

ECOTREKKING: A VIABLE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE FOR THE KOKODA TRACK?

by

SIMONE GRABOWSKI

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Management (Honours) in Tourism



November, 2007

DECLARATION

I certify that this thesis has not already been submitted for any degree and is not being submitted as part of candidature for any other degree.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me and that any help that I received in preparing this thesis, and all sources used, have been acknowledged in this thesis.

Signature of Candidate

S. Grabowski

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE NO.
Acknowledgements	iv
Abstract	v
List of Abbreviations	vii
<hr/>	
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND	
1.1 The Study – Conceptual Considerations	2
1.1.1 Thesis Statement	6
1.1.2 Rationale for the Thesis	6
1.2 The Case Study	7
1.3 Research Objectives	9
1.4 Implications of the Study	10
1.5 Outline of Chapters	10
<hr/>	
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Tourism Development	13
2.1.1 Sustainable Tourism Development	14
2.1.2 Development Theory and Inequality	16
2.1.3 Tourism Ethics	18
2.2 Alternative Tourism Market Segmentation	20
2.2.1 Ecotourism	21
2.2.1.1 <i>Ecotrekking</i>	22
2.2.1.2 <i>Community-Based Ecotourism</i>	25
2.3 Tourism Typologies	28
2.3.1 Ecotourist Profile	30
2.4 Summary	32
<hr/>	
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Case Study Research Design	34
3.2 Secondary Data Approach	35
3.3 Quantitative Research Approach	36
3.4 Quantitative Research Process	37
3.4.1 Sample	37
3.4.2 Instrumentation	38
3.4.2.1 <i>Pilot Study</i>	38
3.4.3 Profiling the Kokoda Tourist	39
3.4.3.1 <i>Psychographic Measures – Motivation and Satisfaction</i>	39
3.4.3.2 <i>Respondent-based Measures</i>	42
3.4.3.3 <i>Trip Profile and Socio-demographic Measures</i>	42
3.4.4 Data Collection	43
3.4.5 Data Analysis	44

3.5 Comparative Research Approach	45
3.6 Methodological limitations	45
3.7 Ethical Considerations	46
3.8 Summary	47
<hr/>	
CHAPTER IV. THE HOST – A CASE STUDY	
<hr/>	
4.1 Papua New Guinea	49
4.1.1 Tourism's role	50
4.2 Heritage Tourism	52
4.3 Kokoda Track	53
4.3.1 Tourism on the Kokoda	55
4.3.2 PRA Methods	57
4.3.2.1 <i>Results of PRA</i>	59
4.4 Summary	62
<hr/>	
CHAPTER V. THE GUEST	
<hr/>	
5.1 The Kokoda Tourist	64
5.1.1 Socio-Demographic Profile	64
5.1.2 Trip Profile	66
5.1.2.1 <i>Travel Characteristics</i>	66
5.1.2.2 <i>Travel Preferences</i>	67
5.1.3 Psychographic Profile	70
5.1.3.1 <i>Motivation</i>	70
5.1.3.2 <i>Satisfaction</i>	72
5.1.3.3 <i>Carrying Capacity</i>	75
5.1.4 Respondent-based Profile	76
5.1.4.1 <i>Self-defined Motivation</i>	77
5.1.4.2 <i>Self-defined Characteristics</i>	77
5.2 Summary	79
<hr/>	
CHAPTER VI. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION	
<hr/>	
6.1 Question 1 – Market Segmentation for Sustainable Development	81
6.2 Question 2 – Outcomes for the Host	84
6.3 Question 3 – Matching Host and Guest Expectations	85
6.4 Implications	87
6.5 Recommendations for Future Work	89

LIST OF APPENDICES	
Reference List	91
Appendix 1 – Kokoda Track Permit Holder Trekking Statistics: 2005, 2006	102
Appendix 2 – Social Mapping: Efogi Village workshops 28-29 April, 2004	103
Appendix 3 – Kokoda Track Tour Operators Contacted in Data Collection	108
Appendix 4 – Pilot Survey	111
Appendix 5 – Letter to Operators	116
Appendix 6 – Questionnaire	117
Appendix 7 – Frequencies and Descriptive Statistics	122
LIST OF FIGURES	
Figure 1.1 – Concept map: Matching community and tourist needs	6
Figure 1.2 – Seasonality of trekking permits granted on the Kokoda Track 2001-2006	8
Figure 2.1 – Alternative Tourism	21
Figure 2.2 – Sustainable ecotourism motivational domain model	31
Figure 4.1 – Total number of visitor (non-resident) arrivals by purpose to PNG	50
Figure 4.2 – The Kokoda Track	54
Figure 4.3 – Villages on the Kokoda Track	58
Figure 4.4 – Social mapping of tourism by the KT communities	59
Figure 4.5 – Map of Kovelov Village 5-Year Plan.	59
Figure 5.1 – Histogram of travelling companions	67
Figure 5.2 – Food preference	69
Figure 5.3 – Satisfaction of food	69
Figure 5.4 – Satisfaction and motivation of various trek components	73
Figure 5.5 – Carrying capacity of the KT	75
Figure 5.6 – Respondent based-profile	76
LIST OF TABLES	
Table 3.1 – Matrix framework	34
Table 4.1 – Tourist arrivals in the South Pacific 1995 - 2001	51
Table 4.2 – Trekking permits issued on the Kokoda Track	56
Table 5.1 – Demographic profile	64
Table 5.2 – Accommodation preference	68
Table 5.3 – Reasons given for visit	70
Table 5.4 – Importance of aspects influencing travel motivation	71
Table 5.5 – Emotions of trekkers	74
Table 5.6 – Expectation versus experience	74
Table 5.7 – Means* of importance by respondent-based profiles	77
Table 5.8 – Carrying capacity per year by tourist type	78
Table 6.1 – Benefits of small-scale, high-yield ecotrekking	89

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Stephen Wearing. He has been a tremendous support in the last three years steering me in a direction I never dreamed I would take but I am grateful that I have had the opportunity. He has done all that one could ask of a senior academic encouraging me to think, question and then think some more.

My deepest appreciation to the staff and postgraduate students at the School of Leisure, Sport and Tourism, University of Technology, Sydney, for their support. In particular, I extend my thanks to Stephen Schweinsberg who has spent endless hours proof reading my chapters and brainstorming ideas when I felt they had dried up and Dr. Simon Darcy who assisted me with my methodological dilemmas.

I would like to thank Patrick Lindsay, CEO, Kokoda Track Foundation, Gail Thomas (Kokoda Trekking Ltd.), Charlie Lynn (Adventure Kokoda), Jim Drapes (BackTrack Adventures) and David Howell (Kokoda Historical) for their assistance in questionnaire distribution. I would also like to thank all the trekkers who were willing to complete the questionnaire. This study could not have been completed without their passion for the people and environment of the Kokoda Track.

Kathryn, who, even with a very demanding full-time job had the time to sit with me and discuss the direction of my thesis. Thank you for always being available and supportive.

To my parents, Monica and Joe, brother Adam and sister Kate, your patience and love have helped me get through university whilst staying sane.

Finally, my fiancé Ben, I am indebted to you for reading and editing my work without any knowledge of the field. Thank you for putting up with my mood swings and still standing by me during a very stressful year.

ABSTRACT

Tourism as an industry in the 20th and 21st Century has primarily been an international money-making industry which has attracted many governments of less developed countries as a fast mechanism for development. This has often involved a trade-off between the pursuit of economic wealth and support for the social, cultural and natural environments. The negative impacts of mass tourism in these economies are countless and well documented, especially as many of these countries are still trying to deal with impacts caused during colonial occupancy. Consequently, alternative tourism has been presented as a way to manage tourism development which is economically, social and ecologically sustainable. One manifestation of this trend is community-based tourism, which aims to be inclusive of the host communities as they plan for tourism and considers the socio cultural and natural resources and desires of tourists in a more equitable manner.

The aim of this thesis is to determine how ecotrekking as a form of community-based tourism can provide a foundation for development for remote rural communities in developing countries. It was conceptually determined that if the needs of the community matched those of the tourists, then a sustainable ecotrekking industry can evolve. To explore this issue contextually, a case study of the Kokoda Track (KT) in Papua New Guinea is presented based around three research questions:

1. What role can market segmentation play in sustainable tourism development in remote rural communities?
2. What outcomes do the Kokoda Track communities envisage for the future of tourism on the Kokoda Track?
3. Do Kokoda tourists meet the outcomes envisaged by the community?

A review of the literature found that market segmentation is a tool used in destination planning to assess visitor characteristics and match these to resource capabilities. It was employed in this study to determine the characteristics and needs of Kokoda tourists through a questionnaire survey distributed to trekkers via the tour operators. It was found that the Kokoda tourist is a university educated, middle-aged man who visits the KT for adventure and historical reasons. They have higher-order needs of personal development and knowledge and value the authenticity of the experience.

The second research question was approached using secondary data analysis. Notes from Participatory Rural Appraisal workshops with community leaders in 2004 and 2005 were reinterpreted. The key themes to emerge were that the communities have a great need for basic facilities (education, transportation, telecommunications, medical infrastructure and water supplies) and they see tourism as an economic means to develop those facilities. They would like to build more guesthouses and provide food for tourists to increase revenue however, they are unsure of the extent to which this will be supported by trekkers.

A comparative analysis of the findings from research questions 1 and 2 was employed to address the third research question. The quantitative needs of the tourist market segment were matched to the qualitative expectations of the communities. It was found that the current Kokoda tourist is in favour of many of the outcomes that the Kokoda communities envisage. These include the provision of locally made food and guesthouses.

Further to this, the empirical results from the questionnaire found that ecotourists and cultural tourists are the tourist types that need to be targeted by operators. They indicated a strong match with the desires and needs of the Kokoda communities. For example, they indicated that the KT can cater for a much smaller number of trekkers than the other three pre-determined tourist types (adventure, organised and historic tourists). Additionally, the natural and cultural environments are more important to these tourist types inferring that the protection of these resources is of primary importance.

Consequently, it was established that ecotrekking can play an important role in development in less developed countries, if the right market segment is targeted to meet the needs of the community. Generally this can then ensure a slower rate of development, which allows the communities to adjust to the changes that occur at both a socio-cultural level and also in the infrastructure within their communities. In the longer term it also allows them to see how tourism can provide long term benefits not offered in extractive industries such as forestry and mining.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AT – Alternative tourism

CBE – Community-based ecotourism

CBT – Community-based tourism

CMT – Conventional mass tourism

HDI – Human development index

KT – Kokoda Track

KTA – The Kokoda Track Special Purpose Authority

KTF – Kokoda Track Foundation

LDC – Less developed country

NGO – Non-government organisation

UNDP – United Nations Development Programme

WWF – World Wide Fund for Nature