, 2000; Monson, 2011). As Zoleveke (as cited in Corrin, 2010, p. 221) noted,

Land thus was the most valuable heritage of the whole community, and could not be lightly parted with. This is based on the belief that the departed ancestors superintended the earthly affairs of their living descendants, protecting them from disasters and ensuing their welfare, but demanding in return strict compliance with time-honoured ethical prescriptions. Reverence for ancestral spirits was a cardinal point of traditional faith and such reverence dictated the preservation of land which the living shared with the dead.

The above conceptualises the spiritual connections and the importance of land and customary land ownership, which is the principal form of land tenure in the country.

Today, more than 80 percent of the land in Solomon Islands is customarily owned, and any regulation of customary land prior to colonisation was controlled by Kastom, which varies from island to island (Foukona, 2007; Monson, 2011). The other 20 percent is either alienated or leased land. The Constitution of Solomon Islands 1978 spells out that only Solomon Islanders are entitled to perpetual estate, which is owned by the government through the commissioner of lands (Monson, 2011). Non-Solomon Islanders however may apply to lease land. After the 75 years of the lease of expires, it is returned to the owner. Registration of customary owned land is not compulsory and plants, rivers, rocks and even taboo sites are used to mark the beginning or ending of a territory or subdivision (Monson, 2011). This is a major barrier to development in the country as it is not easy for foreign investors to acquire land in the Solomon Islands. Furthermore, Solomon Islanders usually lack the capital to start enterprises as unregistered lands usually fail to meet the lending criteria offered by financial institutions (Gay, 2009; Sofield, 2003). Custom-land is not in individual ownership. It is owned collectively by tribe, family and a line which can be traced through patrilineal or matrilineal ancestors. The present generations are entrusted as custodians of the land for their benefit and for the future generations (Sofield, 2003).
Secondary rights can be given to other families, lines, tribes or persons to make gardens, grow crops, harvest fruits and cut trees for canoe or house building. Also, permission can be granted through Kastom (usually a feast) if other lines are interested in other lands that do not belong to them (Brown, 2000). The tribe is the administrative body that uses Kastom to guide them through such processes (Foukona, 2007; Sofield, 2003). Kastom in this manner refers to the production and reproduction of knowledge and practices to preserve stories and genealogies that have bearing on the land (Monson, 2011). Kastoms and practices regarding land tenure vary from island to island.

3.3 Background- Tourism in the Solomon Islands

There are various reasons why the Solomon Islands could be an appealing tourist destination. From the rugged volcanic mountains to the magnificent low coral atolls, the Solomon Islands is home to 173 birds species, 4500 species of plants and friendly people with diverse cultures and languages (SPTO, 2014a). The Solomon Islands also have a lot of attractions to offer to both international and domestic tourists; these range from natural to historical attractions. World War II battles waged on Guadalcanal Island and other parts of the country have given much in terms of history and war relics both on the land and under water. The dive sites provide the spectacular remains of World War II warships and the opportunity to see some of the tropical underwater marine life. The natural attractions of the country include beautiful scenery, atoll islands, beautiful lagoons, volcanoes, beautiful tropical beaches and tropical fishing spots. The local villages also have a lot to offer to those tourists who are interested to meet the local people and learn about local lifestyles, culture and practices. These include the local languages, the local way of cooking, fishing, house building, traditional dancing and other entertainment; or tourists can just immerse themselves into the local village to mix with the local people and listen to their folk stories. Therefore to understand the development of tourism at both the national and the local level, it is equally important to acknowledge the government’s national development policies and issues as they affect the development of the tourism sector. As such, development and the Solomon Islands will first be discussed, followed by the evolution of tourism in the Solomon Islands.

3.3.1 Development and the Solomon Islands.

Since gaining Independence at the conclusion of the British Protectorate in 1978, the Solomon Islands still holds onto its traditional beliefs and social organisation structures alongside modern law. Since Independence, the Solomon Islands national development plans have been drawn up in five year terms. The development targets and priorities are set and implemented by the national government and focus mostly on economic production. The goal to achieve full development has been challenging and progress has been slow. Then in 1999 the economy totally collapsed following
the Malaita-Guadalcanal ethnic crisis (Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination, 2010).

Following the post crisis period the strategy of sustainable development concepts and principles emerged, and new methods were adopted such as the Medium Term Development Strategy (MTDS), National Economic Recovery, Reform and Development Plans (NERRDP) (United Nations, 2006). The main objectives focused on improving the security environment to bring back law and order to the country, strengthen and improve good governance and governance institutions, bring macroeconomic stability and income growth, restore basic social services in health and education, and re-establish the foundations for sustained economic growth and human development. Other sectoral plan strategies were ignored. These are: the need for sustainable management of natural resources, leading environment and development concerns, rural development and empowerment and the need for a national sustainable development strategy (United Nations, 2006).

Following a decision made by the SIG cabinet in 2009, an agreement was made to replace the MTDS with a long term National Development Strategy (NDS); thus a National Strategic Plan (NSP) was prepared. The previous plans have been challenged by some major national issues encountered by the country (Table 3.3.1). Recognising the previous failures, the new approach in an attempt to achieve its development goals highlighted the need to put the people of the Solomon Islands at the heart of the NSP. Four focus areas were chosen to encompass the national objectives: to provide better lives for all Solomon Islanders, improving livelihoods of all the people of the Solomon Islands, taking better care of all the people of the Solomon Islands and creating an enabling environment.

It was also recognised that the previous plans have had mixed success due to reasons outside their scope; thus the new NSP is holistic and integrates Provincial Plans, Corporate Plans of Ministries, and the national budget of the country. Both the National and Provincial plans must be drawn up from a local context perspective (donors must only facilitate and provide mentorship only during the design of the plans). More importantly, the plans must be concrete, taking into account time, resources and capacity constraints (SIG, 2010a).
National Challenges faced by previous Solomon Islands development plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing social and economic opportunities to the people of the Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Rate of Population Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Stability and Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Poverty and Supporting the Vulnerable Members of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to quality Health Care and Addressing the continuing threat of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria, HIV/Aids and other diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Quality Education, closing the Skills Gaps and Addressing the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even distribution of the benefits of growth and the development of all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Narrow Economic Base and the Reliance on one Major Sector (forestry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low and volatile economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with the adverse effects of global developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The state of Physical Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To better adapt and mitigate the adverse effect of climate change and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deforestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the relationship with the regional, bilateral and multilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising the level of good governance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3.1: National challenges which constrain the implementation of national plans.

Source: Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination (MDPAC) 2010

The 2010 framework for NSP drawn up by the MDPAC also indicated several objectives which suggested how the government can tackle the above (Table 3.3.1) challenges. However, it is up to the government of the day to prioritise which area is to be translated into national policies and strategies (SIG, 2010a). In the Medium Term Development Strategy 2008-2010 the promotion of tourism was identified (under the economic and product sector) as one of the key priority areas for the national development policy of the country. This was also re-emphasised in the (NDS 2011-2020) and other reports pertaining to potential sectoral developments in the country.
Under the NDS 2011-2020 objective 5 (Table 3.3.2), tourism, together with agriculture, fisheries and mining are being considered as possible natural resource sectors with potential for development. However, the report also stressed the challenges to develop tourism in view of poor infrastructure, limited human resources and weak marketing. Additionally, the document also takes into consideration the need to address rural development effectively, as more than 80% of the land is collectively owned, with about 84% of the population still living on subsistence agriculture in the rural areas (SIG, 2010b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDS1 : To build better lives for all Solomon Islanders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1. Alleviate Poverty and improve the lives of Solomon Islanders in a peaceful and stable society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDS 2: To support the vulnerable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2. To support the Vulnerable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3: ensure all Solomon Islanders have access to quality health care and combat malaria, HIV, non-communicable and other diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4: ensure all Solomon Islanders can access quality education and nation’s manpower needs are sustainably met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDS 3: Improving livelihoods of all the people of the Solomon Islands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5: increase economic growth and equitably distribute employment and income benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 6: develop physical infrastructure and utilities to ensure all Solomon Islanders have access to essential services and markets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDS 4: Creating and maintaining the enabling environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 7: effectively respond to climate change and manage the environment and risks of natural disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 8: improve governance and order at National, Provincial and community levels, and strengthen links at all levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3.2: NDS to guide development activities and programmes

Source: SIG 2010b
Although tourism has been recognised as a priority area in the NDS, the decision to develop this economic sector in the country is largely a top-down approach and is determined by the government. Even though policies and strategies have been outlined and documented, the implementation of any national development area has been the task of the national government. The provincial government has limited power, while the local community can only control any development that is within their land boundary. As such, even though national policies are designed, implementation has been an on-going challenge for the country. This has been one of the hindrances to the development of tourism in the country. Having looked at SIG national development plans, the next section will discuss the history of tourism in the country.

### 3.3.2 The evolution of tourism in the Solomon Islands

Despite the first European contact with the Solomon Islands dating back to the 16th century, tourism is a recent phenomenon in the Solomon Islands. Although tourism statistics were documented before the 1920s (Towner, 1988), according to Douglas (1997) tourism statistics for the Melanesian countries were only readily available after the mid-1960s. Despite the infrequent arrival of a few cruise boats with passengers, tourism was not recognised by the British administrators, and annual tourist arrivals were recorded as very few (a dozen) (Douglas, 1997). Tourism was not regarded as an export that could bring in any benefits to the country. Though there were a few stores and Western style accommodation was offered to visitors, they belonged to the missionaries. The first entrepreneurs to acknowledge the prospects of tourism in the Pacific region were Messrs Burns and Philip (BP), who offered escorted tours, leaving the infrastructural development to the Colonial administrators.

The limited infrastructure, accommodation and restaurants provided by the Europeans were purposely targeted for the government workers and early prospecting European settlers; it was just by chance that the few tourists who came could use them. Tourists’ spending was very low and was not aimed to contribute to economic growth. In most cases, the money given by tourists was in the form of donations to the missionaries because of their tremendous work in converting the local people and for advancing modernisation to the islands (Douglas, 1997).

By the 1930s travel to Solomon Islands, Papua and Vanuatu on a steamer ship from Sydney was made possible by the BP services and W.R. Carpenter & Company. The transport system was not aimed to provide accessibility for tourists but was targeted at those expatriates who travelled between these countries. Tourists’ perspectives about the islands were different. Although there were few records of tourists who visited the islands, the intention was to see the “cannibals” and “savages” (Douglas, 1997). According to Douglas (1997), these travels were the beginning of modern technology spreading to the Islands, and as air transport was starting to develop so came the
beginning of World War II. World War II also played a vital contribution to the early development of
tourism in the Solomon Islands through the building of the Henderson Airfield7 and the battlegrounds
such as Guadalcanal and Tulagi. The war relics are now part of the attractions of the country. As
Douglas noted, when the war was over, the military groups left behind the groundwork for a tourism
industry including infrastructure such as roads, bridges and airfields in many of the Islands.

Following the end of the war an American headquarters office was converted into a hotel called
Woodford which later became the Mendana hotel, but its policy segregated out the Solomon
Islanders. In other words, the hotel could only accommodate non-Solomon Islanders (Douglas, 1997).
Furthermore, the post-World War II period also invited a niche market of diving tourists who came to
the Iron Bottom Sound8 just to dive and see the remains of the World War ships.

By 1956 air transportation started to use the Pacific Islands as a stopover for fuel refills. This saw the
introduction of air transport for tourists into Honiara by Qantas airways, though tourist arrivals
remained low. By 1963, The Solomon Airlines Megapode Airways operated as a domestic airline
flying out of the Henderson field in Honiara. It was later purchased by a Papua New Guinean
operator (Macair) in 1986, who dry leased a de Havilland Dove, which was renamed Solomon Airways
(Solair) (Douglas, 1997; Panakera, 2007). The first international flight was Honiara - Kieta
(Bougainville in PNG). After a 49% share purchase of Solair in 1976, the Solomon Islands government
purchased the remaining 51% of shares in 1984, making the airline a 100% Solomon Islands owned
operator (Panakera, 2007). It was also in 1963 that the Solomon Islands Chamber of Commerce
suggested with reluctance the use of brochures to market the country (Douglas, 1997). Although air
transport was improving, tourist numbers were still low – in 1966 there were only 490 tourist arrivals
into the country (Scott, 1968 as cited in Douglas, 1997).

Despite several tourism development plans suggested by Scott (1968, as cited in Douglas, 1997)
1997), conferences on tourism management, the establishment of government agencies to be
responsible for tourism, and suggestion for regional cooperation in the Pacific, the British
administrators were not convinced tourism would be economically viable when compared with other
exports for the country, so they did not pursue the industry (Douglas, 1997; Sofield, 2003). However,

7 Henderson Airfield is now called the Henderson International Airport and is the only
international airport in the country serving international flights into Honiara.

8 The Iron Bottom sound is the sea between Honiara, Savo and Ghella Islands (refer to map of
Solomon Islands). During the Guadalcanal campaign there were six naval battles fought there, which
resulted in the sinking of 67 warships and transports in this area.
in 1969, the British administrators approved the opening of a tourism office for the country; but it never succeeded because of lack of funding and human resources. Following the country’s independence in 1978, a team consisting of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and World Tourism Organisation (WTO) members was invited to prepare a tourism development strategy for the country. One of the requirements was to have a tourism office to support it; this then resurrected the failed office, which was now called the Solomon Islands Tourist Authority (SITA) (Douglas, 1997).

The Solomon Islands Tourist Authority was established in 1984 as a requirement stipulated by the funding organisations, and in 1985 the first policy statement to support tourism was developed. The policy outlined five major guiding principles, which were: the development of tourism alongside the other economic sectors of the country, tourism to be developed at a moderate rate so that the socio-economic, cultural and environmental impacts were minimised, tourism must be developed to conserve the natural, cultural, historical and environmental aspects of the country, and tourism was to be decentralised to other Provinces (Ministry of Tourism, 1985).

Since that time, tourism has received very little input from the successive governments into promoting and developing this sector, and this is shown in an on-going lack of support (Panakera, 2007; Sofield, 2003). Tourism in the country has depended on niche markets sought by people who want to experience something different from the main tourist flow, in particular the links with World War II (Panakera, 2007). In 1989, the Solomon Airlines increased its international routes by leasing a 737-200 from the International Lease Finance Corporation (ILFC) to include these routes: Honiara, Auckland, Nadi (Fiji), Port Vila (Vanuatu), Port Moresby (PNG), Cairns and Brisbane (Panakera, 2007).

The seating capacity is share coded by Solomon Airlines with the designated destination with the exception of both the Australian routes (Pacific Regional Transport Study, 2004).

By 1984, there were still only two hotels. The Woodford hotel was purchased by a Japanese franchise group and renamed the Mendana hotel, while the Blums Homotel was called the Hibiscus Hotel. In the year 2003 Islands Hotel Ltd, an Australian company which has other properties in Solomon Islands, purchased the Hibiscus hotel and renamed it the King Solomon Hotel (Panakera, 2007). Also in the 1960s and 70s most of the accommodation was located in Honiara; but other motels and guest houses were built in Malaita, Munda, Gizo and Kira Kira, while in Guadalcanal there were three resorts being build (Panakera, 2007).

Tourist numbers have increased, yet it has been a small growth rate. In 1987 visitors to the country amounted to 12,500 compared to 10,500 in the year 1980. This 19% increase indicates a small annual growth rate of 2.6% (TIM, 1987). The average length of stay for this period (1980-1986) was 11.3 days. The major market was Australia, followed by New Zealand. By 1990s there was still inadequate
infrastructure; however small-scale accommodation such as guest houses and motels began to be established by Solomon Islander operators. Tourist numbers were slowly increasing, yet they remained very small compared to other destinations in the Pacific. The slowly growing industry suffered significant setbacks when there was an ethnic crisis between the people of Malaita and Guadalcanal from 1999-2003. However the Australian led Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands (Ramsi) was called in to help restore order and law in July 2003, and since then the industry has been slowly building back, trying to gain tourists’ confidence to come back to the country. Today the country has six medium sized hotels, three resorts and more than 20 other accommodation types ranging from motels to eco-lodges. While there is still a very small number of international tourists, it has slowly increased from 4,508 visitors in the year 2002 to 23,925 visitors by the year ending 2012 (SPTO, 2013a).

To summarise, tourism in the Solomon Islands is a recent phenomenon. There were few tourists who visited the country in the early colonial days, and tourism was not viewed as important for economic growth by the British administrators. There was minimal infrastructure provided, but they targeted the early European settlers. The spread of modern technology during the World War II period encouraged the development of tourism in the country. World War II also contributed to the initial foundation of tourism in the country in terms of infrastructure and for creating a tourist niche market for the country. Although improved air services to the Pacific region in the 1960s encouraged tourism in other Pacific Islands such as Fiji, the Solomon Islands still did not recognise the importance of tourism. Infrastructure was still minimal, and there were only two hotels. It was not until 1985 that the government recognised tourism and drew up a policy plan to direct tourism development in the country. Since then tourist numbers, while still very small, have grown slowly. In the years 1998-2003 the industry collapsed because of the ethnic crisis, but it is now slowly recovering. To the present, tourism accommodation has grown from two hotels to six medium sized hotels and more than 20 accommodation types such as guest houses, motels and homestays, and visitor numbers have increased to nearly 24,000 in the year 2012. Despite this slow growth, tourism has some significant contribution to the narrow based economy of the country. These contributions are discussed in the following section.

3.3.3 The contribution of tourism to the Solomon Islands economy

The tourism industry in the Solomon Islands is made up of small to medium businesses, with the latter mostly foreign owned and managed. The immature nature of the sector also indicates its performance and contribution into the national and local economy of the country. It is however difficult to separate and identify the contribution of tourism at each level of the economy such as the national and provincial or community level, due to lack of records or data at the community level. As
such the data provided in this section is a general indication for the country unless otherwise indicated (some data are available for the rural areas).

Following the country’s independence through to the present, there have been very few tourism arrivals in the country; nevertheless, records have indicated that tourism has contributed in various ways to the country’s economy. Most of the literature on Solomon Islands tourism dwells only on the positive economic impacts with little attention given to other aspects such as its effect as a developmental tool, its contribution to infrastructure and so forth. The infancy stage of the sector is reflected in the number of visitor arrivals to the country over the years (Figure 3.3.3). Visitor arrivals are very low with a slow progressive growth, yet fluctuating over the years.

![Figure 3.3.3: Visitors arrivals in the Solomon Islands from 2007-2011](source: SPTO (2013))

When compared with the neighbouring Pacific countries, the Solomon Islands’ share of the tourism market in the region is but a small fraction (Table 3.3.3). This gives a clear indication of tourism performance in the country. The country’s GDP in 2013 was SBD$6,748, with tourism’s contribution only a small component of this (Table 3.3.4) when looked at from a global perspective. However, it must be appreciated that tourism generates direct income for the Solomon Islands government (SIG) in the form of taxation and fees from tourism businesses and employment and indirect income through tax on goods and services that are provided to the tourists. SIG also receives foreign currency from tourism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>113,114</td>
<td>121,757</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>675,050</td>
<td>660,590</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Polynesian</td>
<td>162,776</td>
<td>168,978</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>5,264</td>
<td>4,907</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>4,559</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td>111,875</td>
<td>112,204</td>
<td>13.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>6,094</td>
<td>5,048</td>
<td>-18.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>163,173</td>
<td>169,975</td>
<td>15.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>127,420</td>
<td>134,660</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>22,941</td>
<td>23,925</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>46,005</td>
<td>49,010</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>-38.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>93,824</td>
<td>108,145</td>
<td>11.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,533,296</td>
<td>1,564,808</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3.3: Visitor arrivals in Pacific Island countries

Source: SPTO (2013)

Tourism also provides income and employment opportunities for the local population including those in rural communities. While tourism is still under-developed in the Solomon Islands, it has benefited the unskilled and semi-skilled population by providing jobs in hotels, restaurants, transportation etc. Needless to say, most of the jobs are low paid, while the higher paid executive jobs are filled by non-Solomon Islanders. Tourism also stimulates backward linkages in the rural communities where local residents are able to sell their goods and services to tourists and tourism operators. In Gizo for instance, fishermen sell fish, crayfish and squid directly to tourists or to the Gizo Hotel, Sanbis Resort and Fatboys Resort. Likewise, farmers, carvers and women also sell their fresh vegetables, carvings and local handicrafts to tourists and tourism establishments around the Island. Other informal jobs created by tourism come through tour guiding. As a development strategy, SIG has used tourism to
secure funding from aid donors and other organisations such as UNWTO and IMF to develop projects at the community level. For instance, there is a multi-donor programme (The Enhanced Integrated Framework or EIF) currently providing a grant (about SBD$100,000) which is open to youth groups, women’s groups and local communities to apply for to assist with any small tourism related activities. This project was part of the SIG’s National Development Strategy (2011-20) and the aim is to enhance local communities’ livelihoods by providing opportunities through tourism linking up with local activities in the communities such as agriculture and handicrafts (SIG, 2014b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SBD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct contribution to GDP</td>
<td>392.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contribution to GDP</td>
<td>1541.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct employment</td>
<td>8,500 jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employment</td>
<td>22,000 jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor export</td>
<td>598.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to tourism investment</td>
<td>129.2 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3.4: Tourism contribution to Solomon Island economy through GDP, employment, visitor export and investment.

Tourism is also used by SIG as a developmental tool through human resources development. As part of the bilateral aid agreement between the New Zealand (NZ) government and SIG the New Zealand government has been providing scholarships such as the New Zealand Aid– Pacific (NZAID-Pacific) scholarship (formerly the New Zealand Overseas Development Aid (NZODA) scholarship) to Solomon Islanders to study tourism at tertiary level. Likewise, the Australian Government under the Australian Pacific Technical College (APTC) scholarship scheme provides funding to support high school leavers and hospitality workers to attend hospitality training in regional institutions in the
Pacific (Schofield, 2009). Human resource capacity building is important if the SIG wants to develop tourism in the country and not only that, but scholarship recipients are exposed to the outside world and therefore grow in international understanding which contributes to the process of modernisation (Grandoit, undated).

Tourism also contributes to building and improving public infrastructure in the country. The SIG relies on aid donors to provide funds for public infrastructure such as wharves, airfields and bridges. Tourism has been responsible for the upgrading of Munda airport and Gizo to an international standard. These are the only two domestic airstrips which have a sealed tarmac (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006). Both of these facilities were funded and constructed by the New Zealand government and they were prioritised due to the fact that they serve the Western Province, in particular Gizo Island which is the top tourist destination in the country (Gay, 2009).

As seen from the discussion above, although the contribution from tourism into the Solomon Island economy is relatively small by global standards, the significance of tourism to the Solomon Islands is not only for economic gains, but it spreads into other sectors of the country. This is a promising direction indicating that tourism can contribute to the Solomon Islands economy and into the local community if the communities are provided appropriate training on community based initiatives. Tourism alone will not be able to rectify all the problems the SIG is facing. However if tourism is developed alongside other economic sectors, it may have the potential to contribute significantly to the economy of the country (Sharpley, 2002).

3.3.4 Tourism infrastructure

The Solomon Islands are geographically dispersed, thus a well-defined transportation system is important to get the tourists to the various islands and communities. This however, is one of the poorest areas in the development of tourism in the country. The Henderson International Airport is the country’s only international airport, and it was built during World War II. It was upgraded later to meet international civil aviation standards. To get into Honiara, travellers either fly via Brisbane (Australia), Nadi (Fiji), Port Vila (Vanuatu) or Port Moresby (Papua New Guinea) using those countries’ national carriers - Solomon Airlines, Fiji Air, Air New Guinea and Virgin Blue (however at the time of writing this thesis, the Nadi- Honiara route had been suspended due to some issues between the government of Fiji and the Solomon Islands). There is an average of two flights per day for international flights.

Travelling into the nine provinces is either by boat or air. There is a network of more than 20 domestic air strips linking Honiara and the Provinces that are served by Solomon Airlines. With the exception of Western Province, domestic flights into other Provinces are once or twice a week by
Solomon Airlines domestic. The domestic airstrips only cater for small aircraft and the lack of navigational aids mean that there are no domestic flights at night. The domestic airstrips mostly have little other than a check-in counter; they lack facilities such as toilets, water and eating places.

Central and Malaita Provinces are close to Honiara, thus travelling to these areas by fast boat takes only few hours, and there are a few companies which provide such services. However for other provinces, travelling on a boat can take up to two weeks and there are no boats services that are purposely targeted for tourists. While it is the cheapest form of transport to the Provinces and travellers get to see other areas which are not served by planes, transport by boat is not recommended for tourists. The facilities on the boats can be appalling as the boats are usually overcrowded, and lack water and other services during travel. The government has built few wharves around the Provinces, but such links are more appropriate to serve the needs of the local population than the tourism industry.

There are poor road networks within Honiara and the Provinces as well. While Honiara town has a tar-sealed road, traffic jams within the city are a major issue which needs government attention. Roads in other provinces are associated with pot holes and dust, and some communities have no roads linking them at all. This is indicative of the level of priority the national government holds for tourism.

### 3.3.5 The attractions

The Solomon Islands has many attractions and activities that can appeal to different market segments. There are natural, historical and cultural attractions around the country. Apart from the beautiful scenery and natural environment there is a lot to participate and enjoy, including World War II relics, water activities and romantic getaways. However a survey by the SPTO (2014a) on tourists to the Solomon Islands found that tourists visit for two main reasons: the culture and the hospitality of the people. This is a shift from diving which has been the main attraction of the country over the decades. With more than 900 Islands, the kastoms, the practices, languages and the lifestyle vary across the islands. The people of the Solomon Islands are very friendly and hospitable towards outsiders and foreigners. It is quite in line with the culture to see a Solomon Islander smiling, waving or even greeting a stranger whom they do not know. Other attractions of the country include cultural tours to the local villages, island hopping, volcano tours, fishing and sailing, bird watching, dolphin watching and venturing into the provinces to experience the different lifestyles.
3.3.6 Tourist profile

The Solomon Islands’ key market is Australia, followed by New Zealand and the United States of America. A survey by the SPTO (2014) identified the following as the tourist profile for the country:

Most of the tourists to the Solomon Islands are male (63%), with 45% being in the 19-44 age bracket followed by 37% in the 45-64 age category. Fifty-three percent of the tourists travel as individuals while another 23% travelled as a couple. When asked what was the main activity that attracts them to visit the country, the holiday tourists indicated diving as the primary reason for visiting. Secondary to that is swimming or snorkelling, followed by sightseeing or cultural tours. About 54% of the visitors to the country stayed in hotels and resorts, the rest stayed in private accommodation, guest houses and bed and breakfast operations. While the average length of stay is 15.3 nights, tourists from USA stay longer than those from Australia and New Zealand. Tourism spending on average is SBD$1410 per night per person with holiday tourists spending more than business tourists. Accommodation amounts to more than half of the tourists’ expenditure to the country, with food next on the list.

Domestic tourists are not included in this count; however, they are one of the important markets for the small and locally owned tourism business. There are no data or records of domestic tourist profiles and spending. Another important market is that of expatriates who live and work in Honiara. Although this market is not documented in most of the visitor data, a survey in 2006 indicated a total of at least 600 people who spend more than one month but less than three years in the country. With a high disposable income this market travelled domestically taking short recreational trips with diving as their main activity (Gay, 2009).

3.3.7 Tourism policy and strategy

As discussed previously, the first government policy statement on tourism development was drafted in 1985 (Solomon Islands Ministry of Culture and Tourism). The objectives of the policy were: to promote and develop tourism so that the sociocultural and environmental impacts are minimised, while maximising economic benefits; to develop the natural, cultural and historical attractions and allow more community involvement in tourism development; to promote investment in tourism facilities and activities; and to decentralise them into the provinces. Emphasis was also placed on the environment and local capacity development to enhance their knowledge of tourism activities. During this period, knowledge of and skills for tourism were limited as there was a lack of qualified human resources in this industry.

A few years later, the need to have a structured directive for tourism development was realised and the government developed a national tourism strategy. Drafted in 1990, the Solomon Islands
Tourism Development Plan 1999-2000 outlined development strategies to promote both local and international investment in tourism activities. The framework provided in the Tourism Policy identified the following areas: accommodation development, infrastructure development, transport, urban improvement, visitor attractions, tourism legislation and organisation, community and visitor awareness education, marketing and promotion and human development for the SIG tourism planning and developing. However, these goals were too idealistic and did not take into account the limits of governments support for this industry and the available resources. Thus only 12 of the 41 recommendations provided were operable and implemented either fully or partially (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006). This indicated that the document may have been drafted without considering the practical implications and challenges faced by the communities regarding the legislation and cultural values and practices.

In 2006 the Solomon Islands government (SIG) as part of the post-crisis programme and effort acknowledged the necessity to revive the tourism industry. This recognition needed a clear vision and direction for tourism development in the country, thus it was appropriate to have a more updated and relevant tourism policy. Funding and expertise from the Commonwealth Secretariat were utilised to develop a ‘Solomon Islands Tourism Sector Strategic Plan’ in July 2006. This strategic plan was to be used to guide the Ministry of Tourism and the government in terms of decision making for tourism development into the future.

The 2006 strategic plan reviewed the recommendations from the previous national policy to provide directives for the Ministry of Tourism and SIG. It was identified that mass tourism was not appropriate for the country due to poor infrastructure and institutions; thus tourism in the Solomon Islands should concentrate on small to medium scale product development and encourage direct consultations with customary landowners (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006). Thus the strategic plan recommended: that the government must adopt a sustainable tourism development approach through understanding of the concept of eco-tourism; and community based tourism must be promoted in the communities, with tourism development decentralised, each province having their own tourism policies and plans. Since then, the tourism sector strategic plan has been promulgated by the government. However like the previous policy plans, only a few of the projects and objectives have been implemented. The Ministry of Tourism and other stakeholders have struggled to promote and develop this sector. The lack of support from the government is by far the greatest hurdle to be overcome.
3.3.8 The Ministry of Culture and Tourism – Division of Tourism (DoT)

During the 1970s and 80s the Department of Tourism did not have its own Ministry, its responsibilities being split between various departments (Douglas, 1997). It was in the 1990s that the Ministry of Tourism and Aviation was established, but it later became a Division under the Ministry of Commerce, Industries, Employment and Tourism. In 2003 The Division of Tourism (DoT) became a National Government Department within the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Under the mandate of the Minister of Tourism the division has a major role in tourism as it is the policy-making arm of the National Government and is responsible for tourism planning and development in the country. The Division is headed by a Director, assisted by the Deputy Director. The office is staffed by six officers who are responsible to formulate and implement appropriate tourism development policies and programs (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006). The main functions of the division are:

- Formulate tourism policies, legislation and regulations
- Provide tourism training and education
- Responsibility for tourism projects, product development, planning and research and development
- Coordination and development of provincial tourism.

Funding to carry out their functions comes from the annual budget estimates and is very small to cover departmental and operating costs. For example, in the year 2012 the budget estimate for tourism was SBD$1.5 million and in 2013 it was SBD$1.8 million (SIG, 2013). The largest amount received by the division was in 2012 but it went directly to the Festival of Pacific Arts and not the Division (personal communication, Rachel Sibisopere of DoT, 2013). Other specific programs and projects depend on the SIG development budget which relies on aid donors for funding. And this, of course, depends on the donor’s priority areas of development. However this system has changed since the year 2012. Funding for the Department of Tourism is equally distributed between the fifty members of parliament and they are responsible for their own constituencies (Source: interview with government officers, 2013).

While the DoT now has six qualified staff in the area of tourism and hospitality, they are understaffed in terms of carrying out the tasks and responsibilities of the DOT. As such even though the DoT understand their roles and functions to carry out in promoting tourism to the tourism operators and the public, they are not able to perform as expected as a result of limited human resources (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006). Furthermore, their performances in encouraging tourism depend on the financial resources allocated to them by the SIG.
The above discussion provides an indication of where tourism is on the government’s priority continuum. It is not possible to comprehend how the DoT will be able to effectively execute its functions to achieve its objectives given that they operate on such a small budget. Now that tourism funds are channelled through the different MPs the budget for DoT has been considerably reduced, unless it is a project funding that comes directly from an aid donor. Additionally, the Solomon Islands is made up of different islands which are geographically dispersed therefore travelling to these islands to promote tourism through creating awareness to the public for instance is limited because lack of funds. The funds for tourism are equally distributed to the 50 MPs, and local residents who want to develop tourism projects must apply for the funding through their MPs. However, in reality this does not always happen due to systematic misuse of the funds by the MPs. There is also a concern here because even those MPs whose constituencies do not have the potential for tourism due to poor infrastructure and other factors still receive the tourism funding. For example those in Utupua and Tikopia where there are no airstrips and the boats only visit once every three months still receive the funding (R, Sibisopere, personal communication, September 2013).

3.3.9 The role of the Solomon Islands Visitors Bureau (SIVB)

The Solomon Islands Visitors Bureau (SIVB) was established under the SIVB Act of 1996 which replaced the former Solomon Islands Tourist Authority (SITA). SIVB is the marketing and promotion wing of the DoT. It is a Statutory Authority with Board of Directors appointed by the Minister of Tourism. Under the Act, the Board of Directors have the power to market and promote the Solomon Islands as a tourist destination given the approval from the Minister of Tourism (SIG., 1996). Other responsibilities include the supervision and regulation of tourist related activities, taking out loans and investments, and establishing its own fund. Other duties also include the preparation and presentation of an Annual Report and audited financial reports to the Minister of the Crown who presents it to the Parliament (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006).

Under the directives and supervision of the General Manager the primary roles and function of SIVB are: the promotion, encouragement and development of tourist travel; to ensure there are adequate, efficient and attractive tourist services through promotion and development; to coordinate the activities of tourism stakeholders in the Solomon Islands, and to provide awareness about the benefits of promoting and developing tourism to the rural communities. However the promotion of tourism benefits to the rural population has been ineffective and requires partnership with the DoT and other stakeholders (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006).

The role of the SIVB in tourism development in the country is very important because they are responsible for the destination and product marketing of the country to overseas markets. But their efforts in marketing the country overseas have proven ineffective due to reasons such as the poor
infrastructure of the country, the cost of the airfare getting into the country and impediments to
domestic travel, the unreliability of Solomon Airlines, continuous natural disasters and political
upheaval that has struck the country at times (Table 3.3.9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disaster Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Cyclone Namu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Cyclone Nina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2003</td>
<td>Ethnic crisis (Malaita vs Guadalcanal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Cyclone Zoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Cyclone Beni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>April riot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Tsunami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Tsunami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Flood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3.9: Summary of recent natural and man-made disasters that have affected the country
Source: adapted from Roughan and Wara (2010).

It is also the role of the SIVB to coordinate the activities of the local tour operators; and while the
SIVB did promote most of the local tourism operations of the country on their official website, the
promotion has proven ineffective. Fundamentally, the SIVB collects data on the types of product and
services offered by the tourism operators and sells them on their website, but there has been a lack
of any tourism awareness conducted by the SIVB in the local communities. This is very important
because tourism is a relatively new phenomenon in the villages and most of the local communities
are not aware of the benefits of tourism. Unless the local communities are aware of the benefits they
are most unlikely to promote tourism.

A special Regulation to the SIVB Act was enacted in 1999 which expanded the SIVB’s roles to include
inspection of tourist facilities, issuing of tourist business licences, collection of accommodation bed
levy and setting classification standards for accommodation establishments. While the other roles
have been carried out the SIVB the country is yet to have a classification standard for
accommodation. This is very important if SIVB wants to promote quality services to overseas markets because at the moment most of the tourism facilities have not reached international quality standards.

The preceding discussions provide the background information on the Solomon Islands and a snapshot of tourism development in the country. Tourism in the Solomon Islands is still at an early stage of development, and it faces a lot of challenges which impede or constrain developing this industry in the country. Tourism has not been developed further than Honiara, the Central Province and the Western Province, which is introduced in the following chapter. This case study was carried out on the Island of Gizo, which is located in the Western Province and therefore it is only fitting to briefly provide background information for an improved understanding of the setting.

3.4 Setting the scene and background information

This section provides information about the research setting. The three rural villages which comprised the case study are located on Gizo Island, which is in the Western Province of the Solomon Islands. It is therefore fitting to provide a background of the Province – its location and its people, followed by an outline of tourism development in the area, to provide a broader context of the setting. The next section presents background information on Gizo Island and tourism in Gizo and in particular diving as the main attraction in Gizo. It will then conclude with a description of the three villages where the case study was undertaken.

3.4.1 Geographical location – Western Province

Established under the Provincial Government Act, the Western Province gained self-autonomy from the national government in 1984 and is one of the largest provinces in the country. Located Southwest of Choiseul and Santa Isabel, the Western Province is made up of 11 moderate sizes islands and hundreds of smaller ones and are partitioned by The Slot (New Georgia Sound). The double chain islands cover a distance of approximately 200km from Northwest to Southeast (SIG, 2014a). Those facing the New Georgia Sound are Ngatokae, Vangunu, New Georgia, Kolombangara and Vella La Vella. The Shortland groups of Islands are situated at the far north-west while Simbo, Rannongga, Gizo, Vona Vona, Rendova and Tetepare lie on the outer side, as shown on the map (Figure 3.4.1).
3.4.2 Natural resources endowment

The Western Province is truly blessed with abundant natural resources including fish, forests, minerals, water, and fertile land for commercial agriculture. It is also popular for its beautiful tropical islands, world-class diving, magnificent marine life and World War II relics (SIG, 2014a). Apart from the many small lagoons, the Western Province boasts the world’s largest saltwater lagoon. In short it is the gateway for tourism in the Solomon Islands. Customary land tenure accounts for 80% of the land and alienated land, which is the second type of land tenure in the Province, makes up 20%. The alienated land is administered by the government through the Commissioner of Lands, and a certain percentage is registered as perpetual estate held by non-Solomon Islanders (SIG, 2014a).
3.4.3 The culture and the language

Cultural heritage is a significant part of the life of the people of Western Province, and culture and *kastoms* reflects identity. The people from Western Province are mainly Melanesian, however there are few Micronesian settlements in the Shortland Islands, Noro (see map of Solomon Islands) and Gizo, which are home to I-Kiribati people who are also known as Gilbertese in the Solomon Islands. There are about 16 main languages and other dialects spoken around the villages and this highlights the various cultural groups in the Province (Bennett et al., 2014). Further to that, cultural groups and religious (church) affiliation are two common ways in which people of Western Province can identify themselves. The chief is the head of a tribe in Western Province and it is common for the eldest male of the family to inherit the title; nonetheless there are certain eligibility quality characteristics required. The Chief must be an influential leader with vast knowledge on *kastoms*, oratory skills and the land. In the case where such requirements are not met or in the absence of a first born son, means of transfer of title varies across Islands (Bennett et al., 2014). Though women from the Western Province can be culturally custodians of the land, most of the decision-making pertaining to land is made by the men. This indicates that the role of women with respect to land is really important only when it comes to land inheritance (Rural Development, 2001 as cited in Bennett et al., 2014).

3.4.4 Political organisation – The Western Provincial Government

The governance structure of the Western Province consists of the Provincial Assembly, the Provincial Executive and the Provincial Administration with its administrative headquarters based in Gizo. The people of Western Province are represented in the National Parliament by nine MP’s who are voted in by nine constituents (Table 3.4.4) in the Province. Assisted by the Deputy Premier, the Premier is the Political head of the Province and the Provincial Assembly. The Provincial Executive or the governing body is made up of thirteen Members of the Provincial Assembly (MPAs) which includes the Premier and his Deputy. With a four year term, there are twenty-six MPAs who form the Provincial Assembly, and this represents the 26 wards (Table 3.4.4) in the Province.

The presiding officer is the speaker who does not necessarily have to be a MPA and is elected by the Provincial Assembly; however a member of the executive committee must execute the role of the Deputy Speaker (SIG, 2014a). It is the responsibility of the speaker to convene and control the assembly meetings. The provincial assembly meets twice in a year unless an urgent matter arises which calls for unscheduled meeting. The governing body holds meetings two times in a month; however the Premier has the power to call for extra-ordinary meeting should any urgent issues be brought forth. The executive members elect the Premier and his Deputy while the Premier will choose his Provincial Ministers to take up the ministerial portfolios in the Province. It is within the
central government’s jurisdiction to approve any senior management such as the Provincial Secretary (PS), Deputy Provincial Secretary (DPS), treasurer and planners.

Table 3.4.4: Western Province National Constituencies and Provincial Wards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Province national constituencies</th>
<th>Western Provincial wards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shortland Islands</td>
<td>Ward 1 – Outer Shortlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 2 – Inner Shortlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rannongga/ Simbo</td>
<td>Ward 3 – Simbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 4 – North Rannongga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 5 – Central Rannongga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 6 – South Rannongga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vella La Vella</td>
<td>Ward 7 – Vonunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 8 – Mbilua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Vella La Vella</td>
<td>Ward 9 – Dovele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 10 – Iriqila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gizo/Kolombangara</td>
<td>Ward 11 – Gizo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 12 – South Kolombangara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 26 – North Kolombangara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West New Georgia/Vona Vona</td>
<td>Ward 13 – Vona Vona Lagoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North New Georgia</td>
<td>Ward 14 – Kusaghe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 15 – Munda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 16 – Nusa Roviana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 17 – Roviana Lagoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 20 – Kolombaghea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 25 – Noro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South New Georgia</td>
<td>Ward 21 – Bunitusu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 22 – Nono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendova/ Tetepare/Marovo</td>
<td>Ward 18 – South Rendova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 19 – North Rendova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 23 – Ngatokae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 24 – North Vangunu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Western Provincial Government 2014

3.4.5 Rural population

It is not unusual to see most villages in the Western Province are situated along the coast; however the population size and demographic settings in the 26 wards vary from island to island. As the second most populated Province to Malaita, the Western Province registered 76,649 people and 13,672 households in the 2009 census, with Gizo Island (both urban and rural) as the most populated island, with 7,177 people (SIG, 2014). There is a high dependency ratio in the Province as 40% of the population are under the age of 15 years. Thirteen percent of the population live in urban centres.
such as Gizo and Noro; however 87% of the population are still living in rural areas, though urban growth is increasing (SIG, 2014). The population of the Western Province is increasing by an average of 18% between the 1999 and 2009 census reports, and with the average of five babies born per day at the Gizo hospital alone it is projected that by the year 2015, there will be 23,000 children who will be in the age range of 0-7 years old (Bennett et al., 2014).

3.4.6 Health services and education

The people of the Western Province are very fortunate to be served by two hospitals. The Hellena Goldie is a 68 bed hospital in Munda and is under the administration and operation of the United Church. Gizo Hospital with 86 beds is the second largest in the country and is government owned and operated. Both of these hospitals have operating theatres, basic laboratory and pharmacy facilities, radiology and dental clinics. The health services and facilities provided include: outpatient clinics, immunisation, family planning, and health education. Malaria, pneumonia and diarrhoea are the most common health problems faced in the Province (UN-Habitat, 2012). A report by the Western Province Health Division in the year 2009 confirmed that the province has expanded its services and facilities to reach most of the rural populace. There are 24 rural health clinics, 29 nurse aide posts and five health centres which can provide basic health services such as malaria testing and treatment (Bennett et al., 2014). Although this is an achievement for the Province (as per the report), it is still inadequate when the population size is taken into account. Life expectancy has increased from 55 years in 1989 to 62 years in the year 2009, but there is still a high percentage of infant mortality, with 77 deaths per 1000 births before reaching the age of one (UN-Habitat, 2012).

The Western Province when compared with other provinces in the country has the highest literacy rate in the 2009 census. However, an assessment carried out on the education services in Western Province indicated a lack of professional teachers around the Province. For instance, there were 261 teachers in the various levels of education in the Province but only 0.7% had a Master’s Degree, 18.3% held a Bachelor’s degree, 46 % with diploma and 19% with a certificate in teaching. Further to that there is a high level of untrained teachers which results in poor pass rates and student literacy (Bennett et al., 2014). Despite these limitations, Western Province is still ahead in terms of basic reading, writing and mathematics compared to other provinces in the country (Bennett et al., 2014).

3.4.7 Tourism in the Western Province

The Western Province has engaged in tourism development longer than any other province in the country. Most of the tourism activities in Solomon Islands happen around Honiara and the Western Province (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006). It is only recently that other Provinces such as Central, Makira and Malaita are participating in and encouraging tourism on their shores. The Western
Province, especially Gizo Island, has been the top tourist destination of the country, with scuba diving as the main tourist attraction. From the Marovo Lagoon to the Shortland Islands, the Western Province boasts some of the most magnificent tourist attractions in the country. These include the largest saltwater lake in the world (Marovo Lagoon), world class dive sites, World War II relics and wrecks, the Kennedy Island (has association with President JF Kennedy of USA), volcanic activity around Simbo and Vella la Vella, surfing spots, historic site tours and many cultural activities.

3.4.8 Tourism in Gizo

Gizo is the second largest town in the country and is also the administrative capital of the Western Province of Solomon Islands. Located about 370 kilometres north-northwest of the capital city of Honiara, it is the main economic centre connecting the rural villages of Western Province to the capital. With a population of 7,177 (2009 census) Gizo Island is renowned as the top tourist destination in the country with some of the best diving sites in the world (SIG, 2014). Gizo can be reached by boat or an hour and a half flight from Honiara. Apart from a newly constructed airstrip which was funded by the New Zealand Government in 2013, Gizo Island lacks infrastructure and other amenities, as is reflected in the poor road conditions around the Island.

Although the visitor arrivals to Gizo Island are small compared to other international destinations, Gizo is the main tourism destination and is also the dive capital for the Solomon Islands. The tourism industry in Gizo is made up of a network of one hotel with 54 rooms (the only hotel in the Western Province), two resorts which are foreign owned and managed, and a few small locally owned accommodation types such as motels, guest houses and lodges. Both of the resorts and the hotel each have a restaurant and a bar and there are three other restaurants in town serving lunch and occasionally providing dinner. The restaurants serve western cuisine, but the specialty for Gizo Island is seafood. All of the locally owned accommodations have communal cooking facilities. With the exception of the Gizo Hotel which sourced most of its supplies from Honiara and Australia, the locally owned establishments purchase most of their supplies locally (source: interviews with local operators in Gizo and anecdotal experience).

The main form of transport around Gizo is motor powered boat. These are very popular for inter-island travel. Travel within the island is now easier with a few taxis and a hire car rental providing land transport. Unlike other Provinces, Gizo Island is well connected to telephone and internet for communication and has other basic services such as a bank, hospital and a post office. With such basic services and facilities Gizo is a remote tourist destination which attracts those enthusiasts who want to explore unique experiences. Due to the stage of tourism development in the country, there has been minimal information on visitor profile to the provinces. Therefore, part of the field work
was to find out about the type of tourist who comes to Gizo as they are the tourist market for the case study villages. The results are presented in the next section.

3.4.9 Tourists profile to Gizo Island

The three villages are located on the outskirts of Gizo Island and given their different stages of tourism development they mostly rely on tourists who visit Gizo Island. As such, understanding the tourist profile and perceptions of Gizo Island will provide a fundamental contribution to understanding the potential tourist markets for CBT in the rural villages. Understanding the types of tourists can help in planning of resources to match the desired facilities and services (Wall & Mathieson, 2006). Although the data collected from tourists in Gizo for this research have limitations, they provide an indication of the types of tourists in Gizo and their preferences. In the absence of official statistics and tourist research, they provide a proxy for better understanding the tourism context for CBT.

The total number of visitors surveyed was forty. Fifty percent of them were female and the age range was from 18 years old to 52 plus. The highest proportion of visitors fell in the 25-31 years age group with 18%, followed by those in the 50 plus age bracket with 13%; the age groups 32-38 year olds and 39-45 year olds have 4% each, and 18-24 year olds made up only 1% of the visitors.

The key market to Gizo Islands are Australians with 55%, followed by 15% from New Zealand, 12.5% from Europe, 5% from Britain, 5% from America, 5% from other countries and 2.5% from other Pacific Islands. Travelling to the country is very expensive, and Australia is the closest country to the Solomon Islands. This may account for the higher proportion of Australian visitors. For the length of stay in Gizo, 25% of the visitors stayed between 8-14 days followed by 22.5% between 2-4 days. Another 20% stayed for 1 month or longer while 15% were on Gizo between 5-6 days. Although 7.5% indicated their stay was 30 days or more, 2.5% stayed for one week and 5% visited Gizo for one day only.

Gizo is located outside of Honiara and connecting to Gizo can be problematic due to the unreliability of domestic flights by Solomon Airlines. It is only reasonable to have a long length of stay because visitors will have to transit or spend few days in Honiara before travelling to Gizo Island and the same for their return travel. Therefore, tourists who want to explore more of the islands or participate in other cultural activities need to increase their length of stay.

Gizo is also well known for diving packages, and it is cheaper for visitors to buy a group package and stay in Gizo for one or two weeks. For example, the Gizo Hotel offers “STAY 7 PAY 6” and “STAY 12 PAY 10” packages for divers.
When asked about the types of accommodation they used in Gizo, 27.5% stayed at the hotel followed by 22.5% using village stays, with other accommodation types being used by 15% of the respondents. Friends and relatives accommodated 12.5% of the participants and a further 10% stayed in motels and guest houses, 7.5% on yachts and 5% in rest house and backpackers.

Visitors were also asked about their main reason for visiting Gizo. Thirty percent indicated holiday, 17.5% were on a business trip, 15% gave other unspecified reasons and 12.5% were there for diving. Another 10% came for surfing while 5% were there for recreation and 2.5% came for sightseeing. The tourists also listed other activities they would like to see offered on Gizo Island (Table 3.4.9). There were other reasons for visiting Gizo as shown in the visitors’ responses: 30% visited for cultural experiences, 25% for diving, 12.5% each for holiday and sightseeing, 10% for surfing, 2.5% for others did not indicate other reasons for visiting, 1% for visiting friends and relatives and 5% prefer not to answer this question.

In terms of the activities the visitors participated in while visiting Gizo, 55% went diving. Another 17.5% visited local villages, 10% went surfing, 7.5% went snorkel a further 7.5% went sightseeing and 2.5% went fishing. The visitors were also asked if they visited any local villages during their stay in Gizo; 42% never went to any local village, 25% visited Paeloghe, 20% to Saeraghi, 5% visited all the villages on Gizo Island, 2.5% each for Titiana and New Mandra and 2.5% decided not to answer the question.

While 65% of the visitors surveyed were first time visitors to Gizo, 15% had visited Gizo twice, 7.5% were on their third visit and 12.5% had visited Gizo four times or more. The visitors were also asked from where they had got their information about Gizo Island. Forty five percent of the visitors got it from their previous visits while 22.5% used the internet. Fifteen percent used their friends and relatives as the source of information, 10% (5% each) used other means and travel guide books. Another 2.5% used the SIVB, a further 2.5% received their information from Solomon Islands friends and 2.5% decided not to answer the question. Foreign owned establishments such as the Gizo Hotel and the Dive Shop are well organised and have their own marketing through the internet and overseas. The small locally operated bungalows depend on the SIVB to do their marketing.

The visitors were also asked how they booked their accommodation on Gizo; 30% of the total participants did not make any prior bookings. 27.5% used the internet, 22.5% booked through their friends and relatives, 12.5% used other booking agents, 5% used travel agents and 2.5% did not indicate how they booked. Visitors were also asked if there was enough information for tourists who wants to visit Gizo Island. There were 32.5% who thought there was enough information and 27.5 % indicated that there is “just enough”. Another 22.5% thought there was very little information available while 15% think there is not enough, and only 2.5 % indicated more than enough.
| Diving, |
| Snorkelling |
| meeting local people |
| surfing |
| fishing |
| kitesurfing |
| sailing |
| Village stay |
| Marketing of local food |
| Local night life |
| Handicraft demonstration (like carving) |
| Nature walks |
| Cultural events |
| Local culture |
| Village visits/ tours (singing, dancing, meal preparation) |
| Local cooking |
| Historic site tours |
| Hut weaving |
| Craft market (local craftwork) |
| Cultural information |
| Festivals |

Table 3.4.9: Activities tourists would like Gizo Island to provide for tourists
To summarise, the findings from the survey indicated that the biggest group of tourists to Gizo Island are within the ages of 25-31 years old with Australians the main market, followed by New Zealanders. The average length of stay for the visitors is 8-14 days and the majority of them stayed in a hotel, followed by village stays. Most of the visitors were travelling to Gizo for the first time and did not make any prior bookings when in their home country. The main reason for visiting Gizo Island was for a vacation, with the most common activities participated in being diving and visiting local villages. Almost half of the respondents never visited the local villages, but Paeloghe followed by Saeraghi were visited by a small number of tourists. The visitors also listed many activities they would like to see in Gizo and these include diving, snorkelling, surfing and other activities which are connected to the local lifestyle and cultures. These data provide an indicative understanding of who travels to Gizo and the types of tourist products they use and would prefer. This information can contribute to future planning for tourism is Gizo, including community-based tourism developments.

3.4.10 Tourism policy statement – The Western Provincial Government

One of the goals of the policy statement is to decentralise tourism activities into the Provinces and therefore one of the recommendations was that all provinces must have their own developmental plan. Today only Western Province and Makira have their own developmental plan. This will be discussed in this section and followed by the Western Province tourism policy statement 2014.

Tourism policy for the Solomon Islands is centrally planned by the SIG through its policy maker, the DOT. This should inform and provide directives to both the national and provincial governments about the planning and development of tourism in the country. A Western Province Tourism Development Plan was drawn up in 2008. The goal of the Western Province Tourism Development Plan 2008-2013 was to promote tourism in Western Province, to diversify the local economy and to provide employment opportunities for the local people. The objectives include to plan and develop tourism in a sustainable way for the people of Western Province, to appreciate the natural, cultural, environmental and historical resources of the people of Western Province at the local and international level, to encourage a network of tourism facilities and quality accommodation for tourists, to promote and maintain Western Province as a tourist destination, and to raise awareness about the benefits of tourism in the villages (Ministry of Tourism and Culture, 2008).

The plan also highlighted two development priority areas, namely improvement of infrastructure and airline services, and access to training. It also highlighted some of the challenges and issues raised by the stakeholders. These include air access, training and awareness, infrastructure, water, electricity, waste management, environment and conservation, communication, quality standards, other transportation, land tenure reform, and funding assistance. Although the plan also indicated some action plans to address the concerns only a few of the issues were acted on given that the provincial
DOT relies on the national government for grants and funding to execute these. At the time of writing this thesis there was very little that had been done apart from the newly constructed Munda and Gizo airports which were funded by the New Zealand government. There is still no improvement to Solomon Airline services and communication to the Province and very little work has been done on tourism awareness due to financial constraints.

With the formation of a new provincial government in 2013, a new tourism policy statement was formulated by the Provincial executive and assembly under guidance and support from the Ministry of Provincial and Institutional Strengthening. The policy was developed by the Western Province team to ensure that all the views, goals, and vision drawn is from the Western Province and not from outside people (SIG, 2014).

The policy statement was developed with the aim to promote the Western Province as a competitive tourism destination emphasising the province’s living cultures. The policy goals include to: delegate functions to tourism officers so that they are able to administer and develop the tourism industry in the Province; ensure that there are adequate resources to cover logistics and administrative costs for the tourism office; introduce and encourage Western Province Tourism Councils; carry out tourism inspections throughout the province; and, open a tourism headquarter in Gizo and information centre on Munda (SIG, 2014). This policy statement looks good on paper but as discussed previously, the provincial government relies on grants from the national government to implement policies, unless there is funding from donors. The grants are usually paid in quarterly instalments and represent only a small figure.

3.5 The case study sites

This section describes the three villages that comprised the case studies for this research. The three villages were chosen because of their accessibility, their location on Gizo Island which is the top tourist destination of the country, and the researcher’s familiarity with the place. Although the three villages are located on the same island and are not very far from each other, there are both similarities and differences between these three villages. Some of the similarities include all of the three villages being on the same island and able to be reached by both land and sea transport. They lie just few minutes’ drive from one village to the next. The population of each village is less than 500 people and they do not have a cash economy. Like most of the rural villages in the Solomon Islands these three villages also lack modern facilities. The local residents rely on subsistence agriculture and fishing for their livelihoods. Their surpluses are taken to the Gizo market to be sold for cash. All of them are located on the coast, making them vulnerable to natural disasters. However, despite these similarities the three villages have some significant differences. Titiana is a Micronesian settlement while Paeloghe and Saeraghi are both Melanesian, and their political system and kastoms differ
accordingly. The people and the population of the villages also vary. Tourism development and the magnitude of tourism engagement also vary between the villages. Saeraghi has been welcoming guests from as early as the 1980s while Paeloge and Titiana have only engaged with tourism more recently.

### 3.5.1 Titiana Village

Titiana\(^9\) village lies on the southern coast of Gizo Island (Figure 3.5.1). Titiana is a Micronesian village with people whose lineage can be traced to Gilbert and Ellis Island (today called Kiribati). They are also known as Gilbertese. As a result of overcrowding in the above islands the British Government in the 1950s relocated them to the Solomon Islands and in particular, Choiseul and Gizo Island. With 53 households and a population of 269, the people of Titiana rely on the sea for their survival. Fishing and diving are crucial for their livelihoods, and the surplus is sold at the Gizo market for cash. They do not cultivate the land for subsistence agriculture. The Titiana people still maintain their Micronesian culture and language, which are totally different from the surrounding Melanesian villages in Gizo.

Prior to 2007, the people of Titiana all lived on the coast. However when the tsunami happened on 2 April 2007, the village was badly devastated and the villagers fled up to higher ground (Methodist Church of NZ, 2007). Today most of the people have moved back to the coast. Apart from two people who have just started to build bungalows, there are no tourism establishments in the village. However Titiana village has excellent swells for surfers and beautiful sandy beaches which attract domestic tourists and excursionists. The village is made up of extended families who live on their block. These blocks were allocated to their early ancestors by the government when they first migrated to the Solomon Islands. There are two ways of land allocation in Titiana. The first system works under “Trusteeship”. This is government land which was allocated to their ancestors and families when they first migrated. A committee made up of Trustees was chosen to be the custodians. They have all the rights over any issues and decisions regarding the land in the village. The land was divided into blocks for each family descendant who will in turn pass it onto the next generation. There are no areas for expansion even if the families increase. The other system is the

---

\(^9\) Due to the scant literature on rural villages in the Solomon Islands, the background information provided is taken from what literature could be found about the village and from the interviews.
perpetual estate where individuals buy land from the government and are transferred perpetual title.

Figure 3.5.1: Map of Gizo Island

Source: mapsouthpacific.com

In terms of political governance, the highest decision making body is the “Trustees”. Any matters regarding the whole village and land are presented to them, who will discuss the issues and make decisions. Any decisions made by the Trustees are final and villagers have no right of appeal. These Trustees are highly respected and comprise mature males who have leadership qualities and knowledge regarding the land and the Gilbertese kastom.

A village organiser is another type of leader who acts as mediator between the village and the provincial government. The village organiser, who is also a male, must be educated and work closely with the Trustees, but he does not have the power to make any final decisions. The third type of leadership is the church leaders, representing the two churches in the village. The role of the church leader is to provide spiritual guidance and pastoral care to the village. Church leaders also work closely with the Trustees but do not have the power to make final decisions.

Like most of the rural villages in the Solomon Islands, the village lacks most modern infrastructure. Although mobile communication has now connected the village with other parts of the country and overseas, there is no electricity or proper water and sanitation system in the village. The two churches in the village are the United Church and the Seventh Day Adventist church. Titiana also has a primary school, a community high school and an aid post. Some residents have tried to developed tourism in the past but it failed. It has been just recently that two other people from the village
started to build bungalows. Tourists can ask the local residents for permission to enter the village but there are no protocols or village rules for tourism, or tourists who want to visit the village for sightseeing and surfing. Also tourists who visit the village do not have to pay village fees for entering the village.

### 3.5.2 Paeloge village

About three kilometres away from Titiana and a 30 minute ride from Gizo town is Paeloge village (Figure 3.5.1). This is a Melanesian village with 400 people whose ancestors are from Simbo but were brought to work and re-settled by the government during the British Colonial days. The village is made up of families and tribes where the Chief is the head. The Paeloge village has two churches and a primary school. Most of the people in Paeloge live on subsistence agriculture with only a few residents working in Gizo for cash income. Land in Paeloge belongs to the government, therefore families register their land to have perpetual titles. The head of the village is the Chief, but individuals can make any decisions regarding development on their land as it is not customarily owned by tribes. Apart from the Chief, there are church elders who represent the two churches in the village. The church leaders also make decisions, but they must work with the Chief, who makes the final decision.

Tourism has only become part of the leisure repertoire in the village fairly recently and as such, there is no word in the local language to describe tourism, though a tourist is usually referred to as waet man. Tourism development is not easy for the local residents due to financial constraints, therefore the process is slow. However in the last couple of years there have been three simple community based homestays constructed around the village. It is just recently that the beaches, in particular the waves, have begun to appeal to surfers due to the world class surf. The beaches in Paeloge are favourite spots for picnics by tourists, locals and domestic tourists who travel as excursionists. To date, only one resident has developed their beach for tourist activities such as snorkelling, beach picnics and relaxing on the beach. Tourists can ask the local residents to visit the village but there is

---

10 Simbo is a volcanic Island located 31km SW of Gizo Island.

11 A waet man in Solomon Pidgin is a person who is not a Melanesian, Polynesian or Micronesian but is from a different race.

12 Domestic tourists is a neglected market by responsible tourism officers such as the DOT, SIVB and the provincial DOT. As such there are no statistics or records relating to this market segment in the country.
nothing arranged for tourists when they visit the village unless they use the beach for surfing or stay in the bungalows.

3.5.3 Saeraghi village

At the western tip (Figure 3.5.1) of Gizo Island is Saeraghi village, which is home to 160 families who dwell in 32 households. The people of Saeraghi trace their ancestors from Vella La Vella and according to history, their ancestors owned the Island of Gizo. The village is headed by a paramount chief who works closely with other tribal chiefs. The people of Saeraghi are Melanesians and they speak Vella La Vella language. The land and resources on Saeraghi are owned by families who come from various tribes. The people in Saeraghi village still rely on subsistence agriculture, though a few people travel to Gizo to sell their surplus for cash income. There are two churches and a school in the village. Saeraghi has the finest white sandy beach around Gizo Island and is the famous village for tourists who visit Gizo Island. Tourists have visited the island since the 1980s because of its spectacular natural setting, but it is just recently that the local residents have started to build village homestays. Although tourists can enter the village at any time there is a minimal entry fee charged which goes to the community. Individual fees are paid to the landowner if the tourists use other properties on private/family owned land.

3.6 Chapter Summary

Chapter two detailed the issues surrounding the concept of development and the progressive advancement of the various development ideologies using tourism as a tool for development. The rationale to promote CBT through the alternative development approach because of the varying economic, socio-cultural and political characteristics that exists between developed and developing nations was also justified. Therefore, community participation, sustainability, just distribution of benefits and empowerment filled the vocabulary on CBT literature as it is deemed appropriate for communities. This research examines the appropriateness of community based tourism in the rural villages of the Solomon Islands using a case study approach. Thus the importance to discuss the context of the Solomon Islands and the villages that comprised the case studies is considered in this chapter.

The Solomon Islands is a tiny tropical country in the South Pacific with just more than 500,000 people. It is isolated from the rest of the world by lying 5˚12 degrees latitude and 154˚162 longitude in the Pacific Ocean. Made up of more than 930 small islands, the majority of the country’s population (more than 80%) still live in the rural areas surviving on subsistence agriculture and fisheries for their livelihood.
Discovered by the Spanish explorer Alvaro de Mendana in 1568, the Solomon Islands gained Independence from the British Protectorate in July 1978. Since then traditional kastoms and practices, Christianity and modern law coexisted but conflicting at times. There are two formal governance system; the national government and the provincial government. The third and the informal system is found in the local communities which also vary between islands. The communities reflect an individual or groups identity through the land and the different tribes. These are inherited through matrilineal or patrilineal system. Thus today, more than 80% of the land in the country is customary-owned and is governed through the traditional kastoms which also vary from island to island.

Development has not advanced since Independence and Solomon Islands has been labelled as one of the poorest country in the Pacific with poor economic performance relying on aid donors. Despite a total collapsed of the economy during the ethnic crisis between Malaita and Guadalcanal people from 1999-2003, the country is slowly recovering with an increase of 3.2% in the GDP by the year 2013. Though systemic exploitation has been a great challenge to transform the national economy. The primary export for the country come from logging, fish, copra, cocoa, palm oil and most recently gold. Tourism has been recognised since 1985 and is also listed as one of the development priority area in the NDP 2011-2020 although there is nothing further than the development stage.

The Solomon Islands is blessed with natural, historical and cultural attractions however, due to the country’s geographical location, tourism in the Solomon Islands has been depending on niche market. According to the history of tourism, the dive market has been sustaining this industry since post-World War II although a survey by SPTO (2014) revealed that tourists visit the Solomon Islands because of the friendliness of the people and the diverse cultures. There are other factors that also impede mass tourism and these include, natural and man-made disasters, the poor infrastructure connecting the islands and the national government attitude to leave this industry for the private sector to develop. As such despite the efforts of DOT and SIVB to market and develop the industry, tourist arrival to the country has been very low compared to other neighbouring countries.

However, tourism in the Solomon Islands today comprised of no more than 6 medium foreign owned hotels, three resorts and more than 20 other accommodation types such as guest house, motels and backpackers. International arrivals so far has just been more than 23,000 by the end of 2012 (SPTO, 2014b).

Much of the tourism in the country is taking place in Honiara and the Western Province. The Western Province and in particular Gizo Island has been known as the tourist capital for the Solomon Islands. Although the Province is abundant with resources for tourism, developing tourism is not easy for the Western Provincial Government as they work under the national government. This has been a
challenge even though the Province has it tourism development plan, implementing the plan is yet another issue. Tourism in the province therefore, is mostly developed by the private sector and the local communities. Tourism in Gizo is made up of one medium sized hotel, two resorts and few other accommodation types and a dive operation. The major market to Gizo has been the dive tourists who were enticed by the World War II relics. However, according to a survey conducted for this study about 30% of the visitors indicated their reason for visiting Gizo is for holiday purposes. When asked what activities they were engaged in while in Gizo, 55% came for diving while 17.5% visited local villages. Thus to examine the effectiveness of CBT in the rural villages, the case study for this research involved three villages located on the coast of Gizo Island in the Western Province. Like other Pacific Island countries, tourism is a recent phenomenon to these villages and thus their meaning and understanding of tourism is very different from a developed country perspective (Berno 2007). As such to understand the tourist market to these villages a visitor survey was conducted while in-depth face to face interviews is appropriate to capture the local residents’ opinions and views about CBT in their villages. These methods are elaborated and detailed in the next chapter.
Chapter 4 Methodology

4.1 Epistemological background

The approaches taken to collect data to answer the research questions and objectives will be presented in this chapter. The initial discussion details the rationale for using both qualitative and quantitative research methods. This is then followed by the details of the research methods utilised. Ethical issues are presented and the section concludes with a discussion on the study’s limitations.

Much of the early research on tourism was predicated on quantitative methods. During those times mass tourism was highly recognised because of its significance as an economic development tool at both national and international levels. Quantitative methods adopt a positivist paradigm to understand the social world. The ontological basis of quantitative methods is that the social world is organised by universal laws and truths and therefore human behaviour is predictable and can be determined by causal relationships. Thus in quantitative methods, the researcher would start with a theory, develop a set of propositions, gather the data, analyse them and make general conclusions about the tourism phenomenon or the people studied. These processes and contents of quantitative methods and development paradigms are Western ideologies which have been applied to developing countries (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Jennings, 2010; Patton, 2002).

The growth and expansion of tourism into developing countries brought unfavourable consequences. Thus tourism proponents sought solutions and in doing so, realised the weaknesses of quantitative methods in other contexts or cultures because it is difficult to envisage the real culture of the studied population. Every culture is unique and there is no ‘right culture’. The two most relevant critiques of the quantitative method relate to their ‘truth’ and ‘appropriateness’ (Jennings, 2010). This implies that understanding and meanings of tourism phenomena are constructed by the people or community studied and therefore, looking to quantitative data to give true and valuable information about other cultures is not always appropriate with quantitative methods.

Tourism is now a global phenomenon that is taking place in almost every country and culture, and the Solomon Islands is no exception. Tourism is a relatively new phenomenon in Pacific countries (including the Solomon Islands). Though these countries participated in some of travel, their conceptualisation, understanding and definition of tourists and tourism is different from that of a western perspective Berno (1999); Berno (2007). This implies that communities are not culturally uniform and therefore other cultures view the tourism phenomenon differently from those in the Western countries. Because of these cross-cultural differences, there is now increasing attention being given to cross cultural methodologies in tourism research. This is to address the potential clash
between Western concepts and frameworks and local cultures (Kozak, Bigne, & Andreu, 2010). It is now appreciated that there is more than one lens through which to view the social world and that different ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies exist in other cultures (Jennings, 2010).

Qualitative methods are used in ethnographic research and consider both emic and etic perspectives. This fits in with the study of tourism which is a Western concept and how it interacts with other non-western cultures. According to Thomas (2004), the characteristic of quantitative methods is that they are highly etic. Qualitative methods are emic in nature. An emic approach means the phenomenon studied is analysed using the studied people’s cognitive processes without imposing a concept or concepts which relate to the cognitive processes of outsiders. For example, we need to consider how people in a particular culture view tourists who arrive. We should note too that the etic approach studies the setting from an outsider’s standpoint using what are believed to be universal constructs. It is now becoming common to define the epistemological position of a researcher using the etic (outsider) and emic (insider) terms in regard to their data collection, interpretation and analysis (Jennings, 2010).

Qualitative methods however, are not always appropriate in every circumstance and depending on the type of research question, the researcher must choose the most suitable method to address it. According to Jennings (2010, p. 18), quantitative methods can be descriptive in nature and are helpful for tourism planners and managers who are interested in “descriptions of tourism patterns and behaviours, such as socio demographic profiles, statistics on inbound and outbound travel, purpose of travel, duration of stay, mode of transport, type of accommodation used, activities engaged in and patterns of expenditure”.

The contribution of quantitative methods to the development of the type of tourists and their profiles, the travel decisions they make, the patterns of tourists’ movements and flows are important for future analysis, monitoring and evaluation for tourism developers and planners (Jennings, 2010). A quantitative survey was used to describe and profile visitors to Gizo Island as part of this research. This was deemed to be the most suitable method as it allowed for the collection of a broad range of visitor data in a short period of time, and was not too demanding of tourists’ time while they were on holiday. In the absence of official tourist statistics, the results of this quantitative data were presented in Chapter 3 to provide background context and an understanding of the types of tourists who visit Gizo.

According to Belsky (2004) qualitative methods and their different approaches for collecting data are appropriate for tourism research because they adapt to specific contexts and the political aspects of tourism. Not only is it contextual, but qualitative research is also interpretive (Denzin & Lincoln,
Participant observation is commonly used in the field when a researcher immerses themselves within the studied population with the aim to gain a detailed understanding of the topic in its natural and social context. In this method, the researcher goes to the field as a neutral person seeking to comprehend the reality from the subjects’ perspective through participating in their activities.

The reasons provided above support the use of both quantitative and qualitative research methods used in this study. Each method has its own strengths and weaknesses (Jick, 1983). Using them in the appropriate situation is important to gather reliable and unbiased data. According to Berno (1999), even though all cultures are involved in some form of travel, the conceptualisation of the term tourist and tourism varies between cultures, particularly between Western countries and developing nations; therefore it is now increasingly common to study tourism combining both emic and etic approaches. Given that the impacts of tourism also vary but are most greatly felt by developing nations, tourism must be explored from the culture in which it is happening or experienced (Berno, 1999; Panakera et al., 2011). This is also appropriate when looking at community-based tourism which promotes community participation where the input of the local residents is important for successful planning, implementation and developing of tourism projects in their locality. As most authors emphasise, understanding the local community is important because their support determines the outcome of the project.

4.2 Data collection

The gathering of data for this study was conducted through different methods (Table 4.2.1). The first stage was done in New Zealand where literature was reviewed, followed by a research proposal application to the Lincoln University Human Ethics Committee (LUHEC). Once the approval was granted the first in-depth interviews were conducted in Honiara. The in-depth interviews were all based on an interview schedule (Appendix A) prepared by the researcher and in accordance with the Lincoln University Code of Ethics. The intention of the questions was to guide the interview by allowing further enquiry into the topic during the field work.
The questions were prepared based on the aims and objectives of the research. Questions for the government officers (national and provincial) were designed to prompt information on the country’s tourism policies at all levels of government in the country, the government’s involvement in the tourism industry, how the policies were/were not implemented and the barriers to implementation. Questions were also asked about relationships between policies and the different levels of governance. It was anticipated that the responses from the officers would provide a clear understanding of tourism policy and organization in regards to tourism as a tool for development in the country.

Questions for the tourism operators were designed to find out the type of tourism operations around the three locations, the relationship between the government and the private sectors, the types of
tourists they accommodated and the types of activities the tourists participated in. These questions were designed to elicit information that could tell whether community-based tourism would be appropriate for the local communities. The questions for residents in the case study villages were designed to gather information on the community organisation and hierarchy of power, the communities’ perceptions of tourism and its benefits, and their engagement with tourism.

The in-depth interviews with the government officers, tourism operators and local residents were carried out in the period August 2013 – February 2014. The government officers in Honiara were interviewed in the month of August 2013, although attempts were unsuccessful with a certain government department. As such the initial research proposal cited four government officers, but only two were interviewed. The rest of the interviews were conducted on Gizo Island. Total participants for the interview (including Honiara) were 41 (Table 4.2.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Official</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Operators</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titiana village</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paeloghe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saeraghi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.2: Categories of local participants

On arrival in Gizo, the researcher sent a letter to the Provincial Government and local village elders seeking permission to conduct the research in Gizo and the three villages. Once approval was granted, non-probability sampling methods were used to identify a sample from the eight hundred and twenty-nine local residents in the three villages. There are four hundred people in Paeloghe, two hundred and sixty nine in Titiana and one hundred and sixty-nine in Saeraghi. Respondents were selected using purposive and snowball techniques.

According to Barbie (2007) a purposive sampling method is used when the subjects studied are selected according to the researcher’s observation that they are useful and are representative. Snowball sampling is used when it is difficult for a researcher to identify appropriate members of a population. For this field work the researcher together with a government official identified some members of the respective communities for the interviews and recommendations were taken from
these participants to contact other members of the village who would be appropriate for this interview. Although the selection aimed to avoid gender and age group biases, there were more female participants than male (Table 4.2.2).

There were other males who expressed their willingness to participate but never showed up. In Solomon Islands culture, this is an indirect way of showing unwillingness. As such, it was culturally appropriate for the researcher to look for other participants, and in this case females were recruited.

Before the interview commenced, the researcher explained the aim of the research and other information relating to confidentiality and code of conduct as approved by the Lincoln University Human Ethics Committee. With the exception of government officials where interviews were conducted in English, all the village-based interviews were conducted in Pijin. Permission was asked to record the interviews. To keep interview participants’ identity confidential, they were allocated a pseudonym where ‘G’ is for government officials, ‘T’ for Titiana respondents ‘S’ for Saeraghi residents, ‘P’ for Paeloge participants and GT for tourism operators. Consent for local villagers were done through verbal agreement. The interview times varied from less than thirty minutes to one hour.

Participant observations were also carried out during the field work as part of the qualitative method. It is not unusual for residents in Gizo and the three villages to easily identify an outside person, given the size of the island. As such my arrival in Gizo was treated as that of a local resident returning from New Zealand. Within days of circulating the letters and identifying the participants, everyone on the island was aware that I was there to do some research work. The interactions between the locals and the tourists were observed and noted in a notebook as soon as I got home from the field.

The third method used was of a quantitative nature. A self–administered survey (Appendix B) was used to collect quantitative data from tourists who visited Gizo during the fieldwork. The self-administered survey was used to identify the different types of tourists to Gizo and what types of activities they participated in or wanted to experience in the studied destination.

The survey design include the tourists’ demographic profiles, the purpose of their visit, their length of stay, the types of facilities they used in Gizo, the types of activities they participated in and what informed their decision to come to Gizo. Participants for the survey were recruited using a non-probability sampling technique. A convenience sampling method was used to recruit participants by choosing people who were prepared to volunteer, available and accessible at the time of the research (Sarankatos, 1998). The participants of the survey were approached in public places around the streets of Gizo and were asked if they were willing to participate in the visitor’s survey. There
were 30 tourists (15 male, 15 female) who participated in the survey, while seven declined. When
the participants confirmed their approval to participate they were given the research information
sheet (Appendix C) and consent form (Appendix D) to read before they completed the survey. The
survey took about 30 minutes to complete and was written in English.

The data analysis was undertaken upon the researcher’s return to New Zealand. The in-depth
interviews were coded using the Nvivo version 10. Prior to that, the data (in-depth interviews) were
transcribed from pidgin and translated into English by the researcher. Coding serves two purposes.
First of all, it helps to categorise individual raw data for future retrieval of information. Secondly,
coding identifies the different patterns among the data (Barbie, 2007). Once they are coded the data
are then categorised according to emerging themes. For quantitative analysis, data were entered
into SPSS version 21. Descriptive statistics, mainly frequencies, were used to analyse the data.
Secondary data were also sought to fully address the research aims and objectives.

4.3 Ethical considerations

This research adhered to the Lincoln University Human Ethics Committee guidelines, by whom
approval was granted. The researcher was cognisant that for many of the participants, this would be
their first time participating in social science research, and therefore, they were likely to be
unfamiliar with the research process.

On arrival in Honiara, contact was made directly with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and the
Solomon Islands Visitors Bureau Office for permission. After explaining the research and its aims and
objectives, I was directed to government officers who were related to my area of interest. I then met
with the officers and set the date and venue for the interviews. Prior to the interviews, the officers
were supplied with brief information about the research and an information sheet (see appendix E)
was provided, and following their agreement to participate a consent form (see appendix F) was
provided for them to sign before the interview proceeded.

In Gizo, letters (see appendix G & H) were sent to the Provincial Secretary of the Western Provincial
Government and Church Leaders seeking permission to conduct research on Gizo Island and in
particular the three studied villages. The same procedures mentioned above were carried out for the
government officers and tourism operators, except that they had different information sheets (see
appendix I).

The procedures for the local participants from the rural villages were as follows: first of all the
participants were provided with an explanation about the research and its aims, the confidentiality of
the research and their anonymity as a participant, and their right to withdraw from the interview
should they wish. A verbal agreement was then sought for their participation and the use of the voice
recording machine. Unless specifically requested, a written consent form was not issued, as verbal consent was more culturally appropriate in the Solomon Islands context.

4.4 Research constraints and limitations

There were a few constraints and limitations faced during the fieldwork. On arriving in Honiara, there was one officer who the researcher was not able to interview because they were out in the Province. Even when they returned from their trip, all attempts to arrange a face-to-face interview were not successful. As such, secondary information was sought instead of primary data obtained through an in-depth interview. The proposed timeline for the research was also adjusted during the fieldwork. It was first proposed that the researcher would be in Gizo and the rural villages by the first week of September 2013; however, due to bad weather conditions, I got there two weeks late to start the fieldwork in the villages and in Gizo.

When I arrived in Gizo, the Nusatupe (Gizo) airstrip was closed due to work on upgrading it and as such there were no tourists visiting Gizo Island, and so data collection for the visitor survey was done between January and February 2014. There were a few visitors in Gizo around October, but all of them were working for Downer, the New Zealand Company that was contracted to do the upgrade of the airstrip. They all lived in the Gizo Hotel and had been there since May 2013. As such, I decided not to survey them as they were not bona fide tourists. There were also changes made to the original dates for the local residents’ interviews as by the time I got to Gizo, it was two weeks before the provincial election around that area, and so ‘election fever’ could be seen around Gizo town and the villages. There were a few instances where roadblocks were erected on the roads to the villages, thus it was culturally appropriate not to approach the villagers until everyone was settled. Also, the interview schedule changed because most of the appointments with the villagers kept changing as some of them never showed up while others kept changing the dates due to other reasons. For reliability of the data, I had to be flexible and fit in with their time.

Another limitation to the study was the representativeness and generalisability of the data collected. The Solomon Islands is made up of different Islands and the kastoms and culture vary across islands, therefore despite the cultural appropriateness of the method used to collect the information the sample does not represent the total population of Gizo or the country. Also, there are some villages in the Solomon Islands which are remote and rarely have tourists; the results would have been different on their case. Also, I lived and worked on Gizo Island for almost eight years and therefore it is my observation that some of the responses would have been different if I had had no connection to Gizo Island. Some of the participants were shy about providing enough information because they knew I had worked as a manager at the Gizo Hotel. Likewise, the number of tourists surveyed was really too small to provide a representative response from tourists who visit Gizo Island; it is also my
observation that the data maybe biased given that the beginning of the year is usually the off-peak period in Gizo Island.

4.5 Chapter Summary

The study used both quantitative and qualitative research methods to gather the data. A quantitative visitors’ survey was employed to collect information about the tourists who visited Gizo. Qualitative semi-structured interviews were conducted with government officers, tourism operators and the local residents of the village. Tourist and tourism is a Western phenomenon which is now expanding into developing countries. Thus the views on tourism vary and for Pacific Island countries the conceptualisation of tourists and tourism is different from the Western definition. As such the use of Western models imposed on developing countries is not appropriate. It is for these reasons that qualitative methods were used.

The interviews with the government officials were done in Honiara and Gizo while the rest of the interviews were conducted on Gizo Island. Using non-probability sampling methods the respondents for the local villages were recruited through a snowball sampling technique. The total number interviewed was forty-one and this included government officials, tourism operators and the local residents.

Ethical issues were taken into consideration and before each interviews the participants were made aware of the purpose of the survey, and they were then advised about confidentiality and verbal agreement was sought for their participation in the interviews. The tourists were recruited using a convenience sampling method. When approached, if they agreed they were given an information sheet and a consent form to sign before they started completing the survey. The quantitative data were then analysed using SPSS version 20, and qualitative data were transcribed and translated from pidgin into English and then coded using Nvivo 10 programme. Once all the coding was done the data was translated into results which are presented in the next chapter.
Chapter 5 Results

5.1 Introduction

As discussed in the literature review, the damage and negative effects caused by mass tourism happened because tourism development was dictated and managed by foreign elites. This occurred because tourists and tourism were a new phenomenon to developing countries, and thus they lacked the necessary knowledge of this concept. As such, community based tourism has been recommended as an alternative to mass tourism due to its holistic nature of involving local residents in any tourism development. It also parallels the broader definition of development.

Thus, for CBT to become a bona fide development tool for communities, they must have control over any tourism development in their villages. This implies that tourism development in the villages must be locally owned, managed and developed by the local residents themselves (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013). In order to achieve sustainability and self-determination, community participation in the decision making and benefits of tourism is a fundamental requirement. Thus it is crucial that communities are empowered so that tourism development is controlled by local hands rather than by external elites.

To be able to assess the readiness of the three villages for CBT, this section will discuss the findings from the qualitative data from the fieldwork. Part one will present the findings from the government officers regarding SIG national and provincial tourism policies. The results in part two are from the interviews with the local residents of the three studied villages and will discuss the following areas: the nature of existing (and prospective) tourism operations in the villages, the level of community participation (both in decision making and tourism benefits), the level of empowerment, and the local residents’ attitudes and perceptions of CBT.

5.2 Tourism as a development strategy for the Solomon Islands

The government’s decisions and policies can affect the development of tourism in any destination, and it is the government’s role to plan, develop and promote tourism so that both the supply of and the demand for tourism are equivalent (Hall, 2003). To have a clear understanding of the position of tourism as a developmental strategy for the Solomon Islands, government officials at the DoT in Honiara and Gizo were asked questions related to SIG tourism policy, planning, development and implementation at both the national, provincial and community level; the issues and challenges encountered by the industry, and the offices responsible. The responses from the government officials were similar to those cited in publications about tourism development in the Solomon
Islands. The issues are divided into three broad categories: Government intervention, issues faced by the DoT and issues with the community. These are discussed in turn below.

**Government intervention**

At present the SIG does not have a national tourism policy or strategic plan to provide the overall direction for tourism in the Solomon Islands, nor do they have a framework to market the country.

The following have been drawn up in the past years: a statement of policy (1986); A National Tourism Policy (1989); Solomon Islands Tourism Sector Strategic Plan 2006; Diagnostic Trade Integration Study 2009; and a Solomon Islands Tourism Task Force Action Plan 2011-2015. The Solomon Islands DoT at the time of this research lacked an updated national tourism policy, as confirmed by one GO1

So the problem with our policy here is that we are following the tourism policy that was made 30 or years ago, and we are still following it because the new one wasn’t approved yet by the cabinet. We are trying to get it into the cabinet so for example our tourism policy 30 years ago didn’t mention anything about you know the environment, technology and all of these things so sometimes it is a constraint for us to try and implement a tourism policy that was made 20, 30 years ago.

Even if there were policy and plans drawn up, my interview with both the National and Provincial government officers provided evidence of insufficient support from the SIG for them to fully execute the policy (Hall, 1994). As GO3 commented

That’s purely an implication on the National Government. It is very easy to blame the Provincial Government especially the political level of the Provincial Government for things like tourism development not taking place. But the thing is that the provincial government is an agent of the national government.

Instead of coordinating the policies so that they are implemented as recommended on the documents, SIG seemed to have left the development of tourism in the country to the private sector (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006).

One of the areas identified in the Strategic Plan 2006 was for each Province to have their own tourism development plan. However, only the Western and Makira Provinces have actioned this. It is also evident from the field work that there are poor communication links between the central government and the local government. This impedes the development of tourism in the country, particularly in the provinces, because the provincial government relies on the national government, NGOs and aid donors for funding (Gay, 2009; SIG, 2014). As GO3 described
There is little data, the work here in the tourism industry in the Western Province has been carried out mostly by private, people from the communities, some investors that come into our province and they just do their own work. They just push their own things and for a lot of the accommodation and services and events in the rural communities, tourists just come across them by accident, there is no planned promotion and planned marketing.

Furthermore, a review of all the documents pertaining to the tourism policy and development actions of the country indicated that SIG highlighted the development of tourism as a means of economic diversification for the country (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006; Gay, 2009). The aims and goals of tourism development in all the documents also emphasised the development of sustainable tourism so that benefits are maximised in the country.

Another goal highlighted in the policy documents is to decentralise tourism activities into the Provinces. However to date, most of the tourism development and activities are within Honiara and the Western Province. The Central Province, Malaita and Makira have been identified as having potential to develop into tourism destinations but so far there has been very low tourism activity there. There are several factors that hinder this decentralisation process, and apart from inadequate coordination by the SIG, the problem is with infrastructure and a shortage of resources, as discussed below.

**Issues faced by the DOT**

The Solomon Islands are a group of 930 islands scattered to form an archipelago. Since gaining Independence, development has been minimal; in fact it has not advanced further than the capital city – Honiara, into the Provinces (see Chapter 3). One of the deterrents to decentralisation is the poor infrastructure connecting the islands. This is expressed by one of the officials:

> Because of the geographical location of the country we have different islands where you need to travel and the fact is that you have to come back to Honiara before you go to other Province. In terms of awareness I think most popular places like the Western and Malaita Province have accessibility already. But for other Provinces still need more awareness to be carried out in the whole country (G02).

A second problem is related to financial resources. As discussed in Chapter 3, the Solomon Islands is an aid dependent country. One of the main reasons which prevents the coordination and implementation of tourism activities into the provinces is lack of funding. As described here:
Well, that is a good question because they said that they are prioritising tourism but in terms of funding, giving us money to actually do all the tourism work and development is very, very small compared to other ministries (G01).

As the officials mentioned, there is some funding for the tourism sector in the country but it has not been well channelled to support tourism development. The DoT used to administer funding for tourism activities; however the procedure is now different as claimed,

That has been the arrangement until the end of 2011. Now it has changed, changed in a sense that now total lump sum approved for that particular year is shared according to the fifty constituencies and the honourable members of parliament now have the upper hand to make endorsements (G01).

According to officials this has been the major obstacle now facing this industry. Unless aid agencies work directly on the projects, the chance of government funds being utilised accordingly is minimal or zero. As GO1 further reiterated

Yes so far the money has been a waste, I mean the funding is wasted. The point is how we know that the honourable and his community development officers (CDO) have the technical expertise to assess and improve a project. Right now from experience, since last year when the funds were diverted to the MP’s there is no project but yet people’s applications are been approved.

And is also true for the provincial DoT

As it is they pulled or gave the fund out to be distributed by the MPs themselves. So we have no idea how they’ve been distributed. We have no idea where and what kind of tourism things have been developed by the government (G03)

Additionally, the national budget does not cater for tourism development in the Provinces. Therefore, it is not possible for the provincial governments to use their annual grant allocations to develop this sector.

The only place that the support can come from is within the national government. We really cannot ask the Provincial government because the provincial government are being given a specific budget or grant every three months to run its administration. That is not a development budget. It is just to sustain the administration. You need a development budget to come from the national government (G03)
Another obstacle for the DoT is human resources. With very limited funding and staff to coordinate the tourism industry it is an issue, as expressed here:

Well, some of the policies we tried to implement but we have problems with monitoring and evaluating it because we are under staffed (G02)

And another comment

At the moment there are only two of us and if we are required to work in the office then we cannot go out to the provinces to do the awareness, we have to go with the other plan of activities (GO1).

And for the Western Province

Very much, the things that I am talking about, data collection, industry development projection, I am talking about the aspect of culture, you know and these are all different areas to be developed within this division before we can do our work properly in the tourism industry. These are not covered by any officer but I am here by myself (G03).

Because of these issues the officials were also asked if they have some networks with other stakeholders to help decentralise tourism into the provinces. This option is not yet fully utilised as mentioned by G01

There could be some areas where we could get involved in and like sometimes we asked the SIVB to help us go out too so they can talk about their function in this industry. Maybe using the NGOs but at the moment we have not yet looked into that yet because of lack of government support in terms of funding to carry out those activities

While the DoT and provincial DoT are constrained by the above factors, the communities themselves can sometimes hinder the development and implementation of tourism activities into the Provinces. These issues are central to the following discussions.

**Issues with the communities**

The government officers were also asked to identify factors that inhibit the development of tourism in the local communities. They suggested that tourism development in the country is also constrained by the communities’ attitudes towards development and therefore implementation is difficult. The government officers were also asked to identify factors that inhibit the development of tourism in the local communities. As mentioned above (see Section 3.2.5) the collective nature of the Solomon Islands communities mean that land is not individually owned; this communal ownership
represents 80 percent of the land in the country (Foukona, 2007; Monson, 2011). One of the commonly cited issues related to the land is explained below:

We have a lot of problem with the land. Most of the land is customary owned. There is a small land that is owned by the government but most of the land is owned by custom. So therefore, there are a lot of problems. When some people develop something we have fights, ahh and you know development didn’t take place so we find that a bit difficult in terms of getting land to build tourism related activities (G01).

This sentiment is also expressed by another officer

The second constrain is that of most of the land in the community or village is customary owned and sometimes the land become the issue. Though they have the potential in terms of what they have when we try to go and implement tourism it became an issue (G03).

Another issue which restricts the implementation of tourism to the communities is their limited knowledge of tourism and its impacts. As stated by G02

I mean the majority of the population are in the rural areas and they have the resources. I think the basic knowledge about facilitating this industry to inform them about the potential of this industry is lacking. And also they do not understand this industry. However, if there is more awareness about the economic benefit of tourism in the homes, I think the people will see this as an area of interest which they tap into to support them in the future.

Lack of knowledge about tourism is not only obvious with the villagers but even those at the national level who mandate the funding for the local villages, such as is expressed here:

Most of the CDOs are not tourism people so they wouldn’t be able to properly assess if you know, the tourism developments that somebody wants to plan is better suited for that area or not. What sort of activities and attractions he or she might develop is best for that area. They don’t know many tourists go to that area, they don’t know about the transportation system (G01).

Despite these obstacles, the DoT have worked very hard to bring tourism development into the local communities. When asked what sort of tourism development the DoT is promoting into the provinces, it is more than just community based tourism, as stated here:

Well just with our own funding system we try to get people involve in tourism. We are trying to get them to create their own economic, ahhh what do you call it? Trying to get them into their own community and in their own small economic activity going (G01).
And from this officer:

So we do bit by bit according to the availability of funds but the focus is to help the people in the community. Most people who receive the funding are homestay owners with few community projects. This cultural centres is one of the projects we are looking at because it is community based. Like the one I mentioned in xxx. If that has been completed and operational we are looking at bringing in cruise ships. That is the market because they come in big numbers (G01)

To conclude, the results from the interviews and relevant literature on tourism development in the Solomon Islands suggest that the SIG needs a new and updated tourism policy. The SIG identified tourism as a national development priority area in their NDS (see Section 3.3.1) and indicated their interest to promote sustainable tourism development. However, there are some challenges, and very minimal government support and actions has been forthcoming to develop tourism in the rural communities. The challenges include poor infrastructure, low financial resources, and a lack of knowledge (both at national to community level) about tourism and its impacts. Although the tourism industry is mostly dominated by the private sector, the data suggested that there is some community involvement in tourism in the provinces. Even though the implementation of tourism activities in the provinces is hindered by national issues, the communities themselves are also an obstacle. This includes problems with land tenure and inadequate knowledge of tourism development and its impact and about tourism in general. The data indicated some level of community based tourism in the provinces, and as such the following section is on community based tourism in the studied villages.

5.3 Tourism business ownership

Community based tourism has been promoted as a developmental tool for communities to mitigate the unwanted effects associated with mass tourism. Developing countries become victims of mass tourism because of a lack of control over tourism development in their community. As such, attempts to liberate developing countries from dependency on outside powers have led to development strategies that permit local control and just distribution of benefits to the communities (Giampiccoli & Kalis, 2012). To determine if community based tourism is a viable alternative for the communities, local residents were asked to describe any tourism ventures or projects (and prospective projects) in their respective villages.

In Titiana village there are two prospective tourism businesses which are just being built. They are owned by two individual residents from the village and are in the form of small accommodation. As described by one of the respondents, “Yes there is one but still incomplete, it is a bungalow” (T12).
Paeloghe village has four tourism businesses which are in operation. One resident is providing their beach for picnic and recreation and the other three supply accommodation to visitors. As stated by one of the entrepreneurs:

Yes we a homestay for tourists who want to spend the night, we also have dugout canoes for tourists who want to paddle in the sea. The reef around my area is also good for snorkelling so maybe that’s what attract tourists to my area (P03).

Local residents from Saeraghi usually sell their beach to visitors. However at the time of the interview there are few businesses which provide accommodation while another one is still progressing. As mentioned by this resident:

Yes so there are three businesses one belongs to xxx and xxx and xxx and they have village stays, small houses with bathrooms, toilet and one of them don’t have a kitchen (S04).

Community based tourism operations are usually small-scale businesses with local control. However, for the community to benefit from tourism development in their locality, the businesses must be locally owned, operated and managed (Zapata et al., 2011). As such the participants were also asked about the ownership and management of the tourism businesses.

Although these tourism ventures in the villages are small scale, they are wholly operated and managed by the residents (families) who owned them. As stated by one of the business owners,

Well in my business I manage it myself and my wife is the assistant manager and my kids work in the business. So my job is when we have guests I tour guide them and that is my main responsibility (S02).

Even in Paeloghe village, “They are managed by those residents who also owned the tourism businesses” (P08).

In conclusion, all of the tourism ventures in these villages are small-scale locally-owned and managed by the individuals and their families themselves. In addition to being controlled by the locals themselves one of the main factors that favours community based tourism is that of local participation. Empowerment is considered one of the fundamental elements that leads to sustainable tourism development. Therefore, to determine the appropriateness of community based tourism in these villages, it is important to understand the community’s participation in tourism in the villages, their level of knowledge about tourism and its impacts, the residents’ support for or disapproval of tourists and tourism, and the villages’ readiness for developing tourism. The following discussion of these is divided into four sections. The first part focuses on participation in terms of
decision-making and tourism benefits. The second part looks at the local villagers’ capacity to understand tourists and tourism. The third and final sections look at the residents’ perceptions and attitudes towards tourism and its impacts respectively.

5.4 Local residents participation in decision-making

Local residents’ participation is a prerequisite to sustainable tourism development (Murphy, 1985). The literature review identified two means of participation (Timothy, 1999): Community participation in decision-making, and community participation in the benefits of tourism. First of all, for CBT to be locally controlled, the community must be consulted for their input from the initial planning stages right through to development and implementation of the CBT. The decisions must be made by the local residents on the basis of what they think best suits them. However, unless the local residents have knowledge and understanding for and about tourism (Berno 2007), participation in making sound decisions will not be effective (Moscardo, 2008). Secondly, participation in the benefits means that everyone in the community (active or passive) should be beneficiaries of CBT. Community-based tourism must be developed and managed so that everyone in the village gets some benefit out of the project.

It is through participation that informed decisions are made regarding tourism development and its benefits and impacts on the community. In addition, through participation residents can determine their own affairs according to their wishes and likes (Moscardo, 2008). However, communities are heterogeneous and have their own hierarchy of power, and as such it would be absurd to treat a community as homogeneous; there will be different thinking and actions towards tourism development (George, Mair, & Reid, 2009). Therefore to assess the local residents’ readiness to engage in community based tourism, the residents were asked to describe the decision making processes in their community.

For Titiana village, any issues regarding community development (including tourism) are usually discussed through public meetings. Such meetings are gender inclusive and held in their kastom house. Everyone in the village can contribute to the discussion through sharing their ideas and input concerning the issue; however the final decisions are made collectively by the head of the village. As explained by this resident

It is from us that we contribute our ideas and we give our decisions and if the trustees don’t agree they will not allow it but if they agree with it, they will announce it as final (T08).

In Paeloghe village, if the development will be on community land every member of the community can take part in the meeting. The residents will share their inputs and wishes but the final decision will be made collectively by the village elders such as the Church leaders in concert with the chief.
However if the proposed project will be on alienated land, the individual together with their family will have their own meeting and discuss the matter. Then the senior or appointed head of the family will make the final decision.

I gathered everyone in the community, old and young and we discussed the issue then I told them to think about it and get back to me on what their thoughts are. When they all agreed to my idea a decision is reached. So that is how we make decisions, I consult every family members (P01).

Like the first two villages, participants from Saeraghi village also confirmed that any developments on communal land are usually discussed in public meetings which are attended by every resident. The final decision however is made by village leaders who also hold the highest power.

Everyone will join the meeting, contribute their ideas but then the chief and the church leader will make the final decision (S07).

Unless the tourism business will be on an individual family land, the discussions are usually done within the family and the head of the family has the final say; however the leaders are usually informed as described here:

Yes I will tell my children and tell them that I want to build a tourism business and later I will tell my chief (S01).

One other reason for encouraging community participation relates to the residents’ sense of belonging or feeling as part of the community. This positive feeling through participation contributes to the residents’ support for tourism development (Mcgettigan, Burns, & Candon, 2006). For this reason, the participants were also asked if they are content with the decision-making process in their villages.

Most of the participants from Titiana village confirmed their belief that their present system where the trustees make overall decisions for their community helps to maintain and protect the cultural values of the community as described here: “Yes this way of making decision is good because it brings the community together” (T10). For them, a communal decision by the trustees is good and is representative of the entire community as illustrated by this participant:

“Yes I think that it is a good thing because after all it is not a one man’s decision but it is a collective decision from the trustees and nobody else will complain about it” (T09).

However one of the interviewees disputed the decision making process as it undermines the progress of the village:
“One of the reasons why I said it is bad because that is why we never developed because of the elders. Because of them we do not develop our village” (T02).

All the respondents from Paeloghe also agreed with the existing decision making process where the head of the family or the trustees makes the decisions.

It is a communal decision which should be of advantage to everyone in the village, Yes I think it is good because when everyone makes collective decision it will bring positive benefits to the community (P01).

Likewise all the participants from Saeraghi approved the decision making process in their village where the chief makes the final decision regarding any development in their community areas, as described here:

Yes because it’s a collective decision from everyone and if everyone agrees then the chief is also happy with it, it should be good because the community will also be happy. However in cases where it is a family land, the head of the family who is the father makes the decision (S01).

Since the existing tourism operations are on family land, the decisions to go ahead were done within families. However, there was consultation in terms of participation in the benefits (these will be discussed in the next section).

As the data suggest, there are different decision making processes in the villages. Titiana is on alienated land which is under the custodianship of Trustees, thus even though residents can contribute their opinions and ideas, final decisions are made collectively by the Trustees, who are the highest decision- making body of the village. For Paeloghe and Saeraghi, if the projects are on individual family land the issue is discussed by the family members but the head of the family has the last say. However for communal land, the final decisions are usually made by the village elders (Chief or Trustees). These decision-making processes are the cultural norms and every one of the participants is favourable towards these practices.

From a cultural perspective, these participation processes are representative and acceptable for each of the villages and they lead to village cohesiveness. However, this conflicts with the Western notion of community participation which argues for individual input for tourism to be sustainable. This suggests that if the Western model of ‘community participation’ were to be imposed on the village systems there is a high possibility of sustainability not being achieved because the cultural processes would be breached. The following section will discuss the relationship between community participation and benefits of tourism.
5.5 Community participation in tourism benefits

One of the goals of community based tourism as a developmental tool for the local community is to ensure that benefits are evenly distributed within the community. To be able to benefit from CBT, the residents must be provided the opportunities to participate in tourism (Moscardo, 2008). Community based tourism argues that the beneficiaries must be participants in the tourism development, whether active participants or passive. According to Scheyvens (2002), economic empowerment is one of the elements that determines the readiness of the community for tourism development. Therefore, to explore the community’s participation in the benefits of tourism, the respondents were asked to describe their engagement with the tourists and if they financially benefited from the present tourism operations.

Though the respondents from Titiana village confirmed seeing tourists visiting their villages all year round, they were not able to provide actual arrival figures. The flow of tourists into the village is not regular and not high in numbers. Regardless, there was a small number of tourists who either passed through or visited their village over the year 2013. At the moment tourists usually only pass through Titiana to visit Paeloghe and Saeraghi village. There are however some are tourists who come to the village, as mentioned by this respondent. “I’ve seen them around my village for surfing, diving and village walk” (T08).

But when asked if the tourists have to pay for fees to participate in these activities, the respondents said that the activities were not regulated. As one of the respondents put it, “I don’t know but maybe they gave the money to those boys who accompanied them to the beach to surf” (T07). The residents were also asked if the community benefited by providing cultural entertainment.

We are not selling our activities we just provide entertainments to show our cultures like the tamure dancing which is one of our custom. The thing is called tekaimoata where the people sing by beating a traditional music box to generate sounds (T04).

Paeloghe had more contact with tourists than Titiana village, although they are not sure how often they see tourists visiting their village. Paeloghe village has three accommodation establishments and therefore the length of stay and host-guest contact is longer than Titiana village, as described by this respondent:

I am not too sure but the tourists who come to the homestay and the beach comes all year round. They usually come and go. I don’t see much tourism happening but the tourists who came for the homestay just come to stay for a month or so to surf. This must be their own arrangement with the person who owns the homestay. Last year I saw a lot of tourists come to surf but in terms of tourism I don’t know (P06).
The respondents were asked who received the payments from tourists who visited the village. If they use the accommodation it belonged to the individuals who owned it; though the community received some money from the tourists as this respondents mentioned, “If the tourists come through the community, the money will be given to the Pastor of the village” (P05).

However this homestay owner said that the payment received from tourists is shared. As he claimed:

> For us, the money comes to our family who set up the tourism homestay. But now we have a committee for trust family community. So the money goes into our trust committee which helps our kids in schools (P01).

Tourism also provided employment for other residents in the village, as he went on to describe:

> In my homestay it is SBD$100 per night per person. But when they go for bush walks the tour guides charge them SBD$200 per person (P01).

They were also asked if there are other benefits from tourism they see in the village:

> The tourists gave out books to the kids, they distribute clothes to the local residents and even toys for the children. They also helped the old women in the villages especially the handicapped. That is how I experienced it when the tourists came to visit our village (P02).

Saeraghi village is quite different from Titiana and Paeloghe. They began welcoming tourists earlier than the other two villages. Just recently they built a guest house in the village, but most of the tourists who visited Saeraghi went there as day trippers. When asked how many times they see tourists visiting their village the respondents had several answers, which were summed up by one of the respondents:

> I think tourists are very interested in our beach so they come once a week. They come on Saturdays and Thursday. They arrive in our village any time and any day. I am not sure what days they come but they come every week (S01).

The respondents were asked what activities the tourists participated in when they visited their village. Unlike the case with the other two villages, there were many activities that tourists to Saeraghi took part in. This included snorkelling, visiting historic places, picnicking and relaxing on the beach; and also they come to learn about the local lifestyle. As S07 described it,

> They come to learn about our traditional food. We teach them how to scrape coconut, how to husk coconut, how to cook pudding, chicken, cassava, and those kinds of things that we teach them.
When asked how the payment was distributed, one of the respondents replied, “Yes in our village they pay her head and it is $50 per head and the money is for the community” (S05).

Another respondent also confirmed that if the tourist requested the community to prepare the entertainment and activities, all the money goes back to the community, as is expressed here:

“We charged the tourists. If we do the motu\textsuperscript{13}, weave the basket and entertain them through dancing we charge them. We charge either SBD$900 or SBD$1,000 and they pay before they can come and watch or take part in the programme (S03).

And if they stay at the homestay the payment is made directly to the owner, who also provides tour guiding. However, if they visit a communal site there is some money given to the community, as this owner explained,

“When tourists pay, SBD$20 is for custom fee and so out of the SBD$100 I charge them, I gave $20 for custom fee to the community” (S02).

This village also received groups (up to 20) of tourists who are repeat visitors. All the visitors who visited these three villages travelled using both sea and land transport such as public transport, taxis and outboard motor canoes from Gizo town.

To conclude, the data suggest that these villages have different levels of participation in tourism development. Titiana has just started to become involved in tourism and therefore tourism activities are very minimal and not coordinated at all. Moreover only the few residents who accompany surf tourists usually receive any financial benefit, and there is nothing other than that for the community yet. For Paeloghe, the existing tourism operations provide some economic benefit such as employment and income to the families who owned the business and the few individuals who worked as tour guides when needed. There was some money given to the community if the owners had to take their tourists to a communal area. Saeraghi village received a large number of tourists compared to the other villages. Tourism creates a few jobs for the individuals and families who own the businesses, and also there are some events where all the community is involved in selling their product to the tourists. The community participates if tourists arrived in numbers and also if the tourism operators take their guests to a communal site. For tourism to be sustainable, local residents must be well informed about the benefits of tourism and its impact on the community. Therefore, for participation to be effective, the residents must have knowledge about tourism. The next findings are on the limitations of participation.

\textsuperscript{13} A traditional cooking method where food is cooked underground.
5.6 The capacity of the communities to understand tourists and tourism

Community empowerment is paramount for the sustainability of CBT. If the community has knowledge about tourism they will be able to plan, coordinate and implement their tourism businesses. Therefore they will have control over the development and will achieve self-determination (Berno 2007). However, there can be many reasons which impede community involvement in tourism development (Section 2.4). Therefore to assess the knowledge of and skills for tourism development and promotion, the respondents were asked if the government, through the provincial government, SIVB or DoT provided any form of training or workshops regarding tourism in the villages.

For Titiana village there has not been tourism awareness at all. The local residents have decided to engage in community based tourism at their own cost. As described here:

We have three tourism businesses but they were not successful. The reason is they lack support from government. This means they don’t have any funds to continue their businesses. As soon as their own capital is used up they cannot eventuate because there are no funds for them be complete and in full operational (T03).

And the main cause of their lack of participation in tourism development, apart from funding:

Most of the population in my village are not well educated and so they are not aware of the potential for tourism development in our community although there are few residents who understand tourism and are aware of this potential and therefore want to expose this so that we can develop tourism in our community (T04).

Additionally, other cultural issues are an obstacle, such as:

Because of land disputes. Some of the land belong to another person and if they don’t want tourism and also the people do not have money. If someone from outside the village wants to start tourism they will disagree as they want to make it themselves. But the landowner don’t have money to start the business themselves (T12).

Paeloghe village also has not received any support from the government to develop tourism. There was no training, workshops or financial assistance from the government to assist them. As asserted by this respondent:

I want to put across to you that any tourists or person who wants to come and set up inside our village or community, we are willing to work with them as partners. So we still looking out for any person who could help us. We have the land but we lack financial backing to build
houses or whatever in our community. I think that is my only comment and I want to tell you
that we welcome any person who wants to start up a tourism business in xxxx so we could sit
make some agreements to work as partners (P01).

And

Yes, according to my observation there should not be any problem if we develop tourism in
our village because at the moment most of the local people are clearing their sites for
tourism however they just need support. I also support your idea of asking the local people’s
view. The government should always consult local people before venturing into any tourism
business. Therefore I would like to thank you for asking me these questions which also gives
me an idea of what tourism is all about. Thank you very much (P08).

The above is also true for Saeraghi village,

Yes if we want to succeed we must make it good and plan it properly. But it’s not easy as far
as I see it because the villagers cannot do it. They must also have some training before they
can start building lodges and village stay. It is not that easy (S03)

When asked how this respondent managed to start a community based tourism venture, the reply
was

I have no educational background on tourism, however I used to work at the xxx when xxxx
was there in the 1980’s when the dive shop was there, that is how I have some work
experience to tour guide tourists and I know how to handle and tourists (S03).

The respondents were also asked how the tourists knew about their village and who accompanied
them to the village. Some of the tourists travelled to the villages by themselves, but most of them
used public transport from Gizo or from any of the tourism operators in Gizo town.

Yeah the xxxx also help us by sending their guests to our village. They told them that our
village xxxx is a special place and so they send them over for come for sightseeing and see
our village (S01).

And from the village of Paeloghe

What I did is this, a tourist came to visit my area and I told him about the activities we have
on our area. I told him to pass around the message to his friends and families overseas, that’s
how the tourist knows our place (P03).
To conclude, there was no awareness, training or workshops held for the villages by the DoT or the provincial DoT. Lack of funds and knowledge for and of tourism have been hindrances to their participating in tourism. The collective culture of the villages is also an issue. There was no promotion of the villages by the government or the responsible tourism offices. Some of the tourism operators helped the villages by sending their guests to visit, but there was no direct promotion from SIG. Tourism in these villages is all unplanned and not properly coordinated, as the residents do not have the capacity to do so. The next section will discuss the perceptions and attitudes of the local communities towards tourism and its impact.

5.7 The attitudes and perceptions of local residents towards tourism development

Residents’ attitudes towards tourism development and its impact have been examined as a factor in determining the appropriateness of tourism development in a specific destination (Lepp, 2007). The community is a fundamental aspect of the tourism product because their attitudes towards tourism can determine the sustainability of the tourism development (Murphy, 1985). Communities’ perceptions and attitudes towards tourism and its impacts are essential to consider so that appropriate measures can be taken to mitigate negative effects and maximise the benefits. By favouring their wishes and opinions, the community will encourage CBT and show willingness to participate (Rocharungsat, 2008). However residents’ attitudes and perceptions vary according to many factors (Section 2.4.6). As such, to elicit residents’ experiences, thoughts and feelings towards CBT in their villages, the respondents were asked to explain their feelings about tourism development in their village.

Respondents from Titiana village expressed both negative and positive attitudes towards tourism development in their village. There were several reasons identified by those who did not support tourism being developed in their village. These reasons included concerns about overcrowding, erosion of traditional values and uncertainty about what were the benefits of tourism. As explained here:

I have not seen any tangible benefits from tourism in my village so I would remain neutral. Unless the people are becoming aware of the benefits of tourism and I see the tangible benefits I would not support it. Therefore I would only support it if I see the benefits to the community (T03).

Another reason why there was a negative attitude towards tourism development was expressed by T01:
I think it is good that there are no tourism developments to be allowed because it is a village. It is not a good idea to accommodate tourists in the villages.

On the other hand those respondents who had a positive attitude towards tourism development in their village gave numerous reasons for their view:

I would cooperate with the community as I’ve mentioned earlier tourism can benefit the community through income generation. The village people can earn some form of income. And to support these development we must be hospitable towards the tourists so that they feel welcome in our village, (T04).

This was typical of positive responses generally. In addition, one of the respondents expressed it like this:

Because when tourists come into the village the people see and learn new things from them. For example the boys in the village don’t know how to surf but when tourists come and take them to surf they start to develop interest (T08).

Another respondent indicated positive attitudes towards tourism development because of the benefits that could be gained from cross-cultural interactions as described here:

“So that the tourists will come and see and experience our village lifestyles and we can also see the white man’s lifestyle” (T10).

Unlike Titiana, all the respondents from Paeloghe expressed positive attitudes towards tourism development in their village. Although some of them mentioned some of the factors that could impede the development of tourism, all comments were positive in nature, such as “I would fully support it and look into how we can develop this industry in our area” (P02)

Tourism development was also perceived as positive because it brought income and other benefits, as explained by this respondent:

When we look at the situation in the villages today, local residents need money to improve their living or livelihood and so tourism is a good idea. I’ve seen how other people run tourism and I think everyone should go into this business (P08).

All the respondents from Saeraghi also conveyed a positive attitude towards tourism development in their village. Though some of their reasons are similar to those of Paeloghe residents, the respondents from Saeraghi would like to see more tourism development in their village as they
consider that it advances the village. Responses such as the following below illustrate this perception:

“I would like to support tourism in my village because when we develop tourism, we will see some improvements in the village” (S04).

As one of the respondents expressed it, tourism development will benefit even the marginalised in the community:

I support tourism because tourism can help the women, they can cook their meals for the tourists, wash their clothes or help to clean up so the women can get assistance and income from that (S03).

As previously discussed, communities are not homogenous and this was reflected in the varying responses from participants when asked about their perceptions of tourism in their village. In Titiana village, there were two opposing views about tourism development. The first group had negative attitudes towards tourism development due to concerns about overcrowding, uncertainty about the benefits of tourism and the perception that tourism could destroy traditional values. The second group had positive responses towards tourism development, specifically relating to its economic benefits and opportunities for skill transfer. The respondents from both Saeraghi and Paeloghe villages all had positive attitudes about and perceptions of tourism development. Respondents in Saeraghi village viewed tourism as positive because it was seen as a means for modernisation and had the potential to help marginalised groups in the community. Similarly, the respondents from Paeloghe also expressed positive reactions towards tourism development because tourism brings in income and provides an opportunity to improve their livelihoods. To further assess whether CBT is appropriate, the residents’ perceptions of the impact of tourism were assessed. This also helps to assess their understanding of and support for tourism as well. These are discussed in the following section.

5.8 Residents perceptions of the impact of tourism

Theorists started to focus on the socio-cultural and environmental impacts of tourism as it was realised that the advancement of tourism for economic development also brings unpleasant consequences. Since then increasing attention has been given to the reactions and responses of local residents towards the impact of tourism with the belief that understanding the people’s perceptions and responses is vital for fruitful and sustainable tourism development (Sharpley, 2014). By understanding the impact of tourism, the local residents are also able to make good decisions to minimise the negative effects so that maximum benefits are reaped.
As such, the residents of the three villages were asked to list any effects of tourism that they thought would impact on their villages. Because tourism is still at its infant stage, the emerging themes from the villages identified the economic and socio-cultural effects mostly, although there was mention of negative effects. However, the majority of the respondents emphasised the positive effects. There were only four respondents who mentioned the environmental implications of tourism.

In Titiana village all of the respondents perceived that tourism presented economic benefits for the local residents, such as:

   Well tourism has both its advantages and disadvantages. One positive impact is that the village can benefit through income generation. If the villagers agree to develop tourism this means that they agree to earn some income from the tourists’ spending in our village. This will not only help their livelihood but also develop the village as well. But they must do it so that everyone in the community gets a share of the benefits to keep everyone happy (T04).

   Tourism was perceived as bringing in employment opportunities for the marginalised groups in the village as described here:

   “Sometimes when tourists come young people and women can go and work in the tourism sector so they can earn some income” (T07).

The respondents also acknowledged the socio-cultural benefits from tourism as described by T11:

   Local communities, my community will not really understand what is tourism, sometimes they might think that we just want to bring in tourists but in my opinion if they understand tourism it will help them in many different ways such as they will be able to sell their foods, if tourists come to the village they will have enough opportunity to market their village to the tourists and when the tourists see our village they can help us in whatever needs we have in the community.

One of the respondents also commented about tourism creating economic benefits for the country and the local community:

   In terms of the economy, so that we can be developed, I mean the good thing about tourism is that it will develop our country and we can build motels, resorts and like that so that people in the village can get some opportunities to work, I mean employment. (T12)

   Tourism not only brings in wages for the local residents but it also contributes to sustainability, such as:
“In my understanding tourism development means preservation of cultures and preservation of resources in such a way that will generate income” (T03).

Despite this generally positive view of tourism from the villagers, there were some negative perceptions mentioned by few of the residents, as described here:

When I mentioned about the preservation of culture, tourism also destroys our local culture. The dress codes for instance. Tourists come with their own lifestyle especially their dressing and young people imitate and adopt such lifestyle which is inappropriate or against our local cultures (T03).

And another view from one of the informants

There are few bad things about tourism. Tourists bring in foreign diseases. Tourism destroys our local customs. The tourists have their own lifestyle and behaviours which are different to us and when young youths see these they imitate and copy these behaviours and lifestyle. For example, they wear bikinis to the beaches or they do other explicit things which are culturally inappropriate in our community and as result the youths adopt these new lifestyle or behaviours which is against our custom (T05).

The cultural impact was the most significant theme in the perceived negative effects of tourism in Titiana village:

Yes one bad thing about it is in terms of the culture. Tourists come and walk around naked which is not good with the people. The people will see them and talk about them. It is something to do with culture (T09).

The respondents from Paeloghe perceived tourism as contributing to their community and other institutions such as described by P01:

There are many benefits that come from tourism. We can receive benefits from tourism inside community, families and also there can be benefits to the Churches, Clinics and Schools. That is how I understand we can get benefits from tourism inside our communities and villages.

The main benefit of tourism perceived by the participants was economic:

The main benefit is income. Local residents will earn some income to help our livelihood maybe in the village or even in towns. Therefore I would say that the main benefit is income for the local residents and even for the government (P02).
Paeloghe already has some tourism development and facilities and the respondents’ perceptions of tourism reflected this experience. The connection tourism has with other informal economic sectors was also seen as a benefit:

There are few benefits I know. One of them is income we earn by charging them on accommodation, the activities they participate in, for example they pay the local people to put on entertainment such as traditional bamboo band, demonstration of our local cooking methods, weaving our local baskets and like that (P05).

One of the respondent’s perceptions was that tourism was not only for economic benefit. It contributes to rural community development and also exposes the community and country to the outside world, as noted by P08:

Some of the benefits I see are through; one is money, it can improve our economy. The second one is that tourism helps to advertise or sell our village to the outside world geographically we are isolated and so tourism helps to promote our area to other parts of the world where tourist come from.

In terms of the negative perceptions of tourism, similar to participants in Titiana village, participants from Paeloghe also indicated the tourist lifestyle as being offensive to local practices:

The bad side of tourism is the cultural differences between the tourists’ culture and the local residents. The tourists’ dress codes are inappropriate and disrespectful in our culture. The bikinis they wear are not accepted in our culture (P05).

And:

Well, the tourists have their own cultures and when they come and put on their bikinis or showing their body when swimming which is new for the village people and they started to make negative comments about the tourists or visitors. The other thing is that tourists are too explicit in their relationships especially with our local girls or boys which is not acceptable in our culture. Because such practices are not accepted and as you know everyone in the village are somehow related and therefore become frustrated or angry when they see tourists hanging out with local boys or girls (P02).

Another respondent feared that tourism was not good because of the demonstration effect, as alluded to by P04:

The tourists have a different culture to us. Sometimes they put on their bikinis or walking around with their half-naked body which is not acceptable in our village. This is not good for
the kids to see and sometimes they imitate the tourists. We also don’t practice this lifestyle in the village so when we see tourists dressed like this we feel embarrassed about it as well.

One of the respondents, who was involved in one of the tourism developments, perceived no negative consequences of tourism on the community:

Yes this is the fifth year I am into a tourism business and I’ve seen the benefits from tourism and even the community also benefits from tourism. I don’t think there are any bad things about tourism, I never see anything bad about tourism (P03).

The perception of tourism by the respondents from Saeraghi included providing opportunity for employment and income generation, and that tourism can help not only the individuals but the whole community, as summarised by S02:

Why I said it will benefit maybe the individual, family or community is like this. For tourists to come to our village Saeraghi, the lodge owners have loads of programme. May be at times some of the activities they do inside the area will benefit the community in a way that they will get some money. I think that’s it.

Again, tourism was perceived as providing employment and income to everyone in the community by linking with other informal sectors. As this respondent put it:

Some benefits from tourism are, when tourists come to your village you will earn money through cooking or selling of shells or any handcrafts you make. And for instance if I build a house in Saeraghi it will help the community because it’s like this, when the white man come they will want to explore the Island, I will ask anyone from the community to paddle or tour guide them around the bush and then tourists will pay them (S03).

Tourism was also perceived as one way of earning money for the village:

In my opinion tourism is like this, it is one income for the community. On our area in Saeraghi tourism is one income, when tourists come to our village they brought money to help us. So tourism is an income for our community (S07).

Similar to the other two villages, the negative perceptions of tourism were mostly about the socio-cultural impacts of tourism. Most of the respondents mentioned about differences in lifestyle, such as:
In terms of the bad side, it’s about our culture because their culture is different to the local village so when they wear their clothes it is not right in our custom. I mean in terms of our custom (S04).

Concerns about tourism practices differing from those of the community, which can be offensive to locals, was also expressed by S06, “Sometimes when they come they do not abide with the local custom in the village”.

Another respondent reinforced this,

In terms of the bad side, it is our culture. Because they are white man so when they come to swim in the water they wear their clothes (bikinis) which is good for them. But according to our custom this is not good. So this makes their appearance in the community bad (S07).

Some of the respondents from Saeraghi perceived that tourism is not bad at all except for the dress codes. Responses like this are mentioned by most of them:

In my opinion there is nothing wrong with tourism. Tourism is a good thing but it is something to do with our custom, when the tourists come they wear their own clothes or under pant, that is their own custom (S03).

Another respondent indicated that it was up to the community to manage the potentially negative impact of tourism:

“In my opinion there is nothing wrong with tourism because if we control it, how to control the guests there will be no negative impacts” (S02).

This was a sentiment also mentioned by S01, “Yes I understand that tourism has some negative impacts but it is the local people who must control the tourists or guests who come to our village”.

The study also found that there is no relationship between gender and perceived impact of tourism in any of the three villages. Although one of the respondents from Titiana mentioned that their elders do not entertain tourism:

I don’t think so because our village elders opposed tourism and discouraged its development in our village. As such I think it depends on our elders if they want to see tourism and the benefits it will bring into our village then we could develop this industry (T04).
However, the study also suggested that those who have some level of education and or had connections to the tourism industry through employment had more positive perceptions than those who had less knowledge about tourism or few associations with tourism.

Yes this is my last comment for you. Now I want to build something for tourism. I am a lady who is interested in tourism because I have seen the benefits of tourism when I worked for xxxx accommodation. I have seen how guests come and the benefits they bring to the people. So now I am living in the village and want to build small houses. I have informed by family and the chief as well. So now I am preparing my area to be cleaned up and build some small tourism for me (S01).

5.9 Chapter summary

To conclude this chapter, the tourism industry in the Solomon Islands has not yet received full recognition from the SIG. There has been very little planning, coordination, implementation and development of tourism at the national, provincial and local communities. This is due to lack of financial and human resources and other issues such as infrastructure, and because of the communities themselves. As a result of minimal government intervention, all of the tourism activities in the villages are solely operated by the local residents spontaneously. Despite the various levels and magnitude of tourism engagement by each of the communities they have a few things in common. One of them is the lack of support from the government (both national and provincial) to empower them to have the full capacity to participate in tourism. While education and awareness is absent from all the villages, there is some economic benefit from tourism, but not everyone has benefited. Few of the operators understand tourism; they learn by experience when they receive tourists. However, knowledge about tourism is very low in the community, and so is the access to tourist markets. Lack of funding is also an issue for the communities.

While there are both negative and positive attitudes towards tourism developments in Titiana village, both Paeloghe and Titiana respondents indicated only positive perceptions towards tourism development. Though all the villages acknowledged that the positive impacts of tourism are related to economic benefits, there are some pessimistic views about the socio-cultural advantages of tourism. The negative effects of tourism were mostly related to the socio-cultural values of the communities. The implications of these to the communities studied are presented in the next chapter.
Chapter 6 Discussion

The concerns about the consequences of lack of local control of tourism development in developing countries have informed developmental policies, resulting in recognition of the need to include community participation in any community development. Despite its potential to contribute to economic growth, the promotion of mass tourism through neoliberal policies also has had adverse impacts in developing countries. Developing countries have been caught in the dependency trap because they do not have the capacity to match developed countries (Telfer, 2009). Also the cross-cultural host-guest encounter through the advancement of mass tourism has resulted in detrimental impacts on the host communities’ environment and socio-cultural values and practices (deKadt, 1979; Wall & Mathieson, 2006).

In response to these concerns, CBT emerged as a development option that encourages community participation so that benefits remain within the community. CBT was developed to promote local control which was believed would lead to sustainability and self-reliance. The definition of CBT may be contentious, but common characteristics of CBT are small-scale locally owned and managed operations that aim to retain and distribute equal benefits in the community (Tolkach et al., 2013).

Community participation in the planning, development and implementation of tourism development is fundamental because it is the communities’ reactions towards tourists and tourism that determines the sustainability of tourism (Murphy, 1985). When locals participate in tourism development they have control over the issues affecting them, and the development is designed according to their wishes. CBT also encourages the equitable distribution of tourism benefits in the community. Developing countries, including Pacific Island nations, have limited knowledge for and about tourists and tourism because tourism is of Western origin, despite their involvement in some form of travel (Berno 2007). Therefore, communities must be empowered through knowledge and education to be effective and confident in their decision-making so that negative impacts are minimised and benefits accrued, leading to self-determination (Cole, 2006a; Sofield, 2003).

This study was designed to assess the appropriateness of community-based tourism as a development tool for rural communities in the Solomon Islands. The research examined the tourism policies of SIG, the socio-political organisations of the communities in the Solomon Islands, the tourist market to Gizo, the existing (and prospective) tourism developments in the villages, the local residents’ knowledge about tourism development, and the communities’ attitudes towards and perceptions of tourism development and its impacts in their community. Based on this, a model is proposed to guide the villages so that full empowerment and self-reliance can be achieved.
Tourism policy at the national and community level

The Government roles and responsibilities in tourism planning, development and implementation are crucial. As legislators, governments are in a better position to regulate and legislate tourism activities in the country so that everyone benefits (Hall, 1994; Scheyvens, 2002). In the event where the market controls the industry and government intervention is absent, sustainability is unlikely to be achieved (Brohman, 1996). The market usually focuses on profit maximisation with minimal concern given to environmental issues and other socio-cultural impacts of tourism on the local communities. Governments therefore must play a balancing-out role in setting the appropriate policies and legislation to ensure even benefit is reaped by every stakeholder (Hall, 1994).

Evidence from the results in this study found that SIG identified the tourism sector as a priority area for development; however it has played a very minimal role in the planning, development and implementation of tourism in the country. The findings also discovered that SIG has a tourism policy which has not been fully implemented, nor has it been updated. As the findings revealed, the lack of support from the national government is the major stumbling block and constraint for coordinating and implementing the policy. This result also reflected the findings of other previous studies and reports by other NGOs and aid agencies (see examples Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006; Gay, 2009; Ministry of Tourism and Culture, 2008), which have also provided recommendations for the SIG to promote tourism as a developmental mechanism for the diversification of the country’s narrow economic base.

Although the reviews of policy and other documents undertaken for this research suggested that to ensure economic, socio-cultural and environmental sustainability and decentralisation of tourism, the government should support the decentralisation of activities into the Provinces, there was sufficient evidence from the study to conclude that the SIG leans towards a laissez faire approach, leaving it to the private sector to develop tourism (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006). As discussed in the literature review, tourism development in the Solomon Islands is still at the nascent stage, therefore this sort of approach taken by the government is a symptom of dependency (see discussion in Section 2.2.4). This is not healthy for the country and in particular the local communities because if the country is trapped in such a cycle, self-reliance is difficult to achieve, as are the benefits of tourism for the locals, because the control is beyond the community’s influence (Petrevska, 2012; Telfer, 2009).

The results also revealed some implementation constraints (see the discussion in Section 3.3.8). Most of these factors inhibiting achievement and implementation are due to circumstances beyond the control of the DoT, the provincial DoT and the communities. These were discussed in the results chapter and included poor infrastructure, lack of funding, an under-resourced staff at the main
tourism Ministry and offices, and a lack of systematic communication between the different levels of
governance (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006; Govan et al., 2013).

These limitations undermined the performance of the industry and also the efforts of the officers
responsible for promoting and developing tourism in the country. Therefore, little has been done to
reach the local communities in terms of funding and tourism education and awareness. This has
resulted in difficulty in promoting tourism and in particular alternative types of tourism such as
community based tourism. In general, these issues (limitations) have been on-going and are noted in
almost all the studies on tourism development in the Solomon Islands. Despite the government’s
indication of intent to promote tourism as an economic sector for the country, the opposite has
happened in reality. The tourism sector has received very minimal recognition in view of its potential
as a developmental tool for economic diversification and opportunities to improve the livelihood of
communities.

The socio-political organisation of the communities

One of the reasons why development strategies have failed to achieve their goals was a lack of
consideration of the difference in socio-political organisation between developed and developing
countries. Development is a western ideology that has been imposed on developing communities
(Goulet, 1992; Sumner & Tribe, 2008). CBT emerged precisely to counteract such notions. However,
communities are not homogeneous and there exist various levels of power (Blackstock, 2006). Thus
to achieve full participation, such issues within the community must be understood (Tosun, 1999).

The results from the three case study villages indicated different decision making processes in each
of the villages. The consultation processes were democratic in the sense that every member of the
community was invited to attend public meetings if an issue arose that pertained to community
development. However, in Titiana, while the local residents can contribute their opinions and ideas
regarding an issue, the final decisions are collectively made by the village trustees. For the villages of
Paeloghe and Saeraghi the results suggested two means of participation in a process. In relation to
family land, only the family members concerned are able to share their views and input, but the
concluding decision is made by the head of the family, who is usually a male. If the development is on
customary owned land, all the residents are consulted for their views and opinions, but the final
decisions are made by the chiefs. This type of participation is common in developing countries
(Tosun, 1999). However, in view of the findings of this research, it is suggested that there is a need to
consider the issue of participation afresh in the light of each particular culture. While Tosun (1999)
argued that such circumstances allow for outside powers to be dominant, this case study asserts that
the Solomon Islands is a collective culture, and Solomon Islanders deem these processes of
participation in decision making as culturally appropriate. This is seen as a way of respect for the
kastom, village leaders and males in the family and community. This is the culture and how the system of governance works in the villages, and everyone is happy with it because it creates village cohesion.

Although the different villages’ involvement in tourism development varies, the level of participation in decision-making is almost the same. Residents’ perceptions of the decision-making process revealed that everyone was content with how their villages are organised in terms of making decisions for community-based initiatives. However, it is the other factors such as the land tenure system (Monson, 2011; Sofield, 2003), the kastom, and the educational level and the level of knowledge of tourism that could impede the facilitation of decisions so that tourism could be developed in a village.

Community Participation and Empowerment

Empowerment is a fundamental prerequisite to community based tourism. Acquiring full capacity to participate effectively in tourism development is crucial for the life span of community based tourism. Empowerment equips the local residents with knowledge and understanding of the impact tourism and its benefits, and thus they are able to become involved in the affairs affecting them, which leads to positive and desirable results. This leads to executing wise decisions to govern and exert control over tourism development so that benefits are distributed evenly and self-determination is achieved. When communities are empowered to participate in the decision making for and benefits of tourism, the chances of them disliking and protesting against tourism development (or prospective businesses) are low (Li, 2006). The tendency to ignore community consent and approvals on the part of tourism planners and developers can stir up anger and hatred and thus kill tourism development (Keogh, 1990).

The results of this research also suggested that there is variation between the residents’ perceptions and attitudes towards CBT in their villages; this was associated with their level of engagement in tourism development. Titiana village has not yet engaged in tourism development, except for one person who has just started to build a bungalow. With the exception of those few residents who have interacted with the very few tourists who come to surf or pass through the village in general, residents’ participation in tourism activities was very low or maybe non-existent for many of the residents in the village. This was reflected in their naiveté about tourism, which was also reflected in their attitudes and perceptions towards tourism development and its effects.

This study also found that some residents were pessimistic about tourism development because tourism offended their culture because of the way the tourists dress and present themselves in the village (Lat’kova & Vogt, 2012; Vargas_Sanchez, 2009). Moreover, there was also a lack of
awareness of the benefits of tourism. But there was also another segment in this village who were optimistic about tourism development in their village. Based on the research of Gursoy et al, (2009) and Wall and Mathieson (2006), who suggested that there can be different attitudes existing in the same destination given different situations, it is possible that those who were positive towards tourism may have engaged in e.g. surfing activities with the tourists, or may have had some connection to tourism through previous work; or as Butler (1980) proposed, their village is still at the development stage and the socio-cultural effects are not very obvious, so that the residents welcome tourism.

Both Paeloghe and Saeraghi residents have had some involvement in tourism activities; but the latter has had a longer time engaged in tourism than the former. In Paeloghe village only those people who operated tourism businesses or who acted as tour guides for the surfers were involved in tourism activities, otherwise most of the villagers were passive participants. The number of tourists visiting the village was higher than in Titiana, yet lower than a Saeraghi village. The different levels of engagement in the village is a result of the location of the business – all of the tourism businesses are located on individual/family land and not communally owned land. This means that only those families and individuals who operate tourism activities are engaged with tourism and in particular share the benefits of tourism. Perceptions of tourism vary between the active and passive participants in the village. Those who were actively involved in the benefits of tourism supported tourism, while those who were passive participants and who had less knowledge about the benefit of tourism were pessimistic about it (Vargas_Sanchez, 2009).

For Saeraghi villagers, the level of engagement in tourism activities is spread across the village. Although the tourism businesses are located on individual and family land, other residents participate by providing food, crafts, tour guiding and entertainment for tourists. This is different from the other two villages, because Saeraghi became involved in tourism a bit earlier. As such, it is likely that although their knowledge of tourism may still be low, the length of time involved could have contributed to their support for tourism. This result is consistent with a study by Lat’kova & Vogt (2012) that subject knowledge does not contribute to residents’ reactions to tourism development, and also it agrees with Doxey (1975) because the village is still in euphoria stage and therefore tends to be more positive about tourism development.

One other factor that could contribute to residents’ reactions to tourism development is community satisfaction; this could come through personal benefit acquired from tourism development (Ko & Stewart, 2002; Lat'kova & Vogt, 2012). Genuine CBT must be locally owned, managed and controlled so that the benefits are retained in the community; and adding to that, the beneficiaries must include both active and passive participants of the community (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013).
Although the respondents from Titiana village perceived economic and social gains from tourism, the results suggested that they have mixed feelings about tourism development in their village. This supports Ko and Stewart’s (2002) findings that personal benefits are related to residents’ reactions. As such, it is possible that such reactions from the residents could be linked to the history of the village and how the land was acquired. Therefore some of the respondents may not see tourism as development (outcome), but rather as a process to achieve community development (Goulet, 1992; Sharpley, 2002).

The results from the study also suggest that residents from Paeloghe and Saeraghi generate some form of income from tourism and that they receive other benefits such as contributions to schools and churches in their villages (although these were not that significant). This could explain why the residents support tourism development in their village.

The development of tourism in an area can have negative and positive effects, which come in the economic, socio-cultural and environmental areas (Andereck et al., 2005; Ribeiro et al., 2013). Residents’ reactions towards these impacts can affect the success of any tourism development. As such, residents’ attitudes and perceptions towards these effects are important for tourism planners and policy makers when considering how to further develop existing tourism initiatives or prior to developing tourism (Türker & Asst Sevgi, 2013). The most cited economic benefits tourism can bring to communities are income and employment opportunities. Tourism can also contribute to economic diversification and increase the standard of living in the community (Andereck et al., 2005). While most people are positive towards the economic benefits, the socio-cultural effects of tourism can also bring in undesirable results. The sociocultural advantages include cultural and historical entertainment and exhibits, promoting cultural activities and heritage, fostering new networks and relationship, revitalising cultures and exposing the community to other cultures (Besculides et al., 2002). The negative side of tourism can include the demonstration effect, increases in crime, a decline in traditional values and traditions, alcohol and drug use, and acculturation (Wall & Mathieson, 2006).

For this study, residents’ perceptions of the economic impact of tourism indicated strong and positive reactions as they see the creation of employment and income. Even for Titiana respondents the projected economic benefits were perceived to be income and employment. Although there has been some surfing in their area, the respondents were not aware of any income being generated through this activity in their village. The results showed that those who perceived the economic importance but did not support tourism were older people who have attachment to their land but have little knowledge of the benefit of tourism. Previous studies have shown that local residents who are attached to the community can have either positive or negative perceptions towards tourist and
tourism (Mason & Cheyne, 2000). Such reactions can happen when tourism development is still at the early stage, as most of the residents are still not aware of the negative and positive impacts of tourism (Butler, 1980).

For Paeloghe and Saeraghi the income and employment from tourism was gained through the homestays, tour guiding, sales of carving and other local crafts and cooking of food (local produce), although the last three activities were not yet available in Paeloghe. There were more tourism opportunities in Saeraghi than Paeloghe because the former received more tourists and had engaged in tourism longer than Paeloghe. However, the income earned from tourism was minimal and irregular as tourist arrivals to these villages are very low. By looking at these economic effects, it was anticipated that both Paeloghe and Saeraghi villages would have had a strong and optimistic view of tourism development because they had actually witnessed the benefits as compared to Titiana village, which had not yet seen the return. This was supported, as the results found that the two villages which had participated in tourism and seen the positive benefits supported tourism development, while those who had not benefited were pessimistic about tourism development.

In Titiana village the perceived negative socio-cultural impacts of tourism were mainly about the local culture. Most of the respondents mentioned that tourism would bring in scantily clad tourists. This is offensive to the local cultures.

For Paeloghe tourism was positively perceived as a way of exposing their village to the outside world, although tourist behaviour which contravened local culture and the tourists’ attire were associated negative perceptions of tourism. For Saeraghi village tourism is seen as a way of promoting local cultures and lifestyles, but there too the attire of the tourists caused some concern. The perceived potential for economic benefits contributed to positive support for tourism development. Paeloghe and Saeraghi villagers are still in the euphoria stage and tourist numbers are still very small. It is likely however that negative reactions will arise when the tolerance level has been exceeded; at this stage it has not yet been reached for these two villages (Wall & Mathieson, 2006).

Out of all respondents only one resident from Titiana perceived tourism as contributing to the conservation of the environment; otherwise there were no other comments on the perceived environmental impacts. This reflects the participants’ level of education.

The villages have just recently become involved in tourism and there has been minimal or no organised training and awareness provided to the villages about the benefits and impacts of tourism. The results from the interviews suggest that there were some respondents who have a realistic understanding of tourism. Thus, although the respondents mentioned the negative consequences of tourism, particularly about the offending of culture through the tourists’ attire, there were a few
respondents who acknowledged that if the leaders of the village have some codes of conduct or rules for the tourists when they enter the village there should not be any problems and so the village could only benefit from tourism.

Overall, tourism planning and development in the country is controlled from a top-down approach by the national government (SIG, 2010b). The above findings indicated that despite the government’s inaction, poor planning and lack of implementation and development of tourism in communities, the rural villages still can successfully develop tourism independently. As the results reveal, the three villages had already engaged in community based tourism. The existing tourism ventures are locally owned and managed by some residents of the communities, which portrays the characteristics of CBT (Giampiccoli & Nauright, 2010). However even though the three villages have shown their engagement in CBT, community participation is still low, with only few people benefitting. The reasons for such limitations include lack of necessary knowledge, lack of access to information on the tourism market, lack of financial resources, and the ‘communities’ themselves.

The communities have demonstrated positive attitudes and perceptions to support CBT, but they have limited capacity to fully participate in tourism development. The results shows that there is lack of empowerment from both the national and provincial governments. This is a barrier to effective participation in the decisions and benefits of tourism, and as the results have confirmed, the few attempts made to develop CBT have had a very short life-span. If the communities are empowered, they will make wise decisions to mitigate the negative impacts of tourism and control tourism development, and therefore be self-reliant (Scheyvens, 2002).

Tourism is a growing industry and although tourist arrivals to the Pacific region account for only a small percentage of global arrivals (UNWTO, 2014) it is still significant enough to have become a backbone sector for the countries (Berno 2007). Since the history of the Solomon Islands tourism industry suggested that tourism in the country is tied to niche markets (Panakera, 2007), it is suggested that such trends will continue. Due to the geographical location of the country and poor connections between the islands, mass tourism is unlikely, but this study has confirmed that CBT is a very good option. The results have also indicated that apart from diving being the prime reason for visiting, tourists are enticed by the local culture and hospitality of Solomon Islanders (SPTO, 2014a). The study’s survey on the tourist market to Gizo also found that the second most preferred accommodation is village stay; and while holiday makers topped the group visiting Gizo Island, about 30% visit Gizo for cultural experiences. The results also found that visitors to Gizo want to see more activities related to cultural lifestyles and practices promoted. Thus, these results support a tourist market that is parallel to one of the aims of CBT. CBT must be developed in line with local cultures and practices (Tolkach et al., 2013). Following these positive results, a model to build community
capacity for the community to participate effectively and achieve sustainable CBT is proposed in the next section.

6.1 A proposed community based tourism model for the Solomon Islands

The above results suggest that the communities have already engaged in community based tourism, but they require support to address how to be fully empowered to achieve sustainability and self-reliance. Therefore, a proposed framework to assist the communities to achieve a sustainable CBT that could increase their livelihood opportunities and self-determination is provided below (Figure 6.1).
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Figure 6.1: proposed model for CBT development for the rural villages.

The above model is proposed as a guide for the villages to achieve economic, socio-cultural and environmental sustainability and self-reliance. The assumption is that the integration of each group
indicated in the above figure will fully empower the community to participate effectively. Through empowerment, the communities can make wise decisions to mitigate the negative impacts of tourism and have control over tourism in their villages, thereby maintaining tourism benefits for the community.

Figure six proposes different relationships and community needs that are necessary for the existing ventures (and any prospective CBT projects) to be successful. The arrows joining the outside lines indicate the community relationship with external actors. The inner variables at the bottom of the diagram are the internal actors. The three variables in the middle of the diagram are the community assessment needs which require assistance from other stakeholders. The different variables and relationships are explained below.

**Community based tourism projects (variable 1):** These are the main tourism ventures in the villages. These include the homestays, guest houses, secluded beaches, and can also include any prospective tourism businesses. They can be owned by individuals, families, tribes or the community. For the community to have control over tourism development in their community, these enterprises must be small scale, locally owned and managed ventures.

**Community assessment needs (Variables 5, 6, 7):** These are lacking, and thus are needed by the local residents to be fully empowered to participate effectively and achieve self-reliance.

**Education (Variable 6)**

The most fundamental issue for the community is education and awareness of tourism. Education for the local communities should be given on both content and delivery. In addition, education should be for and about tourism (Berno 2007). Communities cannot participate effectively in tourism development if the understanding of tourism is lacking. However, educating the local communities should be conducted from an emic (inside) perspective, given the different social-political organisation and cultural practices of the villages. The conceptualisation and understanding of tourism by South Pacific countries (including the Solomon Islands) is different from the commonly accepted definition of tourism from a western model. Therefore, education of the local residents must use the local understanding of tourism and hospitality as the foundation (Berno, 1999; 2007). Berno further added that education for collective cultures such as Solomon Islands should not only teach the local residents how to work in the tourism industry but also how to manage their own business. However, the elements of entrepreneurship in the Pacific context are different from a western model, and thus such training should consider how to integrate the business and cultural
environment. For example, in these three villages training should be designed to include how CBT can be operated alongside the wantok system\textsuperscript{14} so that sustainability of CBT is achieved.

The method of delivery is also a paramount concern. Most villages in the Solomon Islands have low levels of literacy (see literature review), therefore it is suggested that the language of delivery should be Pidgin. Only then can the local residents understand the content of the training and awareness programmes. It is also crucial that education facilitators understand who should be their participants for the training and workshop. For example in some cases, when men and women attend the same training and workshop the women feel scared to ask questions or discuss openly. Likewise, residents who have very low education levels or are not involved in tourism at all tend to be quiet if they attend training and workshops with educated groups or those already involved in the tourism industry. These issues must be considered if educating the local residents is to achieve the goal of educating the locals to understand the effects and benefits of tourism.

**Funding (Variable 5)**

Community based tourism in the villages has emerged organically, created by the individuals and villages involved. It has not been an easy process for operators and one of the inhibitors for sustainable development of CBT in the villages is a lack of capital. It is apparent from the research findings that the government has very little input to support these villages in terms of finance and other resources. This is not only expressed by the local residents but also by officials from DoT:

> Other things is getting access to funds especially for people in the rural areas. To start businesses or to improve the business or even to employ people, that is a constraint. The Ministry has a funding scheme where we give a little bit of money to people especially in the rural areas and people here in Honiara. But that it is not enough, everybody wants a piece of the pie so it’s often difficult (G01).

There was a little financial support for local tourism operators in Gizo town (but not in the villages), as mentioned by an operator:

> “Yes I did receive assistance twice from the Ministry of Tourism but money is very small and just enough for maintenance, very small funding” (GT03).

\textsuperscript{14} The wantok system comes from the Pijin term for 'one talk'. This implies coming from the same language. The wantok system is when preferences are given to extended family members with obligations for future reciprocal benefits.
As a result, even though the villages have the natural, cultural and historical attractions to entice tourists, the local residents are constrained by capital from engaging in tourism development. Due to the communities’ reliance on a subsistence economy, the ability to accumulate cash is challenging. As a result, it is suggested that the government needs to intervene and regulate institutional policies which allow local communities to have access to funds so that they can develop tourism. These could be in the form of small micro scheme loans for tourism development in the rural communities. Funding can also be sourced from NGOs who support ecological conservation.

**Access to tourist markets (Variable 7)**

Accessing tourist information is essential to attract a tourist market. The peripheral location of the three villages mean that they are currently reliant on tourists from Gizo town, and the results suggest that the communities have very little understanding of or knowledge of tourist markets. The findings from the study indicated that SIVB as statutory body is responsible for destination marketing and product promotion of the country (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2006; Gay, 2009). However, there has been very minimal contribution from SIVB to the local villages, and this is merely advertising the tourism product (accommodation type) and nothing more than that. The local residents do not have the capacity and resources to market their attractions and thus rely on spontaneous visitors. This could lead to unsuccessful businesses due to failure to attract adequate visitors to sustain the community based tourism projects (Giampiccoli & Kalis, 2012). More resources and effort is needed for these villages to be able to have access to tourist markets.

**External stakeholders and the community based tourism ventures (Variables 2 and 3)**

To address the communities’ limited knowledge and resources to start up community based tourism independently, one suggestion is to create a network in collaboration with outside stakeholders. As discussed in the literature review (Section 2.4.2 and 2.4.3), it is not unusual for communities to develop tourism autonomously; but support and guidance from outside actors are needed to achieve empowerment and participation if sustainability and self-determination is to be attained. It is proposed that these three villages should work in partnership with SIG (Ministry of Tourism and provincial Department of Tourism), NGOs and aid agencies, and tourism operators in Gizo town. As discussed by Mtapuri & Giampicoli (2013), external stakeholders should only intervene as facilitators and not be in partnership or have any ownership of the development. In this model, the external stakeholders should be facilitating key areas of concern (education / awareness, funding and access to tourist markets) for the community to achieve full empowerment and self-determination.

Local communities through the DoT liaise with the government to communicate with aid donors to provide for public infrastructure and facilities such as roads, water and proper sanitation for the
villages. Since the government does not have enough funding and human resources to provide tourism awareness and education, local communities should link up with NGOs to address these needs. However, it is important that NGOs consider holistic ways of providing effective education (as discussed above in variable 6).

NGOs can also act as mentors, but a fundamental aspect is the need to understand the socio-political and cultural organisation of the villages. Training must be conducted from a cultural perspective rather than a western model. Linking with NGOs is another way communities can gain access to tourist markets. The connection with the tourism operators in Gizo is to acquire some share of those tourist markets. There should be some stipulations for these town operators when taking their guests to the villages, such as payment of a small fee to contribute to the community. Since tourists to these villages are sporadic, the communities should link with NGOs that are located in Gizo for conservation of their natural resources and to access some tourist markets.

Internal network and linkages (Variable 8)

These are local residents in the villages who are not directly involved in the tourism business. To spread the benefits of tourism across the village, those individuals and families who have tourism businesses must communicate with other community members to get them to provide other products and services for tourists. This is also good to encourage and promote locally produced goods and services and therefore discourage leakages (Trejos, Hung, & Chiang, 2009). Since the communities rely on subsistence agriculture and fishing, yet have diverse natural and cultural attractions (see literature review), such arrangements can spread the benefits of tourism for everyone in the village. Therefore a women’s group can be formed to do the laundry for guests or cooking traditional food for guests. The men’s group can provide seafood. Youths can provide cultural dances and entertainment. Local carvers can sell their carvings, while women can also sell their hand-made crafts. The old people can be organised for folk tales and to showcase other cultural rituals. Since one of the goals of CBT is to include both active and passive participants as beneficiaries (Moscardo, 2008), it is suggested that a small percentage of the earnings from these networking of tourism operations and the linkages to be given back to the community (variable 9).

Community (Variable 9)

Communities are complex and made up of various factions, and they have a political hierarchy (Blackstock, 2006; Scheyvens, 2002). The communities in the three villages (Solomon Islands) are made up of various tribes and families (see literature review), and therefore to avoid unequal distribution of benefits, divisions and domination by certain factions (Trejos et al., 2009), quality leaders are fundamental. The community must appoint trusted leaders who can make appropriate
decisions and be able to manage the funds which come from the tourism operations in the village, operators in Gizo or donations from tourists. It is suggested to have a group of local residents consisting of males and females (but representative of families and tribes) to look after these funds and utilise them only when appropriate. Transparency must be maintained. For instance, the money can be used on special occasions such as Easter celebrations, Christmas and New Year’s celebrations. The money can also contribute to pay for materials to build churches, schools etc. It is suggested that all these variables must be integrated to comprise and appreciate the local cultures and the socio-political structures of the communities. It is only then that CBT can be sustainable and contribute positively to the livelihood and well-being of the communities.

This model presented in Figure 6.1 was based on the outcomes of the research undertaken and has been proposed for these three studied villages as guidance for the community to develop CBT to improve their well-being and livelihood. Western Province, in particular Gizo Island, is leading the country in tourism development thus the assumption is that it could be applicable for other villages. However, the Solomon Islands is made up of more than 930 islands with varying socio-political structures, cultures, people and landscape. Therefore, the model is flexible to adjust to the structures found in other islands where necessary.
Chapter 7 Conclusion and Future research

Conclusion

Tourism is now a leading industry, one of the world’s largest. Tourism’s significant contribution to the macro and micro levels is no doubt why countries, including those in developing world, acknowledge and support tourism in their development policies. A Western phenomenon, tourism has now expanded to reach even to the most remote communities in developing countries. An economic rationale has been the most fundamental reason for promoting tourism; however narrow-based economies are also attracted to tourism for economic diversification. The sociocultural and environmental benefits from tourism include improving the community’s standard of living, rejuvenating local cultures and ecological preservation.

Despite its economic potential as the main driving factor for encouraging tourism, its Western-centric nature can also breed undesirable economic, sociocultural and environmental repercussions for developing countries. The development of tourism brings forth the much needed foreign exchange for the poor countries, but the tourism literature maintains that there are associated negative impacts (Wall & Mathieson, 2006). The effects induced by tourism can be direct or indirect, resulting from the differences between developed and developing countries. These factors are external and internal to each country (Hall & Brown, 2008).

There are many factors which influence the unpleasant issues relating to tourism development in developing countries under neoliberal policies. One of the most obvious reason is associated with the economic characteristics of developing countries. Most developing countries have very limited financial resources and rely on others to develop tourism. When this happens, there is a strong outside influence which often results in financial leakages. Leaks can be through profits or expatriate salaries being repatriated to developed countries (Hall & Lew, 2009; Scheyvens & Russell, 2009). Additionally, the host community’s inadequate knowledge of the Western concept of tourism is a problem. The conceptualisation of tourists and tourism from a developing country perspective is not necessarily the same as developed countries (Berno, 1999). The absence of knowledge of and skills for tourism and its impact has led to poorly informed decisions about tourism development in communities, often resulting in developments which are beyond the community’s control.

Inviting multinational corporations from developed countries to invest in tourism in developing countries has also provoked criticism. Some authors have argued that developed countries have used tourism to exploit developing countries, thus the latter are trapped in a situation where they rely on developed countries. Such relationships discourage developing countries from being self-
reliant (Telfer, 2009). Although tourism is regarded as a way to achieve Western modernisation, the participation of developing countries in tourism development that is not within their control can lead to sociocultural and environmental degradation. There is concern that the host-tourist encounter results in cultural conflicts in which developing countries often become the victims of cultural erosion. Such cross-cultural interactions can be positive, but in many cases they interrupt the values, attitudes and traditional practices and cultures of host cultures (deKadt, 1979). Additionally, the focus on tourism as an economic developmental strategy tends to be more business-oriented, resulting in sustainability being a lesser priority. Sustainability should not be viewed in terms of the environment only however, it should be holistic and include the economic, social and cultural practices of the host community. Sustainable development should be balanced so that the environment, host community and the tourists gain equal benefits from tourism development (Telfer, 2009).

The ineffectiveness of development policy which excludes community participation has been realised, and therefore a new development strategy has been employed in an attempt to pursue the most appropriate and fitting approach that is ‘community’ centred, so that they have control over development and maintain the benefit. As such, a new approach to tourism development, which uses CBT as an alternative form of tourism development, has eventuated. CBT is usually small locally owned enterprises which aspire to put ‘community’ at the forefront of development. Central to the notion of CBT is that when communities are engaged in the affairs of their locality undesirable impacts are minimised, because they know what suits them best. This approach is based on the principle that local control through participation in local decision making and empowerment is a fundamental prerequisite to a sustainable and fair distribution of benefits.

Using both quantitative and qualitative methods, the aim of this study was to examine community based tourism as a potential development strategy for rural communities in the Solomon Islands. The goals were to examine the Solomon Islands tourism policies at the national, provincial and local levels; to assess the existing and potential tourism development in the rural villages; to assess the local communities’ knowledge and skills for tourism development and promotion; to examine the type of tourism development (if any) the local residents want to see in their community; to understand the socio-political structure of the communities, and to identify the types of tourists going to Gizo and what activities they would like to experience.

The research used a case study approach which involved three peripheral villages (Titiana, Paeloghe and Saeraghi) on Gizo. Findings from the research revealed that community based tourism has grown organically from within the villages in the absence of support from the national and provincial governments. At the moment tourists are sporadic and the communities have little knowledge about
tourism and its impacts on the community. Even though the tourism businesses in the villages are locally controlled, the local communities lack knowledge for and about tourism. Apart from the ‘land’ as a collective resource, the communities also had no information about the tourist market to their village. Although the communities have a product to market (the natural, historical and cultural attractions for tourists), capital to invest in tourism development is inadequate to proceed. All these factors are impediments for the community to participate effectively in tourism development. As such a proposed community based tourism model was provided to address these barriers.

The results from the research have found that the SIG has indicated tourism as a priority sector in their NDP; however depending on the government of the day, the planning, development and implementation of this sector in the rural communities has not been recognised. Due to the country’s isolation from the rest of the world, mass tourism will not be an appropriate option for the country. This is taking into consideration other factors which hinder mass tourism such as the poor infrastructure which connects the islands. However the geographical isolation of the country, together with the natural, historical and cultural attractions are themselves fitting for CBT. This is because CBT usually attracts a small niche market who are interested in the local cultures and lifestyles. As the study found, despite the government’s attitude to develop tourism into the villages, CBT has already been the preferred option by the rural communities. In support of the three communities, it is also suggested that this is appropriate because the Solomon Islands is a collective culture where land is communally and customary-owned. This in itself has already an advantage for CBT because it emphasises local control and the desirability of benefits remaining in the community. However, if SIG is to promote tourism as a development sector, the empowerment (as in the proposed model) of the local community should be of fundamental concern in the national development policy, as this is the most needed area for the community to be able to develop CBT. Furthermore, the results from the visitor survey also highlighted that there is a market for CBT as the tourists wanted more culturally related activities to be promoted in Gizo.

To conclude, as the results from the study have highlighted, development should be defined and shaped from within a cultural context. Community based tourism involves local communities, and every community has their own socio-cultural and political characteristics which vary widely. As the proposed model suggests, if communities are to be empowered to full capacity so that they are able to control and maintain tourism development, the socio-political organisation and cultural practices of these villages must be considered. The cultural values and practices must be appreciated and integrated into the broader process of empowerment for changes to occur in the villages. Otherwise, the CBT will become unrealistic for the communities and will not be effective, and will end up being just another development policy built on empty rhetoric.
Future research

Tourism is still at the early stages of development in the Solomon Islands and there has been limited literature on tourism as a development tool in the country. Based on previous research undertaken on community based tourism in other islands, fundamental to understanding its successful and sustainable implementation is an appreciation of the diversity of the country and of each island; they vary according to the landscape, people, cultures, language and land tenure system. As there has been very little research undertaken in tourism development in the Solomon Islands, particularly as it relates to community-based tourism, this study is the first of its kind to be done in these three rural villages. As such, a few points are worth considering for future research. As the findings indicated that a lack of knowledge about tourism is common across all the villages, further research on the most effective means of educating the local residents is suggested.

Secondly, community based tourism in these three villages is growing slowly from within the villages. Therefore, to ensure these developments are sustainable and expand to provide maximum benefits to all the residents in the village, further research should be done on the role of customary-owned land and benefit distribution. Basically, most of the land studied is owned by tribes and family units, and thus research into how community based tourism developments under such collectively owned resources can be fair and can benefit everyone is fundamental. Understanding and appreciating traditional social structures as part of any development initiative is vital. It is when traditional social structures are destabilised that divisions between local residents occur. This has the potential to undermine the growth of tourism in the villages.

Finally, there should be some research undertaken on domestic tourism in the Solomon Islands and the local residents who travelled to these villages for day trips and recreation. This area is neglected by those offices responsible for tourism in the country, despite the fact that these domestic tourists also contributed enormously to the local communities. According to the author’s observations, their economic contribution to these villages (if proper data is recorded) is quite large, and it is potentially more significant than international tourists as they frequent these villages more than international visitors.

It is suggested that these three areas are fundamental for the development and sustainability of CBT in these three villages (or any rural villages in the Solomon Islands). As the results from the study indicate, although the SIG has identified tourism as a priority area in the NDP (SIG, 2010b), there were challenges to full development and implementation of tourism in the rural communities. Thus, apart from the government’s attitude towards this sector, there are other factors. The complexity of the communities is another barrier to development. Because of the geographical location of the country and the poor infrastructure to entice international tourists to these villages, addressing these
three points raised above is recommended as the ‘fuel’ to the life-span of CBT in the rural villages. Since more than 80% Solomon Islanders live in the rural areas with a low literacy level (refer to literature review), educating the local residents to understand the benefits and impact of tourism so that they make informed decisions on CBT is paramount.

Moreover, the Solomon Islands is a collective culture and ‘land’ has a cultural significance to the community. As such, it is important to integrate an understanding of the socio-political and cultural organisation of the community into the process of broader development. Lastly, for CBT to grow it needs a tourist market (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013) however as previously mentioned, the rural villages rely only on visitors from Gizo. Due to other factors which act as barriers to get into the country (and to the rural villages) it is vital to understand the domestic market and their needs. This market is important to sustain the CBT when international tourists are low. Only then can CBT become ‘successful’ as a process (means) of development for the villages, though the author is pessimistic about the possibility of achieving self-reliance.
Appendix A:
Interview Guideline

Examples of the types of questions that I will ask the potential respondents for the research.

(A) Government Officers
1. In your opinion, do you think tourism has the potential to become an economic sector for the country?

Prompts
- Why?
- How?
- What is/ are the opportunities available for tourism development in the country?
- What are some constraints that will obstruct such opportunities?

2. Can you explain the government’s national policy towards tourism development in the country?

Prompts
- How effective is/are the policy/policies towards planning and developing tourism in the country?
- How do you implement these policies to the rural communities in the Provinces?
- How does it contribute to tourism development in the rural villages?
- How does it contribute to rural development in the country?

1. Can you list some tourism development strategies (if there is any) for the country?

Prompts
- How are these strategies developed to promote tourism in the rural areas?
- What are some constraints to developing these strategies?

2. What are the marketing strategies for the country?

Prompts
- How do you promote the country to tourists?
- Why use this promotion technique?
- Who is responsible to market and promote the country?
- What are some constraints/ issues to marketing/promoting the country?
- How can these constraints/issues problems be mitigated?

3. Can you describe the government’s policy towards tourism development and the main infrastructures of the country?

Prompts
- How does this contribute to tourism development in the country?
• Can you describe the state of the infrastructure in the country?
• Why do you think it is like this?
• How can we improve these infrastructures?
• What are the constraints/issues?
• How can we improve/rectify these infrastructures/issues

(B) Provincial Officer

Question 1: What is the role of your office in regard to tourism development in the Province?

Prompts
• Aside from the national tourism policy, does the Western Province have their own policies for tourism development in this area?
• Why?
• How do you implement tourism development in the rural villages?

Question 2. What are some issues that prevent you (office) to perform your tasks in developing tourism in this area?
• How do you think it hinders tourism development in the Province/ rural villages?
• And for the rural villages?
• What do you think can be done so that these issues are rectified in order for tourism to be developed in this Province/ rural villages?

Question 3. How do you promote tourism development in the Province?

Prompts
• Where do you get the funding?
• Who is responsible to promote tourism development for the Province/ local villages?
• What are some limitations?
• How can these limitations be rectified?

Question 4. What are some tourism development opportunities in this area?

Prompts
• How do you promote them?
• How do the local villages get involved?
• How do the local residents get the benefits?
• What are some limitations?

Question 5. List the main tourism activities in this area?

Prompts
• How does the Provincial government involved in the planning and development of these activities?
• How do the local villages involved?
• What are some problems/ issues that deters the Provincial Government from involving in planning and developing these activities?

(C) Tourism Operators

Question 1: What type of tourism business do you operate?
Prompts
- When was it established?
- Who owns this business?
- Where do you get the funding to start the business?
- Who manages the business?
- How many staff do you employ?
- How many of the staff are expatriates and how many are locals?
- How many of your employers are family members?

Question 2. Do you receive any support from the National/Provincial government?
Prompts
- If yes, can you list them?
- If not, why?

Question 3. Where do you get all your supplies for your business?
Prompts
- Overseas/ Honiara/locals from Gizo why?
- Any reasons/problems for not sourcing the local markets?

Question 4. Who are your main customers?
Prompts
- How many visitors do you get a week/month/year?
- What percentage makes up the domestic/international tourists?
- Where do most of your visitors/tourists do come from?
- What type of tourists do you get? (business, divers, students)
- What different age groups?
- What month/s is your peak period?
- What month/s is your off peak season?
- Do your customers travel as individuals or groups?
- Do you have any repeat customers? Why/why not?
- How long do they stay on Gizo?

Question 4. What type of tourism facility/activity do you offer to tourists?
Prompts
- Apart from this main facility/activity, do you offer other activities?
- Why?
- Do tourists participate in these activities?
- Why?
Question 5. In your opinion, do you think your customers/visitors are satisfied with the tourism facilities and activities on Gizo Island?

Prompts
- What are the reasons?
- How can this be rectified?

(D) Local Residents
1) In your opinion, what is tourism development?
- What are the benefits?
- How will it help the local residents/community?
- What are the disadvantages?

2) Can you describe any tourism development in your village?
- How do you feel about it?
- Why?

3) How often do you see visitors/tourists come to your village?
- What do they do in the village?
- What days do they come to the village?
- How do they get to the village? (car/boat)
- How long do they stay in your village? (hours/overnight/days/weeks)
- Who accompanied them to the village?
- Do they travel as individuals/groups and why?

4) Why do you think tourists come to your village?
- How do they know about your village?
- What are some cultural attractions in your village?
- Can you list some historical places in your village?
- How much do tourists pay to visit these places?
- Who gets the payment/money?

5) Can you list any tourism project/business existing in your village?
- Who manages/operate them? (individual/family/community)
- Why individual/family/community?

6) In your opinion, what is the potential for tourism in your village?
- What attraction is unique to this village?
- What activities (natural and cultural) can you sell to tourists?
- How can you sell them to visitors/tourists?
- How will you promote these activities?

7) What is your view about tourism development in your village?
- How will it impact the village?
- Is it good/bad and why?
8) In your opinion, what type of tourism development do you want to see in your village?
   - Why?

9) Will you support any tourism development in your village?
   - How/why?

10) Can you describe the political structure of the village?
    - How do you become a member of a tribe/clan/family? (inheritance/marriage)
    - How do you become a member of any group in the village? (youth/women/men)

11) Can you describe the rights to land ownership/access in your tribe/family?
    - Who is the head of the tribe/family?
    - How do they have rights/power over the land/resources?
    - How do other members have rights/power over the land/resources?

12) How do you inherit land/resources?
    - How does this impact on community development?
    - What is your thought? (good/bad)

13) Who controls the land/access for development?
    - For the tribe?
    - For the family?

14) Can you describe the different leadership roles in the village?
    - The head of the tribe/clan/family/other groups?
    - How influential are these leaders/head of the groups?

15) In terms of community development, who has the power to make decisions?
    - How do they make these decisions?
    - How do they consult other members of the tribe/family?
    - Where do you have the consultation meetings?
    - Who is qualified to join these meetings?
    - Why?

16) How do the residents contribute their views/opinions on community development/resources to the head of the village/clan/family?
    - How about youths/women?
    - How about other church/social groups in the village?

17) How does this system of resource ownership/decision making contribute to the general development of your village?
    - Is it good/bad for community development in the village?
    - Why?
Thank you for participating in this survey. It should take about thirty minutes of your time. The results will help me to complete my thesis towards my Master of Tourism Management.

ID: TOU01
1. Gender: Male □ Female □ please tick
2. Age group: please circle
   a) 18-24 years
   b) 25-31 years
   c) 32-38 years
   d) 39-45 years
   e) 46-51 years
   f) 52 or more

3. Marital Status: Please circle
   a) Single
   b) Married
   c) De factor
   d) Separated/Divorce
   e) other

4. What is your nationality? Please circle
   a) Australian
   b) New Zealander
   c) British
   d) American
   e) European (please specify)
   f) Pacific Islander (please specify)
   g) Other (please specify)

5. Where is your country of residency? Please circle
   a) Australia
   b) New Zealand
   c) United States of America
   d) Europe (please specify)
   e) Pacific Islands (please specify)
   f) Other (please specify)

6. What is the date of your arrival in Gizo?...........................

7. How many days do you intend to stay on Gizo Island? Please circle
   a) 1 day
   b) Between 2-4 days
   c) Between 5-6 days
   d) 7 days
   e) 8-14 days
f) 30 days (1 month)
g) 1 month or longer

8. How many times have you been to Gizo Island? Please circle
   a) This is my first time
   b) Two times
   c) Three times
   d) Four times or more

9. How many people travelled together (accompany) with you on this trip to Gizo? Please circle
   a) Myself (please go to question 11)
   b) With others (please go to question 10)

10. Please indicate your travel group? Please circle the ONE that best represents your group.
    a) Couple
    b) Friends
    c) Family
    d) Business Partners
    e) Dive Group
    f) School group
    g) Religious Group
    h) Other

11. Where do you live on Gizo Island? Please circle
    a) Hotel
    b) Motel
    c) Guest house
    d) Rest house
    e) Backpacker
    f) Village stay
    g) Yacht/boat
    h) With friends and relatives
    i) Other, please specify

12. While on holiday on Gizo where do you mainly have your meals? (Please select ONE)
    a) Hotel
    b) Restaurant
    c) Food from Gizo Market (local vendors)
    d) From friends and family
    e) Other, please specify

13. What is your main purpose for visiting Gizo Island? Please circle the ONE main reason
    a) Holiday/ Vacation
    b) Sight seeing
    c) Visiting Friends/ Relatives
d) Recreation

e) Diving

f) Surfing

g) Business trip

h) Experience other cultures

i) To visit the local villages

j) Other (please specify)

14. What are **other reasons** for visiting Gizo Island? Please circle as many as applicable

a) Holiday/ Vacation

b) Sight seeing

c) Visiting Friends/ Relatives

d) Recreation

e) Diving

f) Surfing

g) Fishing

h) Business trip

i) Experience other cultures

j) To visit the local villages

k) Other, please specify

15. If you travel to Gizo Island to experience other cultures, please answer the question below otherwise go to Q9. Please circle as many as apply

a) To meet and interact with local residents

b) To experience the local food

c) To learn and understand the indigenous culture (live in the village with locals)

d) To experience local cultural events such as festivals, singing, dancing

e) To visit cultural/taboo sites

f) Other reasons (please specify)

16. Which of these local villages have you visited while on Gizo Island?

a) New Mandra

b) Titiana

c) Paeloghe
d) Vorivori  
  e) Saeraghi  
  f) None of the above

17. Which of the following activities have you participate in while visiting Gizo Island?  
Please circle as many as apply  
  a) Diving  
  b) Surfing  
  c) Snorkel  
  d) Fishing  
  e) Traditional cultural events (dances, singing)  
  f) Sight seeing  
  g) Visiting local villages  
  h) Visiting historic and taboo sites  
  i) Barbeque/ Picnic on the beaches  
  j) Other (please specify)

18. While on Gizo Island, which of the following activities would you participate in if they are offered? Please circle as many as apply.  
  a) Cultural events (festivals, dances, singing)  
  b) Local village tour/walks  
  c) Bush/nature walks  
  d) Bird watching  
  e) Handicraft demonstration  
  f) Visiting taboo/custom sites  
  g) Traditional lifestyle demonstration (gardening, coconut husking, Toddie making)  
  h) Traditional cooking demonstration  
  a) Sea weed gathering and preparation  
  b) Traditional fishing techniques demonstration  
  c) Canoeing  
  d) Other (please specify)
19. For each of the questions below, please indicate how important this was to your decision to come to Gizo Island by choosing one of the following alternatives for each question by putting a number in the box
1 = not very important 2 = slightly important 3 = neither 4 = very important 5 = extremely important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To increase my knowledge of new places</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To visit historical and cultural sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet local people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have fun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To mix with fellow tourists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To seek adventure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get away from home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To relax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be emotionally and physically refreshed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enjoy good weather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To spend time with people you care deeply about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage in sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get close to nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. How do you get your information about your trip to Gizo Island? Please circle as many as apply

a) Previous visit
b) Internet
c) Travel agent
d) Friends and relatives (word of mouth)
e) Travel guides/books
f) Solomon Islands Visitors Bureau
g) Friends from Solomon Islands
h) Other sources
i) No information
21. How do you book your accommodation on Gizo Island?
   a) Internet
   b) Travel agent
   c) Friends/relatives
   d) Solomon Islands Visitors Bureau
   e) No bookings (just walk in)
   f) Other, please specify

22. In general how much information were you able to obtain about Gizo Island?
   a) Very little
   b) Just enough
   c) Enough
   d) More than enough
   e) Not enough
   f) Don’t know

23. How do you rate your visit to Gizo Island as value for money?
   a) Very poor
   b) Poor
   c) Good
   d) Very good
   e) Extremely good

24. Would you recommend Gizo Island as a tourist destination to other people?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   c) Maybe

25. Please list (as many as possible) activities you would like this destination to provide for international tourists and visitors.

Thank you once again for your time in participating in this survey. Enjoy the rest of your holiday in Gizo!
Appendix C : Research information sheet for tourists

Lincoln University

Faculty, Department or Research Centre: Faculty of Environment, Society and Design (Department of Social Science, Parks, Recreation, Tourism and Sport).

Research Information Sheet for tourists

You are invited to participate as a subject in a project entitled; Visitor Survey

This research is a requirement to complete my Master of Tourism Management at Lincoln University, NZ. The aim of this research is to identify the different types of tourists visiting Gizo Island and what activities they would like to participate in or experience.

Your participation in this project will involve completing a self- administered questionnaire with the researcher and this should take approximately thirty minutes of your time.

By participating in the research project your name will not be identified however code names will be used to ensure your confidentiality. You may refuse to answer any questions if you wish to and you can ask the researcher to withdraw or cancel the survey if you are not comfortable.

To ensure that your identity remain anonymous all information collected will be analysed and presented as group data and this will also apply in any oral presentations, discussions and publications of the research outcomes. Your participation is voluntary and if at a later stage you wish to withdraw all your information from the research project you can contact the researcher through email Becky.Smiley@lincolnuni.ac.nz. The deadline for any information withdrawal is 30th June 2014.

The project is being carried out by:

Name of principal researcher: Rebecca Onio Smiley

Contact details: Lincoln University, P.O. Box 84, Canterbury, New Zealand

They will be pleased to discuss any concerns you have about participation in the project.

Associate Professor Tracy Berno and Dr David Fisher

Contact Details: Tracy.Berno@lincoln.ac.nz and David.Fisher@lincoln.ac.nz

The project has been reviewed and approved by the Lincoln University Human Ethics Committee.
Appendix D: Consent form for tourists

Consent Form for tourists

Name of Project: An investigation into Community Based Tourism (CBT) as a potential development strategy for rural villages in Solomon Islands; A case study of Gizo Island

I have read and understood the description of the above-named project. On this basis I agree to participate as a subject in the project, and I consent to publication of the results of the project with the understanding that anonymity will be preserved. The researcher also agree to send my original transcript should I wish to revise it. I understand also that I may at any time withdraw from the project, including withdrawal of any information I have provided by 30th June 2014.

Name: .................................................................

Signed: .................................................................

Date:....................................................................
Appendix E: Research information sheet for government officers

Lincoln University

Faculty, Department or Research Centre: Faculty of Environment, Society and Design (Department of Social Science, Parks, Recreation, Tourism and Sports)

Research Information Sheet for government officers

You are invited to participate as a subject in a project entitled “An investigation into Community Based Tourism (CBT) as a potential development strategy for rural villages in Solomon Islands; A case study of Gizo Island”

This research is part of my thesis towards the completion of my Master of Tourism Management. The aim of this research is to assess whether Community Based Tourism (CBT) is an appropriate tourism development for rural communities around Gizo Island.

Your participation in this project will involve you being interviewed by the researcher and this should take about thirty minutes of your time. The interview will be taped using a voice recording machine. If you do not wish to be recorded please let the researcher know and written notes will be taken instead.

By participating in the research project you will not be identified and your name will not be used. Instead, a code name will be used to ensure your confidentiality. You may refuse to answer any questions should you wish to. And if you are not comfortable with the questions feel free to advise the researcher to stop or cancel the interview at any time.

To ensure that your identity remains anonymous, all information collected will be analysed and presented as group data. This will also apply in any oral presentations, discussions and publications of the research outcomes. Your participation is voluntary and if at a later stage you wish to withdraw all your information from the research project, you can contact the researcher through email Becky.Smiley@lincolnuni.ac.nz. The deadline for any information withdrawal is 30th June 2014.

The project is being carried out by:

Name of principal researcher: Rebecca Onio Smiley

Contact details: Lincoln University, P.O. Box 84, Canterbury, New Zealand or Becky.Smiley@lincolnuni.ac.nz

They will be pleased to discuss any concerns you have about participation in the project.

Associate Professor Tracy Berno and Dr David Fisher

Contact Details: Tracy.Berno@lincoln.ac.nz and David.Fisher@lincoln.ac.nz

The project has been reviewed and approved by the Lincoln University Human Ethics Committee.
Appendix F: Consent form for government officers

Consent Form for Government Officers

Name of Project: An investigation into Community Based Tourism (CBT) as a potential development strategy for rural villages in Solomon Islands; A case study of Gizo Island

I have read and understood the description of the above-named project. On this basis I agree to participate as a subject in the project, and I consent to publication of the results of the project with the understanding that anonymity will be preserved.

The researcher agrees to send my original transcript should I wish to revise it and I also agree Or disagree [ ] to be recorded. [ ]

I understand also that I may at any time withdraw from the project, including withdrawal of any information I have provided by the end of June 2014.

Name: ...........................................................................................................

Signed: .................................................................................................
Appendix G: Permission letter for Western Provincial Government

Gizo Hotel  
P.O. Box 30  
Western Province

Western Provincial Government  
P.O. Box 80  
Western Province  
Date: 17th September 2013

TO: WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Dear Sir/ Madam  
Re: Permission to conduct research on Gizo Island.

My name is Rebecca Onio Smiley and am currently studying towards my Master of Tourism at Lincoln University, New Zealand. I am in Gizo now to conduct my research which is part of the requirement to fulfil the Master Programme. The purpose of this letter is to seek permission to conduct my research on Gizo Island.  
The details of the research are provided below.  
Research Title: An investigation into Community Based Tourism (CBT) as a potential development strategy for rural villages in the Solomon Islands. A case study of Gizo Island.  
The aim of the research is to assess whether CBT is an appropriate tourism development option for rural communities around Gizo Island.  
If I am given the permission to conduct the research on Gizo Island I intend to interview tourism operators and tourists who visit Gizo Island.  
Thank you for your time and consideration into this matter and I look forward hearing your response either verbally or in written reply.  
Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any further queries.

Yours Sincerely,

Mrs Rebecca Onio Smiley  
Student Researcher

Cc: Rachel Sibisopere (Ministry of Culture and Tourism)  
Cc: Francis, T (Department of Tourism-Gizo)
Appendix H: Permission letter for community leaders

Gizo Hotel
P.O. Box 30
Western Province

Village Leader
........................................Village
Gizo Island
Date:

Dear........................................

Re: Permission to conduct research in..................village

My name is Rebecca Onio Smiley and I am studying towards my Master of Tourism at Lincoln University, New Zealand. I am in Gizo now to conduct my research which is part of the requirement to fulfil the Master Programme. The purpose of this letter is to seek permission to conduct my research in .....................................village.

The details of the research are provided below.

Research Title: An investigation into Community Based Tourism (CBT) as a potential development strategy for rural villages in the Solomon Islands. A case study of Gizo Island.

The aim of the research is to assess whether CBT is an appropriate tourism development option for rural communities around Gizo Island.

If I am given the permission to conduct the research in ..................village, I intend to interview ten villagers. The interview will be voluntary and interested participants must be eighteen years and above and this include both male and female.

I would also be grateful if you could inform the Church Leaders to make a general announcement to the villagers in Church on Sunday for volunteers who wish to participate in the project to forward their names.

Thank you for your time and consideration into this matter and I look forward to hearing your verbal response.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any further queries.

Yours Sincerely,

Mrs Rebecca Onio Smiley
Student Researcher
Appendix I: Research information sheet for tourism operators

Lincoln University

Faculty, Department or Research Centre: Faculty of Environment, Society and Design (Department of Social Science, Parks, Recreation, Tourism and Sports

Research Information Sheet for tourism operators

You are invited to participate as a subject in a project entitled “An investigation into Community Based Tourism (CBT) as a potential development strategy for rural villages in Solomon Islands; A case study of Gizo Island”

This research is a requirement for my thesis towards my Master of Tourism Management. The aim of this research is to identify the different types of tourists to Gizo and the types of tourists' activities they would like to experience in the rural communities.

Your participation in this project will involve you being interviewed by the researcher and this should take about thirty minutes of your time. The interview will be taped using a voice recording machine. If you do not wish to be recorded please let the researcher know so that written notes will be taken.

By participating in the research project your name will not be identified instead code name will be used to ensure your confidentiality. You may refuse to answer any questions should you wish to. And if you are not comfortable with the questions feel free to advise the researcher to stop or cancel the interview at any time.

To ensure that your identity remain anonymous, all information collected will be analysed and presented as group data. This will also apply in any oral presentations, discussions and publications of the research outcomes. Your participation is voluntary and if at a later stage you wish to withdraw all your information from the research project, you can contact the researcher through email Becky.Smiley@lincolnuni.ac.nz. The deadline for any information withdrawal is 30th June 2014.

The project is being carried out by:

Name of principal researcher: Rebecca Onio Smiley

Contact details: Lincoln University, P.O. Box 84, Canterbury, New Zealand or Becky.Smiley@lincolnuni.ac.nz

They will be pleased to discuss any concerns you have about participation in the project.

Associate Professor Tracy Berno and Dr David Fisher

Contact Details: Tracy.Berno@lincoln.ac.nz and David.Fisher@lincoln.ac.nz

The project has been reviewed and approved by the Lincoln University Human Ethics Committee.
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