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This wonderful book asks very important and timely questions about what makes Tasmania special, why we have seen such significant growth in tourism on the Island and the ways this is impacting the State and the people who live here.

It examines whether tourism is creating equitable benefits and frames the thinking through the lenses of sustainability, economic impact, interaction with society and ultimately where our collective future on the Island is headed.

It is very much the role of a university to ask these complex questions and to bring an evidence-based approach to tackling them. Our role is also to initiate, share in and respond to the important conversations and debates that flow from tackling challenges such as these. It matters that we do this and, in a world so fixated on instant information and rapid news cycles, that we apply academic rigour as we go about the task, as this book does.

It is the objective of this book to take this terrific work well beyond any kind of academic boundaries and make it accessible to everyone. It is of itself an exercise in engagement both within the University and out into the wider community. This matters a great deal because creating a better future on the Island is a collective task.

In many ways this book has set out to initiate the debates we need to have as a society. It offers a remarkably rich and diverse range of perspectives from twenty-five authors across the University of Tasmania community, all of whom I acknowledge for their valued contributions. Their thinking and learning have been deeply informed by their own unique life experiences on this Island, making this a truly place-based book.

What I really like about this book is that it doesn’t provide a clear set of answers or a prescribed way of addressing the challenges that we face. It doesn’t shy away from the points of tension and polarising issues that are so often intertwined with State-defining enterprises such as tourism. It doesn’t present a consistent or cohesive set of views and nor should a book of this character.
It is profoundly honest and presents the positive, negative even ugly sides of tourism and we need that if we are to have a genuine conversation and debate.

Where the thinking does align is around the need for a future on the Island that is both prosperous and sustainable. We need to ensure that both are achieved and avoid the binary choices around environment and economy that have marked our history, and have not served the Island well.

We should start our thinking as this book encourages us to, by reflecting on what intrinsically matters here and makes Tasmania the Island we know and love. Inevitably, our connection to this place will draw profound meaning from the very character of the Island, shaped and defined in many ways including by our Indigenous and cultural heritage, the social fabric of our communities, our remarkable creatures and plants, our precious environments, including the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, the hundreds of islands which make up our State, and the neighbouring Southern Ocean and Antarctica.

How we care for and share with others what matters to us all about Tasmania is a timely and important question and this book is an invitation to that conversation.

Professor Rufus Black
Vice-Chancellor and President
University of Tasmania
INTRODUCTION

Tasmania: The state of the state

Anne Hardy and Can-Seng Ooi

Tasmania is an island located 42° south of the equator and 240 kilometres south of the Australian mainland. With over 50% of its land protected as state forest, national parks, or reserves with World Heritage status, and no land for around 10,000 kilometres to its west and (with the exception of New Zealand) 12,000 kilometres to its east, it could be said that Tasmania is one of the last remaining islands where wilderness sits at its core.

In the past 20 years, we have witnessed significant growth in tourism in Tasmania. In 2008, approximately 897,000 visitors came to Tasmania; in 2018 numbers had grown to 1.3 million. But relatively, this growth cannot be compared to destinations like Bali which, in the same time period, experienced growth from 2.5 million to 8.7 million visitors. However, for Tasmanians – ranging from the indigenous Tasmanians through to those who now call it home – the change is noticeable. Just this afternoon, we were discussing the Tasmanian notion of the ‘secret spot’. Many Tasmanians will have grown up with a beach, a forest, a campsite or a place to visit that was their secret. To many of us, this spot was called ‘Spot X’ – a secluded campsite that we could return to on any day of the year, and we could be
sure to find it empty. It felt like ours. And for many years, it was only ours. But in the early 2000s, Tasmania was discovered by what we call *mainlanders*. Our ‘Spot Xs’ were found and many of us will recall arriving at our favourite site, only to discover it was being used. Oh, the horror!

This story is similar to many others that Tasmanians will tell about how their favourite quiet places have changed as tourists have discovered them. The island of Tasmania has experienced changes and with these come resistance, acceptance, profit and loss.

So what makes Tasmania special? And why has this growth occurred? And why have we as Tasmanians reacted as we have, as tourist numbers have risen?

One of the first explanations for this is that Tasmania is an island. At 68,401 square kilometres it is relatively small – small enough for tourists to visit over a long weekend and get a feel for the island. Contained spaces suit the ever-shortening tourist experience. In four days, it is perfectly reasonable for a tourist to expect to be able to cover around a quarter of our beautiful island and experience its vastly differing landscapes.

A second reason for the growth in tourism is an interest in nature-based experiences. Tasmania’s vast areas of wilderness, its boutique paddock-to-plate farm experiences and its producers of premium drinks (gins, whiskies, wines and ciders) have been
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lauded around the world. These experiences are highly valued by the middle-class urban dwellers who make up the majority of visitors to the island.

And then there is MONA. The Museum of Old and New Art has changed the way in which Tasmania is perceived, the tourists who visit here, the arts and cultural industries in Tasmania and even the way in which the state is marketed. It has put our island on the world stage and it seems that King David (David Walsh, the founder of MONA) can do no wrong. MONA has changed the way many Tasmanians view art and the ways in which we spend our weekends. Many of our children are now growing up with a deeper appreciation of modern art and design that can be directly attributed to MONA.

But change is not without its critics. For those of us whose secret spot has been discovered, or whose shack condemned to make way for modern beach houses, and for those of us who now have to queue to park our cars in order to visit Salamanca Market,
or pay far higher rents, this change has come at a cost. In the past five years, questions have been raised over issues including whether we have reached peak tourism in Tasmania and visitor caps should be implemented; whether a tourist levy should be charged; whether private development should occur within Tasmania’s protected areas; whether areas should be closed for visitation in order to allow revegetation and whether the benefits of tourism (which is largely concentrated around Hobart) are equally distributed. These questions often led to heated debates; not a day seems to go by without the issue being raised in the media.

So, what is the state of tourism in Tasmania? Should we allow cruise ships? Should we ban Airbnb? Does tourism really create equitable benefits? And are our children equipped to flourish in this industry? This book seeks to address these questions. It consists of 19 chapters, written by 27 academics with an interest in tourism research from across the University of Tasmania (UTAS) and who are part of the Tourism Research and Education Network (TRENd). TRENd seeks to support tourism research across the university and to engage with the tourism industry in order enhance knowledge transfer, undertake collaborative research and encourages a dialogue between academics and members of the tourism industry.

For those of us whose secret spot has been discovered, or whose shack condemned to make way for modern beach houses, and for those of us who now have to queue to park our cars in order to visit Salamanca Market, or pay far higher rents, this change has come at a cost.

Our book is divided into five sections. The first assesses the issue of sustainability from a variety of angles. Can-Seng Ooi tackles the industry’s socio-cultural sustainability and in particular how we can achieve balanced tourism development. Sarah Lebski then discusses the need to create a new vision for Tasmanian tourism. Following this, Anne Hardy assesses the sustainability of the cruise ship market in terms of its environmental, economic and socio-cultural impacts. Jamie Kirkpatrick provides a provocative assessment of the sustainability of tourism in natural and wilderness areas. Finally, Elleke Leurs explores the issue of roadkill and the impact that this might have upon tourism.

The second section of this book addresses Tasmania as a destination. Alberte Toettenborg assesses how the state has been branded. Sarah Lebski’s chapter tackles the much-debated issue of visitor information centres (VICs) and whether they should continue to exist. Following this, Elizabeth Leanne and Hanne Nelson explore Tasmania’s potential as an Antarctic gateway. This is followed by a chapter by Gemma
Blackwood that assesses how the television series *Rosehaven* has been embraced by Tasmanians and can also act as a drawcard.

In the third section, we consider the business of tourism. Yue Ma then explores the issue of Chinese tourism in Tasmania, including the needs of this rapidly emerging market. Kristyn Harman and Angela Thomas explore how Tasmania’s colonial and Indigenous past is portrayed. The section continues with two chapters on the drinks market – Gemma Lewis and Kim Lehman appraise the rapidly growing wine tourism market, while Alison Dunn and Gerry Kregor assess the emerging premium drinks market. Finally, Kim Lehman, Mark Wickham and Ian Fillis offer their insights on the museum market.

The fourth section assesses the digital future of Tasmania. The impact of the Tourism Tracer project is discussed by Anne Hardy and her Tourism Tracer team colleagues. The contentious issue of Airbnb is then explored in two chapters: Anne Hardy assesses its positive and negative impacts, while Louise Grimmer and Oskaras Vorobjovas-Pinta explore the regulation of Airbnb in Tasmania.

Our final section explores tourism’s interaction with society. Can-Seng Ooi and Becky Shelley call for a more proactive role for tourist attractions in supporting the education of young people in the state, using the Children’s University Tasmania as

Figure 3. Visitors at the Painted Cliffs, Maria Island.
an example. The issue of employment and job polarisation is then tackled by Lisa Denny, Becky Shelley and Can-Seng Ooi. They argue that as the industry grows, priority must also be given to creating better jobs, rather than just attracting high-yielding visitors.

As academics, freedom of thought underpins the work we do. We have not directed our writers in specific directions, nor have we suggested topics. These essays have simply emerged from our colleagues’ areas of passion. The only instruction we gave them was to avoid ‘ivory tower’ language. This book is intended to assess what our researchers perceive to be significant issues in tourism. Each chapter is founded upon rigorous academic research and informed by the writers’ own experiences of life and tourism in Tasmania. We trust that this book fosters robust discussion, lively debate and a desire to ensure that tourism in this state moves forward in a sustainable manner.
Section 1

SUSTAINABILITY
Based on prevailing studies and Can-Seng’s research experiences in Denmark, Singapore, Malaysia, China and Australia, this chapter examines fundamental debates on what is sustainable balanced and sensitive tourism development. Authorities, businesses and the communities in all host societies want to have sensitive and sensible tourism development. This often means having widespread consultation, distribute tourism benefits broadly, and maintaining the distinctive character of the place and product. Achieving these goals is easier said than done. The frameworks in this chapter aim to stimulate deeper discussion on tourism development in Tasmania.

Tourism has become part of life in many societies. In some places, such as Mallorca, Rio de Janeiro and Sydney, tourists constitute part of the community. Without tourists, these places would lose their vibrancy and character. On the other hand, there are places such as regional towns and serene places where a single visitor will stick out. Some places should not welcome visitors at all because of the disruptions
and dangers that they may pose: for example, the specific locations in the Derwent Estuary – Frederick Henry, Ralphs and North West Bays – where the critically endangered Spotted Handfish (*Brachionichthys hirsutus*, Figure 1) are found are kept secret to prevent curious divers from visiting.¹ There are places where visitors are largely welcomed and there are places where visitors should be kept out; the tolerance for tourism development differs in various spots, and that is also the case for Tasmania.

Tasmania and its different locations require nuanced considerations when we discuss tourism development. Tourism development strategies should be balanced, sensitive and in context, otherwise the destination’s development will not be sustainable. Experiences around the world have shown that a sensible and sustainable tourism development strategy must address at least three issues.³ One, the tourism development strategy and resulting policies must be inclusive and supported by different stakeholders. Two, the strategy and policies must utilise the benefits of tourism and mitigate negative effects, with the advantages of tourism distributed broadly. Three, the plans should accentuate and maintain the distinctiveness and
authenticity of the attractions and destination. With a burgeoning tourism industry and bearing in mind these three considerations, what are the parameters that the discussion on Tasmanian tourism development must consider? Let us look at these issues through a number of frameworks.

**INCLUSIVE STRATEGY AND POLICIES**

Tourism affects the whole host community, whether it is jobs in the sector, public infrastructure enhancement, access to tourist attractions or the overwhelming presence of visitors. Tourism offers welcome impacts but also creates undesirable side effects. Building consensus for policies among stakeholders is paramount. Because there are trade-offs, the benefits must also be shared widely so that no group in society receives only the blunt impacts of tourism. To achieve this, diverse stakeholders – such as tourism promotion agencies, businesses, local government, land control authorities, cultural institutions, civil society groups, politicians and local residents – must be consulted. Without a widespread consultation process, unintended negative consequences may result, and the eventual strategy may face strong resistance. The building of consensus is however easier said than done.

There are challenges in the inclusive consultation process. Firstly, identifying relevant stakeholders is a difficult exercise. Who constitutes a stakeholder group? Or more specifically, which groups of residents should be consulted? For instance, Macquarie Point in Hobart is to be redeveloped: who should be considered part of the local community – residents of Hobart, southern Tasmania or the whole of Tasmania? Even narrowing down the area to the city, many Hobartians are not following the discussion. Actively reaching out to stakeholders is important but members of the group may not be responsive. The inability to engage with the majority of people is a challenge not unique to Tasmania.

Secondly, stakeholder groups may be unwilling or unable to cooperate. For example, in a study of the Copenhagen International Film Festival and the promotion of Copenhagen as a tourist destination, my colleague and I have discovered that the organisers of the film festival and the tourism promotion agency are not interested in developing closer collaboration because of their contradictory agendas and interests: closer cooperation may have detrimental consequences for the film festival because it may lose its credibility if it is seen as a tourism promotion event. Similarly there are activities and sites that would lose their credibility if tourism is involved. The role of the Tasmania Parks and Wildlife Service (PWS) includes serving visitors but that role should not overshadow their conservation and educational efforts. PWS’s reputation will be affected if it is seen mainly as a tourism-oriented organisation (Figure 2).
Thirdly, consultation also entails coordination. Building up a broad consensus is time-consuming and requires resources. In order to get unanimity, the final development plan faces the danger of merely reflecting agreements at the lowest common level, and the goals may lack ambition. In order to draw support for a grander vision, the emphasis on stakeholder consultation may then shift away from getting consensus from the ground up to a more top-down approach of convincing residents and various stakeholders of certain bolder ideas and ambitions. This strategy of selling ideas is arguably no different from advertising and marketing of products and services in our everyday life. The aim is to cultivate support through informed engagement. After rounds of inclusive consultation, leadership is needed in making decisions and realising policy direction and implementation. Leadership in cultivating support and bringing all stakeholders forward has become a common way of building consensus.

With these three challenges in mind, inclusive consultation often also involves mobilising and cultivating support. The consultation process must present facts that will help diverse groups of stakeholders to establish informed positions. The quality of the development and the trade-offs are also evaluated. Bringing plans to fruition requires leadership to build up support and ensure the availability of resources.
Table 1 is a framework that shows leadership and resources matched against stakeholder consensus. When consulting various stakeholders, a holistic approach on the quality of development, finding resources for alternative developments and generating means to realise the goals must be weighed up. As with all tables and frameworks in this chapter, Tables 1 to 3 provide ‘idealised’ scenarios to accentuate contrasts. These tables are heuristics.

Table 1. Inclusive consultation of stakeholders: An art of cultivating consensus and finding resources for (alternative) tourism development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limited consensus</th>
<th>Widespread consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No resources available for project</td>
<td>No go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources available for project</td>
<td>Cultivate support for project and/or find alternatives that have stronger consensus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 situates stakeholder consensus in relation to the feasibility of the project. It highlights the importance of cultivating consensus, mobilising the community, and the availability of resources to realise tourism development plans. The different groups for and against various tourism projects around the island can be seen to be part of the democratic consultation process, through which the wider public get diverse views and perspectives. Different groups cultivate their support, while claiming that they speak for the ‘community’. Even with resources available, the projects will not come to realisation if the authorities and the community are not won over.

WEIGHING THE POSITIVES AND NEGATIVES

There are debates on the height of buildings in Hobart and Launceston. Building height regulations will not only affect hotel development but also the character of these cities. Similarly, there are disagreements on whether kunanyi/Mount Wellington should be served by a cable car. Developments at Freycinet Peninsula and Lake Malbena have already drawn support and protests. Tourism is seen as a more environmentally sustainable alternative to forestry and mining, but tourism development also brings about changes. There are trade-offs. Tourism allows for natural beauty to become an economic resource. As alluded to in the earlier discussion on stakeholder
consensus, discussions are healthy and necessary for community engagement. The discussions may be heated but often the solutions embrace a balanced approach, that is, the development brings in the benefits of tourism, while minimising the industry’s negative impacts. The negative impacts include problems related to traffic congestion, pollution, wear and tear on heritage sites, and inflation. Aspects of the host society may also be commodified and touristified: mass trinketisation, for instance, debases local handicrafts. Harvest Market Launceston and Salamanca Market Hobart have largely been successful in keeping out cheap souvenirs and instead stalls showcase Tasmanian wares and crafts. Negative impacts can be minimised, and positive economic and social impacts welcomed.

Coles Bay during summer is considered overcrowded by many residents but visitors from big cities may just consider it a vibrant beachside town.

On the other hand, what constitutes balanced development is unclear and needs to be analysed. A starting point in analysing the trade-offs is the nature of the tourist product. As a heuristic, the two ends of the spectrum are: serene products (to be enjoyed with few persons around, e.g. some places of worship, nature) and carnivalesque products (to be enjoyed with crowds, e.g. markets, rock concerts). Table 2 shows the match and mismatch between serene and carnivalesque products and the size of crowds. Some attractions are more appealing with crowds.

Table 2. Appropriateness: Match and mismatch of carnivalesque and serene products and crowds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carnivalesque products</th>
<th>Serene products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crowds</td>
<td>Appropriately crowded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No crowds</td>
<td>Inappropriately quiet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is appropriate for a city to be lively and relatively crowded. Even where crowds are appropriate, the carnivalesque product should also not be overcrowded (e.g. like Venice at the peak of the tourist season). But perception of crowding is relative. The popular Coles Bay during summer is considered overcrowded by many residents.
but visitors from big cities may just consider it a vibrant beachside town. Regardless, visitor crowds can be managed to the appropriate level through regulations and building tourism capacity. Popular attractions may draw many people to a destination and a strategy is needed to disperse the crowds. The basic strategy in preventing over-tourism is to match tourist numbers with the tourism capacity of a site (Table 3). Over-tourism occurs when there are too many tourists and too little capacity to host them.

Table 3. More visitors can only be sustained with increased tourism capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decreasing tourist popularity</th>
<th>Increasing tourist popularity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change to tourism capacity</td>
<td>Reduced tourist numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased tourism capacity</td>
<td>Under-utilised destination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increased tourist popularity with increased tourism capacity will prevent over-tourism, provided the attraction is appropriate for more crowds. Matching capacity to tourism numbers means ensuring there is enough infrastructure for residents and visitors. In cities this includes providing more visitor accommodation so as not to put affordability pressures on the local housing market, removing traffic congestion with a more efficient public transportation system, physical space development that prevents overcrowding, and ensuring that facilities and amenities are sufficient and shared comfortably by all parties. Tourist cities like Las Vegas, Singapore and Dubrovnik are ‘extreme’ examples. More visitors also provide a case for more public amenities and facilities, as more people will use them, for instance, public transportation, parks, entertainment and festivals. Some regional areas may want to have more visitors – to the appropriate extent – so that they can be better served, and benefit from tourism-related economic activities.

It is possible to activate under-utilised tourism capacity during off-peak periods. The seasons are often seen as a hindrance to tourism development in Tasmania. They are not necessarily an insurmountable challenge. There are other forms of tourism, such as the meeting, incentives, congress and exhibition (MICE) market. Holding visitor-drawing events during the off-peak season makes good sense, as
proven by the winter festival, Dark Mofo (Figure 3). Similarly, cities that host headquarters and regional offices will attract business visitors; such visitors come throughout the year, and their visits are less dependent on the climate. The main focus on nature and leisure activities in Tasmania has ignored other possibilities in tourism development.

The popularity of Tasmania can be managed to a certain extent, such as by increasing advertising or making it harder to visit. By having fewer visitors, the economic benefits as well as improving the economy of scale for enhancing public goods, amenities and facilities may be weakened. Some areas of Tasmania want more visitors while others need numbers to be reduced. Balanced and sensible development weighs the benefits and negative impacts of tourism. The discussions will be fruitful if they are layered and nuanced.

Tourism policies bring social change and economic development. There are different directions and ways society and culture can change and the economy can develop. The balanced approach sounds reasonable, but it is a drawn-out process.
Sometimes the four-year election cycle makes longer-term tourism development initiatives, that may also require deeper structural changes, less interesting for the authorities. Studies have shown that tourism taxes may benefit the economy as a whole, allow the destination to build more tourism capacity and redistribute the benefits of tourism to the wider community but such a policy is often fiercely challenged by tourism peak bodies and generates difficult discussions for policymakers, including those in Tasmania. Indeed the impact and benefits of the taxes are unevenly spread out in the industry. Deeper structural changes may bring about longer-term benefits, but the fear of short-term pains may dictate the agenda.

**AUTHENTICITY: LOCAL IDENTITY AND GLOBAL RECOGNITION**

Authenticity is one of the most contested concepts in tourism research. Scholars have spent decades debating the need to keep a destination ‘authentic’ while others argue that the concept is elusive and merely describes popular nostalgic and romantic imaginations. Society changes and thus authenticity emerges. Following from the discussion on sustained balanced tourism development, policies, by definition, are meant to shape industry, society and culture. Local cultures should not be excessively touristified or commercialised, else they lose their integrity and uniqueness. On the other hand, the example of MONA has transformed the cultural life of Hobart and the surrounding areas. Before MONA was built, scepticism was plentiful. The founding of MONA has created the ‘MONA effect’. The museum is not only a tourist drawcard, it has lifted the confidence of many Tasmanians. Both visitors and residents have access to a high-quality contemporary art museum and the associated festivals. The MONA-associated annual arts festival MOFO (Museum of Old and New Art: Festival of Music and Art) was held in Launceston in 2019 and enlivened the city (Figure 4).

There are things in a society that residents have become used to and have grown comfortable with. Wrest Point at Sandy Bay is a heritage-listed building and has become an official tourism icon of Hobart. There is a general acceptance of the place although many residents are not supportive of the gaming activities in there. Similarly, MONA is built on gambling money and David Walsh, its owner, said that he built the museum to ‘stop himself feeling guilty’.

Communities are selective about what aspects of their locality are considered ‘authentic’. High levels of social ills such as vandalism, gambling addiction, drug addiction, unruly ghettos, homelessness and low educational achievement should be weeded out and are not considered part of a locality’s authentic character! No society
wants to consider these as being authentically representative. On the other hand, technology and infrastructure that improve the quality of life are welcomed even though old ways of doing things are replaced. A community is inevitably diverse and heterogeneous, and there are different views on what is considered locally authentic. Authenticity is a popular concept but a discussion on what is integral to a society is complex and dynamic. Table 4 layers the debate.

Table 4. Authenticity and the support of the community at large.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old culture</th>
<th>New culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not welcomed by community at large</strong></td>
<td>Marginalised, rejected or to be changed</td>
<td>Resistance and protest (but may be welcomed later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welcomed by community at large</strong></td>
<td>Preserved and claimed as locally authentic</td>
<td>Celebrated and accepted as authentic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As part of the authenticity debate in tourism development, there will always be an inherent tension between local identity and global recognition. The local identity refers to how the community largely sees itself. Authenticity must reflect the identity of the place because it is also about ‘who we really are’. As just mentioned, a society is diverse and complex and claims of authenticity are necessarily selective. Because claims of authenticity are prevalent in tourism, the industry and tourists are inevitably enmeshed in thinking about the character and soul of the place. Let me elaborate.

At the individual level, many tourists claim that they want to experience the authentic. Studies have however shown that is only partly and selectively true: more accurately, they want what they imagine to be authentic. Arguably, the lavender teddy bears of Tasmania are considered ‘authentic’ by many visitors but less so by residents. On the other hand, there are experiences that are too authentic for visitors, for instance, the tough-it-out Tassie experience of the Overland Track can be too strenuous for many visitors and many settle for the more glamorous version of having personal guides with meals prepared for them, comfortable beds to lie on, and glasses of Tasmanian...
wine with their dinners. Similarly, many Australians may find authentic local dishes in Thailand and Indonesia too spicy. Personal comfort matters too. The selective desire for authenticity explains why globally recognised tourist products, such as Disney theme parks, Hilton hotels, zoos, observation towers, comfortable nature treks, souvenir chocolates and the like remain popular. And if new types of attractions prove to be popular, they will be copied.\(^{17}\) So today, many towns and cities have pedestrian walking malls (like Brisbane Street Mall in Launceston), festivals, gentrified disused industrial spaces and art installations in public places. Good food, such as that found at the Agrarian Kitchen at New Norfolk, is universally attractive, even though good food is found in all places (Figure 5). It is a source of great local pride that our fresh produce and gourmet food are fast making Tasmania into a food destination. Similarly, Tasmanian wine and gin have gained in popularity with visitors; alcohol is easily recognisable and universal even if the specific products are branded as local.

New tourism projects are often part of wider development plans for the host society, and local residents may welcome them. The argument for distinctiveness and uniqueness to attract visitors is limited to some extent. The argument must be considered with the need for visitors to recognise the attraction in the first place (e.g. beer made in Tasmania, Tasmanian nature). Table 5 offers a framework to think about old and emerging cultures in relation to the awareness by visitors. Tasmania is famous for its nature and wilderness. MONA, Cradle Mountain and Port Arthur are highly popular. Nonetheless there are many things in Tasmania that many visitors know less about but come to appreciate when they visit. Arguably, these include James Boags brewery, Salamanca Market, the Nut at Stanley, the variety of Tasmanian wines, whisky and gin, seafood and clean air. There are also many secret stories that are relatively unknown to visitors, for instance the frontier wars and stories of Willow Court at New Norfolk.

Table 5. All these belong to Tasmania: The good, the bad and the ugly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local old culture and heritage</th>
<th>New culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global awareness/recognition</strong></td>
<td>Well publicised places like Port Arthur and the Tasmanian wilderness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limited global awareness</strong></td>
<td>Local stories, places like Willow Court and Ross Female Factory, quaint antique shops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maintaining the authenticity and character of the destination and associated products is central in tourism development. Table 5 points to visitors’ awareness and recognition of certain products and attractions; they are ready resources or ‘hooks’ for marketing and selling the destination. These include globally recognised products that have been given a ‘local cloak’ (e.g. alcohol, teddy bears, theme parks). Local authenticity is important and is part of the storytelling and branding of the experience.18 Tour guides, travel reviewers and other tourism mediators play an important role in telling those local stories and creating the authentic experience for visitors.19

FURTHERING THE DISCUSSION

Tasmania is attracting ever more visitors. While tourism has been lauded for its economic contribution, there are also serious concerns about the state’s capacity to host them. Dealing with contrasting and contradicting demands from the tourism industry and that of the local community is part of destination development policies and management.

Tourism contributes to social and cultural changes of a host society. That is not necessarily bad. Besides jobs and businesses, the quality of life in the host society can also be improved and enhanced. Visitors provide the economy of scale for better infrastructure, amenities and facilities. There are also negative effects to be discussed: overcrowding, rental pressures and insensitive development are examples. Balanced and sensitive tourism development requires trade-offs, and this chapter has provided a number of frameworks to give some nuance and layers to the debates. Eventually, the final verdict of whether Tasmania has pleased visitors and residents has to be evaluated through the last framework, Table 6.

Table 6. Balanced and sensitive tourism development means having sustained community support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No community support for tourism development</th>
<th>Community support for more tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No tourism growth</strong></td>
<td>Kept out of the tourism market. Economic growth from other sectors</td>
<td>Poor tourism development policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism growth</strong></td>
<td>Unhappy residents because of poor planning, lack of local consultation. Community support has not been cultivated</td>
<td>Balanced and sensitive tourism development. Jobs, revenue, fair distribution of tourism benefits, and tourism used for community development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many places host similar attractions, such as arts festivals (e.g. Venice Biennale, MOFO), processions (e.g. Berlin’s Love Parade, Mardi Gras, Tas Pride), sporting events (e.g. the Olympics, World Cup, AFL games), art museums (e.g. MONA, Bilbao’s Guggenheim Museum, Doha’s Museum of Islamic Art), fine restaurants (e.g. NOMA in Copenhagen, the Agrarian Kitchen) and blockbuster musicals (e.g. We Will Rock You, The Lion King). These products, activities and events please and are eventually embraced by residents and visitors alike. In this context, tourists and residents have common interests and tastes. There are many common grounds to build a tourism development strategy that is inclusive and sensible. But the conversation with diverse stakeholders is an ongoing process, and local support can only be garnered if the benefits of tourism are distributed widely. It is also important to respect and provide the local stories and angles to tourist-pleasing products. The various frameworks here aim to provide some layers to lift up the discussions.
ABSTRACT

As tourists scramble for the best ‘selfie’ spots at famous sites such as the Wineglass Bay lookout, there is some disquiet within the Tasmanian tourism industry. This disquiet is not isolated: worldwide, tourism is no longer seen as a ‘one-way street’ favouring the seemingly insatiable needs of visitors over those of residents and local communities, and where the growth of the visitor economy is the sole measure of industry success. Progressive destinations are beginning some difficult conversations, prioritising ‘greater collaboration and alignment with local government, key industry stakeholders, civic leaders and the non-industry community at large’¹ in order to determine the best way forward. In Tasmania, the tourism industry has experienced a strong growth trajectory. However, there are increasing signs of discontent, often fuelled by poor management and planning. Some Tasmanians are disenchanted and dismayed by tourism development in areas that they consider inappropriate; others feel that their lifestyle and amenities are compromised by an influx of visitors. The experiences of other destinations suggest that a tipping point can occur quite quickly. Tasmania has the opportunity to largely avoid the pitfalls. This chapter tackles how this may be achieved.

Chapter 2

A VISION FOR TASMANIAN TOURISM?

Sarah Lebski
INTRODUCTION

Tasmanian tourism is experiencing a ‘golden age’. For those of us who can easily recall a time when the industry was struggling, the current unprecedented growth could never have been imagined in the Tasmania of 20 years ago. In the year ended March 2019, Tasmania hosted 1.3 million visitors (up 3%) spending almost $2.5 billion (up 5%).

The Tasmanian tourism industry has become a significant driver of the state’s economy. The positivity inspired by a buoyant ‘visitor economy’ has been accompanied by some disquiet, which has been gathering momentum. The impact of such growth is not always welcome. The Chairman of the Tourism Tasmania Board, James Cretan, recently noted that ‘The Tasmanian community is in the midst of a pivotal conversation around how it wishes to see our tourism industry evolve in the future.’ The manner in which this ‘conversation’ is shaped, and by whom, will be critical in developing a roadmap for sustainable destination management in Tasmania which is both cohesive and strategic. This chapter explores emergent views of destination management and proposes a new approach, informed by fundamental changes in how researchers and thought leaders now view tourism.

PAST AND PRESENT

While tourism is usually referred to as an industry, in reality it is probably best described as a system – it is composed of various interrelated parts and its effectiveness is reliant on each of those parts working together to achieve optimum performance. Consequently, the success of the Tasmanian tourism industry is the result of a combination of factors including innovative marketing, increased air and sea access, investment in infrastructure and more diverse and attractive product development. ‘Tourism 21’ (T21), a partnership agreement between the Tasmanian Government and the state’s tourism industry represented by Tourism Industry Council Tasmania (TICT), has guided the industry’s key policies and objectives since its inception in 1997.

In that time – particularly in the last decade – the industry has changed substantially. Tourism Tasmania’s highly successful marketing campaign ‘Go Behind the Scenery’ was first unveiled in 2013. It represented a different approach, moving the focus from smiling couples carefully placed in iconic landscapes to a quirkier, more nuanced view of Tasmania. A recent decision to shift from a destination tourism brand to a cultural brand is a positive realignment. Ideally, it will enable us to champion our island’s unique, people-centred DNA; a goal that will be driven more broadly through Brand Tasmania, the first statutory place-branding authority in Australia.

On the supply side, David Walsh’s ‘subversive adult Disneyland’ MONA has proven the ultimate game-changer, challenging the long-held stereotypical view of Tasmania.
as a charming backwater. Arguably, not only has MONA given Tasmanians a new confidence, but a flow-on effect has helped in building the momentum which has encouraged other businesses to invest in quality tourism products and infrastructure: international hotel brands like the Marriott and Crowne Plaza; local entrepreneurs, Errol Stewart and Josef Chromy; and a host of rich and diverse offerings on a smaller scale, including our distilleries, mountain bike trails, festivals and other niche experiences.

Similarly, the Tasmanian Government’s multi-million dollar investments in tourism-related infrastructure, including the much lauded Three Capes Track; its commitment to a proposed Cradle Mountain Visitor Centre and viewing infrastructure at Dove Lake; and its support for the state’s next iconic, multi-day walk, mark a new era of confidence in the future of the tourism industry (Figure 1).

Understandably, our industry is very proud of its achievements, and in the wake of such success it is easy to become self-congratulatory. Having said that, there is clear acknowledgement that while southern Tasmania has hosted over 1 million visitors in the year ended June 2019, other regional areas have not experienced the same degree of success. There has also been reference to our need to be vigilant in a highly competitive marketplace.

T21 – The Tasmanian Visitor Economy Strategy is currently being reviewed, with the most recent iteration appearing in 2015. The strategy provides a vision ‘for Tasmania to be a world-leading destination of choice, with a vibrant visitor economy supported by our tourism and hospitality industries, strong business and education sectors and a community that embraces our visitors and all the benefits they bring’. But can such a strategy really deliver on these promises? As is typical of this kind of
strategy, the ideals are lofty, optimistic and indisputable. This is not a criticism: T21 is clearly a very important document. In its current form, however, it does not address the broader issues that must be considered to secure a positive future for Tasmanian tourism. It is time to develop another kind of vision: an approach to Tasmanian tourism that is more visionary than vision statement; an imaginative, inspired and insightful approach that addresses a very important question – what do we want the Tasmanian tourism industry to look like in 2030?

**REFLECTIONS ON THE CURRENT STATE OF AFFAIRS**

This is not a new conversation. Elsewhere, it is being prompted by what we have come to know as ‘overtourism’ and a sense that with ever-increasing travel, tourism is becoming a kind of behemoth. The destinations that have experienced the strongest community backlash are well publicised, including Barcelona, Venice and Santorini, all of which are in serious danger of being ‘loved to death’ by an excessive number of visitors. Other issues include the damage to both the natural and built environment, and residents resenting what they perceive as a ‘one-way street’, where their cities and communities become visitor-centric at the expense of those who choose to live and work there. Many destinations are trying to deal with these issues through a range of policy settings from visitor taxes and capping visitor numbers to restrictive regulations regarding Airbnb rentals, but essentially it could be argued that they are ‘shutting the stable door after the horse has bolted’. While the prospect of overtourism may seem an unlikely problem for Tasmania, it is useful to consider the following definition from a study completed for the European Parliament’s Committee on Transport and Tourism (TRAN):

> Overtourism describes the situation in which the impact of tourism, at certain times and in certain locations, exceeds physical, ecological, social, economic, psychological, and/or political capacity thresholds.

Given that seasonal ‘hotspots’ already exist in popular destinations like Coles Bay and Bruny Island, some Hobart residents are blaming Airbnb for the housing shortage, there is unease regarding the management of cruise ship visitor growth, and in an ABC interview in 2018, professional photographer Jason Futrill, warned that the sharing of stunning images on social media was driving the degradation of some of our island’s most beautiful, and otherwise lesser-known, natural wonders; concerns regarding overtourism begin to seem less far-fetched. Tasmanian National Parks Association President, Nicholas Sawyer, recently expressed concern that long-term maintenance and environmental protection in national parks was ‘being overlooked in favour of spending money on tourism infrastructure’. Hobart’s Lord Mayor Anna Reynolds
has welcomed the economic boost to the city, but is also uneasy about ‘how much ratepayer money goes towards infrastructure which is increasingly used by visitors’ and the fact that ‘local projects are being pushed back, when visitor infrastructure needs priority’.13

Although none of these issues may be comparable to the challenges faced by some international destinations, there are plenty of examples of disenchanted communities of interest in Tasmania who are prepared for potentially long and drawn-out debates over a range of tourism developments, from Hobart’s kunanyi/Mount Wellington and Launceston’s Cataract Gorge precinct to the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area. These are not isolated, individual examples. They represent the heart of the dilemma.

In an opinion piece in the Mercury late last year, respected industry leader David Reed echoed similar sentiments from other destinations when he asked, ‘At what time in the future will Hobart cease inviting the world to come and visit? What will be the determining factors that will trigger actions from Hobartians when they realise that we are overcrowded and the Hobart way of life has been seriously eroded?’14 Reed continued, ‘We need to have a discussion about value versus volume, and while we will continue to be the envy of every mainlander if not large parts..."
of the world who want to live and share our lifestyle…when does all the progress and growth actually start the inexorable diminution of Tasmania’s essential brand values?”

Much can be learned from other progressive destinations that have already responded to the challenge for change – finding an approach that acknowledges the importance of growth in the visitor economy, but also actively recognises the need to manage that growth, so that place-based values are enriched, rather than eroded. Kristin Dunne, CEO Tourism Bay of Plenty (NZ) has recently overseen the development of a holistic, place-based destination development plan, *The Love of Tourism*, which communicates the Bay of Plenty’s ambitious aspirations ‘to flourish while balancing the needs of people, the environment, and the tourism industry’.16

While the focus of the Tasmanian Government and the tourism industry has shifted from the growth in visitor numbers to yield and dispersal, the Faroe Islands tourism strategy, *Join the Preservolution!* goes further, noting that ‘growth is only a good thing if it happens sustainably, with the unique nature and culture of the islands, and the needs of the Faroese people, as its principal beneficiaries. Instead of trying to halt an inevitable development, tourism should be used as a tool to create a better society for all Faroe Islanders’.17 Destination management organisation (DMO), Wonderful Copenhagen, like Visit Faroe Islands, is unequivocal in its boldly titled tourism strategy, *The End of Tourism As We Know It*:

Our new vision is not only a four-year perspective: it is a vision that supports our development of the future destination beyond 2020 that we wish to co-create. A future destination where human relations are the focal point, where the differentiation between destination and home of locals is one and the same. A destination, where locals and visitors not only co-exist, but interact around shared experiences of localhood.18

The concept of harnessing tourism for a higher purpose, to create better societies and flourishing communities, is becoming a more common theme in responsible destination management.

These strategies, which are all gaining substantial international attention, articulate some common characteristics:

- The power of tourism for positive transformation.
- A genuine and active focus on sustainability across culture, community and environment.
- The importance of social licence in destination development and management.

Kristin Dunne reflects on sustainability in stating, ‘We balance economic drivers with questions like, “What does this mean for our community?” “What does our
community think about this?“ What does it mean environmentally?“ How can this particular action actually regenerate our environment, not just take from it?“ Culturally, how are we really staying true to our unique culture and DNA and not trying to be like someone else?”

Interestingly, the Tourism Tasmania Corporate Plan 2019–2022 states that ‘Tourism Tasmania will generate ideas, strategy and inform policy to guide a strong and sustainable tourism industry’. It refers to ‘delivering social and economic benefits’ as part of its core purpose but doesn’t acknowledge environmental benefits – the third pillar of sustainable tourism.

David Walsh’s ‘subversive adult Disneyland’ MONA has proven the ultimate game-changer, challenging the long-held stereotypical view of Tasmania as a charming backwater.

The terms, ‘regeneration’ and ‘destination stewardship’ are increasingly being used in progressive destination management strategies, offering a counterpoint to the rumblings around tourism simply being a commodity, or worse, an extractive industry. Indeed, tourism academic Dr Freya Higgins-Desbiolles, from the University of South Australia, is proposing that the entire construct of tourism be redefined to focus more on the community, rather than the tourist. Dr Higgins-Desbiolles suggests the following definition of tourism:

Local communities inviting, receiving, and hosting visitors into their community, for limited durations, and with the intention of receiving benefits from these actions.

Forward-thinking DMOs recognise that they are embarking on an ambitious and challenging course. They have not set out definitive solutions. The process is more a continuum. Kristin Dunne speaks of her organisation’s decision to be ‘brave’, and she has frankly admitted that the Bay of Plenty’s new strategic approach has required considerable courage. This raises the question though: how is it better to simply perpetuate a respond and react cycle, based on individual issues and without any clearly articulated strategic direction?

In describing the process, Dunne states that, ‘It’s about taking the time to think, to ask questions, to challenge everything and to drop your existing world view’.  

This is not simply an example of destination management. This is destination leadership.
THE FUTURE

Tasmania is an island of small, tightly knit communities. Stakeholder networks are often intertwined with personal, business, academic and government affiliations, and change can be problematic. Traditionally, Tasmania has applied the combination of visitor numbers and the amount that they spend as the key metrics for a successful tourism industry. A more recent focus on yield and dispersal is welcome, but still does not consider the broader, longer-term issues of destination management.

The *Tourism Bay of Plenty, Statement of Intent 2018–2019 to 2020–2021* provides a useful definition, ‘Destination Management is the strategic and sustainable management of visitor-related development, coordinated with resident interests, to preserve a region’s unique identity...’

The balance between a ‘heads-in-beds’ imperative and more qualitative performance indicators, linked to Tasmania’s place-based values, will need to be finely tuned over a considerable period of time. Inevitably, engaging both the public and private sectors to build a common vision for tourism in Tasmania will involve different audiences with conflicting agendas. However, as James Cretan also noted in the latest Tourism Tasmania Corporate Plan, ‘Never before has it been as important to have a coordinated and informed discussion around our collective vision for tourism in this state’.

As an industry, we need to be open-minded; we need to expand into new conversations beyond government instrumentalities to a wider stakeholder audience. These conversations should be both creative and realistic, and avoid the echo chamber. Tasmania can learn from those destinations that have already found their courage to begin some difficult discussions about the future of tourism.
ABSTRACT

Cruise shipping remains the subject of much debate in Tasmania and is a highly emotive issue. To some it is a symbol that Tasmania has ‘made it’ as a tourism destination. To others, it is cause for great concern as it symbolises mass tourism and has a variety of negative impacts. This chapter will explore these debates by assessing the environmental, social and economic impacts of cruise shipping in Tasmania, both positive and negative. It concludes with a number of recommendations, with a view to reaching an amenable middle ground.

INTRODUCTION

Each year, my family visits Stewarts Bay beach, just north of the Port Arthur Historic Site, over the January long weekend. We have followed this tradition on and off since the early 1980s. The view from Stewarts Bay beach is quintessentially Tasmanian: large eucalyptus trees grow right up to the beach and as you look out from the beach, you are greeted with the view of green water, and the vast, unpopulated hills
of the Tasman National Park. Two years ago, as I lay on the beach and admired the
green water and seemingly unchanged view, I smelt a rather strange smell. Was it
hot chips? Potato cakes cooking in a fryer? Given that there are no shops on the
beach, nor any within several hundred metres of where I lay, I was puzzled. I walked
up the beach to investigate and to my surprise, just to the south of the beach and out
across the bay I spotted a large cruise ship. The smells were coming from its buffet!
This was a defining moment for me. The feeling of having the beach to ‘ourselves’,
so ingrained in Tasmania’s island consciousness, was ruined. There could be people
watching me, on my isolated beach. And the ship was large, very large. What did I
make of this?
The experience that I had that day is common in Tasmania. Currently Tasmanians
are struggling with ‘others’ viewing – and enjoying – their island state. It makes us
conflicted about the benefits that tourism may bring. I am fiercely proud of being a
Tasmanian and I take enormous pride in talking to visitors about my ‘secret spots’ and
explaining to them that to a Tasmanian, a beach becomes ‘crowded’ with more than
ten people on it and parking is ‘terrible’ if you can’t park right outside your destination.
Cruise ships that regularly host many hundreds, if not thousands, of visitors challenge
one’s sense of place. The loss of sense of place, while hard to measure, can ultimately
make a place unattractive to live in and exists as a significant negative impact of the cruise shipping industry. Yet at the same time, the temporary nature of cruise ship tourists and their economic benefits provide many benefits. Furthermore, cruise ships offer options to those with mobility and other issues, who otherwise might not be able to travel. This chapter will discuss these issues and make recommendations for Tasmania moving forward.

WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT CRUISING

A cruise is defined as a vacation by sea in a ship for pleasure, usually calling at several ports. In 2018, 27.2 million people were expected to cruise the high seas around the world and the industry is experiencing very strong growth; between 2011 and 2016 numbers of passengers around the world grew by 20.5%. Between 2008 and 2014 the cruise market grew faster than leisure travel in the USA by 22%. In 2017 there were 449 cruise ships associated with Cruise Lines International Association (CLIA – the peak trade association for the industry), employing over 1 million employees. Twenty-seven new ships began operation in the same year. Of the worldwide cruise ship market, Australia and the Pacific receive a relatively small share, only 6%. By comparison, the Caribbean receives 35% of the global market and the Mediterranean 15.8%.

Despite the relatively low base, the growth in the Australian cruise market is strong; in the decade from 2004, cruise numbers rose from 158,415 in 2004 to 1,003,256 in 2014.

Cruise ships range widely in size, from very small or micro ships that weigh under 10,000 tonnes and carry less than 200 passengers, to megaships that weigh over 70,000 tonnes and carry more than 2000 passengers. Currently there is substantial growth in the larger ocean cruise vessel market. Not surprisingly, given the growth of the sector and the size of its vessels, cruise shipping is one of the most contentious and emotive sectors of the tourism industry. Within academic research, its impacts have been studied extensively.

THE TASMANIAN CRUISE SHIP INDUSTRY

The growth of the worldwide and Australian cruise sector is mirrored in Tasmania. In the 2017–18 season, 350,000 visitors arrived in Tasmania on board a cruise ship, to Hobart (59 cruise ships), Burnie (30 cruise ships), Port Arthur (26 cruise ships), Coles Bay (eight cruise ships) and one each to Launceston and King Island. Over the summer of 2018–19 it was expected that in Hobart alone, 63 boats would berth between 3 October and 21 June; over 180 ships would berth around the state. This was a considerable jump from the 47 vessels and 60,600 visitors who visited Hobart during the 2010–11 season.
Some of the world’s largest ships now dock in the Port of Hobart, including *Ovation of the Seas* that can host up to 4900 passengers served by 1500 staff. As with the growth of any highly visible tourism sector, debate is simmering over the existence of cruise ship tourism in Tasmania. The sight of a large white ship docked in the port of Hobart is unavoidable from many homes in Hobart over summer, as is the sound of its horn as the ships leave the River Derwent. To some, this is the indicator of prosperity, success and of Hobart having ‘made it’ on the world’s destination stage. To others, cruise ships symbolise globalisation and price wars while posing significant threats to the Tasmanian brand, way of life and environment.

The following section will unpack some of these issues and assess the varying perspectives in terms of the environmental, economic and social impacts, as well as the impacts of cruise shipping upon tourists.

### ECONOMIC IMPACTS

For many, the existence of a cruise ship in a Tasmanian port is a sign of economic prosperity. A recent report\(^9\) estimated that in 2017–18 over $51 million was spent directly by cruise ship passengers and crew in Tasmanian ports. Overall, direct and indirect expenditure has been estimated to be worth over $106 million.\(^10\) Moreover, it has also been reported that 9% of cruise ship visitors will return to Tasmania after visiting the state, thus the industry acts as a significant marketer of the state.\(^11\)
The economic flow-on from cruise ships is also evident. In Tasmania, expenditure by passengers is lauded as a major positive impact of the industry. On average it is estimated that domestic passengers will spend $116 per person versus $164 by international passengers. Overall 43% took a shore tour. This expenditure translates to jobs, growth and economic effects that extend well beyond the tourism industry.

For tourism operators, the power of the cruise ship can be enormous. While there is much to be gained in terms of income, employment and business growth, some challenges are evident. Cruise ships pre-purchase tours and experiences from businesses at very low prices and add large commissions before on-selling them to their passengers. Last-minute cancellations due to high seas can leave operators in the lurch; having employed staff and prepared food, they are left with no compensation if the ship fails to dock. It has also been documented that tour operators find it very difficult to gain access to ship tour managers and have their products sold on board the ship.

The all-inclusive nature of many cruises has also been criticised for constraining expenditure and consequently, limiting positive economic impacts. It has been suggested that economic benefits from cruising are not as great as with other sectors. For example, the provision of lunch on board provides a significant disincentive for passengers to buy their own food while in port.

SOCIAL IMPACTS

From a social perspective there is research that demonstrates that growth in tourism to destinations can instil community members with a sense of pride in their place by confirming that their place of residence is attractive to others. To many Tasmanians, the large white cruise vessels tethered to our docks are precisely that.

Despite this, a variety of concerns have been raised over the social impacts of cruise ships in Tasmania. In Hobart, there have been claims of infrastructure being pushed to the limit on dual cruise ship days. There have been occasions when over 6800 tourists have descended upon the port in one day, placing great strain on infrastructure such as roads and Tasmanians’ favourite ritual: parking directly outside our shop of choice. Ultimately, the pressure that tourism can place on societies can result in local people losing their welcoming demeanour. This is especially the case in destinations where cruise ship companies have bought infrastructure such shops along the waterfront. While this has not occurred in Tasmania, it is possible that this could eventuate; several cruise ship companies have purchased private islands and beaches in the Caribbean to use as their own destinations. Ultimately, as cruise shipping grows, tourist districts can emerge, as is the case in ports in the Caribbean. For locals, these spaces can become unattractive ‘tourist traps’. Given that perceived authenticity is...
an important aspect of what tourists seek to experience and what the Tasmanian Government is currently marketing, the appearance of these enclaves does not offer an attractive prospect.

Residents’ perspectives of cruise ship tourism have been studied rarely in tourism, but when they have, mixed emotions are often reported. Akaroa, New Zealand, experienced a sudden growth in arrivals following the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes in Christchurch. Some residents were reported as perceiving the growth as out of control, feeling like they were being overrun by tourists. Conversely, the majority of residents were not worried by the growth and indeed enjoyed the perceived vibrancy that the arrival of a ship brought and felt it contributed to the community spirit and enjoyed showcasing their town to passengers. It appears that this sentiment has many similarities with the perceptions of residents in Tasmania. In Port Arthur for example, cruising has impacted upon local access to facilities such as the jetty (where fishing is a common activity) and stressed the sewage system at the site, but at the same time it has been reported as providing the community with much-needed income.

A further social issue caused by cruise shipping relates to their country of registration. Currently, there are very few ships operating in Tasmania that are operating under the Australian flag: Bermuda, Cayman Islands and the Bahamas make up the majority of their flags. This practice is known as registering under ‘flags of convenience’ and allows cruise ships to evade Australian tax and employment laws. It is not unusual to witness employment practices that would not exist in Tasmania: long hours and low pay – sometimes no pay and a complete reliance on tips – characterise the employment practices on board cruise ships. Racial stratification is evident on many: I have witnessed one cruise line in Alaska where Greek and Scandinavian nationals made up the engineering crew; Filipinos were employed as waiting staff on minimal wages; and Bolivians were employed as chambermaids, surviving on tips alone.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

From an environmental perspective, the cruise industry has made great changes in recent years to respond to criticism over its environmental impacts. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) regulates the safety, security and environmental impact of shipping worldwide. It has committed to reduce fuel emissions by 30%. This is supported in Australia by the Australian Cruise Association (ACA) who recently produced the Working Together: Cruise Industry Sustainability Guide. The ACA report detailed the collaborative work they are doing including training staff on environmental awareness, making commitments to the IMO targets and investing in exhaust gas cleaning systems (EGCs). The report claims that significant inroads have been made: almost 40% of the CLIA cruise lines fleet are in the process of installing,
or have already installed EGCs. The report also sets out a range of targets regarding waste management, recycling and banning single-use plastics.

The negative environmental impacts of cruise ships are perhaps the most highly publicised issues relating to this tourism sector. It has been estimated that cruise ships create 0.43 kilograms of carbon dioxide (CO₂) per passenger mile, in comparison to 0.257 kilograms for a long-haul flight. Considering many passengers will fly to their cruise’s port of departure, the environmental footprint of this activity is potentially even worse. The main culprit for this CO₂ usage is bunker oil. The term is generic, referring to a variety of fuels that are created during the refining process and used in ships to provide power to engines. Bunker oil is highly toxic to marine life: a thick oil, it can spread large distances and create significant pollution. Recently, the Port of Sydney regulated the burning of bunker oil while in port by ships with more than 100 passengers; they are required to use low-sulfur fuel and air pollution control equipment. At the time of writing, a glance at the TasPort Arrivals schedules for the 12 months from December 2018 suggests that cruise ship arrivals in the Port of Hobart far outnumber cargo ships. Arguably, regulations such as this would have dual effects: they would reduce emissions and position Tasmania as a leader in the reduction of emissions caused by tourism.

Cruise ships that regularly host many hundreds, if not thousands, of visitors challenge one’s sense of place.

Beyond fuel, academics have been assessing other negative impacts of cruising for many years. Ross Klein’s early work *Cruise Ship Blues* exposed damning evidence of a dark side to cruising. These included waste disposal (of all liquids, including gray and black water, cleaning chemicals and even paint strippers) – Klein estimated that a mega ship produced 500,000 gallons of liquid waste including 50,000 gallons of sewage each day. His book also exposed the dumping of solid waste at sea, leading to significant pressure upon companies. In Tasmania, research from UTAS has explored the potential impact that cruise ships’ engine turbulence may have upon benthic marine biotas. The findings of this research were incorporated into the permit system for expedition-style cruise ships in the Bathurst Harbour region in Southwest Tasmania.

**EXPERIENTIAL IMPLICATIONS FOR TOURISTS**

For the tourist, cruise ships offer a variety of opportunities. First, this is highly affordable option for those on lower incomes and attractive for those who are less-experienced travellers. The all-inclusive nature of some cruises and comfort of the ship
as a known experience makes travel affordable and less stressful for many travellers. For example, it is now possible to travel to Tasmania as part of a six-night cruise for as little as $605 per person, including meals.

Second, our population is growing and with that growth there are increasing numbers of people experiencing mobility issues: it is estimated that around 15% of the global population is impacted by either a cognitive or physical disability. Those with a disability are estimated to spend 12.27% to 15.60% of Australia’s tourism Gross Value Added (GVA). A cruise ship is a highly attractive means of travel for these people, as ships often have on-board medical clinics, are equipped with lifts and are highly accessible; medical treatment such as dialysis can be administered to those in need while on board. Passengers at the end of their lives have been documented as being attracted to cruises to achieve life goals; some older people prefer retiring on a cruise ship as an alternative to assisted living.

**DISCUSSION**

So, what do we make of the cruise ship industry in Tasmania? Within the tourism industry there is conjecture. TICT has a governing board with representatives from the transport industry, but remarkably, although its members deliver over 300,000 day-tripping tourists to the state, the Cruise Association of Australia is not represented. It is clear therefore, that this sector is regarded as marginal. Moreover, the Tasmanian Visitor Survey (TVS) does not count cruise ship visitors in their overall visitation numbers, as they do not meet the criterion of staying overnight. To overcome this, a separate cruise study is regularly commissioned to track its performance.

The CEO of TICT and Premier Hodgman have both stated their preference for smaller, expedition-style boats with high yield. This is at odds with where the growth in the cruise sector is occurring – the large ocean cruise vessel market. Tourism investor Simon Currant has gone one step further, stating that large cruise ships are ‘brand wreckers’. I argue that Tasmania is eons away from being ‘wrecked’ when we compare mega cruise destinations such as the Caribbean and Alaska where the arrival of 10,000 to 15,000 tourists *per day* may truly be regarded as brand-wrecking behaviour. However, we know that perception of both capacity and environmental damage is relative. The impacts of cruise tourism in Tasmania need to be monitored through objective research instruments. The social impacts need to be assessed on a regular basis in order to understand how cruise ship tourism is perceived. Similarly, monitoring is needed to understand both the positive and challenging aspects of cruise ship tourism’s economic impacts. And the environmental impacts upon our island state are yet to be objectively quantified.
We also need to understand more about how these tourists disperse within our state. Recently, the limited dispersal of cruise ship visitors across the state was highlighted and criticism has been made that cruise ship tourists’ visitation is too concentrated around arrival ports such as Hobart. The reality of the market is that stays in ports are very time constrained, therefore the extent to which dispersal can be enhanced is limited. Other markets such as fly-drive tourism would arguably be a more sensible target through which dispersal could be enhanced. It is also worth considering that the concentration of cruise ship visitors around their port of arrival could be viewed as a positive, as it constrains visitation, concentrates infrastructure requirements and can arguably mitigate locals’ sense of loss and angst from having to share the rest of ‘their’ Tasmania with visitors.

Finally, inherent in the notion of sustainable tourism is the notion of the tourist’s experience. The role that cruise ships play in allowing those on lower incomes and with disabilities to travel is highly significant and should not be discounted. Not all tourists who arrive in Tasmania can afford or are mobile enough to experience five-star experiences. Nor do all tourists desire one.

We also need to understand the role that cruise ship tourists play when they return home. Little is understood about the impacts that their word-of-mouth recommendations have upon those at home following their visit. Do these tourists, as Simon Currant posited, really ruin our brand of Tasmania? Perhaps cruise ship tourists play a significant role in promoting and advocating our brand. Perhaps they return to Tasmania and bring their families. And perhaps they spend far more than we have realised. There is still much to be learned about this rapidly growing industry sector. Further knowledge will assist us in positioning Tasmania as a leader in sustainable tourism planning while future-proofing its environment, community, economy and of course, its tourism industry.
Tourism has positive and negative effects on the environment and the socio-cultural fabric. It can provide employment, motivate reservation of wild land and repair of damaged environments, but can also cause permanent environmental damage through scenery mining and disrupt local societies and cultures through place piracy. Tasmania is increasingly suffering from scenery mining and place piracy to the degree that qualities that attract tourists are threatened. An increasing lack of control on developments and tourist numbers needs to be reversed if Tasmania is to avoid the fate of overtourism.

INTRODUCTION
Tourists pay for nature experiences outside home and hearth. In doing so, they have well-documented positive effects on economic growth and employment, often in excess of the rewards from primary industry. The less-documented side effects of the explosion of tourists since the late twentieth century on the culture, society and
environment of Tasmania are the subject of this chapter. In assessing the importance of these effects, I subscribe to a vision of society that fosters kindness to both people and the rest of the world.

The positive and negative interactions of tourists with culture, society and environment in Tasmania have been influenced by, and have influenced, the great debates on the future of the less-modified ecosystems of Tasmania, debates of global significance played out among half a million people. The debates have been of global significance because the Tasmanian environment is so globally outstanding that a quarter of the state has been placed in three World Heritage Areas and 40% of the state is designated as conservation land. The global significance of Tasmanian nature and the development threats to its future motivated the formation of the first Green party in the world and a vigorous tradition of environmental action and research.

**TOURISM SAVES NATURE**

When in 1916, somewhat belatedly, Tasmania’s first two national parks were declared, the political rationale was the attractiveness of Mount Field and the Freycinet Peninsula for tourists. The real motivation for those who fought for these parks was nature conservation. Until 1972, the national parks of Tasmania were under the control of the Scenery Preservation Board, a title that revealed the underlying motivation for the reserves. The Scenery Preservation Board was always ready to gift the more remote parts of the parks to logging or hydro-electric development when asked politely, usually by someone on the board, while ensuring that the outstanding tourist attractors, like Russell Falls, remained attractive and accessible. In 1972, the reserve system consisted of romantically beautiful natural landscapes of no economic worth for extractive industries.

Between 1972, when the Tasmanian National Parks Service was established, and 2018, the designated conservation land of Tasmania increased eightfold in area. This expansion was partly as a result of bitter, divisive debates over plans for hydro-electric, forestry and mining expansion in which the Commonwealth Government intervened to force the Tasmanian Government to reserve natural areas. It was also partly because much of the reserved land had no other obvious use. One of the arguments most widely used by proponents of increased reservation was its potential economic value for the tourism industry.

The argument for reservation from tourism was so pervasive that, in resistance, late twentieth century development agencies framed their manifestations of destruction of nature as tourist attractors, from signs about ‘forests of the future’ to advertising the delights of abseiling off the Gordon River Dam. The Forestry
Commission set up its own conservation reserve system, in which the picnic facilities and toilets were usually superior to those available in nearby national parks and wildlife reserves and the expensive interpretation waxed nostalgically on logging and other human interventions in prose easily comprehensible by twelve year old children.

The argument for reservation from tourism has most recently manifested itself in debates over the expansion of fish farming to Okehampton Bay on the east coast of Tasmania, although maintaining recreational opportunities, rather than reservation, was the goal of most of the resisters. Outside a few fragments and the subantarctic, no-take marine reserves have been successfully fought off in Tasmania. The evidence for their effectiveness in maintaining fish stocks has not persuaded either professional or amateur fishers.

The argument for reservation from tourism is accepted political wisdom. In the Liberal and Labor parties, the ideology is one of maximising economic return from tourism development in the conservation estate. In their minds, if other values suffer, it is an acceptable compromise. National parks are there to provide opportunities for economic growth and jobs, powered by tourists. The Greens also want tourism, but only tourism that is consistent with maintaining the natural and historical cultural values of conservation land. They see compromises that result in loss of natural areas and wilderness qualities as acts of destruction.

As in the days of the Scenery Preservation Board, the protective effects of tourism do not extend to phenomena out of sight, smell or mind. The Maugean Skate, a threatened fish that is found in the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area in Macquarie Harbour and Port Davey, seems likely to be rendered locally extinct in the former location because of de-oxygenation of benthic waters by wastes from fish farms. Yet as of September 2018, both Commonwealth and State Government approvals continued for fish farms as close as 1 kilometre to the boundary of the World Heritage Area, while tourist boats skimmed past, headed for the Gordon River and the Sarah Island convict experience.

TOURISM SUPPORTS LOCAL COMMUNITIES

There is no doubt that tourism provides employment in places that would otherwise have become depopulated, thereby enabling continuing associations with place. The collapse of employment in forestry, mining and agriculture has left tourism as the saviour for many small Tasmanian towns. The facilities that are established to support tourists can also benefit local people, who may also enjoy sharing their place with outsiders.
In mass tourism, large numbers of people in search of a nature experience tend to aggregate at the same times in the most advertised places. If these places are not hardened, they become less attractive to tourists, who prefer not to commune with sewage and mud. The hardening of the places in Tasmanian parks that are most frequented by tourists has commonly involved the remediation of damage caused when tourist numbers were smaller. This has particularly been the case at Cradle Mountain (Figure 1), where there was less human-induced bare ground in 2017 than in 1973, largely because tracks have been hardened to narrow lines and the vegetation has partially recovered.

Cradle Mountain provides two other examples of the remedial effects of tourism. Sewage is now pumped out of the valley. It was to be pumped out of the park, but the park expanded to envelop the sewerage plant. The previous inefficient series of sewage treatment techniques had polluted the alpine streams and changed terrestrial vegetation patterns. These effects are now fading.

The road into Dove Lake and the car park at Dove Lake have been bitumenised, lowering their visual and environmental impacts. The drainage and dust from the old dirt road had damaged adjacent vegetation, with tree dieback extending well downslope. Chicanes have been used to prevent motorists from imperilling native animals by speeding. A gate that prevents most cars accessing Cradle Valley and Dove Lake is combined with a shuttle bus service.
SCENERY MINING

Nineteen eighty-three was the year in which it became clear that proposals for the broad scale destruction of native ecosystems for power, wood production and mineral production were no longer guaranteed success in Tasmania. The High Court of Australia, by one vote, found that the Commonwealth Government had the power to stop the State Government constructing a dam on the lower Gordon River because of its potential effects on world heritage values.

The publicity associated with the civil dissension that forced the Commonwealth Government into action resulted in an increase in the number of tourists. They wanted to experience the wild rivers that had just been saved by the blockaders in small rubber boats they saw on their television screens.

Prior to the blockade, Reg Morrison took tourists up the lower Gordon River in a slow boat reminiscent of those used by Huon pine loggers, his previous occupation. Reg had been among the inhabitants of Strahan who were against the dam. After the decision, licenses for access to the lower Gordon River from Strahan were obtained by operators with large, fast boats that enabled them to take more customers, more rapidly. The interpretation on the new fast trip I took as a member of the World Heritage Area Advisory Council, five years after the blockade, consisted of vituperation directed against the National Parks and Wildlife Service, indicating that the concessionaires may have been chosen from among those who supported the dam.

There were reports of rival boat operators racing each other up the river. The physical effect of the increase in speed and frequency was the destabilisation of the sediment on the banks. Slips striated the rainforest-clad slopes. Huon pines collapsed into the river. The banks retreated at a rapid rate. The boat operators blamed the bank collapses on the effects of the Middle Gordon Dam. They continued to cause damage, protected by the State Government until scientific investigations demonstrated that they were responsible, then fought against restrictions on speed and access. A geomorphologist, Kevin Kiernan, labelled them ‘scenery miners’, because of the long-term irreversibility of their actions. They were making short-term profits at the expense of the very landscape the tourists came to experience. The boats are now designed not to produce destructive wakes at allowed speeds, or are confined to areas they cannot damage, so scenery mining has ceased.

While the Gordon River’s banks were collapsing, a more diffuse form of scenery mining was scarring some of the mountains in the wilderness of western Tasmania (Figure 2). The beauty of these wild mountains had been celebrated in books, calendars and diaries. A select group of tourists from mainland Australia and overseas were attracted to walk for days on wilderness adventures. The numbers were very small for the degree of spectacular damage. The mountain range most scarred
by tourists was the Western Arthur Range, where a repeat of Peter Dombrovskis’s classic Lake Oberon photograph one decade later showed tentacle-like scars where people walked from camps to view or poo points. The logbooks suggest that it is unlikely that many more than 500 people a year have ever walked the Western Arthur Range. Unfortunately, only 100–200 pairs of feet a year were sufficient to destroy the shallow peat down to the hard white quartzite bedrock. Recent social media exposure of these Western Arthur scenes has produced increased visitation, yet access is still uncontrolled, after the Tasmanian walking clubs campaigned against the establishment of a permit system.

Earlier instances of scenery mining resulted from a desire to make views accessible to people in cars. The most striking example of this form of mining was the bulldozing of a wide white road from the narrow unobtrusive road to Waldheim in Cradle Valley to the edge of Dove Lake. The road and its giant white terminal car park was visible from the walking trails and mountain peaks. Photographers providing tourism images depicting the views from Cradle Mountain were careful to hide the car park and road behind dolerite tors.

A more subtle form of scenery mining is the product of tourism itself. On a global scale, tourists are major contributors to greenhouse gas input to the atmosphere, largely through travel in planes, ships and road vehicles. Global civil aviation alone accounts for 4 to 5% of total greenhouse gas emissions. International tourists must travel considerable distances to reach Tasmania, one of the ends of the world. Climate change threatens the existence of some of the
natural attributes of Tasmania that most attract tourists. Changes in atmospheric instability resulting from an increase in the slope of the pressure gradient over Tasmania, resulting in turn from human-induced climate change, have been associated with an increase in lightning-caused fires in western Tasmania, fires that threaten to destroy the beautiful palaeoendemic rainforest and alpine vegetation.

PLACE PIRACY

Local people can have their lives changed by mass tourism in many ways. In Hobart, the capital of Tasmania, increasing mass tourism has been associated with increasing traffic congestion, increasing house prices and decreasing availability of rental accommodation, none of which benefit most of the ordinary people who live in the place. The many ships full of tourists that moor in Hobart for a day belch foul marine diesel smoke over the city and introduce new and exciting varieties of colds and flu for very little economic benefit. However, the most disturbing aspect of increasing mass tourism for Tasmanians lies in place piracy which describes the phenomenon of destruction of the place attachment of local people by the social and physical transmogrifications attendant on tourism.

Positive place attachment can occur for a wide variety of reasons, including aesthetics, recreational experiences, childhood memories and association with positive life events. People can be attached to the same places for very different reasons.

Cradle Mountain, the Freycinet Peninsula and kunanyi/Mount Wellington are three of the places in Tasmania to which Tasmanians are most attached. They are also three of the places most visited by tourists, so have attracted many proposals designed to generate profit for investors. They have been thus at greatest risk of place piracy.

While Tasmania has the longest single span chairlift in the world (Figure 3), it is bereft of cable cars, a fact that upsets many of its inhabitants, who feel deprived of one of the more luscious fruits of progress. Proposals for a cable car on kunanyi date from 1905. In the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, there has been intense public debate between proponents and opponents of a cable car on kunanyi approximately once every 15 years. While a cable car would have some minor deleterious effects on natural environments, the major motivation for resistance against its construction is that it is inconsistent with the place that people value, kunanyi as it is at the time. In 2018, thousands of people demonstrated against the most recent proposal. Following the demonstration, the Cascade Brewery and Hobart City Council refused landowner permission for the
development. However, the proponents persisted, receiving State Government intervention in their favour. They probably see the passengers from cruise ships as one of their major sources of custom.

There can be no doubt that both the State and Commonwealth Governments, and the State and Commonwealth oppositions are fond of cable cars, as both major parties have made election promises to provide funds for a cable car for access to Dove Lake near Cradle Mountain from outside the park, despite a lack of any serious attempt to determine the feasibility, cost and cultural consequences of either the proposal or alternative ways to access Dove Lake. Promises of $60 million for a cable car to Dove Lake make a cable car almost a certainty, despite this option being highly likely to be dearer than gold-plated electric buses with diamond-coated bumper bars and antithetical to the place attachment of many. The maintenance of the road will be necessary whether the cable car is built or not.

Past experiences with development proposals in the Cradle Mountain–Pencil Pine area suggest that those being displaced can occasionally repel the forces of change. A proposal to remove the primitive cabins at Waldheim in Cradle Valley to have all accommodation outside the park was successfully resisted by the local people who were emotionally attached to them and their main occupiers. One of the most effective leaders of the resistance, Christine Milne, was later the leader of the Greens Party in the State, then the Commonwealth. Local people also resisted, unsuccessfully, the surfacing of the roads inside the park and the shuttle bus system, both of which promised to change the place they loved. By the time of these changes,
the number of tourists visiting the area was such that local people only felt at home in winter. Today, because of the cultural tourism associated with MONA, there is no off season in Tasmania. Place piracy at Cradle Mountain is almost complete.

The establishment and extension of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area was perceived negatively by most of its neighbours. The PWS was perceived to be unsympathetic to local non-Indigenous cultures. The places being pirated were those where locals built huts, grazed stock, hunted, fished, and went horse-riding or four-wheel driving. It seemed that areas important for local cultural activity were only available to bushwalkers and rafters, mainly from the mainland of Australia, who saw the signs of past human use as ‘disturbance’.

The first management plan for the world heritage Area contained an action that enraged the place sensibilities of west coast locals who enjoyed four-wheel driving along the Mount McCall Road, which ended above the Franklin River site that was proposed for one of the several dams planned by the Hydro-Electric Commission (now Hydro Tasmania). Combined agitation from the locals and a rafting company that used the road prevented its closure, which was designed to restore wilderness value for those who were attached to vistas free of human artefacts. Thus, the white gash of the road is still visible from Frenchmans Cap, an important wilderness walking destination, subtracting from the place experience of some, while maintaining the place experience of others.

The relationship between established users of parks and the tourism industry has typically been less cooperative. Locals who were place-attached to the west of the Central Plateau as a wilderness fishing venue successfully resisted several proposals for helicopter access by tourists. This resistance may have failed in 2018 when both the Commonwealth and Tasmanian governments allowed a permanent ‘standing camp’ with helicopter access for tourists to be built on Halls Island in the western Central Plateau wilderness area. Both governments appear to have ignored the recommendations of the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council against the proposed development. Advice from this statutory body that mining and logging were inappropriate activities to allow in the management plan for the World Heritage Area was critical in the World Heritage Committee intervention that led to the exclusion of these economic activities from the World Heritage Area. The World Heritage Committee report advocated the development of a strategy for tourism, a strategy still in development in September 2019.

The tourists themselves can be subject to place piracy. At Cradle Mountain and Freycinet, walkers seeking quietness and solitude in nature are frequently disturbed by helicopters carrying other tourists. The PWS can prevent helicopter landing, but has no power over air passage. The legal tenure of parks needs to be extended to the atmosphere, as is the case in some other places, to allow such control.
THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENTS

In the mid-2010s, the Liberal State Government initiated an expression of interest (EOI) process for tourism developments within the Tasmanian Reserve Estate. The State Government was prepared to revise park management plans to allow developments. The Commonwealth Government has supported the State Government by providing funds directly to some of the businesses that succeeded in their EOI bids, and by ensuring that its obligations under the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* did not prevent development.

Today, because of the cultural tourism associated with MONA, there is no off season in Tasmania. Place piracy at Cradle Mountain is almost complete.

One of the earlier approved EOI proposals was for an expansion of the privately-owned Freycinet Lodge out of its leasehold and into the adjacent national park. Accommodation ‘pods’ were to be established among the trees. A trailer park was to replace bush. One million dollars was given to the owners by government to expedite the process. The State Government instructed the PWS to amend the management plan to allow the development. The Freycinet Action Network, a local group organised by Sophie Underwood, and a number of state conservation non-government organisations objected strongly to the proposal. The owner of the Freycinet Lodge was the Royal Automobile Club of Tasmania, who listened to the disquiet of many of their members, who were threatening to call a general meeting, and decided to confine the new development to their existing lease. Public pressure has been less effective with smaller companies, one of which has been given several million dollars by government to help it plan to set up private huts on the South Coast Track.

The EOI process is close to the opposite of rational planning. Companies, well aware of the prospect of profiting from subsidised exclusive access to a previously public good, put in EOIs to preclude others from even the most unlikely opportunities. The State Government states that all EOIs have to pass through legal processes. However, their amendments to the state planning process, and the nature of the previous Tasmanian acts related to nature conservation, make it possible for a tourism development to take place anywhere in the conservation estate, or outside it, after suitable obeisance to meaningless rituals.

The Minister for National Parks and Wildlife has the power to approve development of any kind anywhere in their estate, with no right of public appeal.
Development planning and approval processes within parks are administrative, with no guarantee of public input. Areas subject to Commonwealth Government powers are ostensibly better protected, as the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 incorporates a right of appeal against ministerial decisions. However, this act relies on self-referral by developers, or referral by lobbying from those opposed to developments. Once aware of an action potentially relevant to the act, the Commonwealth Minister is required to make a determination on its relevance. It is legally more difficult to appeal a verdict of ‘not relevant’ than to appeal conditions placed on a development deemed relevant. In one case in which development was considered, allowed and lost under appeal, the legislation was changed to ensure that the development could go ahead.\(^3\)

The new Tasmanian Statewide Planning Scheme provides no effective protection from tourism developments that involve scenery mining or place piracy. There is no protection of biodiversity in urban or agricultural zones, and protection in other zones is effectively voluntary. Protection of scenery is even more tenuous, with many standards that allow exceptions to general rules. There is no protection based on sense of place. Rezoning is always an option if the standards fail to allow development. Even the Forest Practices Board, the most powerful enforcer of environmental probity in Tasmania, cannot force conservation of any listed values beyond 5% of the area of the property to be developed, unless it compensates. The Tasmanian Government gives it no funds for compensation.

**WHAT TO DO?**

Political dedication to economic and population growth in Australia makes it difficult to prevent scenery miners and place pirates further degrading Tasmania, as promised ‘jobs and growth’ seem like manna from heaven. However, there are examples of islands elsewhere where limits have been set for growth in tourist numbers and accommodation. Lord Howe Island – included on the World Heritage List – is one.

There are precedents for limitation on numbers, even within Tasmania. Departures on the iconic Overland Track walk have a daily limit, as do those on the Three Capes Track. However, these limits are set by the numbers that can be accommodated. In both cases they are likely to be increased with the approval of additional private hut accommodation. There will soon be three huts at each of the hut sites on the Overland Track. When will the hut nodes become villages? What are reasonable limits to tourism numbers and facilities in existing visitor service areas and elsewhere? Should there be areas without development, or should tourism facilities extend to the limits of the global market, following the Costa Brava–Miami–Gold Coast model? Should there be variation in tourism facilities and tourist densities to allow a variety of experiences...
to be available for both tourists and locals, or should development simply reflect the financial powers of entrepreneurs and the proclivities of individual tourists? Should the present situation of largely unplanned ad hoc development continue, or should we engage in a comprehensive planning process that produces socially, culturally and environmentally desirable outcomes?

The present State Government seems to prefer the unplanned alternative, presumably to maximise economic growth and jobs during their tenure. This approach risks destroying the very qualities that attract tourists to Tasmania. In the absence of effective controls on foreign ownership, it also risks the dispossession of those presently classed as Tasmanians.

Tasmanians have had a reputation for friendliness, one of the major attractions of the state. Yet hostility to tourists has begun to manifest itself where communities have been subject to negative effects from large numbers. The idea of wilderness has been a great attractor for the state. It seems unlikely to survive as such, as oxymoronic wilderness tourism development is promoted by the EOI process. The present planning processes can rubber stamp development of any kind, anywhere.

The hope of avoiding the side effects of overtourism lies in the tourists themselves and those in Tasmania who see controls on tourism as desirable. If recreational vehicle tourists in Australia are largely spiritually-inclined environmentalists, as they are, those prepared to pay large sums for an ecotourism experience are unlikely to countenance the destruction of wilderness values. Local people have been effective in preventing many of the more egregious tourism proposals becoming reality. There is even the possibility that present or future governments will listen to tourists and locals in planning an overall tourism development strategy.
Chapter 5

BLOODY TOURISM
Roadkill and tourists on Tasmanian roads

Elleke Leurs

‘Country roads take me home’
—John Denver (1971)

‘Country roads; TAKE ME HOME’
—Tourist visiting Tasmania after being confronted by roadkill (2019)
ABSTRACT

In the media Tasmania has been referred to as the roadkill capital of the world. Locals and tourists alike may feel disgusted when confronted with the amount of wildlife roadkill on ethical, emotional and aesthetic grounds. Unfortunately, many locals seem to be hardened to the day-to-day confrontations with roadkill, and the awareness among tourists visiting Tasmania about the scale and impact of this phenomenon is seemingly limited. Increased awareness amongst tourists has the potential to lead to a decrease in the number of native animals killed, most notably the endangered Tasmanian Devil. Moreover, tourists might be able to play an important role in demanding changes to current practices by expressing their distress about the disturbing amount of roadkill, as the carnage is in strong contrast with the pristine and green wilderness experience they might have expected. Both humans and animals will benefit from roadkill reduction.

INTRODUCTION

Tourism Tasmania estimates that 1.3 million people visited Tasmania in the 2017–18 financial year, up 4% from the previous year. While the heritage, the food and beverages, the cultural events, the arts and the outdoor sports are acknowledged as attractions by tourists, the natural environment and wilderness provide the strongest motivation to visit Tasmania. Many tourists are attracted to native animals, and many species are now confined to this island as a result of extinction on the mainland. Sadly, the first time that visitors encounter these unique animals is often as corpses on the roads. In Tasmania, the human impact on wildlife populations appears greater than on the mainland of Australia and has resulted in Tasmania being referred to in the media as the ‘roadkill capital of the world’. The number of animals killed on Tasmanian roads is estimated at 500,000 in 2012 and is referred to as (wildlife) roadkill. Tourists are often shocked when confronted with this mortality and morbidity on the Tasmanian roads.

This chapter is not about mitigation driven by ecological frameworks or conservationists’ ideals or practical engineering mitigation solutions. Nor does it describe the conflicting issues of human-animal interactions, road ecology or cultural and ethical approaches. Rather, this chapter reviews the literature on the roadkill issue and speculates on the impact it may have on the overall tourism experience, as there is clearly a research gap related to tourist perceptions of roadkill. The option of seeing wildlife as an economic asset worth saving for tourism’s sake is also discussed. Thus, a contribution is made to the under-researched topic of roadkill, especially in a tourism context, recognising that a solution could evolve from a broad approach combining all the above aspects and involving all stakeholders.
ROADKILL: A background review with a Tasmanian focus

Roadkill is a phenomenon which can bring together disparate discipline areas, such as social science, conservation and tourism. It can be viewed from different perspectives, such as political, geographic and economic. But what exactly is roadkill? A quick Google search results in a definition of roadkill as simple as ‘a killing of an animal on the road by a vehicle’. It obviously is not that simple. Roadkill represents more than just killing, plus is it really ‘an animal’ – any animal? As Michael asks, ‘Is an insect roadkill, or just a smear on a windscreen? Is a moose roadkill or a victim of a car accident?’ In everyday language roadkill mostly refers to marsupials. The meaning of roadkill strongly depends on who is asked: it could be a food source, a nuisance, a potential art work, an educational or research opportunity, a reflection of society, a human-animal connection, an animal welfare issue, a costly property-damaging experience, an injury or a human casualty. Roadkill is a wildlife management issue, and part of road ecology. As summarised by Lunney ‘roadkill is one pressing contemporary problem that demands more than simply ecological and engineering solutions. It is an issue whose solution may derive as much from the humanities as the sciences’. Lunney refers to the ethical aspect by asking the question whether it is justified to force non-human species to adapt to human systems. Others refer to conservation value and extinction risks, road safety and economic impacts, as well as the emotional and financial impact on wildlife carers looking after the injured animals or surviving joeys.

The major factors contributing to animal-vehicle behaviour are the natural or built environment, and both animal and human behaviour. Human factors include traffic volume, vehicle speed, driver awareness, driver attitudes, driver experience and the time of travel. Tourists may be unaware of wildlife behaviours. They may not know that most Tasmanian marsupials are nocturnal and use the roads between dusk and dawn. Real-time research conducted by Tourism Tracer (UTAS) shows that many tourists drive between dusk and dawn, sometimes at high speed on very winding roads. Tourists may be unaware of roadkill hotspots or do not consider wildlife as a potential road hazard.

An increasing number of vehicles on roads in a season when young and inexperienced wildlife go and explore is a recipe for mortality. In addition, driver behaviour and hazard perception will vary depending on knowledge of the driving environment and experience at driving on unfamiliar roads. In 2008, Hobday and Minstrell estimated that 300,000 animals per year were killed by cars: this translates to 37 animals per hour, most of them not reported to the police. The 300,000-roadkill figure occurred in a time where there were only 897,100 visitors per
year, a number that increased to 1.32 million in 2018. The majority of the published articles on roadkill in Tasmanian media mention the estimate of 500,000 animals: 57 killed per hour.

The species of animals killed on the road in Tasmania include pademelons, wallabies, bettongs, bandicoots, potoroos, echidnas, possums, wombats and the iconic and endangered Tasmanian devils. The Tasmanian devil has received global attention since the facial tumour disease was discovered in 1996; this disease has wiped out 80% of its population, and unfortunately a second strain of the disease has recently been discovered. Researchers from all over the world have joined the Tasmanian team in the Save the Tasmanian Devil Program (STDP). The program encourages people to report road-killed devils. Since the start of the reporting program in 2009 over 3000 reports have been received: more than 350 devils killed on roads every year. In 2015, 8 out of 59 cancer-free devils were killed on roads after their release.22 Also in 2015, four devils, vaccinated at great expense, were killed by cars within weeks of being released,23 making car collisions the second highest cause of death for the Tasmanian devil. Other animals such as insects, frogs, snakes and birds are often excluded from these numbers. Also excluded from these figures are the orphans left to die in dens, nests and burrows; the ones left unnoticed, dying on the verge of the road; and the surviving joeys in pouches. Clearly, a reduction in roadkill is highly desirable.
OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHANGE

The existence of a wide variety of roadkill mitigation initiatives indicates that many stakeholders, such as the government, the tourism industry, researchers and other organisations and individuals, acknowledge a need for change. Many innovative solutions for mitigation that have been implemented on the mainland or overseas, such as wildlife corridors or wildlife bridges, are not always financially feasible in Tasmania, however, much else has been done. For example, roadkill hotspots have been identified, and are available for people to download via www.roadkilltas.com.au. Awareness around hotspots is essential in order to minimise animal-vehicle collisions, as these indicate where it is more likely for wildlife to be killed. These specific parts on the roads attract a larger number of animals, sometimes because they are near a water source, or fertile ground, or they cross the paths with the most obvious route for wildlife in order to roam or find a mate.

Another successful example is the expanding network of virtual fencing. Certain sections on the roads have been identified as wildlife hotspots and devices are placed to warn animals of the approaching traffic. The devices are activated by the headlights of the approaching traffic and produce a blue flashing light and sound, with the purpose of deterring the animal from getting on the road. According to STdP, virtual fence devices are a key part of the roadkill mitigation strategy and have proven to be highly successful with a substantial reduction (50% reduction in a recent trial on the west coast of Tasmania) in the number of road-killed animals in areas where they have been deployed. However, research done outside Australia concluded in 2018 that virtual fences have proven to make no difference. Interesting to note is that these researchers concluded that a change in human behaviour may have led to possible reduction of wildlife killed. This underwrites the importance of another initiative to reduce roadkill: the state-wide awareness campaign, developed through a partnership between the Royal Automobile Club Tasmania (RACT), the Wilderness Society, Bonorong Wildlife Sanctuary and the Tasmanian Conservation Trust, which informs drivers of the simple driver behaviour changes that make a difference:

- Look out for road signs and roadkill – they indicate wildlife hotspots.
- Take extra care driving between dusk and dawn.
- Don’t throw food out of your car – it attracts animals.
- Never swerve to avoid animals – slow down instead.
- Roadkill attracts scavengers. If safe, move it off the road.

In addition, many locals care deeply about their wildlife; the Tasmanian network of wildlife carers is very extensive and passionate, as are many other community
groups and organisations deeply committed to making a change. The community has been asked to contribute their local knowledge to identify hotspots. On occasion such communication has resulted in more signage to alert drivers when they are entering a wildlife hotspot. Additionally, a number of signs have recently been changed to increase effectiveness. Also, the community plays an important role in reducing roadkill by using the recently launched Roadkill TAS app. The app allows the collection of consistent data and contributes to a broader understanding of where roadkill hotspots are located on Tasmanian roads. The app, which will be trialled in Tasmania for two years, uses GPS technology and provides members of the public with the means to record where they see roadkill and to indicate what type of wildlife has been killed. Also, many locals adjust their travel times around the dusk-to-dawn guideline to avoid hitting wildlife. However, while most drivers view wildlife-vehicle collisions as a serious issue, particularly when confronted with the death toll, this does not always result in a willingness to change their behaviour.27 Sadly, anecdotal evidence suggests many locals deliberately target certain species as they are considered by many to be (agricultural) pests. Also, doubt about the severity of environmental issues, including species extinction, has been found to be a consistent factor for years, leading people to disengage. Likewise, the cost of changing human behaviours is high for some sectors in society, and ‘the existing environmental knowledge and views among the Australian public is depressing’.28 However, an under-utilised opportunity lies in the power of the tourism dollar. In Tasmania, tourism directly and indirectly contributes about $3.03 billion to Gross State Product, the highest proportionate contribution in the country.29 The government says the state’s national parks support the businesses of 200 nature-based tourism operators and is investing more than $65 million in the management of the state’s parks and reserves to protect wilderness assets and provide opportunities for people, many being tourists, to engage with natural areas.

The sight of roadkill is not what tourists expect ... suddenly, they will gain the uncomfortable realisation that their pristine beautiful holiday has turned bloody as most of the wildlife they encounter is lying dead on the roads.

There is an opportunity for the tourist to become a change agent. The tourism dollar can be powerful. ‘Happy tourists (being happy means not having to see unhealthy animals in the streets) contribute more money to the economy.’30 For Australian road users, seeing crushed native fauna is part of daily life; for tourists
it stands out. Tourists, especially those who have yet to visit Tasmania, might not fully understand the roadkill issue. As Knowler describes: ‘the roadkill statistic is one that is not promoted. It slips under the radar until visitors actually arrive and see the roadkill on the highways and byways. The roadkill might come as a shock to package tourists on their outings to Cradle Mountain and Port Arthur.’ According to Greg Irons, director of Bonorong Wildlife Sanctuary, tourists question why there is so much roadkill and why so little is done about it. The sight of roadkill is not what tourists expect: they come to Tasmania to experience life in the wild, resulting in a clash between expectations and reality; suddenly, they will gain the uncomfortable realisation that their pristine beautiful holiday has turned bloody as most of the wildlife they encounter is lying dead on the roads. Surely, there will always be the exception – I can remember an American who ecstatically jumped out of a tour bus to photograph the dead snake on the road – but most tourists do not want to be confronted with roadkill. In the ‘dislike’ section in the Tourism Tasmania survey negative emotions are expressed: disgust, sadness and anger. It is obviously desirable, but unlikely, that roadkill will be showcased in glossy tourism brochures or smooth websites to minimise the expectation clash. However, recent initiatives with Tasmanian conservation groups, the RACT and Hobart International Airport all attempt to directly inform tourists upon their arrival in Tasmania about the issue, and how to minimise becoming part of the problem. Information brochures have been distributed to rental car companies, tourism operators and at tourist information points.

In addition to increasing awareness, economic value might also be considered. Eltringham, referred to as a naturalist and environmentalist, stated, ‘If wildlife is to survive, some means must be found to reconcile the needs of the animals with the legitimate aspirations of the human population. One solution is to give the wildlife a value so that local people want to conserve it’. Surely, a statement like this will provoke criticism. Many may say the focus should be on animal welfare and money should not be the main focus. However, is it really relevant that a money-driven strategy is used in order to achieve the ultimate goal of saving wildlife? Does it matter that some solutions are money driven, but powered by feelings, emotions and moral obligations? Feelings, emotions and moral obligations are becoming increasingly important. Globally, the trend continues where people demand a change in animal welfare in the tourism context. For example, many tour operators no longer promote elephant rides in Asia, and orca shows in America will come to an end. Even dating app Tinder encourages their users not to upload tourist selfies with drugged tigers. Tiger selfies, once considered as a sign of muscularity, are now considered a sign of animal cruelty. In line with this trend, many tourists want to see an approach that considers animal welfare and expresses the desire to preserve Tasmania’s unique fauna.
Tourists’ concerns are more likely to find an audience than those of locals. Tourists, upon their return home, write to newspapers to express their disgust and ask the government why they are not taking responsibility. Social media platforms are filled with discussions from distressed tourists referring to roadkill they have experienced. Some people claim never to want to return to Tasmania, citing roadkill as the reason. Current research at UTAS tries to determine the extent of roadkill impacts on the tourism experience and Tasmania’s tourism brand. It will be interesting to find out if tourists change their itinerary to avoid the risk of killing animals. Tourism operators could encourage people to book an extra night to avoid wildlife collisions.
CONCLUSION

Finding the most appropriate way to address the issue of roadkill has proven to be surprisingly complicated. Roadkill is a result of human impact, a sad consequence of humans and wildlife sharing the same roads. There are many factors contributing to the occurrence of roadkill, and some of them are out of our control as individuals, such as wildlife abundance, animal behaviour, weather, road conditions and road maintenance. Also, sometimes a collision is unavoidable. However, driver behaviour is a choice: speed, attention and awareness are controllable factors. From an ethical point of view, it is our responsibility to come up with a solution. Roadkill is an animal welfare issue, because of the suffering and (often slow) deaths of the animals hit, as well as those dependent on the animal killed. Sadly, a surviving joey can stay alive for days after the impact. At the very heart of this issue is how much we care, and the ways in which we can express our care to improve the lives of both wildlife and people. Clearly tourists’ involvement has the potential to play a major positive role to turn things around and ensuring that the glossy brochures and the fancy website reflect the reality: a green, lush, pristine island, overrun by native fauna.
Section 2

DESTINATION
TASMANIA
This chapter looks at the jagged history of destination branding of Tasmania. Whereas many studies explore a destination’s branding campaigns, they most often present a snapshot of the brand at a given time. Focusing on Tasmania’s branding campaigns throughout the last 15 years, the chapter describes how the developing branding is connected to the evolving discipline of destination branding and reflects the challenges and conflicts within the discipline.

INTRODUCTION

Throughout Tasmania’s tourism history, the promotion of Tasmania as a tourism destination has helped form the perception of Tasmania. At the time following the establishment of self-government, Tasmania used positively framed tourism promotion to overcome its Gothic beginnings and disgraced image as the ‘Dunghill of England’. Today, tourism promotion falls within the discipline of destination branding. In Tasmania, the tourism sector has become a high-profile area due to
its dominance of the Tasmanian economy; strategically, branding and developing Tasmania as a destination has become paramount in securing sustainable tourism growth. The brand is used for positioning the destination in the domestic competitive market and is integrated into the tourism industry’s efforts to create extraordinary and unforgettable experiences.

Destination branding is a relatively new area of research, with interest in the area intensifying from the beginning of the millennium, prompted by globalisation and intensified competition for attention among places. But the discipline has been rapidly developing in its agenda, presenting two overall waves, namely the conventional marketing wave, concerned with the marketing impacts of destination branding, and the more recent tourism policy wave, concerned with the sociological implications of destination branding.

This chapter will examine how Tasmania’s major tourism campaigns, being the public articulation of the branding strategy, reflect the underlying shift in approach to destination branding. It is argued that the brand can reveal underlying power and discourses if examined. It will be discussed how the shifting agenda causes challenges and contradictions within the discipline of destination branding which lead to almost inevitable shortcomings in Tasmanian authorities’ branding efforts.

To investigate the development of the destination branding of Tasmania, the tourism campaign material and strategic documentation archived in Libraries Tasmania’s catalogues are reviewed. The discussion of destination branding in Tasmania is limited to capturing only authorities’ efforts to position Tasmania in the global competitive market through publicly available records of campaigns and strategies. The selected material is based on Tourism Tasmania’s own historical overview of the positioning of the brand. Campaign material from the past 15 years was selected to cover the period from the early years of the millennium, when interest in destination branding intensified, to the present day.

**WAVES OF DESTINATION BRANDING**

- **THE MARKETING WAVE:**

The fundamental nature of destination branding

The major wave of destination branding around the turn of the millennium approached the concept by way of the ideas of conventional marketing. This wave was primarily concerned with questions of whether branding could be applied to destinations in the same way that it is applied to consumer products and commercial corporations. Like corporate and product brands, destination brands can be managed through elements such as brand positioning, brand identity and brand image, and entail creative
dimensions such as logotype, slogan, photographic style and storytelling. This early approach saw destination branding primarily as a marketing strategy, which has shaped the field’s fundamental nature.

The fundamental nature of destination branding is its selectivity. It is a process of carefully and strategically selecting elements of the destination and packaging them in a way that will create a positive image in the mind of the outside world. Consequently, the brand will present the aspects of the destination which are considered attractive, based on the destination’s tangible attributes and intangible values. Attention is purposely directed away from aspects that are not considered interesting or attractive. In Tasmania, for example, these are aspects such as inadequate tourism infrastructure at some attractions in peak periods and the amount of roadkill on Tasmanian roads. Similarly, attention is directed away from negative aspects of history and traditions. Although heritage is a leveraged attribute of Tasmania, the brutal treatment of convicts and the massacre of Aboriginal people are not part of the branding, even though they are readily admitted to and recognised as a complicated part of the past. Questions can be raised not only as to what a brand does for whom, but also as to what it does to whom.

Firstly, it is positioned towards the specific interests of what has been determined as the most profitable audience. Marketing techniques such as market segmentation, targeting and strategic positioning are used to attract the right kind of tourist to the destination to generate progress and economic growth. Tourism authorities in Tasmania have recently announced that their research has led them to identifying two new and profitable tourist segments for the island. With that announcement they have also heralded a new development within the ongoing destination branding project of Tasmania, as they will need to align Tasmania’s attributes and values with what these new segments are looking for.

Secondly, it is positioned in order to effectively compete in a global environment. Destinations can be regarded as products which must be sold in the global market place, and consequently destinations adopt strategies of communicating themselves as a whole with a simple message reflecting the unique essence of the destination as truthfully and authentically as possible. Taglines often capture the essence and shape the way in which the destination is gazed upon, offering insights as to how the destination should be interpreted. For example, on the Discover Tasmania website, Tasmania has been described as ‘A Curious Island at the Edge of the World’. The word ‘curious’ is an indication of something strange or unusual, highlighting the uniqueness of Tasmania. The phrase ‘edge of the world’ brings into mind great explorers, such as James Cook or Abel Tasman, setting out to discover new lands. This highlights Tasmania as a destination full of possibilities waiting to be explored.
THE TOURISM POLICY WAVE: 
The sociological implications of destination branding

Whereas the first wave of destination branding was concerned with the marketing impacts of the branding project, the wave of the past decade has been increasingly concerned with its sociological implications. Destination branding is no longer regarded as a simple marketing exercise, but a matter of tourism policies which aim to manage the industry and society.

Ooi observed that tourism policy studies draw three main conclusions on policies with attention to sociological impacts.

The first conclusion is that tourism policies must be inclusive to mobilise sufficient support from stakeholders. Destination branding differs from corporate branding in this regard. Whereas corporations can exercise control over those unwilling to align with their brand, destination marketers do not hold the same power. Inclusive processes are necessary for the branding project to satisfy a heterogeneous group of stakeholders with often conflicting interests, to avoid unintended negative consequences for local culture, and to motivate everyone behind a common purpose.

The second conclusion is that a balanced tourism policy is needed to harness benefits of tourism while mitigating negative effects. Again, destinations differ from corporations in that corporations exist to maximise profit and seek to serve as many customers as possible, whereas the destination’s stakeholders may not always support steps towards attracting more tourists. It is a balancing act between positive social and economic impacts which the tourism industry offers, such as employment and infrastructure development, and the negative impacts such as pollution, price inflation and overtourism.

The third conclusion is that tourism policies should accentuate and maintain the destination’s cultural uniqueness and authenticity. Destinations are complex and multiple entities which may not easily be reduced to a manageable product which can be commodified and presented to attract the attention of the outside world. The packaging of a destination should be done with careful consideration for the local cultures.

ANALYSIS: 
The challenges of balanced and socially sensitive branding

From the shift of destination branding as a marketing activity to one having a sociological approach, a number of challenges and conflicting terms have emerged. The promotional campaigns of Tasmania, which as a destination has regularly seen changes in the way it has been promoted, reflect the evolving discipline of destination branding and the challenges and conflicts within.
THE CONFLICT BETWEEN INCLUSIVE PROCESSES AND THE SELECTIVE NATURE OF DESTINATION BRANDING

‘We are the site of great internal conflict; the birthplace of the Greens and proposed home to Australia’s largest pulp mill...’

In destination branding, multiple local interests compete with each other. It is therefore necessary and ethical to consult the different local interest groups in society in the creation of the destination brand to reflect the destination bottom-up.

However, the contemporary discourse of inclusiveness poses a conflict with the fundamentally selective nature of destination branding, where marketing strategies are employed to enhance the competitive position of the destination through promotion of its attractive aspects. On the one hand, it seems that authorities are aware of the need for destination branding to be inclusive, but on the other they also want the project to be effective and efficient. Inclusive processes require authorities to relinquish power over the decision-making, which may lead to diverse ownership, a lack of direction, and uncertainty as to whether the final proposal will be effective in marketing the destination. Therefore, even with inclusive consultation, the branding project requires top-down leadership. Authorities will ultimately still be in charge of the decisions on how to selectively package the destination. Consequently, groups dissatisfied with the decisions will blame the authorities and oppose the brand. On that premise, consensus can be difficult to reach.

The strategic selectivity is employed to enhance the competitive position of the destination in two regards.

To exemplify the challenge within the context of Tasmania, from 2002 to 2006 Tasmania was marketed as a ‘Rejuvenating Journey’ (Figure 1), and later the ‘Island of Rejuvenation’. This positioning was based in a strategy to focus on what nature does to the soul to establish Tasmania as a destination delivering unforgettable natural experiences.

The campaign was rolled out as the forces of a green tourism wave swept the global market; New Zealand had created a strong niche destination in the market through the environmental positioning of their ‘100% Pure’ brand. With New Zealand being an obvious competitor to Tasmania, marketing itself with similar characteristics and having the same challenge in their geographic disadvantage,
tourism authorities in Tasmania aspired to create a similarly strong association for Tasmania. Tasmania’s natural assets were viewed as key to growth in the tourism industry. The strong nature focus was selected with the expectation that it would be effective and efficient. At the time of the campaign, the destination branding discipline was less concerned with the sociological aspects of destination branding, and more concerned with the marketing impacts. The economic reality of Tasmania is that mining and forestry are major industries alongside tourism, but the campaign did not acknowledge the interests of the people who had, for example, lived off forestry for generations. The question of how to make use of the Tasmanian landscape caused an environmental war between Tasmania’s environmentalists and the struggling timber industry, which continues to be a focus of the political debate to the present day. The competing interests of nature conservation and exploitation make reaching consensus extremely difficult.
THE CONFLICT BETWEEN LOCALLY SENSITIVE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT AND VISIONARY TOURISM GROWTH

‘We are forever surging forward whilst nervously glancing back...’

Destination branding has profound impacts on how a destination both benefits and suffers from the impacts of the tourism industry and therefore any tourism development should be sensitive to its local community. Destination branding is closely intertwined with societal change, as authorities use the destination branding project for facilitating visionary strategies for the destination and inspire societal change in a particular direction. If done right, societal change can create more opportunities not only for tourists, but for locals as well. However, this discourse of sensitivity towards local needs poses a conflict with the fundamental nature of destination branding as strategically targeted and positioned towards what is considered a profitable audience. On the one hand, the host community welcomes positive social and economic impacts which the tourism industry offers, such as creating employment, supporting built infrastructure and services, and preserving cultural and natural attractions. On the other hand, the host community is displeased with negative impacts such as touristification of the local

Figure 2. Island of Inspiration Autumn Campaign, 2008, by Tourism Tasmania.
culture, price inflation and issues which arise from insufficient tourism infrastructure. The changes generated by the branding project can cause friction with local habits and interests. In these cases, questions can be raised not only as to what a brand does for whom, but also as to what it does to whom.26

The ‘Island of Inspiration’ campaign (Figure 2) running from 2007 to 2008 and the tourism developments happening surrounding the campaign period are examples of the difficult balancing act between visionary tourism growth and remaining sensitive to local needs. The campaign was based on a strategy to move beyond the single-dimension nature focus and towards a multi-themed and experiential focus with a breadth and depth of personalised experiences and adventures.27 The vision for growth was for a luxury front to move across the island to attract a profitable audience of high-end, high-yielding tourists through accentuating existing premium offers and establishing new ones.28 Around the time of the campaign, in January 2009, the Three Capes Track project was proposed. This tourism development was meant to provide a world-class premium experience for tourists to support the vision of the branding campaign. However, the proposal raised questions as to what this meant for local people who were used to experiencing the popular walk, but unable or unwilling to pay the fee that followed the development. The strategy presented great benefits, with high-yielding tourists and expenditure flowing into the Tasman Peninsula, which at the time mainly saw day-trippers in Port Arthur. But it also had negative impacts with locals finding that places which had served for their enjoyment for years no longer catered to them.

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN LOCAL DIVERSITY AND EXTERNAL PREFERENCES

‘We are a million contradictions lying just below the surface...’29

Destinations are complex and layered with heterogeneous and dynamic identities.30 As the destination brand guides the framework through which the destination should be imagined and experienced, this diversity should be depicted in the destination brand. Only by maintaining and actively promoting the local diversity can authorities prevent the destination from becoming excessively touristified and commercialised.

However, this discourse of consideration of local diversity poses a conflict with the fundamental nature of destination branding as marketed as a whole towards an external audience. On the one hand, authorities are aware that tourists are seeking out unique and authentic destinations. On the other hand, the uniqueness may be too exotic, and tourists will seek out some familiarity. Therefore, the destination must be presented in a way which can be understood by outsiders.31 This entails reducing
cultural diversity into a simplified, coherent story which is preferred by visitors and ensures high market penetration. But locals may not recognise themselves in the seductively described brand crystallised in the mind of the outsiders. Locals may find the authenticity of their identity compromised, while an outsider may not appreciate a complex brand story, although it might be more accurate. The destination’s diversity may not sell well, but its commercialisation may destroy the spirit of the destination and affect locals’ sense of belonging.

The campaign ‘A World Apart, not A World Away’ (Figure 3) running from 2009 to 2012 worked to overcome Tasmania’s geographical challenge as well as the effects of the 2008 global financial crisis which caused an economic downturn and a large decline in household wealth. The campaign emphasised the accessibility and relatively close proximity of the experiences and attractions in Tasmania. It was a coherent message, featuring rhetoric resembling inspirational quotes and chocolate-
box visuals that were stunningly beautiful, but also conventional and idealised within global tourism promotion, and based on promotional tools thoroughly tested in other destinations. The campaign emphasised Tasmania’s competitive facets directly measured against global standards by focusing on its world-class qualities. This was a simple and easily understandable message to send to foreigners. The underlying effort to set Tasmania apart as a destination was softened in favour of more streamlined, global standards in communication, bypassing the local uniqueness. The campaign may have been attractive for the external audience, but also potentially so familiar that it would not have demanded too much attention, as Tasmania was branded similarly to other destinations in the global marketplace.

The ‘Go Behind the Scenery’ campaign (Figure 4) which followed, running from 2013 to 2018, in contrast made a virtue out of the complex diversity and contradictions which constitute Tasmania. The advertisements were full of quirky visuals with curious details and word play with implied connections, increasing the amount of attention devoted to grasp the ad. The campaign may be the most successful to date,
being Tourism Tasmania’s longest running campaign. By encouraging the audience to ‘create their own Tassie story’, the campaign managed to give the impression of both depicting the Tasmanian identity authentically and being inclusive of all the layers and diversity that both residents and visitors bring to the community. The campaign suggested that Tasmania should be understood as a destination where diversity is waiting. However, whereas Tasmania’s diversity of tourism experiences was clearly articulated, it can be argued that the embedded diversity within the island’s local culture was not fully integrated in the campaign. Due to the fundamental aim of destination branding to position the destination towards an external audience, it can be argued that the diversity became a commercialised product served through a coherent delivery, rather than an endeavour to create a sense of belonging for the diverse cultures within the Tasmanian community.

**DISCUSSION**

Through the analysis it appears that authorities in Tasmania are up-to-date with good practice advocated in current destination branding research. Authorities often have the best intentions in their endeavour to brand the destination in a balanced and socially sensitive way. However, the discussion focuses on their ability to effectively overcome the challenges of the discipline.

Tourism authorities in Tasmania seem aware of the need for inclusive processes. This is indicated by the T21 strategy which serves as a joint blueprint agreed upon by the State Government and the tourism industry, represented by the TICT. The degree of inclusiveness is ambiguous. The strategy is an agreement between the main sponsors of the tourism industry. Local interests may be used largely as informants for educational purposes or to justify decisions already drafted in policies. In theory, inclusive processes sound like a good idea, but in practice they are complex and costly, and the result potentially ineffective. The attempt to please everyone may end up pleasing no-one.

Tourism authorities seem to approach the destination branding project with the aim of harnessing the benefits of tourism while mitigating its negative effects. Sustainability is accentuated in a Tasmanian tourism context. The sufficiency of the policies is ambiguous. Tasmanians are asking questions about both tourism capacity and unequal benefit flow from the branding project within communities. Theoretically, a balanced approach is important, but in practice the meaning of ‘balanced’ is up for negotiation, and the groups in power are likely to further their own interests and dominate the implementation of the branding project.

Finally, tourism authorities seem aware of the need to maintain the unique diversity of Tasmanian communities, as implied in the promotional campaign ‘Go Behind the
Scenery’. The ability to address actual diversity below the glossy surface by marketing Tasmania through its diverse experiences is up for discussion. Celebrating diversity sounds contemporary, but when various parties come together in a coherent delivery, the destination is still reduced into a somewhat homogenous commodity.

In conclusion, the present-day debate in destination branding research may be too idealistic in nature, failing to take the challenges of the practitioners into account. Even if complying with good practice, due to the heterogeneous and complex stakeholder landscape with differing perceptions of the destination and its offerings, the sufficiency of social sensitivity in destination branding will also be based in various individual beliefs. There are no general guidelines or measurements to be found in research, as the answer is profoundly bound to its societal context as well as subjectivity. At the same time, Tasmania is privileged to have a close connection between the state’s tourism researchers, the government and the industry, which should lead to a more diverse and nuanced branding agenda, but the challenges and disciplinary conflicts persist, leading to shortcomings. Time will show how future efforts address the disciplinary discussions and conflicts outlined in this chapter. The findings within this chapter may contribute to the ongoing dialogue.
The tourism and travel industry epitomises the profound impact of digital technology, particularly in the last decade. For visitor information centres (VICs), this is a period of challenges and opportunities as they adjust to the kind of disruption that is considered the ‘new normal’. Visitor information is becoming ubiquitous. Whether it is delivered via the hotel concierge, an information kiosk, open Instagram feeds, curated holiday profiles directed to your smartphone, Google Glass or a local expert, there is a real risk of information overload. Every stage of the customer journey – from holiday planning, to the actual experience, and ultimately the post-holiday reflections – has been subjected to significant change. Customers are accessing multiple touchpoints for inspiration and decision-making. Our intense fascination with the online world and its ability to provide instant information may suggest that there is no longer a place for costly VICs which focus on human interaction and a predominantly ‘bricks and mortar’ approach. Closures are certainly occurring, however others are rationalising and adapting to a dynamic new environment. This chapter explores the changing nature of VICs, and some current and future considerations for Tasmania in the provision of contemporary visitor services.
INTRODUCTION

VICs as we know them today have long been a part of the tourism landscape. Historically, Tasmania has been at the forefront in publicising our island state as a holiday destination. The Tasmanian Tourist Association, founded in 1893, took on the role of marketing Tasmania to its residents through offices in Hobart, Launceston and the North West Coast. Subsequently, the Tasmanian Government Tourist Bureau extended promotional activities to mainland capital cities, with the first office being opened in Melbourne in 1913.

Like many visitor destinations across the world, Tasmania has continued to embrace the concept with considerable enthusiasm. While interstate tourist offices have not survived, the Tasmanian Visitor Information Network (TVIN) is the most recent iteration, designed to assist visitors both prior to their arrival and during their holiday through online and offline channels. Based on a New Zealand model, the TVIN structure was introduced by the Department of Tourism in 1996; this was a time when mobile phones were viewed as a curiosity, and the tourism industry considered a fax machine as the height of technology and convenience! Since the early 2000s, TVIN operations have come under considerable scrutiny, with a succession of reviews examining the network’s governance, marketing and performance. Tourism Tasmania undertook significant research in 2013–14, which resulted in an internal document, Engaging our Visitors, A Review of Visitor Servicing in Tasmania. This research drew on international and national studies and included recommendations for a more streamlined and contemporary approach to the provision of visitor services around the state. In recent years, the exponential adoption of digital technology has certainly been one of the major drivers for the repeated review of Tasmania’s VICs.

With the decentralised ownership of VICs, change has tended to be more incremental across the TVIN. VICs in Launceston and Devonport provide examples of positive change.

As a result of an earlier report, the City of Launceston VIC moved to a higher profile location several years ago and introduced a large central desk equipped with iPads for customer use (Figure 1).

In 2018, the Devonport Visitor Centre relocated to the new, $48 million multi-purpose paranaple arts centre, which provides a cultural and service hub for the city. The centre’s co-location with an art gallery, library, theatre and other facilities encourages stronger visitation from both residents and visitors, and has enabled resource-sharing across various areas including the VIC. While progress is being made, cost remains a major limitation, particularly regarding relocation from outdated sites and the introduction (and maintenance) of the latest technology. Like other states,
Tasmania’s accredited VICs are also owned and operated by local government, which has driven both their number and locations. These are not necessarily aligned with visitors’ current needs and expectations.

**THE TASMANIAN VISITOR INFORMATION NETWORK (TVIN)**

The TVIN is the key provider of visitor information services around Tasmania. Its vision is ‘to have a network of visitor centres across the State providing high quality, personalised visitor servicing, connecting visitors with communities, creating memorable holiday experiences and providing economic benefit to the State’.

Today, the TVIN includes 16 accredited VICs located throughout the state; the ‘yellow i’ logo signifies those centres that are governed by a Code of Practice and comply with national guidelines. The network currently includes VICs
located in the ‘gateway’ cities of Devonport, Launceston and Hobart, as well as Burnie. The remaining centres are positioned across regional Tasmania.

With the exception of the Port Arthur Visitor Centre, located at the Port Arthur Historic Site, the continued existence of VICS depends on the largesse of local government. This situation is mirrored nationally, where 89% of VICS are owned and/or operated by local government. The total actual cost of VICS to local government in Tasmania is difficult to estimate, due to the variance in budgetary arrangements. However, the fact that one of Tasmania’s smallest councils contributed $880,000 to its VICS during the 2017–18 financial year suggests a very substantial investment across the TVIN. Network members seek to offset their costs through the commission charged for bookings related to accommodation, tours, transport, activities and attractions, as well as retail sales. The VICS also sell events tickets, national parks passes and fishing licences, and industry operators can pay for brochure displays and advertising space within the various centres.

The TVIN is overseen by a management group, which also has some specific roles, including addressing visitor servicing issues of statewide significance, reviewing membership applications and monitoring ongoing compliance with the National Accreditation Guidelines. The group is comprised of representatives from regional VICS, each of Tasmania’s four regional tourism organisations and Tourism Tasmania. The management group provides direction to the TVIN’s Executive Officer, who is also a member of the group. Historically, the TVIN has had a strong reliance on Tourism Tasmania to manage the network, however a major change occurred in the governance of the TVIN in 2010 when Tourism Tasmania relinquished its role as manager of the network, transferring responsibility to what was then known as the reference group. Tourism Tasmania continues to provide an annual grant which supports the network’s management and administration, and includes the salary of the part-time Executive Officer.

**OTHER VISITOR INFORMATION SERVICES IN TASMANIA**

While this chapter focuses on the accredited visitor information services in Tasmania, it is worth noting that, in addition to the TVIN members, there is a secondary layer of visitor information provided through Tasmanian businesses which display a ‘white i’ logo. There is no regulation regarding the use of this logo, however applications for the installation of ‘white i’ signage usually require the support of the relevant local council. This signage is administered through the Department of State Growth’s Transport Division and articulated in its *Tasmanian Roadside Signs Manual*. The TVIN has introduced an ‘associate member’ category
for interested ‘white i’ providers in an effort to improve communication and professionalism across visitor information servicing more generally. Often, there are two main obstacles for non-accredited providers achieving status:

1. Having a minimum of one full-time equivalent (FTE) staff member overseeing visitor information operations.
2. Operating across seven days a week.

The Tasmania Parks and Wildlife Service also operates visitor centres at its most popular national parks – Mount Field, Cradle Mountain, Freycinet Peninsula and Lake St Clair – as well as several other smaller ones. However, their operations are focused on providing information and services relevant to particular parks and are generally limited to PWS attractions only.

DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY vs TVIN?

Tourism Tasmania’s quarterly Tasmanian Visitor Survey is the most consistent way of determining the TVIN performance. It is an exit survey of approximately 9000 interstate and international visitors. Survey questions vary from time to time, however it is possible to provide a snapshot of responses relating to the TVIN over a six-year period from December 2012 to December 2018. The data included below is based on the total number of visitors to Tasmania, excluding cruise ship passengers.

First, here are some key points related to visitors’ use of digital technology:

- The number of visitors travelling with a smartphone has increased from 59% (of 904,789 visitors) in the year ended December 2012 to 91% (of 1.3 million) in 2018.
- In terms of the way in which visitors use their smartphones in-destination, looking up maps or navigation information has had the largest increase over the six-year period from 58% (2012) to 75% (2018).
- During the same period, visitors have also increased their use of smartphones to make bookings (from 18% to 27%) and find travel information (from 39% to 49%).

Despite the uptake in digital technology, TVIN use has remained steady. Since 2012, approximately 12% of visitors to Tasmania have obtained assistance from an accredited VIC prior to their arrival in the state, approximately 32% visited a VIC to obtain additional information after their arrival, and approximately 6% of those who visited a VIC made a booking. It is interesting that the actual number of visitors to VICS indicates little variance over the six-year period, while the total number of visitors to Tasmania has increased by 46% over the same period. The data available through the
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TVS is useful, however it should not be viewed in isolation. Other metrics that can indicate the success or otherwise of VICs include online engagement, industry and community engagement and ultimately the cost-benefit analysis that is particular to their individual owners. Interestingly, Tasmania, along with the Northern Territory, has the highest proportion of visitors using a VIC. That said, a Destination New South Wales report also notes that nationally, ‘only 4.4% of total visitors went to a VIC’.6

VICs:
Community assets or sustainable businesses?

In the year ending December 2018, 50% of interstate and international visitors to Tasmania made a booking through an online travel provider prior to arrival, and the number using a mobile phone to book accommodation during their holiday has risen by 14% during the same period.7 The ever-increasing adoption of internet-driven booking sites suggests that revenue sourced from VIC bookings is likely to decline in the future – or does it? The situation in New Zealand, for example, certainly doesn’t reflect the low percentage of bookings that occur in Tasmania and elsewhere in Australia. Their i-SITE network, equivalent to Australian VICs, has more that 7 million ‘walk-in’ visitors per annum, of whom almost 33% make a booking.8 VICs in Queensland are almost breaking even with average revenue per visitor at $5.36 and average cost per visitor at $5.98.9

Although VICs are extending their income streams, the business case for many is debatable. The TVIN directly generated $7.3m in revenue during the 2017–2018 financial year, however the disproportionate number of visitors to the Tasmanian Travel and Information Centre in Hobart (approximately 230,000 annually) should be kept in mind. While both state and local government currently indicate a willingness to continue their substantial financial support to Tasmanian VICs, it is arguably an easier decision while the state’s visitor economy rides the ‘crest of the wave’. However, within the respective councils, a commitment to funding visitor centres has not always been a commonly held objective. Having said that, some councils have been adopting a more expansive approach to VICs which goes beyond ‘balancing the books’. The Queensland town of Bowen provides a good example:

The VIC makes a huge economic contribution, creating over $4 million worth of marketing activity for local businesses in Bowen, purchasing merchandise stock locally and as a local employer for staff and volunteers...While our centre doesn’t technically make a profit we are the conduit for the region. Our RV area brings in $10,000 in permit fees to Council and visitors contribute around $230,000 to local businesses while they are here.10
Quality visitor servicing can influence a whole range of positive outcomes – for example, visitors have better experiences, they stay longer, disperse further, spend more and encourage additional visitation through word-of-mouth recommendations. As the Bowen experience suggests, this enables a dynamic visitor economy where expenditure extends well beyond hotels, tour operators and others directly involved in the tourism industry. Indirect expenditure on fuel, retail shopping and the range of goods and services typically required by travellers, as well as the supply chains that provide everything from hotel linen to cleaning products, make a further significant economic contribution to the visitor destination. Tourism is everyone’s business. This view is supported by the latest TVIN Annual Report (2017–2018) which states that:

Return on investment cannot simply be measured in dollars and cents spent in centres or the number of walk-ins though. Research carried out in South Australia and Western Australia to examine the extent of the impact of visitor information centres on tourist behaviour, shows that engagement with visitor centres can result in additional expenditure in the community on fuel, food, retail, accommodation and attraction services. [According to the Tasmanian Visitor Centres’ Survey 2018], 65% of visitors to centres indicate they will spend more as a result of visiting a centre.11

VICs also provide employment opportunities and build social capital. The TVIN employs 120 staff including 66 FTE positions, clearly with a significant flow-on effect in their respective local communities. The network also includes 375 volunteers, who contribute an average of 960 hours per week.12 This level of community involvement engenders pride in being ‘a local’ and often increases appreciation of the area’s natural and cultural assets.

VIC staff can play an important role in offering alternative visitor experiences or access to those that are often overcrowded, susceptible to damage or culturally sensitive; for example, they can assist visitors in avoiding peak periods at the iconic Wineglass Bay on Tasmania’s East Coast, and inform them of the campaign to discourage visitors from chasing wombats on Maria Island!

More recently, VICs have taken on the task of supporting crisis management. They have become a key resource in assisting visitor safety, providing the latest advice regarding road closures, weather conditions, natural disasters and other related information.

Stephen Schwer, CEO Central Australian Tourism supports these views, but makes an interesting, additional observation:

Given the range of functions VICs undertake and the audiences they serve in their communities, VICs are a public good, however that doesn’t mean they have to operate at a loss.13
Despite many councils adopting a cost-neutral approach, the experience in New Zealand, Queensland and other successful VICs indicates that Tasmanian VICs should continue to work towards better business outcomes to ensure their long-term viability. Their reliance on external funding means that they are potentially vulnerable to changing economic circumstances. In times of fiscal restraint, such services can be perceived as discretionary and reviewed for potential savings, particularly when existing budgets struggle to fund essential expenditure. Under these circumstances, the focus on visitor centres may easily shift, where they are viewed more through a prism of high staffing levels and substantial running costs.

Clearly, the days are long gone when VICs were simply distribution points for brochures and maps and directed visitors to the nearest public toilets. For some, they are viewed as ‘the backbone to our local industry, providing major exposure for local operators, supplying our visitors with unique experiences, the opportunity to purchase local produce or products and of course a chance to chat to one of our very passionate and knowledgeable locals’.14 Tourism is all about ‘the experience’ and arguably it is the personal connection that ultimate differentiates VICs from internet-based visitor information.

This is founded on the notion that visitor centre staff are the custodians of local knowledge; the people who will share the destination’s hidden gems, the special places that aren’t always visible or ‘accessible’ to visitors. At best, VICs are dynamic, multi-purpose visitor hubs. They are fun, sociable, connected and interesting places which reflect the destination brand. In other words, VICs can provide a visitor experience that technology is unable to replicate.

### CHALLENGING THE STATUS QUO IN VICs

Historically, VICs have focused on service delivery and a ‘build it and they will come’ approach. Service delivery has been largely introspective, rather than based on the considerations of the visitor. The same has applied to the housing and location of VICs, where councils have often used their own properties to avoid the increased financial burden of paying rent. This has resulted in some poorly designed and quite unsuitable buildings being appropriated, which sit in stark contrast to best-practice models like the Southern Highlands Welcome Centre in New South Wales or the Canberra and Region Visitors Centre.

### FIVE KEY SUCCESS FACTORS

While many VICs are unlikely to experience the good fortune of a purpose-built, or even a fully refurbished site, research has consistently identified five key benchmarks which should be adopted wherever possible.15
1. A prominent location which provides a sense of welcome; good signage, a high footfall area, safe pedestrian access and appropriate parking, proximity to other businesses and attractions.

2. Flexible spaces/co-location to create a ‘hub’ providing visitors with an additional reason to visit, a reduction in overall costs, and the ability of cohesive, brand-aligned businesses to showcase the region.

3. Visitor-aligned functionality and design; sufficient inviting and comfortable spaces, uncluttered, a logical and effective flow from one area to another avoiding queues and confusion, removal of counters and other physical barriers, a physical size that is appropriate to current and projected visitor numbers.

4. Well-trained, knowledgeable and engaging customer service which enables unbiased, authoritative, quality information that is tailored to individual visitor needs and interests and focuses on local insights and experiences (offline and online).

5. Innovative information technology that complements staff knowledge and advice; integrated and curated content across all platforms, technology that is user-friendly, simple to update and maintain.

Other success factors have also been identified:

- ‘Fish where the fish are’: VIC staff are increasingly mobile using customised vehicles and a range of ‘pop-ups’ at events and popular locations, often, but not always, complementing built facilities.

- An information-plus approach: successful VICs are signifying the destination brand through stories, merchandise and experiences – in fact, they are becoming attractions in their own right. Additional customer-driven services and facilities include charging stations, luggage storage and water bottle fillers, with centres appearing more like a visitors’ lounge; that said, it is important that VICs don’t lose sight of their core objectives.

- A deep understanding of consumer touchpoints (both online and offline) and the appropriate mix of inspiration and information throughout the trip planning cycle, informed by rigorous data and analysis. It has been noted that within the next five to ten years, ‘travellers will use their devices to call up real-time advice based on pre-set profiles, past travel patterns, peer group preferences and emerging behaviour while in the destination’.16

- Bringing the funding bodies and other influencers on the journey: VICs cannot continue their transition into a dynamic, contemporary and customer-focused environment without substantial financial support. The Southern Highlands Welcome Centre, for example, provides hot-desks and meeting spaces for visiting councillors and staff, Regional Development Australia, AusIndustry and other organisations that don’t have offices nearby. These facilities are also available to residents.
WHAT’S ALREADY HAPPENING IN TASMANIA?

There are encouraging signs for the future of VICs in Tasmania, with some centres already adopting progressive strategies. Aside from the City of Launceston Visitor Information Centre and the Devonport Visitor Centre mentioned earlier, the well-established Wonders of Wynyard Exhibition and Visitor Information Centre and the Makers’ Workshop in Burnie are good examples of visitor servicing combined with engaging experiences and a sense of place. The Huon Valley Visitor Centre has also relocated to a more prominent site in the main street of Huonville. It provides an important shopfront for the valley’s quality producers and makers whose only other promotional opportunities are markets and special events. The Tasmanian Travel and Information Centre in Hobart has ‘fished where the fish are’ by delivering mobile information on segways during the Australian Wooden Boat Festival in Hobart.

The City of Hobart has been exploring augmented reality through a new map ‘Augmented Tasmania’, which is one of the more interesting advances in visitor information in the state. The map is currently situated in the popular Hobart waterfront precinct and uses augmented reality (AR) and smartphone technology to highlight visitor experiences, not only in Hobart but throughout Tasmania. Having the map in an outside, public space should assist the Tasmanian Travel and Information Centre in diverting visitors during peak season, especially when large international cruise ships are visiting Hobart. The centre is located in an historic building owned by the City of Hobart, and it is not of sufficient size to meet demand during the summer months. The AR map represents a visitor-friendly, creative and practical approach to issues relating to functionality and design.

WHERE TO FROM HERE?

How can twenty-first century VICs truly add value? The State Government released the Tasmanian Visitor Engagement Strategy in late 2016. The first of its kind in Australia, the strategy ‘sets out to address the visitor journey from a whole of state perspective’. The Premier, Will Hodgman, also notes that it ‘strives to make sure that every visitor to Tasmania has access to the right information…’

Visitors continue to seek out credible and trusted sources of information about local activities and directions. They want local insights into the area, unique information they can’t get anywhere else to add value to their experience in the destination and to confirm information and affirm decisions. [Personal interaction]…is at the heart of a new approach to visitor engagement.
To this end, one of the strategy’s three priorities is to ‘reimagine’ the VICs, which includes the development of a framework for the best model through which visitor information can be provided on a statewide basis. Importantly, the model will include identification of the key locations which are decision points for our visitors, including attractions and venue co-location options. The framework will be aligned to the Tasmanian brand and enable an integrated digital strategy and booking system.\textsuperscript{20}

The strategy promises the development of ‘a flagship Tasmanian Visitor Experience Centre (TEC)’. The TEC will be an attraction in its own right and focus on ‘a visitor-centric approach that offers a great place to visit, to learn, to book, to buy, to download, to recharge, to talk with an informative local ambassador’.\textsuperscript{21} The State Government has announced the development of Tasmania’s first Visitor Experience Centre, to be located at Triabunna on the East Coast. The centre is a pilot project and will be jointly funded by the government and the Glamorgan Spring Bay Council. A second TEC site will be developed at Strahan. At this stage, however, the model has not been completed and no details are publicly available.

An increasing trend towards personalised itineraries and a deeper visitor experience will require VICs to make a strong and continuous commitment to professional development.

It is to be hoped that the acknowledged success factors for VICs will be implemented in due course, along with a visitor services experience that is based on national and international best practice. Some Australian VICs that are leading the way include the Albany Visitor Centre in Western Australia which has introduced a breathtaking virtual reality experience of the region and the Malanda Falls Visitor Centre in Queensland which tells the story of the area’s rare and unique tree kangaroo and other natural and cultural assets. The success of this storytelling is reflected in the positive online reviews, the Malanda centre being rated as #1 TripAdvisor attraction in the region.\textsuperscript{22} The Southern Highlands Welcome Centre in New South Wales has taken visitor services to a whole new level, having recently won an international award for the best toilet facilities! The brightly coloured toilets complete with flowers, free wi-fi, posters and quirky facts stickers have been credited with increasing visitation to the centre and expenditure.\textsuperscript{23}

An increasing trend towards personalised itineraries and a deeper visitor experience will require VICs to make a strong and continuous commitment to
professional development. Visitor servicing provides a special opportunity to promote the Tasmanian brand – i.e. all the attributes that make our island unique; this requires a better understanding of ‘place’. Staff need to be highly responsive and develop more detailed knowledge beyond the kind of information that is available online. The opinion of a well-informed resident regarding the best restaurant in town is usually more valued than a print-out of all local restaurants. Achieving an appropriate balance between the provision of quality information and the pressure of closing a sale is another challenge. Overall however, the concept of a Visitor Experience Centre presents some exciting opportunities.

Beyond the nominated sites at Triabunna and Strahan, implications for other Tasmanian VICs, if any, are unknown. A holistic model is highly unlikely given the number of councils involved and the differing environments in which the VICs operate. Ultimately however, councils may find it necessary to rationalise their centres – for example, introducing travel hubs in the most popular locations outside the major cities, partnering with high-profile local businesses such as distilleries, retailers and producers, cultural spaces like museums and historic sites, and adopting mobile information delivery which enables flexible visitor servicing at a lower cost.

Any future shaping of VICs in Tasmania must consider some key issues which are very common elsewhere – for example, VICs are significantly embedded in their local communities and quite rightly are a source of considerable pride; many rely on the goodwill of volunteers who enjoy interacting with visitors and each other. The kind of pragmatism that is required to drive a different vision of VICs in Tasmania may meet significant resistance from communities that have a more introspective view of their importance. Whatever follows, VICs must continue to offer compelling reasons for visitors to seek them out. Evidence points to a generally positive future for VICs. Constant innovation, fresh thinking, deeper, richer, local knowledge and most importantly a real understanding of our visitors, suggest that there will be detours rather than a dead end!

**KEY LESSONS**

Despite earlier predictions, digital technology has not replaced human interaction in the provision of visitor information services. Instead, technology is being viewed as a way of complementing and enhancing visitor information services, rather than an end in itself. Personal connections remain very important and arguably the VICs’ most significant point of difference.

In addition, visitor services are so much more than the provision of information. The TVIN particularly will need to continually evolve to meet the consumers’
changing needs and expectations; this will involve a customer-driven approach which will necessitate a much deeper understanding of our visitors, including more sophisticated data collection and analysis.

And finally, the success of VICs is dependent on a range of key factors. The introduction of Visitor Experience Centres provides the Tasmanian tourism industry with a very significant opportunity to refine, re-evaluate and potentially reinvent the concept of VICs; the shift from ‘information’ to ‘experience’ is a deliberate and significant step. It also provides the impetus to examine all the success factors in best-practice visitor services, both nationally and internationally.
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‘GATEWAY’ TOURISM
Exploring Antarctica in Tasmania

Elizabeth Leane and Hanne Nielsen

ABSTRACT

Tasmania’s connectedness with the continent to its south is everywhere evident: in the island’s weather systems and geology, in the history of sealers, whalers and explorers who used its ports, and in museums, landmarks and memorials. Hobart’s identity as an Antarctic ‘gateway’ is also important in the city’s place-branding. This chapter reflects on the sites, events and experiences currently available to tourists interested in the island’s southern connections. Contextualizing Hobart as one of five Antarctic gateways globally, the chapter explores the city’s distinctive relationship with the far south and suggests ways of fostering its Antarctic identity in the future.
in the island’s southern connections. Contextualizing Hobart as one of five Antarctic gateways globally, the chapter explores the city’s distinctive relationship with the far south and suggests ways of fostering its Antarctic identity in the future.

While the increasing numbers of tourists visiting Antarctica – over 56,000 in the summer of 2018–19 – regularly attract media headlines, fewer people are conscious of a growing low-latitude Antarctic tourist industry. Port cities positioned on a ‘southern rim’ around the South Polar region have long acted as convenient exit, entry and resupply points for vessels travelling to the far south. Five of them are widely acknowledged ‘Antarctic gateways’: Hobart, in Tasmania; Christchurch, in New Zealand’s South Island; Ushuaia, at the southern tip of Argentina; nearby Punta Arenas, in Chile; and Cape Town, in South Africa. The first four are small regional cities that are increasingly leveraging their Antarctic associations not only to attract Antarctic travellers – scientists, support personnel, tourists – but also as part of the place-branding of the cities themselves. (Cape Town’s gateway identity is less pronounced due to the city’s far larger size). Only the South American gateways, and particularly Ushuaia, can claim a substantial flow of tourists to Antarctica – over 98% of Antarctic cruise travel leaves from these cities. However, all four are conscious of the potential of their Antarctic connections, past and present, to generate visitor interest, and they traditionally compete for the unofficial title of the world’s ‘premier’ Antarctic gateway. Local, regional and national governments in all four cases have, for several decades, implemented deliberate strategies to promote and capitalise on the cities’ South Polar connections: as a tourism and marketing researcher observed almost 20 years ago, ‘the Antarctic is being used to sell cities’.¹

Tasmania’s connectedness with the region to its south goes back many millions of years. In the last stages of the break-up of Gondwana, Tasmania acted as a land bridge between Australia and Antarctica; its final separation about 33 million years ago opened up a ‘Tasmanian Gateway’ allowing the circumpolar current to flow and Antarctica to transform into the ice continent that we now know.² The two continents’ former union is evident in the island’s geology – such as the dolerite columns that form kunanyi/Mount Wellington’s ‘Organ Pipes’ – as well as its flora, such as the fagus or deciduous beech (*Nothofagus gunnii*), which has been linked to Antarctic fossils. People living in what we now call Tasmania have felt the presence of the cold south for tens of thousands of years in the form of the wind and the weather. In recent times, numerous voyages – commercial, exploratory, scientific and touristic – have departed from Hobart’s port, and the city has become a hub for Antarctic research and logistics, with the Antarctic sector bringing over $186 million annually to the economy (2017–18).³ Part of Tasmania is already halfway to Antarctica: Macquarie Island is not so much a gateway as a subantarctic tourist attraction in itself, with visitor numbers managed by the Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service (PWS). The present
visitor quota for Macquarie Island is set at a maximum of 12 shore visits (with up to 1,000 visitors in total), two cruise-only visits and two yacht visits per season. The connections between Hobart and Antarctica are real and enduring, but not all are immediately evident to tourists. Increasingly, Hobart’s gateway identity is being curated for visitors, through interpretative material, museums and festivals. Beginning with an overview of the city’s past and present links to the far south, this chapter reflects on the sites, events and experiences currently available to tourists interested in the island’s southern connections. We explore particularly Hobart’s distinctive relationship with the far south, arguing that its ‘gateway’ role extends far beyond mere logistical access. We conclude by suggesting some new ways of fostering its Antarctic identity in the future.

TASMANIA’S ANTARCTIC CONNECTIONS

In 2017, the Australian Government held a competition for school children to name the new icebreaker commissioned as a key part of its Australian Antarctic Strategy and 20 Year Action Plan, which would replace its existing Antarctic vessel, the RSV Aurora Australis. The winning entry was Nuyina – the palawa kani word for the southern lights. This selection recognises ‘the long spiritual connection Tasmanian Aboriginal people have with the frozen continent, as the most southerly humans on the planet during the last ice age’. Not only the spectacular light displays in the southern sky, but also the weather whipping up off the Southern Ocean has connected the Indigenous communities of the island (or, at times, peninsula) with the region to their south for over 40,000 years.

The connections between Hobart and Antarctica are real and enduring, but not all are immediately evident to tourists.

In terms of European exploration, Tasmania’s ‘gateway’ identity can be traced to the first circumnavigation of Antarctica led by James Cook in the early 1770s. The expedition’s two vessels, Resolution and Adventure, became separated in the Antarctic fog, and the Adventure (captained by Tobias Furneaux) headed north, exploring the east coast of the island before rendezvousing with the Resolution in New Zealand. Although Cook did not see the Antarctic continent, his reports of the plentiful wildlife in its surrounding ocean spurred sealers and whalers to turn their attention south. The Port of Hobart, which Europeans named and occupied in 1803, became a bustling
centre as vessels from around the globe used it as a base for their subantarctic and Antarctic forays. While whaling was initially mostly in local waters, sealers ventured frequently to Antarctic and subantarctic islands. Macquarie Island – included as part of Van Diemen’s Land when the latter became a colony in 1825 – saw fur and elephant seals (and later, King and Royal penguins) boiled down for their blubber.

More glamorous were the national exploring expeditions that overwintered, recovered and resupplied in Hobart. A French expedition led by Jules Dumont d’Urville ventured into Antarctic waters in two successive summers, stopping in Hobart for the intervening winter (1839), when many of the sick crew were hospitalised; those who died were buried in a local Catholic cemetery. A British exploring expedition led by James Clark Ross passed through in 1840, establishing a magnetic observatory in the grounds of what is now Government House. After a successful season in Antarctica, the expedition returned to spend the winter in Hobart. With the Tasmanian Governor, John Franklin, being himself a past polar explorer (who would later return to and die in the Arctic as Commander of the same two ships that Ross took to the Antarctic), the expedition was feted by the local community: among other things, a melodrama based on their journey entitled *The South Polar Expedition*, was performed in the Theatre Royal – probably the earliest Antarctic play.

With fur seal populations decimated and exploring activity focused primarily on the Arctic, few expeditions voyaged into the far south from this point until the end of the nineteenth century, when geographical interest in the region revived. The ‘Heroic Era’ of Antarctic exploration (1895–1922) saw numerous expedition ships transit through Hobart’s port, including those led by Henryk Bull, Carsten Borchegrevink (whose expedition included local Tasmanian Louis Bernacchi), Douglas Mawson, Roald Amundsen (returning triumphant from the first sledging journey to the South Pole), and Ernest Shackleton (the Ross Sea Party of his Imperial Trans-Antarctic Expedition used Hobart as its departure point). Remembering that Macquarie Island is part of Tasmania, we can add to these Shackleton’s *Nimrod* expedition as well as Robert Falcon Scott’s first expedition in the *Discovery*, as both visited the island on their way south.

By the mid-twentieth century, seven Antarctic territorial claims had been made – including Australia’s claim to 42% of the continent, the Australian Antarctic Territory – and the first permanent scientific stations were being constructed. Building on its earlier links, the French national Antarctic program used Hobart as its base from 1948. The vessels involved in the Australian National Antarctic Research Expedition (ANARE) also frequently left from Hobart, although the Australian Antarctic Division (AAD) – which coordinates Australia’s research and activities in the far south – was initially based in Melbourne, moving to Kingston only in 1981. The following year saw the secretariat for the newly formed Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic
Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) established in Hobart, drawing hundreds of delegates annually for its meetings. Almost two decades later, in 2001, the secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) was also located in the city.

The city’s attractiveness as a convenient port for vessels travelling to East Antarctica, which drew so many commercial and exploratory expeditions in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, remains important to the present day. Vessels servicing not only the French and Australian programs, but also more occasionally the Chinese, South Korean, Japanese and Italian programs, call in at Hobart. The Chinese government signed a memorandum of understanding with the Tasmanian Government in 2013 on Antarctic research and logistics cooperation, and the French Institut Polaire Français Paul-Emile Victor followed suit in 2014. Australian expeditioners themselves now travel by both air as well as sea. An Airbus A319 has been used to operate intercontinental passenger flights from Hobart to Antarctic locations, including the blue ice runway at Wilkins aerodrome and Pegasus runway near McMurdo Station. Freight has been dispatched from Hobart via a C-17 Globemaster aircraft during collaborative operations involving the AAD and the Royal Australian Air Force.

Hobart has also functioned as a minor gateway for Antarctic tourism, with both over-flights and tour ships operating from the city. The company Antarctic Flights charters aircraft for 12-hour round trips. Although these usually leave from cities in
mainland Australia, such as Melbourne and Sydney, a Hobart-Antarctica-Hobart charter flight took place in late November 2018. (It did, however, include a stopover in Melbourne prior to the Antarctic leg.) The main attraction for tourists travelling from Hobart to Antarctica by sea is Commonwealth Bay, the site of Mawson’s hut from his 1911–14 Australasian expedition, about 2600 kilometres south of Tasmania. Voyages to this region typically take 26 to 30 days, with stops at the New Zealand subantarctic islands and Macquarie Island. Although the centenary of Mawson’s 1911–14 expedition saw a burst of interest, the itinerary is far less popular than journeys to the Antarctic Peninsula, due to the long voyage duration, the notoriously rough seas and the difficult ice conditions that mean landings are not guaranteed. Thus, while Hobart has a history of being a gateway port for Antarctic tourism, it accounts for only a small portion of the Antarctic tourist traffic overall.8

Despite this, Antarctica has a presence in the city’s main cruise ship terminal, Macquarie Wharf No. 2. Disembarking visitors are greeted by a detailed display that outlines the priorities of the AAD and the importance of environmental protection in the far south, and includes a map showing Australia’s claims in the Antarctic. Text positioned above two larger-than-life Emperor Penguins reads ‘Welcome to Hobart: Gateway to Antarctica’ and a photo-board with face cut-outs allows visitors to project themselves visually into the frozen south. Such displays position Hobart as a gateway for learning about and vicariously experiencing Antarctica, rather than simply a gateway for physical access to the far south.

ENCOUNTERING ANTARCTICA IN AND THROUGH TASMANIA

Tasmania, and particularly Hobart, are not only places that are visited by Antarctic travellers on the way to and from their icy destination, but also places where Antarctica can be encountered indirectly, through sites that display and embody its heritage, culture, governance and science.

While Hobart’s place-branding as an ‘Antarctic gateway’ is a relatively new phenomenon, it is heavily reliant on the city’s historical connections with the continent, manifested materially in particular artefacts and sites in the city, which are concentrated on its waterfront. Some of these links with the past are more visible than others: while the group of try-pots that sit innocuously in the green strip of Salamanca Place quietly point to a history of exploitation of marine mammals that encompasses subantarctic and Antarctic locations, the Mawson’s Huts Replica Museum, which celebrates Australia’s first and most famous national exploring expedition, is harder to miss in its position opposite Mawson Place. As Aant Elzinga reflects in an analysis of the ‘politics of memory’ in the construction of the South American Antarctic gateway cities, ‘a selective gaze [is] at work when memories
of past events, narratives of polar exploration and traces in material culture are mobilized both in the production of geopolitical imaginaries and in promotion of eco- and polar heritage tourism’. The City of Hobart has enhanced particular connections through the funding of public artworks, such as Stephen Walker’s sculptural tribute to Bernacchi, with sledge dogs and a camera pointed south, on the edge of Sullivan’s Cove.

For over ten years, locals and visitors interested in Hobart’s Antarctic heritage have had the advantage of Polar Pathways, a self-guided walk-drive tour of 30 different relevant sites in and around the city, from the obvious to the obscure. Created by geographer Lorne Kriwoken and historian John Williamson, the tour can be followed using a free brochure or a more detailed booklet. This points towards a growing willingness to curate the ‘gateway city’ tourist experience in Hobart – one that is matched by an increasing engagement with Tasmania’s polar heritage within the museum sector.

Efforts to create an interpretative experience for visitors to Hobart interested in Antarctica started shakily. A multimillion-dollar ‘Antarctic Adventure’ centre in Salamanca Square featuring a cold room and simulated toboggan ride performed poorly over its period of operation from 1997 to 2004, by which time the Tasmanian
Government was paying $10,000 per week to maintain it. In 2005, then Tasmanian Minister for Economic Development and Minister for the Arts Lara Giddings considered that a lack of clear purpose contributed to the tourist attraction’s failure: ‘It was not exactly an exhibition to tell people about Antarctica and it was not exactly a theme park either.’ By this point, an Antarctic exhibition in the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery (TMAG) was considered a better option, with over half a million dollars put aside for its development.

The result was ‘Islands to Ice: The Great Southern Ocean and Antarctica’, a permanent exhibition in TMAG launched by Giddings in early 2006. Implicit in the title, and evident in the interpretative material, is Tasmania’s role as a geographical and historical entrée into the Antarctic: the exhibition is ‘an invitation to journey south from Hobart across the oceans to the frozen continent…’. In addition to the expected historical artefacts and taxidermied penguins, the exhibition features a popular relief map of Antarctica made from ice that visitors (particularly children) can lay their hands on and a theatrette where the audience uses 3D glasses to view photographer Frank Hurley’s images from the Australasian Antarctic Expedition (AAE) of 1911–14. The exhibition is a popular feature of the Museum, with about one in six reviews of TMAG on TripAdvisor mentioning it, almost always as a positive feature.
During the centenary of the AAE a second museum was established on the Hobart waterfront: a full-scale replica of the expedition hut in Commonwealth Bay, Antarctica. The Mawson's Huts Replica Museum, run by the Mawson's Huts Foundation and supported by Federal Government and philanthropic funds, allows visitors to Hobart to get a sense of the space in which Mawson’s men lived, complemented by interpretative material and knowledgeable guides. Rated as the best Hobart museum on TripAdvisor, the replica attracts around 70% of its visitors from the Australian mainland, and nearly 10% more from international locations.\textsuperscript{15}

The Mawson’s Huts Foundation is also the force behind the Australian Antarctic Festival (AAF), held biennially in early August since 2016. The AAF echoes the earlier ‘Antarctic Midwinter Festival’, which occurred annually from 2001 to 2009. Running over four days and supported by local and state government as well as polar cruise ship company Chimu Adventures, the AAF involves school activities, tours of research vessels and local heritage sites, open days, industry showcases, films, exhibitions and other forms of education and entertainment. The 2018 event attracted 21,000 visitors, with 16.1% coming from interstate or overseas.\textsuperscript{16} This regular event is enhanced by more occasional initiatives that draw on and enhance Tasmania’s Antarctic culture.

Figure 4. An interactive relief map of Antarctica made of ice is a popular part of the ‘Islands to Ice: The Great Southern Ocean and Antarctica’ exhibition.
and heritage. In 2016, for example, *Antarctica: The Musical* had its world premiere at the Theatre Royal – the same venue that had hosted the world’s first Antarctic theatrical performance more than 150 years previously.

The high concentration of Antarctic researchers in Hobart makes the city an attractive destination not only for leisure travellers but also visiting researchers. A 2013 report from the Tasmanian Government’s Department of State Growth (DSG) found that during the Antarctic Centennial year (2011–12), ‘delegates to Antarctic conferences, forums and meetings in Hobart spent over 8,950 visitor nights in Tasmania, injecting an estimated $2.75 million into the economy’. Each October, CCAMLR hosts two weeks of meetings at its Macquarie Street premises in Hobart, attracting over 280 delegates. With CCAMLR’s decisions, particularly around proposals for Marine Protected Areas in the Antarctic, becoming more high profile, the meeting itself is drawing media attention to the city and its Antarctic connections. The city has also hosted large international meetings such as the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM) in 1986 and 2012 and the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) Open Science Conference in 2006. The 2020 SCAR
conference is expected to bring an influx of around 1000 delegates to the city. It is not only official events that draw researchers to Hobart; expeditioners en route to Antarctica for a summer field season with the Australian Antarctic Program often spend several days in the city prior to their scheduled departure. Recognising this, the Hobart City Council holds an ‘Opening of the Season’ event to farewell the expeditioners and celebrate the city’s Antarctic links.

A number of local businesses in Hobart and southern Tasmania capitalise on the economic opportunities presented by visitors with an interest in Antarctica. One example is the local gin producer, Süd Polaire. The distillers, who opened a bar called ‘Institut Polaire’ in 2017, offer a range of polar-inspired products including ‘Antarctic Dry Gin’ and ‘Expedition Strength Gin’. This Tasmanian producer uses an imagined connection with Antarctica as a selling point: marketing material describes how ‘pristine Tasmanian rainwater swept across a vast expanse of Southern Ocean from Antarctica’ is a key ingredient in their spirits. The brand name makes it a popular beverage with transiting expeditioners, while the gins offer a taste of the far south, inviting tourists and locals alike to reconsider Tasmania’s connections with Antarctica as they sip their ‘glacial cut’ drinks. In other cases, local businesses provide a service directly to Antarctic operators (TasPorts for local port facilities in Hobart, William Adams for tractors modified to suit Antarctic weather extremes).

The economic value of the Antarctic sector to Tasmania’s economy is recognised by the Tasmanian Polar Network (TPN). The TPN, which was incorporated in 1999, aims to ‘strengthen, promote and grow Tasmania’s business, education, training and research expertise in the Antarctic and Southern Ocean sector’. It includes over 60 member organisations from sectors as diverse as shipping, traverse equipment, weather forecasting services, research and education, accommodation, and tourism operators. The TPN is a key player when considering the commercial elements of being an Antarctic gateway city, as many members offer their services both to local tourists and to those with a South Polar connection.

The DSG also has an interest in Antarctica, and has a dedicated business unit called Antarctic Tasmania that was established ‘to fulfil the Tasmanian government’s commitment to the international Antarctic sector and to support this sector’s growth’. As well as advocating for industry players, and promoting Hobart as a logistics hub for other national Antarctic programs, Antarctic Tasmania highlights the many tourist-friendly sites and experiences that make up ‘Hobart’s Antarctic attractions’. The TPN and DSG are therefore aware that the importance of Hobart as an Antarctic city goes beyond logistics and direct connections to the far south; rather, it encompasses visibility and relevance throughout the wider tourist experience for those who visit the city.
Hobart’s Antarctic connections have attracted attention at a range of policy levels, illustrated by the Tasmanian Government’s *Tasmanian Antarctic Gateway Strategy* (2017) and the Parliament of Australia’s Joint Standing Committee on the National Capital and External Territories report on *Maintaining Australia’s National Interests in Antarctica* (2018). The *Tasmanian Antarctic Gateway Strategy* was designed to strengthen the state’s position as a gateway with a ‘strong and vibrant Antarctic and Southern Ocean sector’ that made valuable contributions to the state’s economy. The 2018 parliamentary report suggested that Hobart’s competitiveness as an Antarctic gateway city could be improved by focusing on developing Antarctic infrastructure, promoting Tasmanian industry, and positioning Hobart as ‘an international Antarctic science and research hub’. It included 22 recommendations, including the establishment of an Office of Antarctic Services to ‘oversee the promotion of Australia, and in particular Hobart, as an Antarctic gateway and hub to international Antarctic programs’.

Development activity currently underway in Hobart will see the Antarctic infrastructure capabilities of the city expand in the coming years. TasPorts is currently working on a $60 million new logistics hub in Hobart, due for completion by mid-2020, the same year that the new icebreaker *RSV Nuyina* is scheduled to arrive in the city. The planned development of an ‘Antarctic precinct’ at Macquarie Point would support the existing community of Antarctic researchers and scientists, who are currently housed at institutions including the Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies (IMAS) at UTAS, the AAD and the CSIRO. It could also potentially showcase natural, historical, cultural and political connections with Antarctica through artworks, exhibition spaces and venues for speakers and forums.

While economic factors are most often cited when justifying the promotion of Tasmania as an Antarctic gateway, the Australian Government’s investment in this identity inevitably has a geopolitical aspect. Raising the profile of Hobart as a historical and present-day gateway symbolically reinforces Australia’s interests in the continent of which it has the largest of all national claims. The geopolitics of ‘Antarctic gateways’ occasionally shifts from dormant to active, as in 2018 when the leader of Tasmania’s Green Party, Cassy O’Connor, criticised Premier Will Hodgman’s attempts to foster the Chinese Antarctic program’s use of the city as a hub, pointing to China’s supposed territorial interests, military activities and mineral exploitation in the continent. The situation echoed 1950s media fears around the USSR’s increasing presence in the region claimed by Australia. Despite the 1959 Antarctic Treaty’s effective suspension of territorial claims, geopolitical tensions of this kind persist, and need to inform the way any gateway city curates and presents its Antarctic connections to national and international visitors.
BEYOND THE GATEWAY

Hobart’s ‘Antarctic gateway’ identity is clearly an attraction for tourists and other visitors to the city. However, the term might also limit the way we think about Hobart and the other ‘southern rim’ cities. C Michael Hall, using a definition of the term from within economic geography, argues that most of the supposed ‘Antarctic gateways’ do not technically warrant this descriptor, lacking (for example) a sufficient number of vessels permanently based in their ports.27 Gabriela Roldan suggests a usage of the term that goes beyond its economic and logistical origins: she contends that a ‘gateway’ should be considered more than a ‘transportation hub’, instead expanding to include political and scientific interests as well as community engagement and education.28 We agree that the relationship between Tasmania and Antarctica exceeds the idea of a thoroughfare that the term ‘gateway’ implies. Increasingly, the state’s Antarctic connections are being built around knowledge generation and governance as much as logistics and resupply. Geologically, climatically, geographically, historically, culturally and politically, Tasmania forms part of an extended South Polar world, and in this sense Hobart (like its counterparts) might be better thought of as an ‘Antarctic city’ than a ‘gateway city’.

As we have shown, there is evident will at all levels of government to actively promote and foster Tasmania’s links with Antarctica. Nonetheless, from the tourist perspective Tasmania’s Antarctic associations, embedded as they are within a range of industries and sectors, are poorly integrated. There is no one physical or virtual site that brings together the myriad ways in which the island and the continent are connected. Such a site – perhaps connected with the proposed ‘Antarctic precinct’ – would cement the connections between Hobart and Antarctica in the public imaginations of a wide range of domestic and international tourists. The far south need not seem so very far away, after all.
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This chapter examines Tourism Tasmania’s current online cross-promotional destination marketing strategy for the ABC television series Rosehaven, specifically demonstrating how the state agency works to link existing Tasmanian tourism destinations to the fictional settings of the television series. It also assesses the ‘real-life’ destinations that are actively promoting Rosehaven as part of local tourism initiatives. Overall, the show’s ‘quirky’ personality appears to be a valuable asset for broader Tasmanian branding trends, helping to dramatise the concept that Tasmania is a unique island destination, different from the rest of Australia: a place of unusual people and locations.

Tasmania is currently experiencing an upturn of economic investment in its screen industry, which has resulted in a marked increase in film and television production that directly or indirectly features Australia’s southernmost state. Before 2014, the typical annual spend on screen production in Tasmania stood at about $2 million, but in the last five years that amount has quintupled to about $10 million.¹ High-
profile arthouse films such as *Lion* (director Garth Davis, 2016) and the new historical thriller *The Nightingale* (director Jennifer Kent, 2018), have showcased dramatic parts of Tasmania’s scenery to domestic and international audiences. Television series such as *The Kettering Incident* (2016) and *Rosehaven* (2016–) and the series *The Gloaming* have been filmed entirely on location in Tasmania.²

Clearly, the small-scale Tasmanian film and television industry is ‘having a moment’.³

An upshot of such investment in a local film industry is the increased potential for Tasmanian-focused screen production – and ‘distinctive Tasmanian stories’ – to generate visitor interest in Tasmanian destinations, linking film and television to one of the state’s most economically important industries: tourism. There is potential for specific fan-inspired pilgrimages to the precise shooting locations of a television series or film – often called film-induced tourism, screen-induced tourism or film tourism – and for more general interest in Tasmania that could come through increased promotion of clearly-delineated Tasmanian screen spaces via the mass media.⁴ Hence, these kinds of mediated interests from an imagined ‘visitor’ could conceivably stretch from permanent migration to the state to short-term touristic stays after seeing the state prominently displayed in a fictional or documentary screen text.

The purpose of this chapter is twofold: firstly, it is to examine Tourism Tasmania’s current online cross-promotional destination marketing strategy for the ABC television series *Rosehaven*, specifically to demonstrate how the state agency has been working to link existing Tasmanian tourism destinations to the fictional settings of the television series, in the hope of creating television-generated tourism. Secondly, I also assess the ‘real-life’ destinations that are actively promoting *Rosehaven* as part of local tourism initiatives, and whether these are linked to the state-based destination marketing. *Rosehaven* has been selected as a case study for analysis because it is a current production and hence has the potential to create a sustained or long-term audience over a number of years: the third season of the show aired in early 2019, within six months of the research conducted for this chapter.⁵ Seasons Two and Three were also co-produced by American pay TV channel Sundance TV, so it also has the potential to tap into US and international tourism markets.⁶ As I will show, the television show has featured in a range of destination marketing materials by Tourism Tasmania, where the target market appears to be ‘mainlanders’, especially visitors from major metropolitan centres. Overall, the show’s ‘quirky’ personality appears to be a valuable asset for broader Tasmanian branding trends as the state draws connections to its cultural and creative productivity, which also helps to dramatise the concept that Tasmania is a unique island destination within the broader Australian market: a place of unusual people and locations.
THE TV SERIES AND LOCATIONS

*Rosehaven* is premised around two close friends who have wound up moving to a small town in southern Tasmania. Daniel (Luke McGregor) has returned to Tasmania from Melbourne, coming home to work for his mother’s real estate business in Rosehaven. His best friend Emma (Celia Pacquola) arrives in town soon afterwards, leaving her fiancée and deciding to take a break from her old life in strange new surroundings. Hence, while the show dramatises the protagonist Luke’s re-acclimatisation to regional Tasmanian life, it also demonstrates the everyday eccentricities through Emma’s ongoing discoveries about the quirky quotidian of the town (such as her delight in discovering that Rosehaven has a 24-hour butcher). *Rosehaven* also mines the comic potential of the ‘odd couple’ relationship that links the two friends.

The show could be classified loosely as a situation comedy or sitcom, yet while it features a repetitive episodic structure and richly comic and quirky characters, it avoids the manic pacing and exaggerated laughs that often characterise the genre: as Steve Greene suggests, the show is ‘surprisingly unafraid of silence’. It also contains moments of genuine pathos between the central characters, intimating that the show operates as an offbeat drama as well as a comedy, in the tradition of ‘small-town’ Australian dramas such as *SeaChange* (1998–2000).

In critical reviews of the show, a lot of attention has been given to the importance of the Tasmanian settings used for televisual storytelling. Alexandra Neill notes that the program uses the rural location to project a ‘love letter’ to an under-represented part of the country, which simultaneously avoids the cliché of conventional tourism marketing about the location as it ‘points the camera solidly at the particularities of life in Australia’s small towns – isolated, insular and reluctant to change’. Interestingly, while Tourism Tasmania has employed an ‘escape to the real Rosehaven’ strategy, some international reviewers of the show have described watching the series as a virtual escape from the real world; a kind of balm to assuage political and economic woes. Marc Silver, writing for *The Washington Post*, notes that many critics have observed that ‘in this year of disasters and strife, TV viewers want to escape via sitcom’, while then noting ‘I can’t think of a better refuge than Rosehaven?’ Whether it is armchair travel or real travel, *Rosehaven* appears to be a text that inspires the concept of escape, which is even suggested by the show’s title (a ‘haven’ being a place of safety or refuge).

So, what kind of virtual travel experience does the show provide the viewer? The program’s focus on a real estate business gives prominence to ordinary double-brick homes and the small shops that Daniel and Emma need to visit as part of their jobs: hence, it offers viewers the chance to see rural places and townscapes of southern
Tasmania that regular tourism marketing campaigns focusing on spectacular wilderness sites would normally miss. Establishing drone shots of ‘Rosehaven’ show picturesque townscapes and the surrounding countryside, but importantly, the typical ‘touristic’ shots of the Tasmanian wilderness (Cradle Mountain, Freycinet National Park, etc.) are not a feature of the show. In reality, the television series was shot in a number of locations in southern Tasmania.10

**DESTINATION MARKETING AND ROSEHAVEN**

Destination marketing and screen tourism is an emerging research field within tourism and marketing scholarship. As Lundberg, Ziakas and Morgan have suggested, ‘very few studies have focused on destination strategies for on-screen tourism, with some exceptions, including *The Lord of the Rings* tourism within a New Zealand national image strategy…and *Dracula* tourism within the social development of national identity transformation of Romania’.11 Therefore, it is interesting to see an emerging case study where an Australian state is able to utilise distinctive destination marketing strategies for a more localised region than at national level. Perhaps Tasmania’s unique position as an ‘island state’ allows it more possibility for differentiation than the other states. For a long time, Tasmania has asserted its distinctiveness as a tourist destination from the ‘mainland’; visitors to Tasmania are arguably attracted to the region ‘by its unspoiled natural environment, the character, diversity, extent and uniqueness of which combine in a way as to afford visitors an experience unlike any other elsewhere in Australia’.12

Using a television text such as *Rosehaven* for destination marketing means drawing upon these same characteristics, but adding more details and humour to the overall messaging.

After the first season of *Rosehaven* aired on the ABC in late 2016, the Tasmanian DSG reported that Screen Tasmania had worked closely with Tourism Tasmania to help in the identification and implementation of ‘cross-promotional opportunities’ that could target Tasmanian screen tourists and fans of the show.13 The result of this focus was the creation of a *Rosehaven* travel itinerary and the production of a promotional video called ‘Luke and Celia’s Guide to Tassie’ that could be distributed and leveraged through Tourism Tasmania’s social media networks, especially Facebook and Twitter.14 The video uses ABC-provided footage from the show and voiceovers from the co-creators on top of stock tourism shots and aerial photography of Tasmania, including Dove Lake, Wineglass Bay and Cradle Mountain.

Asserting the island’s ‘uniqueness’ as suggested above, in the video Luke McGregor suggests that ‘Tassie’s cool because you can travel half an hour to completely different spots. It looks different, the palette’s different’. Celia Pacquola
agrees, noting that the ‘range of landscapes was so different in such a small space, which was very exciting to find’. In reference to the cinematic qualities of the location, Pacquola also believes that ‘there’s parts of [Tasmania] that feel like Middle-Earth… and the air is really clear!’ The video ends with Pacquola’s suggestion that if she had a free weekend in Tasmania, she would visit MONA and go to a local market to buy ‘some of the delicious cheese of this region’ as well as trying out the other local food and drink options. Other than the shot of Geeveston that is visible in the clip from the show, there is no reference to shooting locations or particular details about destinations close to the show’s production: this film is aimed at the tourist interested in wider experiences of Tasmania. Therefore, information is given that could be useful to a visitor to Hobart in search of gourmet and cultural experiences of the state – or else a fan interested in retracing the steps of the two starring celebrity comedians.15 Such a strategy appears valid and an attempt to maximise the potential visitor market to Tasmania, through extending the themes of the television series – and the quirkiness of the main actors – into pre-existing tourist experiences in southern Tasmania.

In the lead-up to the release of Season One of Rosehaven on ABC television and streaming video app iView, Discover Tasmania commenced an online destination marketing campaign aimed to stimulate interest around the Tasmanian television locations. On 6 October 2016, it posted the following comment on its @tasmania Twitter account ‘@ABCTV’s new comedy #Rosehaven might be set in a fictional #Tassie town, but the stunning scenery is very real!’ This caption was accompanied by an aerial photograph of the real town of Geeveston, as well as a hyperlink to an existing Discover Tasmania article about the Huon Valley by Paul Fleming called ‘Inside the Huon Valley’, which was published as part of its ‘Go Behind the Scenery’ campaign (which had been a key part of Tasmania’s destination marketing strategy since 2013). While Fleming’s article contained no reference to Rosehaven, soon after this a more targeted article about taking a Rosehaven-themed self-drive itinerary was published on the Discover Tasmania webpage. Titled ‘Rosehaven’, the article commences with a direct address to presumably identify the key market – domestic interstate visitors – by speaking to ‘mainlanders’:

Are you a mainlander? If you’ve had a chuckle over the Rosehaven shorts, we have a real-life town that’ll knock your knitted socks off. It’s a place where real mainlanders are flocking to. It’s the real Rosehaven. We call it Geeveston. (Might we add, it’s known for more than the Geeveston Fanny apple.)16

Emphasising Tasmania’s insularity and weirdness, the article describes a touring route (or a self-drive itinerary) leaving from Hobart to the Huon Valley region, so that you can ‘discover the real Rosehaven’. The jokey tone here attempts to emulate
the quirky humour of the TV comedy. It locates Geeveston as the key film tourism destination for potential *Rosehaven* television tourists, with the town explicitly named as ‘the real Rosehaven’. Demonstrating its potential as an enjoyable visitor experience, the article suggests: ‘There’s plenty more than awkward estate agents and towns named Snug to attract mainlanders this way. There’s century-old apple orchards, boat builders and cider makers.’ So, while the towns and hamlets in the itinerary are close to the show’s filming sites in the Huon Valley – Huonville, Ranelagh, Grove, Franklin and Geeveston are all mentioned in the piece – it tends to mention more generic southern Tasmanian experiences that are not specific to fan engagement with the series. So, the self-directed drive to ‘Rosehaven’ locations encourages the reader to design an experience which will allow them to engage with quirky local characters and places akin to the show’s narrative, but it avoids a literal revisit of key film shooting locations and settings.

The idea of Tasmania being a ‘quirky’ travel destination has been embraced in the wake of cultural tourism events such as MONA and its related festivals …

For Season Two, a new wave of marketing appeared on Discover Tasmania’s social media channels, and a new ‘behind-the-scenes’ video was published. On 15 November 2017, Discover Tasmania introduced a new short video called ‘Five Towns Make One Rosehaven’ onto their @Tasmania Twitter account with the accompanying message: ‘It’s #Rosehaven night! Time to take a #TassieStyle roadtrip to meet the towns that star…’. Unlike the marketing materials mentioned for the initial season of *Rosehaven*, ‘Five Towns Make One Rosehaven’ does work to identify some of the key film locations, and it clearly depicts the town of Geeveston and the Longley International Pub (renamed the Rosehaven pub in the series) as viable screen tourism destinations. While the aim of the video is apparently to demonstrate the ‘behind-the-scenes’ complexity of filming on location – and the ability for a screen text to be stitched together from a composite set of destinations – director Shaun Wilson emphasises the importance of Geeveston as the authentic marker of the fictional town, observing that ‘any time you see a big wide shot of Rosehaven or a drone shot, you’re looking at Geeveston’. Overall, the recurring theme in the marketing materials is to emphasise the applicability of a ‘Rosehaven’ experience across southern Tasmania, as if any town in the area would be able to provide a sense of the show.
TOURING ROSEHAVEN SITES

In early 2019, I took a range of trips to the main towns and locations depicted in *Rosehaven* and established that the Huon Valley region was the only place actively making a connection to the television series for potential screen tourists. As a result, I took two self-directed driving journeys from Hobart to the Huon Valley region in May 2019, to examine the way that *Rosehaven* might appear across visitor signage and experiences, as a way of assessing the existing touristic infrastructure. As a participant observer, I visited the major destinations and visitor centres of the region as well as the specific sites identified in the Discover Tasmania ‘Rosehaven’ article, looking for signs of *Rosehaven*.21

The results of my research indicated that despite the range of destinations utilised across the three seasons, currently the Geeveston Visitor Centre is the main place actively drawing a connection to the television series and its real-life locations. Many of the businesses mentioned in the ‘Rosehaven’ article were unaware they were being themed as a TV-like experience in Destination Tasmania’s marketing materials.22 While many of the businesses have shops selling local goods and wares, only the Geeveston Visitor Centre tried to draw a connection with the show. And yet, to date the Visitor Centre has received no mention in Tourism Tasmania marketing materials.
about Rosehaven screen tourism, although the numerous mentions of the town would be likely to drive any interested screen tourists to the right vicinity.

This centre, located right in the heart of Geeveston, is an obvious place for the Rosehaven-centred television tourism in the town. The Visitor Centre sits in an iconic building of the town, the old Town Hall and Council Chambers (originally built in 1914). The large building is filled with a range of historical exhibits and activities that highlight the town’s lengthy association with the forestry industry but also its connection to national parks and wilderness areas, such as the large-scale nature-based tourism attraction Tahune Forest Airwalk, which was first opened to the public in 2001.23

In Geeveston, Rosehaven screen tourism draws on culturally resonant ideas attached to the rural small town. At the centre, a large display feature has been set up focusing on the television series, situated prominently near the entrance of the building and close to the combined information and sales desk. It is the only show (or film) that is featured on a display wall in the centre. The display features laminated news stories about the show’s production, promotional photos, large framed film stills with cast signatures, webpage printouts and maps signposted with film location sites both in the Huon Valley and beyond it in southern Tasmania. A simple list identifies towns and Hobart suburbs that are named as featured ‘locations’ in the third season (they refer to Mountain River, Longley, Seven Mile Beach, Richmond, Chigwell, Brighton and Oatlands as well as their own town). The Visitor Centre also sells unofficial merchandise themed around
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the television show. There are two Geeveston-made local products – quince jam and home-made knitted scarves – that are labelled as having been ‘made in Rosehaven’. The products do not adopt any of the branding or typography of the television series but use the word ‘Rosehaven’ as a signifier of place. Overall, the local destination marketing materials for Rosehaven could be featured or highlighted in future state tourism promotional materials, particularly as they draw upon similar ‘quirky’ small-town tropes that match the sensibility of the television show.

DISCUSSION

In her research on the motivations that drive the screen tourist, Niki Macionis has argued for the appearance of three distinct categories of tourist: the serendipitous film tourist (‘those who just happen to be in a destination portrayed in a film’), the general film tourist (‘those who are not specifically drawn to a film location but who participate in film tourism activities while at a destination’) and the specific film tourist (those who ‘actively seek out places that they have seen in film’). The lack of broader online promotion of the Geeveston Visitor Centre Rosehaven display means it can only capture the attention of serendipitous film tourists and general film tourists, both types of film tourist who have discovered or decided to engage in an activity related to film tourism only upon arrival at the destination, and unlikely to have engaged with the ‘pull factors’ of marketing campaigns as a draw factor to the destination. Meanwhile, I would suggest that one of the aims of Tourism Tasmania’s group of destination marketing materials for Rosehaven is to attract specific film tourists, as the agency has created ‘pull factor’ materials and listed specific destinations for themed experiences to the southern Tasmanian region that seem aimed at a fan-inspired media pilgrimage.

However, the reality of creating screen tourism in regional Tasmania is that the likelihood of it creating a sustainable tourism venture for hardcore fan-pilgrims of the show is very low. This is due to the relative distance between the shooting locations and a major metropolitan centre (Melbourne is the closest major city to Geeveston). Unlike ‘regional’ screen-induced tourism destinations such as Barwon Heads for SeaChange or Goathland for Heartbeat – both famous television-based tourism locations in tourism research – the southern Tasmanian locations are much more difficult to reach from a major city, hence there are increased costs to travel to the destinations. Perhaps the idea of trying to attract large quantities of specific screen-induced tourists to Tasmanian television locations is a nearly impossible task.

However, what the state-based destination marketing campaign also does is to connect Rosehaven and the show’s peculiar and distinct style of ‘quirkiness’ as a signifier of the entire island, which serves to connect the show to broader Tasmanian
branding trends. The idea of Tasmania being a ‘quirky’ travel destination has been embraced in the wake of cultural tourism events such as MONA and its related festivals, especially Dark Mofo, the most well-attended annual event in Tasmania. In 2014, Lonely Planet described Tasmania as ‘wild and dramatic, cultured and quirky’. In 2016, the Premier Will Hodgman suggested that the Dark Mofo festival ‘has embraced all that makes Tasmania quirky and unique’, which also insinuates that this quirkiness is commodifiable and outward-looking. Recently, Brand Tasmania has also connected MONA to a cool kind of nonconformity, writing about a new feature of the museum: ‘[t]hat’s quirky, offbeat and outrageous. That’s Tasmanian’. In this way, the ‘quirky’ attitudes of the small-town characters in the television show seem to be a Tasmanian quality or attribute, and therefore any specific destination marketing materials set up around Rosehaven help to reinforce that broader messaging about Tasmania as a distinctive travel location.

To conclude, given the local work achieved in Geeveston to construct specific Rosehaven screen tourism experiences for serious fans of the show, it makes sense for the state to shine a spotlight on this initiative, which could help to reinforce the geographic connection between Geeveston and the fictional setting of the television series, and potentially increase site-specific television tourism to the town. However, the existing destination marketing campaign does significant work by connecting the television series with an emerging ‘quirky’ brand attribute of Tasmanian identity, that is able to market both cultural businesses such as MONA and regional places and experiences such as an insular small town in southern Tasmania. Perhaps that’s already enough to knock our knitted socks off.
Section 3

TOURISM BUSINESS
ABSTRACT

International tourist numbers to Tasmania have grown steadily in the past decades. Tasmania has experienced a surge of Chinese tourists following Chinese President Xi Jinping’s presidential visit to Hobart on 18 November 2014. Pure and pristine nature, lavender bears, gourmet seafood, the Port Arthur Historic Site, and the recently popularised aurora gazing and outdoor adventure activities have come to be regarded as unique Tasmanian experiences by many Chinese. The boom of Chinese inbound tourism has spurred the state’s economic growth, enriched cultural exchange and stimulated regional development. To document this fledgling development, this chapter documents the growth of Chinese tourist numbers in Tasmania, their cross-cultural tourist experiences and their perception of the island. Drawing from tourism theories and research data, this chapter offers three practical recommendations to the industry: understand the dynamism of Chinese culture; guide tourists into the experience; and deal with language barriers and social media.
INTRODUCTION

Chinese outbound tourism has grown dramatically in the last 20 years, propelling China into its current position as a major source of tourists. This booming phenomenon of Chinese travelling overseas is driven by the growth of national economic power and the subsequent rise in household disposable income. Relaxation of travel restrictions and the opening up of China, along with the increasing accessibility of tourist visas have also been instrumental in encouraging Chinese to travel. Additionally, the Chinese have acquired a taste for seeing the world. The desire for exotic cultural experiences and enjoyment in nature has intensified. Mainland Chinese made 127 million trips in 2017, making China the biggest source of international visitors in the world. The economic contribution made by Chinese outbound tourism is also significant. In 2016, Chinese travellers spent US$261 billion overseas (this figure includes Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan). Chinese tourism generates economic value and employment opportunities for travel destinations. The level of Chinese outbound tourism has drawn attention both globally and regionally, and many operators want to capture this market.

While this trend is burgeoning, providing tourism products and services to this market becomes challenging, because Chinese culture is diverse and complex, and is problematic if cultural understanding is inadequate. Therefore, it is pertinent for researchers and practitioners to understand Chinese tourist behaviours more comprehensively, in order to provide better tourism experiences.

The purposes of this chapter are three-fold. Firstly, it briefly presents the history of Chinese tourism in Tasmania. Secondly, it discusses the range of Chinese tourists’ experiences today. Thirdly, it proposes practical recommendations on bridging cultural gaps.

This chapter derives from my PhD research on the influence of socio-cultural backgrounds on Chinese tourist experiences. Besides reviewing the literature, both first-hand and secondary data are used, including from the 25 interviews conducted in 2017 (with mainland Chinese travellers, international students from China, Chinese tour agents and first-generation immigrants); observations and informal conversations over the past five years as a researcher; and information from websites, news sources, government reports and social media posts.

CHINESE TOURISM IN TASMANIA IN THE PAST

Over the past few years, the number of Chinese tourists in Tasmania has grown phenomenally. Figure 1 illustrates the five largest tourist source markets: the US, China, New Zealand, the UK and Hong Kong, as well as Japan. Japan was an important international market in the 1980s and 1990s before China’s economic
Now, China and Hong Kong represent the two major Asian markets for Tasmania. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that while Australia recorded a total of 1,315,600 Chinese tourists for 2018, at the same time only a small fraction of these visitors (52,300 in total or approximately 3%) chose to travel south to Tasmania.

There were important events and activities that spurred the growth of Chinese tourism in Tasmania. Firstly, as part of the ‘celebrity effect’, an increasing number of well-known celebrities promoted the island through their glowing reviews of Tasmania. For example, the purple Tasmanian lavender bears became insanely popular among Chinese visitors after the Chinese actress Zhang Xinyu visited the state and publicly enthused about the bear in 2013. Another boost came from megastar Eason Chan. He painted a mural in the Tasmanian town of Sheffield and filmed a travel show at the same time. More significantly, Chinese President Xi Jinping and his wife Peng Liyuan visited Tasmania and this drew widespread attention to the state in China.

Secondly, films have offered Australia marketing benefits in terms of attracting Chinese tourists. Research shows people who visit film locations display more emotion and awareness towards the destination, because the image-rich plots and
narratives from films can be associated with the locations. In 2013, a romantic micro film *Heartbeat Love* (再一次心跳) was produced by Australian Tourism and Tourism Victoria, starring Taiwanese singer and actor Show Luo and actress Yang Cheng Lin. Parts of the film were shot in Tasmania including the Tahune Forest Airwalk. Many Taiwanese films and TV series are popular among mainland Chinese, and this one has been watched by many. Later *Chef Nic* (十二道锋味) featured Tasmanian food produce in 2014 and *City to City* (城市1对1), made by CCTV (China Central Television) in 2018 characterised Tasmania as a niche and unique travel destination. When I asked interviewees what they have heard about Tasmania, one participant said:

"First, the heart-shape of the island is stunning [unique shape]; second, it is one of the most southern islands, and previously some movies were related to here; and later on, some Chinese celebrities came."
This shows that the films, celebrities and its related word of mouth are of considerable importance in attracting Chinese tourists.

Thirdly, the development has been facilitated and supported by an array of policies and agendas. Table 1 shows some examples of the key items between 2011 and 2017. These were geared towards the Chinese outbound tourism market. In addition to the items in the table, as Hobart becomes an increasingly important gateway to Antarctica for scientific purposes, the Chinese polar resupply vessel *Xue Long* of the Chinese National Antarctic Research Expedition has used Hobart to resupply and refuel regularly in this decade.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Main content</th>
<th>Applies to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania Getting China Ready Program (DSG)</td>
<td>11 Aug 2014</td>
<td>Organic growth for the state</td>
<td>Tasmanian Hospitality Association <em>Practical Guide to providing service to Chinese guests</em></td>
<td>Hospitality and tourism workers across the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China-Australia Free Trade Agreement (ChAFTA)</td>
<td>Signed: 17 Jun 2015 Effective from: 20 Dec 2015</td>
<td>Boost trade and create jobs</td>
<td>Removes barriers to the trade of goods and services and investment flows: agriculture, foods, resources, energy, manufacturing, services, etc.</td>
<td>Everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China-Australia Year of Tourism</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Bring Australia and China closer together</td>
<td>A number of events were held during the year in China and Australia</td>
<td>Tourism, economy, academics, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHINESE TOURIST EXPERIENCES AT THE PRESENT

The data from interviews were thematically analysed to understand Chinese tourists’ experiences of Tasmania. It reveals a few features and travel patterns.

Firstly, Tasmania is famous for its remoteness. It draws great interest among Chinese because of its location – ‘the end of the world’ (世界的尽头) – and its uniqueness and exotic experiences. The interviewees reported that they were often attracted to Tasmania’s natural scenery and unpolluted environment, among which the coastline ocean views they regarded as very impressive. However, the data revealed that weather and season had a major influence on tourist satisfaction; it seemed that some tourists did not expect bad weather and were surprised if they did. Images of Tasmanian are often presented with blue skies, white clouds and green background. When I asked Chinese informants how they would introduce Tasmania to friends and relatives, a participant told me:

- For holidays I recommend here, but you need to select good weather to visit.
- I chose Tasmania because so many people said it’s a beautiful place, so we decided to visit, but we didn’t expect the weather to be bad.

Figure 3. Tourists at Devil’s Kitchen.
Wineglass Bay, Cradle Mountain, kunanyi/Mount Wellington and Mount Field were frequently mentioned as significant experiences. However, these places were often only experienced as photogenic landmarks; many interviewees were unable to spend much time in these locations. A reason for this behaviour is that many Chinese generally lack outdoor skills and experiences, which makes them less adventurous. Bushwalking has not been seen as a popular outdoor activity since many Chinese tourists prefer sightseeing and are less experienced in hiking in the wild.

Much of the Tasmanian wilderness is part of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area. However, while many interviewees appreciated the nature in Tasmania, the concept of ‘wilderness’ can be a contradiction for many. In western thought ‘wilderness’ represents a well preserved and pristine land with little human modification. However, in Chinese language and culture, the direct translation of wilderness is 荒野 (huāng yě) which carries negative connotations, portraying images relating to coldness, loneliness and hopelessness. This sentiment was captured in one of the interviews:

People recommended here as a place for natural sightseeing, but it looks 荒凉 (wild/cold, underdeveloped) for the low population density.

In China, when people visit natural attractions, they commonly connect and associate some historical stories, myths and ancient poems with the aesthetic value of the nature. For example, when tourists climb the Mount Tai area in China, dozens of human-made sites and modifications guide tourists in what to gaze at and how to gaze. Research has suggested that compared to Australian visitors, Chinese tourists are more likely to have an instrumental or anthropocentric view of nature – that they think the environment exists for the benefit of people, and are less likely to hold aesthetic attitudes towards beauty and meaning in wildlife and nature. This difference in perception was evident in the interviews of tourists at the Port Arthur Historic Site. While it is lauded as a major tourism attraction for the Chinese tourists, their mode of visitation differs markedly from Australian tourists. Visiting graveyards and prisons are taboos for many Chinese because it is considered inauspicious in tradition. Some interviewees expressed a hesitation to visit this sort of site as Port Arthur was a colonial convict prison and has a cemetery island. However, because Port Arthur has established itself as one of the top, must-visit attractions in Tasmania, and is included on the UNESCO World Heritage List, many reported that they were prepared to override these psychological barriers and visit the site.

Unlike the representation of Chinese people in the movie Crazy Rich Asians, the vast majority of Chinese do not live extravagant luxurious lives. Many actually suffer from anxieties caused by limited time and money, and there are various pressures from society. Ma, Ooi and Hardy determined that these anxieties included a lack
of local knowledge, inadequate pre-travel research, limited travel time, restricted annual leave, expectations for achieving value for money, pressures from authenticity and cultural taboos, language barriers and choices of food.\textsuperscript{15} Table 2 illustrates that Chinese tourists spent the least time among major inbound markets to Australia. Consequently, their desire to maximise their experiences in a limited time is a major issue for Chinese tourists to Tasmania.
In terms of travel preferences, it is becoming easier for a Chinese citizen to apply for a tourist visa as a Free and Independent Traveller. Moreover, many now speak English and have the ability to drive themselves. However, my research found that although some Chinese travelled to Tasmania out of their own free will and booked flights and hotels by themselves, they were not confident travelling independently on the island because of perceived barriers such as language, driving on the left-hand side, a lack of local tourism infrastructure and information.

- The inconvenience is the transportation. If we go out to buy things, it’s not easy.
- In between touristic spots, they should have set up buses for people who don’t drive, or want to save a bit of money.
- Tasmania signal is not good, the GPS sometimes can’t cover.

Consequently, many would choose to book a whole or half a trip with a Chinese travel agent which provided ground transportation and basic tour guiding to make the travel easier. As a result, mediators such as tour guides play an important role in Chinese tourists’ experience creation.

Lastly, smartphones and technology have become many Chinese tourists’ – especially the younger tech-savvy generations’ – companions during overseas holidays. The most commonly used mobile phone application is WeChat, which was launched in 2011. To date, WeChat has one billion monthly active users, and nearly a third of time spent on mobile apps in China is spent on WeChat. WeChat is not only used to access travel information and for maintaining contact with family and friends at home; its real-time cashless payment function facilitates Chinese outbound tourism expenditure. To date, some shops and restaurants in Hobart have caught up with this trend and launched a Chinese WeChat payment option. Additionally, as mentioned, Chinese tourists spend a very short time in Tasmania, which creates challenges for researchers and marketers to survey this market. In my research, I was able to effectively overcome fieldwork difficulties by using WeChat to flexibly connect with participants and collect data on this cohort of tourists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CREATING EXPERIENCES FOR CHINESE TOURISTS:
Practical implications for the future

This section highlights the practical implications for the Tasmanian tourism industry that emerged from this study. The discussion is developed around how Chinese socio-cultural backgrounds may affect the experience creation.

UNDERSTANDING THE DYNAMISM OF CHINESE CULTURE

For operators in Tasmania, understanding the dynamism of Chinese culture is essential. Assumptions are often made about the Chinese market, such as ‘Chinese tourists like travelling in big bus groups’ or ‘Chinese tourists eating instant noodles’. Such assumptions lead to misrepresentations of Chinese travellers and may affect the degree to which certain products and services can be designed and marketed effectively. The changing circumstances in China create heterogeneity and cultural complexity amongst Chinese people. Profound social changes such as ‘the rise and collapse of the Soviet Union, the now-defunct one-child policy, standardised education, the rapid rise of Christianity, emigration, a state-driven market economy, changing visa policies and so forth’ have created new types of potential outbound tourists whose behaviour and motivations evolve rapidly.

An open-minded and flexible approach to deal with these phenomena might bring benefits to tourist experiences. For instance, a new media tool – Tiktok short videos – has brought some niche experiences around the world under the spotlight, and it has also created new ways of reinterpreting the existing experiences. Such applications have become new travel hobbies for many who were born after 1995 (Generation Z) and who are also strong spenders overseas. Tourist experiences can be enhanced when the industry catches up with the dynamism of the cultural trends.

GUIDING TOURISTS INTO THE EXPERIENCE

There are many attractions all over the world that are considered to be ‘must-visit’ attractions for Chinese people. However, not every attraction is comprehensively known by Chinese tourists; many Chinese tourists are under-prepared when they travel, which leads to a lack of preconceptions about the attraction, so they do not know what to expect and what to appreciate.

One solution to addressing cultural gaps is to associate the experiential provisions with what Chinese tourists are familiar with. For instance, Tasmanian convict history and events can be connected with those happening during the
same timeline and similar context in China. Many Chinese tourists come to Tasmania and visit cultural sites with curiosity and interest, and by linking the history and culture, the stories and heritage become relevant and appreciable. Appropriate association could achieve a better educational engagement and memorable outcome.²³

Further, although national parks are a highlight experience in Tasmania, not all Chinese are ready to indulge in pure nature and they might not have a clear expectation. Before their walk starts, it would be highly beneficial to introduce basics about Tasmanian flora and fauna, how to respect nature and wildlife, and what rules to follow while exploring the attraction.

**Given that many Chinese tourists have limited travel time and are budget conscious, there is great potential for operators to design customisable product packages that suit tourists with different time budgets.**

The two issues highlight that mediators, such as tour guides and bus drivers, are very important in guiding Chinese tourists’ experiences.²⁴ It is necessary for operators to carefully inspect who or what mediates Chinese tourists’ experiences. For instance, tour guides who accompany and verbally interact with the tourists are arguably the most influential people. They are often responsible for creating an image and affecting the interpretation of the attraction or destination. As a result, clear communication between operators and mediators is essential. Operators could train such mediators by providing introductory materials, establishing a code of conduct, and explaining the core product or experience they designed for Chinese tourists. Given that many Chinese tourists have limited travel time and are budget conscious, there is great potential for operators to design customisable product packages that suit tourists with different time budgets.

**DEALING WITH LANGUAGE BARRIERS AND SOCIAL MEDIA**

Language barriers are easier to solve compared to cultural knowledge barriers for tourists. To overcome communication gaps generated by language, native speaking guides and frontline staff play a key role. Such staff can act as ‘cultural ambassadors’ representing both locals and Chinese.²⁵ Additionally, modern technologies such as instant translation applications provide timely and cost-
efficient tools for the creation of experiences. These are useful provided that the translation is accurate and delivered in a culturally sensitive manner. This aspect deserves more research, especially in relation to how the term ‘wilderness’ is marketed.

Finally, the Tasmanian tourism industry stands to gain a better understanding of how Chinese perceive Tasmania (and in doing so, enhance the experience) with the help of internet resources and social media such as Weibo, WeChat and online tourism forums. Marketing via these channels can facilitate interaction, communication and engagement with Chinese tourists.

CONCLUSION

For many Chinese visitors, locations such as Tasmania are rather exotic and foreign, and consequently tourists may find themselves more anxious in such places given less travel time, less infrastructure, less cultural knowledge and fewer Chinese services. Although Tasmania has great potential to profit from the growing Chinese market, if the industry does not invest time in ensuring that their offerings provide Chinese tourists with enjoyable and memorable experiences, negative experiences and word of mouth could occur. With careful tourism planning, Tasmanian tourism can grow in a sustainable and healthy direction in terms of providing cross-cultural experiences to Chinese inbound tourists.
ABSTRACT

Tasmania’s convict sites have become a drawcard for visitors as the Tasmanian Gothic sensibility has gripped the imaginations of artists and the general public alike. Visitor numbers to Tasmanian convict sites have grown to unprecedented levels. This phenomenon can usefully be explored through the theoretical lens of thanatourism, the study of travel to sites associated with human suffering and death. This chapter presents case studies drawn from Port Arthur, the Cascades Female Factory and the Penitentiary Chapel to illustrate the ways in which the Tasmanian convict story is being told, including which stories are present, and which are elided.

People can experience such a deep fascination with sites associated with human suffering and death that they feel compelled to visit such places in person. Their motivations for doing so are complex and range from bearing witness to the horrors of the past through to thrill seeking. This longstanding phenomenon was given the descriptor ‘dark tourism’ by John Lennon and Malcolm Foley in 1996 when they
explored some of the dilemmas in interpreting sites associated with the late President John F Kennedy following his assassination in Texas on 22 November 1963. The concept of dark tourism has since been extended to encompass a broad range of phenomena. Particularly relevant to this chapter are its application to sites associated with wartime atrocities and crime as well as the concept of thanatourism, a term used to describe visits to sites imbued with death.

History, though, is complex. Any given site may be associated with multiple layers of events and memories dating from different times or even from overlapping time periods. Endowing space with a narrative creates our sense of place. Such storying can be traced through informal channels such as gossip as well as cultural practices like creative writing, art, drama, music, dance, and filmmaking. Selective and deliberate branding of places also transpires through socio-economically driven endeavours. Placemaking for tourists includes interrelated elements such as the provision of maps, tailored transport and accommodation facilities and the erection of purpose-built interpretive centres supported and supplemented by brochures, placards, apps, static and interactive displays, tours and events for site visitors.

... at what point should our engagement with history take on shades of celebration and amusement, and is it okay for stories that are not ours to become part of our own self-representation?

Tasmania has a difficult past. The colonial encounter, described by some as an invasion, between the British and original inhabitants of the land that began in 1804 resulted in a near genocide with just a few dozen Aboriginal people remaining by the middle decades of the nineteenth century. Over the same period, the British government and its colonial counterparts transported 76,000 men, women and children to Van Diemen’s Land, as Tasmania was then known, to serve sentences as convicts. These convicts, their overseers, the infrastructure developed to contain and manage them, and the soldiers sent to guard them contributed extensively to the usurpation of the lands and expropriation of the resources of the original inhabitants of the island. The traces that the island’s convict past has left in the landscape have been inscribed by UNESCO on its World Heritage List. Ironically, the privileging of this aspect of Tasmania’s past effectively erases the histories of entanglement between Aboriginal people and colonists at these very same sites.
Tasmania is currently home to five of the 11 sites that make up the Australian Convict Sites World Heritage Property. This chapter takes a case study approach to exploring some of the challenges and opportunities in representing convict sites to Tasmania’s growing number of visitors. It draws on two sites on the World Heritage List: Port Arthur and the Cascades Female Factory. It also considers another of Tasmania’s premier tourist attractions with links to its convict and Indigenous past, Hobart’s Penitentiary Chapel. Currently, as our case studies illustrate, convict tourism providers concentrate on providing engaging experiences involving role-play, theatrical performances, video installations, and the use of other interactive devices such as digital touch screens and even playing cards. The role of narrative and the relatability of convict characters feature strongly in these present-day site interpretations while the island’s Indigenous past is curiously absent.

A useful lens through which to consider such absences is leading tourism researcher Philip Stone’s influential framework relating to dark tourism in which he has ranked tourist sites according to their perceived degree of darkness. At the lighter end of Stone’s spectrum are sites associated with death and suffering. Hallmarks of such sites typically include higher tourism infrastructure and lower political influence and ideology than sites at the darkest end of his spectrum, those of death and suffering. For Stone, the darker sites have an educative orientation rather than the more entertainment- and heritage-centric focus of the lighter sites on his dark tourism spectrum.2

We argue that the absence of interpretive materials about Tasmanian Aboriginal peoples, particularly in relation to their collision with British colonists, stems from the darkness of this history in comparison with the more feted history of convictism. While convictism is popularly understood to have given rise to unrelentingly harsh lived experiences and sites associated with it attract those with an interest in dark tourism, Australians have come to celebrate the story of their convict ancestors as ‘one of survival. Their story is one of nation-building’.3 Commonly understood as having been exiled from the other side of the world, the collective story of Australia’s convicts is understood as describing ‘how a new nation was formed from hardship, inequality and adversity’.4 On the other hand, there remains no consensus in Australia that the extensive colonial wars that unfolded across the nation’s frontiers ever actually took place despite meticulous archival research demonstrating the extent of atrocities that took place during, for example, the Vandemonian War.5 Politics, then, has influenced the ways in which key Tasmanian sites are interpreted for tourists in relation to their significance as places of incarceration for white convicts while omitting any mention of the Indigenous convicts who were confined to the same sites to be punished and reformed, or of events associated with the Vandemonian War and Australia’s colonial wars more generally that played out at these sites.
PORT ARTHUR

Port Arthur holds the most tangible ruins of the convict legacy in all of Australia. It is the embodiment, as Maria Tumarkin notes, of ‘the colonies' darkest stains … [of] the shame, depravity … pitiless punishment, humiliation, and back-breaking labour-hell’. It is one of Tasmania's most popular tourist destinations, despite, or perhaps because of, being arguably one of the darkest sites in the state. Set in an extraordinarily breathtaking landscape, the ruins represent an uncanny link to the past: crime, punishment, and death permeate the Gothic atmosphere. Yet juxtaposed against this, a contemporary visitors’ centre populated with interactive and technological interpretations brings the stories of Tasmania's convict era to life. Furthermore, multiple tours are available throughout the day – tour guides offering another layer of interpretation as they tell a curated selection of those stories.

Upon purchasing an entry ticket to the site, the visitor is issued with a playing card; one from a deck called ‘Pack of Thieves?’ each of which tells the story of a particular convict. The visitor is invited to interact with a display to discover the identity, offences, punishments and life story of the convict on their card. This display proves to be very popular with all ages; it entices visitors to stop and contemplate those individual stories before they exit the Visitor Centre to be faced with the grander metanarrative of convict history. It is an entertaining game and visitors can be overheard sharing their stories and competing with one another to see who had ‘the most gory’ card. There’s a sense of excitement and awe at the greater suffering of one convict over another.

Perhaps one of the most interesting tours is the one to Dead Island, romantically renamed ‘The Isle of the Dead’. A short ferry ride across the river takes tourists to a tiny island graveyard, filled with headstones of those convicts and free settlers who worked in some capacity and died in Port Arthur. The guide expertly shepherds the group from one headstone to the next, while telling stories of some of the key figures. The narrative worlds the guide creates are filled with amusing and sometimes celebratory commentary. Tourists learn about the wealthy and dashing forger and author Henry Savery who was born with a silver spoon in his mouth but couldn’t stay away from temptation. Words like ‘rascal’ are used – a word having affectionate connotations. Words like this position tourists to feel fondness for and empathy with the convict.

Another story was that of the three Stavely children whose father was an overseer at Port Arthur. The three children aged 5–30 months old died variously of drowning, bronchitis, and an unknown malady. The plight of infant mortality strikes home, and visitors are reminded how severe and tragic life was even for the free settlers. The death of the three innocent children evoked more of an emotional response with one tour group than hearing about ‘the poor buggers’ that were tortured and humiliated
day in and day out. A constant phrase repeated throughout the tours was how these men and women shaped the colony and formed the society that was to become the Tasmania we know today.

Walking through the grounds from one ruin to the next offers tourists a multitude of experiences. To stand inside the scarred ruins of the church and listen to the bells chime is eerily beautiful. The beauty and majesty of the site is always juxtaposed with a sense of the Gothic – the torture, horror and death existing in parallel spaces. A walk through the Separate Prison provides a unique interactive experience, where tourists can peer through a tiny hole into a cell to view cascading images and words about a person who was perhaps housed in that cell. The museum houses artefacts that showcase the kind of education and labour both convicts and free settlers would have engaged in, and tourists are told that convict labour was able to produce 41,000 pairs of boots and shoes in the year of 1841 alone. The isolation of convicts is explained and illustrated by a hooded mask artefact, but then poignantly arranged next to text which tells of the ways the men would subvert this isolation,
through whispering dialogue in between the lines of hymns during a church service. Somehow the visitor is left with a sense of the convict spirit – convicts that rose up and conquered their situation in life.

Sites in dark tourism associated with traumascapes are considered cathartic, wielding power and an experience of the sublime. The juxtaposition of death and beauty is a romanticised cultural trope and relates to the pervasive notion of the sublime: ‘beauty in distress is much the most affecting beauty’. Port Arthur has it all: Gothic ruins; a desolate, stark, rugged and remote landscape; and storytelling celebrating the macabre, mysterious, and violent past. Yet there is a tension as visitors who write about dark tourism: we’re laughing and enjoying this too much. Should we purchase these souvenirs? We must uncover stories of the ‘Other’ rather than the sanitised and amusing stories told for pleasurable tourist consumption. Despite this, a visit to Port Arthur is incredibly moving as well as evocative and pleasurable, and a souvenir of that pack of cards comes home.

A subtler take-home package for settler Australians with long-established roots is the affirmation that the nation was founded on the bloodied backs and bodily fluid–
drenched soil of their white convict ancestors. In short, the brutalised convicts exiled to the Australian colonies forged a future out of adversity with those who survived being the forebears of many of today’s settler Australian families. How Indigenous Australians, more recently arrived Australians, and international tourists respectively might interpret this messaging is an entirely different matter.

Missing from the site’s interpretation is any acknowledgement of the extensive frontier or colonial wars fought across the continent as the nation’s first peoples and the invading British colonists clashed over contested land and resources as well as issues of sovereignty. Given that these wars resulted in at least 90 Aboriginal men from Australia’s eastern seaboard being transported as convicts, some of whom spent time at Port Arthur, it would seem highly relevant to incorporate their experiences into the site’s interpretation. In a similar vein, a compelling case could also be made for including information about the Vandemonian War fought between Tasmanian Aboriginal people and the British from the mid-1820s to 1832, particularly given that a key objective of the general movement (the ‘Black Line’) was to drive all of the island’s remaining Aboriginal population into the Tasman Peninsula, the place where Port Arthur, built in 1830, now stands.

CASCADES FEMALE FACTORY

The Cascades Female Factory was a primary site for the reception and incarceration of female convicts. It operated as a place of work and punishment, a hiring depot, and also considered itself a site for reform. What survives today are the remains of three of five former yards that formed the factory. Tourists can walk around at their own leisure, take a ‘heritage tour’ which is a typical walk-and-talk tour about the site, or join the ‘Her Story’ dramatised tour, a tour which is touted as ‘part history, part roaming theatre show’. The performance involves two actors: one who plays the character of Mary James (which tourists are told is a pseudonym to protect her memory and show sensitivity to her living descendants), and one who plays the character of an overseer. Visitors accompany Mary as she walks through the site and follows an expertly written script which both provides explication of the function of each area in the site and brings it to life with live action and interaction between the two characters. The audience is aligned with Mary as she whispers covertly and enlists their help to conspire against the overseer. The performance becomes interactive as tourists roleplay to help Mary pick oakum (cleaning ship ropes of their tar build-up to recycle it), warn her when the overseer is approaching so she can stop talking (talking was an offence for convict women, life was forcibly silent), and respond to her as she tells the harrowing story of servitude, rape, infant mortality, solitary cells, madness, starvation, cold, and back-breaking labour.
Halfway through the performance, the tour gathers around a pulpit where church services were once held and joins with Mary to sing the hymn *Abide with me*. The singing is charged with emotion, and genuine tears are shed by some. It’s a deeply affecting experience, as surprisingly most of the tourists seem to know the words and sing loudly, yet reverently – reminding us that we are all connected as humans more than we may realise. The playfulness that had tourists conspiring with Mary just moments before is combined with intense feelings of poignancy and sorrow as they hang on her every word and are drawn so powerfully into the past through her performance. This experience was profound and harrowing. The performance focused on a single story and did not cover breadth in its telling, but it did uncover depth, and with it, a sense of having gained something authentic from the experience.

For the overwhelmingly white tourist group we joined, Mary’s story was a highlight and certainly worked well in conveying key aspects of female convict experiences. Yet this and the other interpretive experiences at the site left those unfamiliar with Tasmania’s convict past with an impression that all female convicts were lower class white women. The many women of colour and the few Indigenous
women incorporated into the convict system were rendered invisible. A greater omission, though, is the lack of interpretive material at the Cascades Female Factory about the burial there in May 1876 of Truganini, a woman whose death, in the wake of the Tasmanian genocide, was mourned globally as she was incorrectly considered to be the last of the Tasmanians.12

**PENITENTIARY CHAPEL**

The Hobart Penitentiary Chapel was built in the early 1830s alongside an adjoining prison barracks, later to become the Hobart gaol. Underneath the chapel were 36 solitary confinement cells, unlit and unventilated. The website publicises the site as ‘the dark heart of the convict system ... [where] 55,000 men ate, prayed, slept and were punished’.13 Today tours are offered through the courts and buildings, the chapel, the cells, the underground tunnels and the gallows.

A highlight of the tour is *Pandemonium*, an immersive film which is projected, 4 metres tall and 21 metres wide, onto three walls of the chapel. Visitors must first walk up the steep and precarious steps of the tiered wooden seating to view the film. This walk to be seated to begin the experience immediately throws the body into a sense of unease, discomfort, and unbalance. Teetering on the edge of the church pews, and taking care of where to position the feet, the senses are heightened and poised with a foreboding of what is to come. The film is spectacular. The opening scenes are of the hangman sharpening a blade – the sounds of the blade as it strikes a stone echo around the chapel, and the hangman’s grisly face leers out at the audience. The film is a post-modern pastiche of words and images floating from one wall to the other – white convict men and women are introduced to the viewer, as their offences and punishment are revealed. Scenes from Ireland and England are interspersed with scenes on convict ships, fleeting scenes from Aboriginal Australia, and scenes of punishment. All the while the hangman makes repeated returns, and the sound effects of the knife are juxtaposed with sea shanties and snatches of dialogue.

Advertising material for this experience includes the words: ‘meet a line-up of buz-coves, bit-fakers, nibblers and other motley lags in this luscious evocation of Cinerama’.14 Criminal slang is celebrated, giving pickpockets, counterfeiters, and thieves literary character. The film is imbued with a strong early Australian ‘ocker’ voice, though it is at the same time poetic and chaotic. The viewer is left not quite fully grasping any one particular storyline but having a taste of a multitude of different storylines that contributed to the convict narrative.

The walking tour is marked by moments of stark emotion mixed with lighter hilarity. Bodies move in and around the courthouse – tourists stand in the witness boxes and
roleplay being interrogated, another sits in the judge’s seat and bangs a wooden gavel onto the desk. In an era of selfie culture, cameras are clicking all around. We stand, and sit, and walk, and move. We descend cautiously down to the underground tunnels and are shepherded along dark narrow walkways to see the solitary cells. One of us walks into the solitary cell and takes a darkened selfie, which would later be followed by selecting the perfect Instagram filter to showcase the sense of claustrophobia the cell evoked. The cells’ lack of ventilation suddenly becomes a reality. The air is thick with dust, eyes sting, and some tourists are coughing.

We welcome the chance to walk out of the tunnels, up the stairs, and out into fresh air.

The tour then proceeds to the execution yard and gallows. Tourists learn that the gallows is one of only two working gallows in Australia. The gallows trapdoor is quite small – less than a square metre – but tourists are forbidden to walk on it and must gather around, beside, and behind it. The guide explains that Tasmania
had a healthy appetite for capital punishment, and that hundreds of people were hanged there until 1946. We're shocked to learn that it was only in the lifetimes of one generation ago that public hanging was still practiced. We learn that the first woman to be hanged was Mary Coghlin, a victim of repeated domestic violence, executed in 1862 for defending herself and killing her husband. The mood, already sombre, becomes macabre when somebody asks a question of the guide. ‘Were they hanged one at a time in succession?’ ‘No, five people could be hanged at once – one on each corner and one in the middle’. Suddenly feeling nauseous, some of us move out of the gallows area and walk back to the garden. As we do, we see a family of tourists taking turns holding the noose next to their heads, crossing eyes and poking out their tongues as if they’d been hanged, posing for the camera. It feels as if that crosses a line. We ask ourselves at what point should our engagement with history take on shades of celebration and amusement, and is it okay for stories that are not ours to become part of our own self-representation? What meanings are shaped through the casual proliferation of Instagram images – ones that might encourage more tourism, but which reduce the rich, troubled and inhumane stories of our past to consumable bites of entertainment.

Despite the centrality of the Penitentiary to the interrelated Indigenous experiences of the British empire's colonial wars and convict transportation, only a slight nod to this difficult past is provided through a brief visual reference to the Vandemonian War in Pandemonium. Fleeting scenes depict pre-contact Tasmania and signal the British invasion without providing any details about the latter other than a phrase incorporating the work’s title: ‘pandemonium ensues’. Later, a passing reference is made to today’s thriving Tasmanian Aboriginal communities, although it is not made clear what it is that they’ve survived. With the New South Welsh Aboriginal convict Musquito and Tasmanian Aboriginal man Black Jack having been hanged at the Penitentiary (among others), and five Māori convicts from New Zealand being imprisoned there before being sent to the probation station at Maria Island, there was scope to have incorporated their narratives into the interpretations at this site.

CONCLUSION

For Stone, tourist sites at the darker end of the spectrum have an educative orientation rather than the more entertainment and heritage-centric focus of lighter sites. Consistent with the long-established genre of the Tasmanian Gothic, the three convict sites that formed the basis of our case studies were consistently portrayed as dark. Each provided interpretive experiences for tourists extending beyond mere entertainment. Aiming to be educative in highly interactive and sometimes innovative ways, their interpretive endeavours are best described as edutainment, blending educative and
entertaining elements. More recent interpretive approaches have a unifying factor in that they have been influenced by one of the island state’s newest yet arguably best-known cultural institutions.

From its deliberate placement on the outskirts of greater Hobart in a working-class suburb, the purpose-built, deliberately edgy MONA emanates a deep desire to shock and a strong leaning towards darkness. Its syncretic treatments of old and new art shocked Tasmania into the twenty-first century with its cultural influence infusing institutions within and beyond the city’s boundaries. Across the three convict sites we experienced, the influence of MONA was most visible in recent interpretations such as Pandemonium. Deliberately dark and with an inherent capacity to thrill, the film was symptomatic of a more aesthetically conscious approach to Tasmania’s convict past.

Across all three sites, we observed how history as ‘performance’ is perhaps the most effective form of evoking deeper emotional responses beyond aesthetic grabs and the creation of self-serving bites of social media. Also apparent is a trend towards history becoming ‘art’ with aesthetic choices being favoured that speak to influences inspired by MONA. Likewise, history is becoming ‘story’ where deliberately chosen words and literary techniques are curated for consumption. Performance and curation, though, see some stories privileged while others are overlooked or even deliberately omitted.

Saturated with blood, pain, and gore, each site’s interpretations graphically portray how the suffering of the largely white working-class convict population gave rise to the birth of the modern Australian nation. Yet this bloody tale obliterates an even darker, less palatable, and less politically acceptable truth, that of a nation forged out of the devastation of its colonial wars, wars that saw Australian Aboriginal people incorporated into the convict system alongside indigenous people from other sites of conflict across the British empire. This significant omission can be understood with reference to Stone’s dark tourism spectrum which shows how less fraught interpretations tend to be privileged over more politically-charged and ideological narratives. This, though, comes at an opportunity cost for Australians whose difficult past can only be reconciled through painful processes of truth and reconciliation.

The Australian nation was forged following extensive conflict between the British newcomers and the continent’s original inhabitants with the combatants’ blood soaking the very soil that was commandeered for the [white] convicts celebrated as the nation’s suffering yet triumphant founding figures. Opportunities abound for Tasmania’s convict tourist sites to engage in deeper, darker, more sophisticated and honest interpretations that cut to the heart of the nation’s origins and avoid whitewashing Australia’s difficult birth.
In recent years, Tasmania’s reputation as a visitor and food-lover’s paradise has intensified. As a destination, the state is also well-known for its wine tourism, with a range of cellar door experiences on offer. In this chapter we explore the intersections between wine, tourism and culture, with a view to proposing a typology of cellar door and wine tourist experiences in the Tasmanian wine industry. By characterising and grouping such experiences, as well as outlining their benefits, this chapter illustrates where we have been, where we are currently, and what the next opportunities may be.

When visiting a destination, a tourist is invariably exposed to the local food, wine and/or other beverages, as well as the outward expressions of culture such as heritage, art and festivals. These individual products and overall industry sectors are tightly embedded in the tourist experience; thus, not surprisingly, more and more tourists are specifically travelling to places because of the food, wine and cultural identity or lifestyle it offers.
In recent years, Tasmania’s reputation as a destination for quality visitor experience has intensified: it is now known for its premium products, including cheese, seafood, wine, whisky, beer, fresh fruit and vegetables and leatherwood honey. Tasmania is also known for its natural beauty, friendly and interesting people, unique flora and fauna, and rich culture and history. As a consequence, visitor numbers continue to grow, and the state’s food and beverage products are attracting premium prices. From a cultural perspective, the establishment and success of David Walsh’s MONA and associated festivals has placed Tasmania on the wish list of thousands of travellers worldwide.

In this chapter we explore the intersections between wine, tourism and culture, with a view to proposing a typology of cellar door and wine tourist experiences in the Tasmanian wine industry. Characterising and grouping such experiences demonstrates where we have been, where we are currently, and what the next opportunities may be. We believe our typology will help those in the industry understand where their cellar door offering is currently positioned and identify opportunities for them to develop or focus their wine tourism strategy. For each ‘type’ of experience, we highlight the benefits from the producer’s perspective. Prior to presenting our typology, we review the key developments into the needs and preferences of wine and cultural tourists, supporting the contemporary view that not all consumers visiting a cellar door fit the traditional definition of what is described in the literature. In the final section, following our typology, we discuss what all of this means in terms of future opportunities for collaboration between the Tasmanian, wine, tourism and cultural sectors.

WINE TOURISM IN TASMANIA

Over the past two decades, the Tasmanian wine industry has enjoyed significant growth, particularly in terms of vineyard plantings and number of cellar doors. For example, in 1999 there were 36 cellar doors and 119 vineyards; by 2005, this had grown to 54 cellar doors and 244 vineyards. By 2018, there were 95 cellar doors and more than 2000 hectares under vine across 230 individual vineyards. Despite this growth, the state still produces less than 1% of Australia’s total wine output, largely because the industry is very premium in nature, and most of the state’s 160 wine producers are small in scale.

Wine tourism has long been a strong contributor to Tasmania’s economy, through the people it employs and the experiences it offers. Over the past two decades the number of interstate visitors to Tasmanian wine cellar doors has risen from around 90,000 (16.6% of all visitors to Tasmania) in 1999 to nearly 298,000 today: 23% of the total. According to the state’s wine authority, Wine Tasmania, the Tasmanian wine sector contributes $115 million annually to Tasmania’s economy, and of this, $15.2 million is from tourists visiting cellar doors. At a national level, Wine Australia
estimate that nearly 90% of wineries in Australia have a cellar door, and increasingly these businesses are offering ‘value-added services, facilities and activities aimed at attracting more visitors and diversifying revenue streams’. Wine businesses contribute over $40 billion annually to the Australian economy, and the combined expenditure of domestic and international wine tourists is estimated to be $9.2 billion.

Key to the success of this sector are Tasmania’s four wine tourism regions or wine trails (Figure 1), and industry associations, which single out wine tourism development in their strategic plan and publish printed and online wine route brochures. Many cellar doors are also close to popular towns, cities and tourist entry points into the island state, making it easy for tourists to visit the winery either intentionally, or on impulse if they are driving past.

Wine tourism is well-regarded as a vital sector of the Tasmanian wine industry, with strong growth in both the domestic and international traveller market. However, issues still surround the design and implementation of wine tourism both here and around the world. Understandably, some wine producers concentrate on making quality wine and perceive cellar doors and wine tourism activities to be merely a secondary part of
their business. A growing portion of the industry appreciates the potential for wine tourism to enhance the sales, profitability, brand and reputation of the winery, so long as care is taken in designing and implementing a differentiated visitor experience, and additional attractions such as fine dining, events, accommodation and cultural experiences are offered within the regions. Of course, certain activities and initiatives may work well for one winery but not another, due to differences in their resource capabilities, target market and location. What is important is that the region’s tourist and visitor needs are understood and continually addressed with experiences that have the potential to not only meet but exceed their expectations.

DEFINING THE WINE TOURIST

Wine tourism experiences can be considered ‘soft’ attractions that carry significant emotional and sensory value and which draw upon linkages to the food, culture, landscape and heritage of a destination. As a field of research, wine tourism emerged in the 1990s. Perhaps the mostly widely adopted definition was that proposed by New Zealand researchers Hall, Cambourne, Macinis and Johnson, who defined wine tourism as:

Visitation to vineyards, wineries, wine festivals and wine shows for which grape wine tasting and/or experiencing the attributes of a grape wine region are the prime motivating factors for visitors.

Some years later, Australian wine scholars proposed a segmentation of wine tourists according to their interest in and knowledge of wine, thus highlighting the educational component of wine tourism. Wine tourists have also been defined according to the level of ‘sensation’ they are seeking from a wine experience, and those seeking higher sensations will be particularly attracted to experiences (such as cellar doors and events) that enable them to increase and test their wine knowledge. This aligns with other research that suggests the typical winery visitor is 30–50 years of age, relatively well-educated, professional and on a moderate to high income.

But not all wine tourists are seeking the same degree of experience. Many visit wine regions and cellar doors simply for the enjoyment factor, or because they wish to socialise with others in what is typically a pleasant and relaxing environment. Consequently, wine producers should plan and design their cellar door space and activities so the needs and preferences of both high and low involvement consumers are catered for. Research in South Australia found that enriching and high-quality service experiences at the cellar door may even trigger a desire in the consumer to become more involved in wine. Other Australian studies have found that a tourist’s decision to visit a winery or engage in a wine-related activity is generally impulsive and that wine tourists are seeking experiences and leisure activity not necessarily linked only to wine consumption. Moreover, ‘although what happens inside the
Figure 2. Consumers testing their knowledge at a wine tasting masterclass in Northern Tasmania.

Figure 3. Visitors relaxing with a picnic on the lawn overlooking a vineyard.
cellar door of wineries is important, the broader location (winescape) and setting can be an equally important element in the total context of the business of wine tourism. Staging visitor events and concerts in the vineyard’s natural setting can also strengthen the consumer’s appreciation for the wine region and connection to the wine brand.

...a visitor who experiences a deep or sensory level of engagement with a wine, vineyard or destination, can become a ‘brand ambassador’...

Overall, wine tourism research has moved beyond simply describing who the wine tourist is and how they behave, to understanding the experiential connections between the industry, the place and the consumer. As such, wine producers need to extend the visitor experience beyond just an opportunity to taste and buy wine and consider how they can offer activities that are educational and more memorable. To do this, wine producers need to appreciate how the cellar door has evolved from being purely a purpose-built facility for trialling and purchasing a product to one of the central locations where consumers develop a relationship with the wine brand.

DEFINING THE CULTURAL TOURIST

Developing an understanding of the cultural consumer and their motives, and the interrelated issue of cultural tourism is of interest to both practitioners and academics in recent times. Though a widely agreed and accepted definition of cultural tourism is still lacking, in a broad sense, a cultural tourist can be defined as ‘any individual who visits cultural institutions or places such as museums, archaeological and heritage sites, operas, theatres, festivals or architecture while away from home’. More specifically, cultural tourism can be defined in terms of:

...visitors’ attendances at a range of cultural attractions...including: historic or heritage buildings, sites or monuments; Aboriginal sites and cultural displays; art or craft workshops or studios; festivals or fairs; performing arts or concerts; and museums or art galleries.

Importantly, though, the needs and wants of consumers such as cultural tourists can be described as hedonistic and self-gratifying, rather than functional and utilitarian. They are also seeking an authentic experience and wish to be ‘immersed’ in the place they
are visiting\textsuperscript{16}. Typically, the cultural tourist is older, better educated and more affluent than the general traveller, and tends to stay longer and spend more in a destination.\textsuperscript{17} Arguably, they are also similar to wine tourists, in that they are interested in engaging, emotionally enriching experiences. Hence, there is considerable value in exploring the connections between wine, tourism and culture, with the aim of offering more cultural experiences at the cellar door or winery, which are at the same time self-gratifying.

In relation to the consumption of wine, consumers’ behaviour is linked not only to the product itself, but also to the situation and environment in which wine is consumed. It is our contention that such situational and environmental factors can add significantly to the wine consumer’s cultural experience. For example, cellar doors are typically located near the vineyard, which itself can be an aesthetically pleasing environment. Similarly, cellar doors are increasingly being housed in architecturally designed buildings with a low environmental footprint that take account of the natural surroundings, all of which adds a further element of interest and reason to visit.

**A TYPOLOGY OF CELLAR DOOR EXPERIENCES**

Resulting from the demand for more engaging, enriching and sensory experiences, many Tasmanian wine producers are extending the activities and facilities available at their cellar door. Depending on the season or day of the week, wine consumers can enjoy tours of the winery or vineyard, picnic on adjoining lawn or gardens, listen to live music, admire artwork and dine on restaurant-quality food or discover local produce. This combination of cultural activity not only satisfies the consumers’ basic needs, but also adds a strong element of pleasure, and produces a sensory experience\textsuperscript{18}. For wine producers, extending the experiences they offer enables them to target a broader range of consumers (locals and visitors), many of whom may not be traditional wine drinkers or wine tourists.

The use of typologies in the consumer behaviour and tourism literature is widespread. Typically, they are used to identify different segments of a market or depict a range of activities according to different variables or along a continuum. In Tables 1a, 1b and 1c below, we propose a typology of experiences that are commonly offered by Tasmanian wine producers, or which could be made available in the future. These experiences include basic offerings such as a cellar door tasting, through to experiences making use of arts and cultural activities of interest, we believe, to a broader range of consumers and tourists.

We have grouped the experiences according to the degree to which they extend beyond the traditional wine tasting, progressively offering a deeper engagement with the visitor, thus: Basic (Table 1a), Extended (Table 1b) and Advanced (Table 1c). Alongside each ‘experience’ we note some of the key benefits available to the wine producer should
Table 1a. A typology of cellar door-based experiences in Tasmania: Basic level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Potential benefits to the winery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casual tasting at the cellar door (not booked in advance; seated at a bar for example, rather than in a private reserved space; a non-paid experience aside from a small tasting fee)</td>
<td>Direct-to-consumer sales, generating customer information for database or wine club and connecting (or re-connecting) customer with your brand. Opportunity to extract further benefit through social media and positive word of mouth if visitors are encouraged to share their experience (photos etc.) online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-guided tour of the vineyard (non-paid experience)</td>
<td>Additional activity/experience to attract a broader segment of tourists, including non-drinkers. Encourages deeper engagement with brand, wines, and location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in ‘open vineyard’ weekend or festival</td>
<td>Networking and collaboration with other wineries. Shared exposure/marketing to a broader consumer base (i.e. extended reach of the festival marketing and advertising rather than individual brands).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BYO picnic option and space</td>
<td>Visitors stay longer and potentially buy more wine than if they were just tasting. Increases likelihood of visitors sharing and capturing their ‘picnic’ experience on social media (i.e. online word of mouth).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided tour by third-party tour operator</td>
<td>Similar benefits to casual wine tasting, but through a third party the winery can outsource some of the resources required to deliver an experience, giving staff more time to serve other visitors or work in other areas of the business. The experience is likely to be educational and memorable due to the presence of a guide and group interactions. Advance bookings allow for better planning, especially during peak tourist seasons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1b. A typology of cellar door-based experiences in Tasmania: Extended level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Potential benefits to the winery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Events</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host a music event or concert at or adjacent to the cellar door, winery or vineyard (consumer pays a ticket price to attend)</td>
<td>Cellar door, winery or vineyard can be hired out as a venue, hence earns additional income. Likelihood of extra income through wine sales at event Can increase brand awareness within the general marketplace but not necessarily among wine consumers Opportunity for increased engagement with other businesses in the region and/or the local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host a wine festival, e.g. showcase a variety or type of wine, or the start/end of vintage (consumer pays a ticket price to attend whole festival or separate special events)</td>
<td>Collaboration and networking with other wine producers, tourism operators, artists, food producers Brand exposure and the potential for local, national and international media interest Potential to convert less-involved wine consumers to a higher level of involvement if experiential and education activities are included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food and wine</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site dining and food options, ranging from cheese platters, cafe dining to fine dining experience</td>
<td>Attract broader market, not just tourists and visitors interested in wine Encourage visitors to stay longer and increase spending during visit, which can equate to significant additional revenue stream By showcasing local produce, wine producer can enhance their brand and create a sense of provenance and regionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-booked, structured tasting and/or guided winery or vineyard tour with the winemaker</td>
<td>Consumers choosing these paid experiences are usually more involved with wine and/or interested in the region and provenance, which increases likelihood (and quantity) of purchase and wine club conversion. Targets a growing number of consumers who are seeking deeper food and wine experiences, and therefore likely to become loyal customers and brand advocates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued overleaf*
### Art and culture

| Host activities aligned with cultural tourism on site: art class – photography, drawing or painting; wellness program – yoga, relaxation therapy etc. | Attractive to visitors wanting a more immersive experience, with activities aligned to their specific needs 
Potential to convert less-involved wine tourists to a higher level of involvement |
|---|---|
| Sculptures, artwork, or artefacts curated as an exhibition or event; in-house museum, art collection or professional historical display | Of interest to art and cultural tourists and visitors who share similarities with wine consumers and are therefore an attractive market 
Potential to convert less-involved wine tourists and consumers to a higher level of involvement |

Table 1c. A typology of cellar door-based experiences in Tasmania: Advanced level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Potential benefits to the winery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| On- or off-site short wine education courses where personal interaction with the owner or winemaker is emphasised, alongside a premium dining or food experience and possibly accommodation and opportunity to blend own wine | Targets a growing number of tourists and consumers who are seeking bespoke experiences that are educational, somewhat exclusive, ‘hands-on’ and immersive 
Provides visitors with the opportunity to personally experience the vineyard or winery, living through new emotions, acquiring new knowledge and skills through engaging in a creative activity shared with fellow tourists, and through interactions with the makers 
Strong potential to develop a ‘brand ambassador’ or ‘advocate’ relationship with the visitor 
Can target a more affluent consumer segment who are willing to pay premium prices for personalised and exclusive experiences |
| Luxury wine experience incorporating personalised and exclusive visits to multiple wineries as part of a pre-arranged tourist product/package | In addition to the benefits listed above, this experience provides significant brand exposure within new markets 
A suitable experience for attracting wealthy consumers, possibly from international markets seeking a ‘once-in-a-lifetime’ experience 
Networking and collaboration with other wineries, accommodation providers, tour operators, food producers etc. who are involved in delivering a ‘packaged’ experience |
they consider incorporating this into their existing offering. Importantly, this list of benefits is not exhaustive and does depend on the winery’s capabilities, their brand, and broader marketing strategy.

As can be seen from our typology, there is considerable range of activities for wine producers to utilise at the cellar door, or off-site, should they wish to encourage visitors to their winery and engage with wine tourism. Our contention is that there are significant benefits to incorporating ‘culture’ into the experience offered, given this enables wineries to not only attract more visitors, but engage with visitors on a deeper, more emotional level. Recent research conducted in Australia confirmed that wine tourists are more likely to buy wine when their cellar door or wine tourism experience is pleasurable19. In addition, the ‘behind-the-scenes’ type activities we describe in the ‘Extended’ category (Table 1c) tend to deepen the connection and attachment the consumer has with a brand: visitors who experience these types of activities are more likely to become brand advocates and therefore spread positive recommendations online and in person.

Even the activities we categorise as ‘Basic’ (Table 1a) can augment the cellar door visitor experience and therefore have the potential to attract the cultural tourist. When designed and executed carefully, these activities also act to leverage extra value: they expose the wine producer to a broader consumer base, encourage visitors to stay longer and buy more, and increase brand awareness and the likelihood of repeat visitation. For many wine producers, this level of interaction with tourists may be all that they can realistically achieve; few have the financial, human and physical
resources to offer the bespoke experiences we group as ‘Advanced’. Nonetheless, we hope all producers and indeed tourist operators can draw on the overall idea that a visitor who experiences a deep or sensory level of engagement with a wine, vineyard or destination, can become a ‘brand ambassador’, something most major national and international wine companies actively seek.

**A WAY FORWARD**

In recent years, a growing number of Tasmanian wine producers have recognised the logical connection between wine, food, music, art and history for their consumer and many now offer culture-linked or -based experiences. These offerings are not unique to the state, however Tasmania’s reputation for unique and premium produce, spectacular scenery, and a rich colonial heritage aligns with the needs and wants of both the wine consumer and the cultural tourist. In addition to the marketing and branding benefits of wine tourism, our typology refers to a number of other reasons why producers should consider extending or developing new activities at their cellar door, winery or vineyard. Visitors to a cellar door are primarily motivated by their desire to taste and buy wine. However, offering more advanced and additional experiences should enable a winery to attract new visitors and more potential buyers, generate new income streams, and encourage repeat purchases either via a wine club or some other distribution channel (perhaps later selecting that wine from a restaurant’s wine list or in a retail outlet). Large music festivals in a vineyard are not necessarily designed to increase wine tourist involvement or attract cultural tourists, but they certainly expose large groups of people to the wine region, wine brand, and potential wine tourist experience. Moreover, those who visit the winery for the first time as part of a headline act concert may come back for a more intimate wine tourism experience.

Finally, there are likely social reasons why wine producers would consider extending their cellar door experience. Many in the industry are motivated by the lifestyle inherent in growing grapes and making wine and are deeply passionate about sharing their expertise and experiences with others. As highlighted in our table, many wine tourism activities offer benefits in terms of networking, learning and development. From this perspective, coordination and collaboration among wine producers, either in the form of a wine route brochure or a celebratory wine festival, results in the region as a whole becoming more attractive to tourists and visitors. This builds connections and cultural identity, and contributes to the transformation of a basic or newly established wine region into a tourist destination known for its suite of sophisticated wine tourism experiences.
Chapter 13

THE MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TOURISM AND THE CRAFT DRINKS INDUSTRY IN TASMANIA

Alison Dunn and Gerry Kregor

ABSTRACT

In recent years Tasmania's reputation for quality produce has been enhanced by the emergence of premium drinks such as craft beer, cider and spirits. The niche nature of production, combined with the logistics of exporting produce from the island, has encouraged producers to harness tourism practices such as cellar doors and food and drink festival participation to increase direct sales. In Tasmania, producers work more closely with tourism agencies than in any other jurisdiction we have studied. The symbiotic relationship between tourism and premium drink production in Tasmania looks set to endure and support a sustainable industry into a bright future.

INTRODUCTION

Over the last 20 years, craft beer has taken the world by storm.1 Craft beer emerged slowly in the US from the 1980s but has since spread into a global phenomenon with Australia and New Zealand at the forefront of craft production.2 Even traditional brewing countries such as Belgium and the Czech Republic have developed craft
beers alongside their traditional offerings. Tasmania has been keeping pace with global trends and craft beer has also been joined by craft cider and craft spirits. Although whisky has been produced in many countries outside its native Scotland for centuries, Tasmania has proved an excellent location for the production of New World malt whisky. In recent years, Tasmanian whiskies have attracted international acclaim and have scooped top prizes at premium international competitions. Whisky production has been joined by celebrated world-class gin and vodka fashioned in the same hand-crafted style. Tasmanian craft cider has similarly earned international acclaim, capitalising on the island’s history as an apple producer.

New businesses trying to enter established markets encounter numerous barriers to building brand awareness and sales of their products. In the beer industry in particular, multinational brewers have sought to dominate not only production but also distribution channels and retail outlets. In contrast, smaller players in other industries – for example the wine industry and horticulture – have adopted tourism practices to overcome similar barriers by attracting consumers to sites where the produce is grown or made. This chapter will explain the symbiotic relationship between tourism and craft drinks production demonstrating the role tourism has played in the emergence and sustainability of the craft drinks industry in Tasmania.

**BACKGROUND**

Tasmania’s reputation for high-quality food and produce has grown in recent years to gain widespread international attention. In 2015, Tasmania was chosen as the Australian state to host the finale of Tourism Australia’s first national food and drink marketing campaign, ‘Restaurant Australia’. Tasmania played host to 80 of the world’s top chefs, food writers and influencers. Tourism Tasmania embraced the Restaurant Australia campaign and has placed greater emphasis on Tasmania’s premium produce, particularly food and drinks, in their brand campaigns. While premium production is being celebrated in Tasmania, a study into the relationship between tourism practices and premium drinks production is essential. Wine tourism has been studied extensively but little is known of other craft or premium drinks namely beer, cider and spirits. An investigation into the growth of craft drinks businesses and their reliance on tourism is overdue and Tasmania offers the ideal location for such a study.

This chapter centres on the use of tourism practices by premium niche drinks producers in Tasmania. It forms part of a wider research project that has concentrated on the adoption of tourism practices by the craft beer industry in several parts of the world. When we turned our attention to Tasmania, we realised that craft beer was only one third of the picture; we could not ignore the burgeoning craft cider and spirits sectors. In Tasmania we set out to identify all craft or premium niche drinks
producers but before we could begin, we had to define ‘craft’ or ‘premium niche’ drinks producers. The use of the term ‘craft’ became popular in the US to distinguish smaller independently-owned microbreweries from the huge multinational-owned brewers and their constellation of brands. To develop an understanding of the emergence of the term ‘craft’, a brief review of trends in the global brewing industry is warranted.

Over the twentieth century the number of global beer producers shrank as massive conglomerates were generated from a relentless trend of mergers and acquisitions. Multiple brands were launched during this period, but ownership was being concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. As an example, the American brewer, Anheuser-Busch spent the second half of the twentieth century acquiring breweries across the US. By the end of the century it became the target of Belgian brewing giant Interbrew who had recently merged with Brazilian brewers Am-Bev. In 2016, Anheuser-Busch InBev (AB InBev) continued to further its control of the global industry by merging with its principal rival, multinational conglomerate SAB-Miller, to become the largest brewer in the world. In Australia, AB InBev controls the Fosters Group which contains Carlton and United, Cascade and others and – of relevance to this discussion – Matilda Bay Brewing, which was Australia’s first craft brewery, and which still projects a craft image through its brand.

Brewing on a gigantic scale encouraged multinational brewers to adopt a production orientation. In other words, the top priority was to control and minimise the costs of production. Minimising costs led the brewing conglomerates to add cheap adjuncts such as corn and rice to many of their beers and by the end of the twentieth century mass-produced beer in the US had garnered a reputation for a lack of flavour. As Bastian, et al. noted ‘by the 1990s the US brewing industry was producing a bland narrow range of beer differentiated by marketing rather than flavour’. Demand for craft beer grew out of this background, driven initially by enthusiasts’ demand for diverse and flavoursome beers. In response, the emergence of craft breweries reversed the declining number of breweries in the US and elsewhere. The number of US breweries had fallen from a high of 4131 in 1873 to a low of just 89 in 1978. By 2017, 6372 breweries were operating.

Multinational brewers responded to the rise of craft brewing by adapting their tried and tested strategies. Initially they brewed new brands, with higher quality ingredients, that they identified as craft beer. When these beers did not prove to be popular, they started to acquire craft breweries and their labels. In 2017, AB InBev acquired Australian craft brewer Pirate Life. This act continued a long tradition of obtaining Australian beers that started with the subsuming of Fosters Group. As multinational brewers have continued to produce and market their beers as ‘craft’ the term has become contentious and is said to confuse consumers.
In Australia, the peak body, the Independent Brewers Association (IBA), specifies that Australian ‘independent’ breweries must sell less than 40 million litres per calendar year; that no more than 20% of the brewery is owned by a brewer selling in excess of 40 million litres and the brewery does not own more than 20% of a brewery selling more than 40 million litres. The IBA emphasises independence and told the ABC that ‘we’ve stepped away from the term craft. Craft beer became a marketing term, so it could come out of a very large brewery and it could be owned by a multinational’. Cider Australia recommends that craft cider should be made with 100% Australian fruit. The Australian Distillers Association promotes sustainable and ethical distilling and business practices. As the universal adherence to the term ‘craft’ has declined and definitions in use highlight size more than tradition, for the remainder of this chapter ‘premium niche drink producers’ will be used to signify small-scale producers of high-quality beer, cider and spirits within Australia. ‘Craft’ will be retained for references to US and UK brewers.

The wine industry has demonstrated that smaller producers can generate retail sales, broaden brand awareness and grow a loyal customer following by opening cellar doors and allowing visitors to try their wines. The wine tourism model offers a blueprint for newer premium niche drinks producers. This is particularly true in Tasmania where, according to a recent Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) report into the wine industry, boutique wineries prevail. The report found that in contrast to Tasmania, the industry on the Australian mainland was dominated by large-scale grape growers and winemakers. The boutique model operating in Tasmania, where independent labels produce wine from the grapes they grow, has not only inspired other premium niche drinks producers in the state but also other food producers such as cheesemakers, seafood producers, fruit growers and more.

Craft breweries we have studied in the US and UK have faced similar barriers to accessing consumers that many small producers in the wine industry encountered before the adoption of wine tourism. Opening cellar doors, known as tap rooms by US craft brewers, allows visitors to small breweries to see where the beer is made, talk to the brewers, sample the product and buy beer to take home. Tap rooms are one strategy used by US craft breweries to introduce their beer to consumers and build customer loyalty. Craft brewers support this strategy by engaging consumers through social media to keep them informed of new beer styles, seasonal releases, competition success and beer events. The third strategy adopted by new brewers is to attend specialised beer festivals and local events to build brand awareness and sales. Thus, tourism practices are central to two of the three strategies craft brewers adopted in the US to circumvent the barriers to market constructed by the multinational brewers.
Although it is clear that brewers appreciate the benefits of adopting tourism practices, their relationship with tourism is largely superficial. Visitors are welcome to call in to the brewery tap room to sample the beer, but the brewery often provides only rudimentary facilities where the beer can be tasted. In addition, breweries show little interest in collecting visitor information. They sometimes compile online or mail-order customer lists but are unaware of who has visited the premises. Moreover, they do not systematically attempt to understand what visitors think of their experience at the brewery. There are few resources to spare on visitor comforts as all energy is devoted to producing the highest quality beer possible. In contrast to the multinational producers who focus on the costs of production, craft brewers’ concentration on the quality of the product is known as a product orientation. Tasmanian craft beer brewers, like producers of cider and spirits, are determined to produce premium niche drinks of quality and flavour to differentiate their product from that of the mass producers.
CURRENT PROJECT

In order to investigate the use of tourism practices by premium niche drinks producers in Tasmania, this project attempted to identify every premium niche drinks producer. This process was complicated by the dynamic nature of the industry. That is not to suggest that businesses are opening and closing frequently. In fact, as can be seen from Table 2, the producers have demonstrated a high degree of stability. But new entrants to the market appear regularly. For example, 11 new breweries and 15 new spirit producers have opened in Tasmania since 2016. An additional aspect of complexity is the tendency for some of the businesses to change their name.

...there are 36 distilleries in Tasmania... one distillery for every 14,500 Tasmanians... Scotland has 120 distilleries or one for every 45,000 Scots.

To contend with the dynamic nature of the industry and to collect accurate data, we used a variety of sources. We combed numerous websites including the individual websites of each business, website listings on tourism trails and general tourism listings, articles and posts on beer, cider or spirits sites. Facebook and other social media as well as traditional media articles were examined. To ensure we collected a complete range of data, we often had to phone and even visit some businesses.

GEOGRAPHICAL SPREAD

As might be expected, most producers are based in the south of the state where the majority of the population lives. However, premium niche drinks producers are spread throughout the state. At the time of the survey, two breweries, two cideries and three distilleries were based in the state’s North West. In the North, which encompasses the northern conurbation of Launceston, there were seven breweries, four cideries and eight distilleries. In the vast area of the state that is classified as the South, 18 breweries, 11 cideries and 26 distilleries were located. Twenty-six distilleries could be regarded as a significant number for one part of the state. Interestingly, there are 36 distilleries in Tasmania which represents one distillery for every 14,500 Tasmanians. By contrast, Scotland has 120 distilleries or one for every 45,000 Scots. In premium niche distilling, Tasmania punches above its weight and that’s without factoring in the quality of what is produced.
Previous research on similar businesses in locations in the US and UK demonstrated the willingness of craft drinks producers to adopt tourism activities as a business strategy. The Tasmanian survey confirmed that tourism practices are employed at some level by almost every premium niche drinks producer in the state. As can be seen from Table 1, the three main tourism practices that were used by surveyed drinks producers are cellar door operations, event participation and craft drinks trail membership. Although trail membership may be regarded as a marketing mechanism, beer, cider or whisky trails provide a focus for touring visitors. Tasmania has incorporated trails as a method of encouraging cooperation among small producers and for marketing clusters of businesses in the food and drink space. State Government financial support has been crucial to establishing the three trails dedicated to premium niche drinks.

As shown in Table 1, sixteen or 60% of the 27 Tasmanian breweries were Beer Trail members and also operated cellar doors, although only two did this full time. All but one of the breweries participated in events (96%). Of the 16 Tasmanian cideries, nine (56%) were Cider Trail members, 13 (81%) operated cellar doors, seven of which were open full time, and 12 (75%) participated in events. From the 36 distilleries, 15 (42%) were members of the Whisky Trail. Not all distillers made whisky and many of the producers were relatively new which might explain the lower proportion of trail members. Twenty-four (67%) operated cellar doors, nine in a full-time capacity; 28 (78%) were event participants.

The survey results show that the most popular tourism activity adopted by premium niche drinks producers was event participation although more cideries operated cellar doors than participated in events. In the qualitative phase of the project, event participation was described as a burden on time and staffing by many interviewees. It

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craft beverage</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Cellar door (Full-time/Part-time/No cellar door)</th>
<th>Attend events</th>
<th>Trail members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4/12/11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cider</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7/6/3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirits</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9/15/12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is surprising then that event participation is part of the business strategies of such a large proportion of the firms surveyed. In Tasmania, wine festivals persist as a frequent occurrence although Tasmanian wine producers have been in business for decades. Some authors have suggested festival participation is a strategy adopted in the early years of drinks production which declines as the business develops more traditional forms of distribution. This is not supported by what we found in Tasmania.

**BUSINESS START-UP DATE**

As mentioned earlier, the premium niche drinks industry in Tasmania is dynamic but Table 2 supports the argument that a high degree of sustainability is evident. All 18 businesses that opened before 2010 are still in business. The years between 2011 and 2015 witnessed a doubling of the number of breweries and a tripling of the number of cider-makers and distillers. After 2015, the rate of opening continued apace in brewing and distilling but slowed in cider making.
THE MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TOURISM AND THE CRAFT DRINKS INDUSTRY IN TASMANIA

In comparison to craft drinks producers in other areas, the number of breweries in Australia as a whole rose from 200 in 2013 to 350 in 2016.¹⁹ As already noted, the number of breweries in the US also surged from 3785 in 2014 to 6372 in 2017, an increase of 59%.

### STAFFING AND OWNERSHIP

In terms of employment, craft drinks production in Tasmania could be described as a cottage industry. As displayed in Table 3, only nine of the 79 businesses identified in the study employed more than 10 staff. Of those nine, six were distilling businesses and most of them had been in business for some time. The majority of Tasmanian premium niche drinks producers were staffed by one or two people. That is 67% of breweries, 75% of cideries and a lower but still significant proportion of distillers at 50%. These businesses are mainly family-owned and operated with only one distillery being owned by interests outside the state.

The interviews that followed the survey confirmed that many drinks producers were based on a partnership. The partnership was either two friends or a husband-and-wife team. The normal pattern was for the husband to work full time in the business with his wife combining part-time work outside the business with almost full-time work within the business to keep it running.

### Table 2. Establishment of drinks producers in Tasmania.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craft beverage</th>
<th>Opened before 2010</th>
<th>Opened from 2011–15</th>
<th>Opened from 2016</th>
<th>Total at 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cider</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirits</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Staffing of drinks producers in Tasmania.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craft beverage</th>
<th>2 or fewer</th>
<th>3 to 10</th>
<th>More than 10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cider</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirits</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sustainability of business models is called into question by these employment figures. Some businesses are run by retirees whose work hours have increased beyond those they worked before retirement. Most couples are working double shifts. Many reported in the interviews that festival participation placed an enormous burden on the business. To participate in festivals, the business had to employ casual staff to operate the cellar door or the festival stand, or close the cellar door. Festival attendance also placed pressure on production. A successful festival can deplete stock and interrupt production, making it difficult to meet regular orders.

BUSINESS COMMUNICATION

Previous research on craft breweries in the US highlighted the importance of websites and social media as vehicles to build a craft beer community. In the 1990s, newsletters were a popular technique to communicate with customers and attempt to build a community around the product. The advent of social media made communication much quicker and easier. One of the Californian craft brewers we interviewed, who had been in business since 1996, enthusiastically christened social media ‘word of mouth on steroids’.20

In Tasmania, the businesses surveyed also reported extensive use of their website to communicate with customers. Only two of the total number surveyed (79) opted for a Facebook page alone rather than a website. Social media communication was also found to be crucial with all but three of the producers; those who used social media communicated via more than one platform. The premium niche producers we surveyed and interviewed in Tasmania shunned traditional advertising preferring to rely on word-of-mouth publicity supported by social media. They shared this tactic with comparable craft producers in the UK and US.

CONCLUSION

Premium niche drinks production is flourishing in Tasmania. Although the number of new business openings has slowed in cider production, the overall trend displays continued growth. The Tasmanian industries share many of the trends evident in other parts of the world: the businesses are geographically spread, most have adopted up to three different tourism practices to get their produce to consumers and they are small scale in terms of production and employment. They also preferred social media and word-of-mouth advertising to traditional marketing communications.

The continued popularity of direct selling via cellar doors and events demonstrates that Tasmanian producers understand that tourism practices
are a crucial avenue to create value for their business. The interviews revealed a much greater appreciation of the role tourism activities play in their business models. Interviewees in the US and UK indicated that they only cooperated with equivalent drinks producers. There was little evidence that producers engaged with tourism or tourism organisations. In Tasmania, by contrast, collaboration with tourism organisations was the norm, with many business owners sitting on the boards of local tourism organisations. In some cases, the business had been established with the expectation that they would mainly cater to tourists. As it has transpired, premium niche producers in Tasmania have also been embraced by their local communities but tourism practices remain a fundamental business strategy that supports and sustains their business.
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VISITOR MOTIVATIONS IN ARTS AND CULTURAL ORGANISATIONS

A regional context

Kim Lehman, Mark Wickham and Ian Fillis

ABSTRACT

Although research into arts and cultural production and consumption is increasing, there remains a lack of empirical knowledge about visitors’ motivation to visit museums in regional locations. We utilise a visitor survey to assess the motivations for consuming cultural experiences at the Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery (QVMAG), a regional museum in Launceston, Tasmania. The results of this study both conformed to and deviated somewhat from extant research across the areas of ‘cultural involvement’ and ‘motivation’, which has important implications for marketing management and strategy development in regional contexts.

INTRODUCTION

The significant contributions that arts and cultural institutions such as museums make to the economic and social development of regional economies is now widely recognised by practitioners and policymakers alike.1 This recognition has underpinned a drive by museum practitioners to better understand the bases for
museums’ economic and social contributions to society, and the means by which they can be maximised. As a result, museums have embraced a range of research programs to better understand the nature of their visitors, looking at, for example, the mix of locals versus tourists. Much of the information museums collect about their market segments is derived from visitor research. While such research has been conducted since the 1930s, many of the early studies undertaken were either not effective in eliciting visitors’ motivations, or were simply implemented poorly. During the 1960s, museum visitor research changed its focus to the burgeoning marketing phenomenon, and in particular, the manner in which museums could be more effective if they conceptualised their visitors as ‘consumers’. The resultant research was largely dependent on visitor surveys, which were viewed as useful tools for providing data for policy and strategy making; the marketing-led rise and increasing use of visitor studies can be seen as:

...an important step toward [museums] developing a client orientation in that it signals a shift from a functionalist, ‘object-centered’ ideology toward a humanist, ‘people-centered’ one.

More recently, there has been growing interest concerning the psychographic profile of museum visitors (understanding the bases of their preferences, experiences, and satisfaction levels). For the greater part, this has allowed museums to be more aware of the nature, diversity and needs of their market segments, and to be more attuned to providing a quality cultural experience that evokes the authenticity desired by the modern visitor. For museums, understanding visitor motivations is critical to more sophisticated customer segmentation and the ability to influence visitation; as noted by Slater.

Understanding motivations is important as it reveals the underlying reasons why visitors choose to participate in specific leisure activities.

With a sound understanding of what motivates potential visitors, arts and cultural organisations are better able to formulate and communicate their product offerings. This is certainly important for museums which now operate in an openly competitive environment for visitors and financial resources. Practitioner-led research has not yet examined the motivations of visitors to arts and cultural organisations in regional locations, which face a range of very different social and economic challenges. As Winkworth notes, there is a lack of supporting government infrastructure in the regional Australian context that has led to a ‘sustainability crisis facing museums...exacerbated by a lack of policy and equitable funding structures for museums and heritage collections’. The opportunity to attract alternative funding is also limited by a lack of sponsorship
opportunities, a constrained economic and physical resource base, and an inability to attract drawcard exhibitions due to relatively lower tourist numbers, geographic isolation etc.\textsuperscript{12} Overall, the majority of research into museum visitor motivations has been conducted in metropolitan contexts (e.g. the Tate Modern in London, the Powerhouse Museum in Sydney, the Louvre in Paris, and the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa in Wellington), and does little to assist museums in regional locations understand their potential and actual visitors. Given these challenges, and the paucity of research in this context generally, this chapter discusses an empirical examination of visitor motivations to an arts and cultural organisation conducted in a non-metropolitan location, namely, QVMAG in regional Tasmania. The study concentrated on on-site visitors, with the aim of capturing behaviour patterns linked to physical visits. This is an important consideration as QVMAG is a significant cultural institution for Launceston and the surrounding regions, serving multiple social purposes for the host population.

MUSEUM VISITOR MOTIVATIONS

Research into art and culture visitor motivations tends to focus on two key criteria: the visitors’ level of involvement in the art and cultural sector, and the specific motivations driving visitation to museums. Both of these criteria serve as the basis for our survey of the motivations of visitors to a regional arts and cultural organisation.

VISITORS’ LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT

A visitor’s ‘level of involvement’ refers to the relative importance of a given product or service as it relates to their needs, values and interests at a given point in time.\textsuperscript{13} As a result, a museum visitor’s levels of involvement could be either stable and enduring in nature (a repeat visitor to museums), or transient and situational in nature (a casual visitor to museums). Stable and enduring involvement is manifest in an ongoing concern for a product class, independent of specific purchase intentions.\textsuperscript{14} Transient and situational involvement is manifest as a temporary perception of product importance based on the consumer’s desire to obtain particular extrinsic benefits.\textsuperscript{15}

SPECIFIC MOTIVATIONS DRIVING VISITATION TO MUSEUMS

Understanding specific motivations provides a means to assess how and why visitors to museums engage in their art and cultural consumption.\textsuperscript{16} In arts and cultural research, a number of approaches to motivation have been taken to better understand the cultural
consumer. For example, Hood’s\textsuperscript{17} early research introduced the study of ‘values’, as opposed to simply considering demographics, and used frequency of visitation as a framework. While there appears to be a confusion between ‘values’ and ‘motives’, this study centred on the values which were found to be the bases for leisure-choice decision-making. Falk and Dierking\textsuperscript{18} found three main motivating factors for museum visitation: social recreation, education and reverence (that is, escapism from daily routine).

...non-metropolitan cultural institutions serve multiple social purposes within their host population, as well as in the surrounding regions. This was clearly the case for QVMAG and the Launceston region.

**SURVEY METHOD**

As noted in the introduction, our study took place at QVMAG. Originally opened in 1891, QVMAG is Australia’s largest regional art gallery and museum, and is situated on two sites in the regional city of Launceston. One is a dedicated art gallery and the other houses the natural sciences and history collections in a former nineteenth century railway workshop. A survey approach was adopted in order to obtain insight from a comprehensive sample of QVMAG visitors, with the survey instrument administered on both of QVMAG’s sites by trained volunteers and staff over 21 days in January 2016. In total, 2104 visitors returned responses to the survey.

**FINDINGS**

**SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS AND DEMOGRAPHICS**

The majority of the visitors surveyed in this study identified as female (61.8%), and reported having a university qualification (59.9%), and being older the average age in Australia (78.5% were aged above 35 years). Diverging from the findings of metropolitan museum visitor research somewhat, a minority of respondents reported above-average income: 45.9% reported a household income in excess of the average Tasmanian wage (A$70,000). In terms of place of residence, this research found that the visitors to QVMAG were predominantly from the local region (36.4% reported living within 20 kilometres of the museum) or from interstate/overseas (55.8%). Table 1 presents an overview of the demographics of the QVMAG visitors surveyed.
CULTURAL INVOLVEMENT

Consistent with previous surveys involving visitors to metropolitan museums, our survey results demonstrated that visitors to the regional QVMAG predominately comprised those already engaged with cultural matters. Data relating to the levels
of visitation firstly indicated that the majority of visitors (53.1%) reported visiting the museum a minimum of three times in a given calendar year; 85.6% when including those that visited at least once per calendar year. The survey indicated that only 7.2% of respondents visited a museum once a year (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In a typical year, approximately how many times do you visit a museum or art gallery?</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Once a year</th>
<th>1 or 2 times</th>
<th>3 to 5 times</th>
<th>6 or more times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, the survey indicated that the majority of visitors were favourably predisposed to cultural activities and experiences with 66.7% reporting having ‘serious’ or ‘intense’ interest in cultural institutions. Interestingly, 30.1% of visitors indicated that they had ‘neutral’ or ‘no interest’ in museums and/or other cultural institutions (see Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you describe your interest in museums and other cultural institutions?</th>
<th>No real interest</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Some interest</th>
<th>Serious interest</th>
<th>Very intense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey indicated that the majority of visitors to QVMAG rated museums’ roles in underpinning community well-being, curating local history and culture, and a place for education as either ‘important’ or ‘very important’ (88%, 94.4% and 95% respectively). While the proportion of visitors that did not perceive museums as important curators of local history and culture or as places for education were marginal (4.8% and 4.5% respectively), a proportion those surveyed (10.4%) did not perceive that QVMAG had an important role in improving community well-being (see Table 4).
MOTIVATION

The survey sought information linking motivation variables to the individual’s visitation to the QVMAG by focusing on the visitors’ perceptions of ‘well-being’, ‘learning’, and ‘family and social interaction’.

WELL-BEING

The majority of visitors surveyed agreed that QVMAG provided a place to have ‘a stimulating cultural experience’ (80%), a ‘pleasant environment to spend some quiet time alone’ (68.2%), and to a lesser extent, a ‘place to invigorate creativity’ (54.7%), and a ‘place to relax and relieve stress’ (53%). Somewhat inconsistent with previous research relating to metropolitan museums, however, the majority of visitors to QVMAG (63.9%) were either ‘neutral’ or ‘disagreed’ with the statement that museum helped them ‘escape the hustle and bustle of their daily activities’ (see Figure 1 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Attitudes towards museums and galleries in general</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not important</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums and art galleries should add to a community’s well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums and art galleries should be a place to see local history and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums and art galleries should be of educational value to the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This research indicated that the majority of visitors to QVMAG agreed that the museum provided ‘a place to discover things I do not know’ (85.9%), ‘a place to learn about art, history or science’ (84.8%), ‘a place to expand my interests in a particular area’ (62.9%), and ‘a place to seek personal fulfilment’ (63.5%). Interestingly, the data indicated that only 37.4% of the visitors surveyed were motivated to visit the regional museum in order to do something that they have never done before (see Figure 2).
FAMILY AND SOCIAL INTERACTION

This survey indicated that the only statement which gained a majority positive response was the measure relating to ‘spending quality time with my family or children’ (55.7%). All of the other measures failed to achieve a majority of positive responses with regard to regional museums’ role in providing a place for family and social interaction (see Figure 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family and social interaction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To discuss the exhibitions with others</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To share my interests with my friends and/or relatives</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To show QVMAG to visiting family and/or friends</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To socialise with my friends and/or relatives</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To spend quality time with my family or children</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Visitors motivated by family and social interaction.

IMPLICATIONS

The results of our survey both conformed to, and deviated somewhat from, previous research within arts and cultural organisations in relation to demographic characteristics, ‘cultural involvement’ and ‘motivation’ of visitors to QVMAG. In terms of demographic characteristics, the profile of the visitors to QVMAG were similarly older, predominantly female and more highly educated than average, which aligns closely with similar surveys focused on museums in metropolitan locations. Also consistent with previous surveys, the majority of visitors to QVMAG (63.6%) reported being ‘tourists’ to the region (53.7% domestic and 9.9% international). Diverging from the previous surveys, the majority of visitors in our study reported earning less than the national average – which is consistent with Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) reports that have consistently demonstrated lower annual earnings by employees in regional locations. This divergence has implications for the pricing and product/service offerings of museums in regional locations, in that they are economically constrained by the
prices they can charge and the quality and range of products and exhibitions that they are able to offer. Interestingly, while the data indicated that QVMAG was able to attract visitors from interstate and international locations, the visitation rate by domestic Tasmanian residents from outside a 20-kilometre radius was less than 8%, which is a significantly different proportion than those reported in metropolitan studies. The implication for QVMAG (and other museums in regional locations) is that its current products and services (or the marketing of them) do not present an attractive enough value proposition to motivate domestic tourists to undertake travel to the regional location on its own. It may be that museums in regional locations need to enter into cooperative arrangements with a range of businesses and services to create a visitor experience that domestic visitors will find holistically attractive.

In terms of involvement in cultural experiences evident in our survey, the majority of visitors reported being highly culturally involved and being favourably predisposed to cultural experiences as visitors to museums in metropolitan locations. While it is not surprising that museums attract cultural consumers, attracting the non-visitor – perhaps those not particularly ‘interested’ in art and
culture – has been an issue for both practitioners and policymakers for some time. In our survey, a significant proportion of visitors (30%) reported having ‘neutral’ or ‘no interest’ in museums and/or other cultural institutions. Taken together, this presents two important marketing issues for museums in regional locations; firstly, there is a need to define a range of new products and services to attract ‘new’ visitors to museums in regional locations. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, a significant number of visitors in regional locations may not belong to what would be considered ‘traditional’ museum target market segments. This raises important marketing research imperatives to understand the market segments of visitors to museums in regional locations in finer detail.

On the whole, the survey findings demonstrated that there was support for the notion that QVMAG, and its range of products and services, was linked to societal contributions in terms of community well-being, history and culture, or education. However, ‘community well-being’ was perceived by the visitors surveyed as the least important of the three listed roles (see Table 4). It seems that the potential role museums can play in this regard is undervalued by visitors in the regional context. Previous research has shown how crucial the museum sector can be in the broad area

Figure 5. The Inveresk campus of the Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery.
of health and well-being, and it may be that future marketing strategies will need to communicate the potential role museums can play in building community well-being in order to improve this level of perception.

In terms of the three groups of motivation factors (well-being, learning, and family and social interaction), a majority of visitors to QVMAG indicated a strong belief in the role that museums generally play in improving individual well-being, in terms of providing ‘a stimulating cultural experience’, a ‘place to invigorate creativity’ and a ‘place to relax and relieve stress’. While these findings are consistent with previous surveys relating to museums in metropolitan locations, visitors to QVMAG did not perceive the role of ‘helping visitors escape the hustle and bustle’ as particularly important. We believe that this is likely affected by the location of the museum being outside of capital city infrastructure and the day-to-day pressures associated with it. While ‘hustle and bustle’ can be a relative term, perhaps the role of a museum as a place of sanctuary is simply not relevant in non-metropolitan locations where the pace of life is relatively slower. Similarly, visitors to QVMAG did not perceive the museum as a place for socialisation, or a place of meeting; it is likely that other specialist providers (cafes, parks etc.) fulfil this role in regional locations. This implies that museums in regional locations need to consider a range of augmented roles to position themselves as options for social interaction (opening museum cafes, guided and virtual tours, seminar series etc.).

An interesting finding was in relation to QVMAG visitors wanting to spend ‘a quiet time in a pleasant environment’; with 68.2% of visitors reporting this an important motivator, it would seem pertinent for museums in regional locations to include related cues to this in their marketing strategies.

With regards to ‘learning’, the most significant motivators for the QVMAG visitors were to ‘discover things I do not know’ and ‘learn more about art, history or science’. While visitors were predominately ‘repeat consumers’ of cultural experiences, they remained interested in broadening their artistic and cultural knowledge base. Perhaps the most interesting point to be raised in this study was the lack of any significant relationship between ‘social and family interactions’ and motivations to visit. Socialising with friends and relatives, and ‘showing’ the museum to visiting friends and relatives was not reported as important by the visitors we surveyed. The factor ‘To share my interests with my friends and/or relatives’, however, was considered as important. We feel that this could relate to the ‘learning’ group of factors above, where the visitor is seeking to share their education experience with others. More significantly, the factor ‘To spend quality time with my family or children’ had just over half of visitors indicating it was an important motivator for visitation. Again, there are potential links to the education role of the museums, as well as to the importance of the concept of a ‘cultural
experience’. Clearly, non-metropolitan cultural institutions serve multiple social purposes within their host population, as well as in the surrounding regions. This was clearly the case for QVMAG and the Launceston region. Given the findings of our survey, we recommend that additional studies be undertaken within arts and cultural organisation in other regional locations to account for non-metropolitan differences that may play a role in motivating visitors, which could then provide a finer-grained causal analysis between visitor motivations and actual consumer behaviour within a regional context.
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Section 4

DIGITAL FUTURES
This chapter describes the Tourism Tracer project that was created at UTAS with the vision of exploring the visitor experience. Its application has now extended beyond the tourism industry, providing an example of how tourism can provide benefits to other sectors and industries. The chapter outlines the genesis of the project, the ethical issues it was required to consider and the key findings that emerged from the study. It also considers the challenges of this tourism innovation and the impacts that it has had, and may continue to have, upon the state of tourism in Tasmania.

Understanding how different type of tourists travel is one of the most fundamental questions that faces tourism researchers and the wider industry. Until recently it has also been almost impossible to address this issue precisely. In 2016, researchers from UTAS attempted to solve this problem, resulting in a project that tracked tourists in fine-grained detail across the entire state of Tasmania. The project, now called...
Tourism Tracer, delivered many firsts: it was the first time that tourists had been tracked across an entire destination, for their entire length of stay; it was the longest tracking project ever conducted; and it contained the largest cohort of participants of any tourism research tracking study. Importantly, amid growing concerns about data privacy, this project was conducted with tourists’ consent. The results attracted significant media and industry attention, culminating in a commercial licence agreement with a local Tasmanian company to use the Tourism Tracer technology. This chapter will explore the objectives of the project and its key outcomes, as well as the role that innovative technology can play in contributing towards tourism development in island destinations such as Tasmania.

**GENESIS OF TOURISM TRACER**

Tourism Tracer was originally funded by Sense-T as the ‘Sensing Tourists in Tasmania Tourist Tracking Project’ in 2015. The goal of Sense-T was to fund research that would promote technological innovation to assist major industries in Tasmania. Sense-T was established as part of the Regional Forest Agreement in Tasmania with the aim of supporting regional industries after the demise of large-scale commercial logging in the state. Tourism has long been regarded as an alternative source of regional employment to traditional extractive industries, yet curiously the bulk of Sense-T funding was allocated to aquaculture, agriculture and forestry projects. So the concept of funding tourism research, let alone a cutting-edge technology project, was an innovation in itself.

Underpinning the research proposal for Tourism Tracer were growing concerns among tourism researchers and the wider industry about the accuracy and value of traditional survey research. While surveys can produce valuable data on tourists’ socio-demographic profile, their ability to capture visitor travel data is highly problematic. Surveys are often done at the end of travellers’ journeys, asking them to recall how much money they have spent and where they have been.¹ For readers of this chapter who are avid travellers, you will know how difficult this can be, especially when travelling in a foreign country. The use of scales in surveys are also problematic. Scales that ask participants to rank issues and experiences from 1 to 7 have been demonstrated to be particularly unstable as participants often tend to tick the same number repetitively, due to the time they take to read and complete.² Furthermore, eye tracking research has demonstrated that the way respondents view surveys differs vastly and this has an impact on the ways in which surveys are answered.³ Finally, it has been noted that the method is limited by the significant differences in how participants from different cultures respond to surveys.⁴
Surprisingly, despite rigorous peer-reviewed research that has demonstrated problems with its accuracy, survey research is still routinely used to estimate where tourists travel. Techniques such as travel diaries, where tourists are required to onerously record their movements in 5-minute blocks have been used, alongside retrospective recall of overnight stops (e.g. the Australian International Visitor Survey). These approaches fail to accurately – let alone precisely – record people’s movements. The recognition of these issues formed the rationale for establishing Tourism Tracer.

...our data suggests that dispersal marketing strategies need to be differentiated by port of arrival and that a one-size-fits-all marketing approach for the entire state will not assist the regions.

The Tourism Tracer research team was multidisciplinary and included experts in social media use, statistics and survey design, an economist, a policy expert, a tourism behaviour expert, and an expert in the newly emerging Chinese tourism market. The team was advised by three international experts who were leaders in GPS tracking (Professor Bob McKercher) and social media usage (Professor Ulrike Gretzel and Dr Dan Wang). The first six months were spent trawling through research papers and debating ways in which the team could track tourists with their consent in order to understand exactly where they travelled. The use of mobile phone tracking, data from existing app providers such as Strava, and GPS-enabled receivers and wristwatches were all considered. Eventually the team settled on a solution: an app with an embedded survey and GPS that could be loaded onto a study phone, that we would give to participants to carry with them over the course of their trip to Tasmania. This technique was chosen because at the time of the study, there was no WiFi in the Launceston airport, so even the most attractive app in the world could not have been downloaded onto participants’ phones if they were from overseas and did not have data. Indeed, many domestic travellers encounter mobile reception coverage issues in Tasmania unless they are with specific providers.

To incentivise participants to carry the phone with them, and to charge it each night, the phones also worked as wireless hotspots that other devices (personal mobile phones, tablets, laptops, etc.) could be connected to. This was very attractive to many of our participants who did not have consistent mobile reception or who had data packs that limited their internet access. They were able to access up to three gigabytes of data through the study phones. Participants were also offered a digital map of their travels at the end of their trip, tracing their journey around Tasmania.
The design of the app took many months, as did the selection of the study mobile phones that the app was loaded upon. The team needed to ensure the app did not drain battery life too quickly, that it collected and stored the GPS data even when not in mobile phone reception (as coverage across the state is patchy), and that the app could be easily be used by both native and non-native English readers, along with Mandarin readers (Figure 1). The team also had to ensure that the 250 study phones had appropriate GPS capabilities. Once this was done, the team worked with the phone provider to ensure that the phones were ‘staged’ in an attractive manner. This meant that only the Tourism Tracer app could be viewed and that hotspotting the phones to participants’ own mobile phone was an easy process.

Following this, the team conducted field visits to determine the best means to recruit tourists. The way in which study recruiters approached potential participants, the design of the flyers, the wording on the flyers and the design of the banners, along with the content of the goodie bags, were all carefully thought through. Prior research had demonstrated that no study had ever successfully tracked tourists via an app with embedded survey and GPS capability, so the team needed to ensure that no issue remained unconsidered.

In February 2017, the recruitment began. To the team’s delight, nearly 500 participants were recruited over that calendar year.

During the early days of the project, when the project team sought advice from the tourism industry as to what survey questions should be embedded within the app, Sense-T announced that data from Sense-T would be open access. To honour this promise, the team needed to design a dashboard. The brief to the team who created this, Ionata Digital, was to create a dashboard that lacked numbers and could sync with existing datasets in close to real time. As soon as tourists left the state, the researchers asked the team at Ionata to ensure that their data was automatically visualised on the Tourism Tracer dashboard. The team wanted to bring the data alive and to avoid static PDF-document style delivery. During the first phase of research, Carto software
was used; in the second phase of research, in 2017, the Ionata team developed their own visually stunning real-time visualisations. The result was what the team now affectionately call ‘the dots’, which represents tourists’ movements as they travel throughout the state. The interest in these dots and the remainder of the dashboard was intense. To date, Tracer has featured in over 60 media stories in Australia and internationally, and the Tourism Tracer dashboard (tasmania.tourismtracer.com) has been viewed over 8000 times.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

One of the most significant issues for the Tracer team was the issue of ethics and consent. In Australia, all university research involving humans must comply with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct on Human Research. This statement informs UTAS’s Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee, which all researchers must seek permission from prior to conducting research with humans. The national statement and UTAS’s Human Research Ethics Committee are designed to ensure that participants who consent to take part in research are respected. This respect may manifest in the form of protecting their privacy, their identity, and their dignity, and reducing their risk of harm or distress.

For this research, the Australian Telecommunications Offences and Other Measures Act (no.2) 2004 required us to collect the identity of those participating, in case they committed a crime while hotspotting from our study phones. However, within the database of the GPS data and survey data, the identity of participants was not recorded. The research team was acutely aware that tracking is a highly invasive activity, therefore we had to ensure, via our consent statement, that participants were aware that they were being tracked, could pull out of the study at any time,
and could retrieve their data if they wished to have it withdrawn from the study. The team was concerned that this would be a deal-breaker for participants, but it seemed that the affiliation of the research with UTAS and the open nature of the study reassured participants that their data was safe. This trust, coupled with the incentives described above, generated a willingness to participate. The ease with which tourists were recruited surprised the team and appeared to demonstrate that if potential participants realise there is a valid reason for collecting data and that benefits to society may emerge as a result of research, then they are more likely to consent to taking part.

Ethics remains a highly significant issue for tracking studies. The Cambridge Analytica scandal, that occurred in 2018 when Facebook data was unethically used without users’ consent, highlighted public resistance to being tracked without prior knowledge. In May 2018, the European Union announced the General Data Protection Regulations that stipulated that the data of European citizens may not be used without their consent. This is very similar to the ethical considerations that UTAS academics have to abide by, so did not present a problem for Tourism Tracer. However, for credit card companies, mobile phone companies and apps which do collect data without seeking express permission, this new ruling raises major questions. Does an app that asks users for permission ‘…for their details to be used to improve the customer experience’ adequately explain that users’ movement and personal data will be used to follow their movements in detail? According to the National Statement on Ethical Conduct on Human Research and the UTAS Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee, it would not. In the future, anyone seeking to track tourists’ movement using technology will have to be very cautious about their procedures and compliance with regulations such as these.

**KEY OUTCOMES**

The Tourism Tracer data revealed a variety of outcomes. The most significant of these were the itineraries that highlighted precisely where tourists travelled each day. The study team combined the survey data collected via the app with the GPS data and were able to determine that there were eight commonly appearing itineraries of travellers through the state of Tasmania (Figure 3).

These itineraries challenged existing tourism theories. For example, the data revealed that first-time visitors were more likely to undertake the Linear East route than repeat visitors. This contradicts long-held tourism theory by Oppermann whose New Zealand research argued that repeat visitors tended to visit fewer destinations and attractions. The team were also able to determine that a high percentage of trips could be described as ‘open-jaw’ style travel, where tourists enter from one port and
leave from another. This was very common on the Linear East route, where just over 50% of tourists were found to be entering the state in Hobart and leaving via Launceston.

Other surprises that emerged from this data related to regional dispersal. Currently the Tasmanian Government has a goal to ensure that 66% of tourists disperse into Tasmania’s regions (defined as tourists who leave the city boundaries of Hobart, using the Tourism Tasmania survey data).\textsuperscript{12} Our data has revealed that dispersal into the regions differs markedly according to the gateway entry point. Tourists from Hobart (Figure 4) tend to disperse far less than those who enter via Devonport or Launceston, as illustrated in the graphs below (Figure 5). Consequently, our data suggests that dispersal marketing strategies need to be differentiated by port of arrival and that a one-size-fits-all marketing approach for the entire state will not assist the regions.

The research has also been able determine issues related to tourists’ risk taking: 13% of our sample were recorded driving, at some point during their trip, between 10pm and 6am. Moreover, the fine-grained detail of the data can reveal how different cohorts of tourists’ approach curvature in roads and how fast they drive.

Tourism Tracer has been designed to sync with existing datasets, meaning that comparisons between its data and that of the TVS can be undertaken, along with other datasets. Perhaps those most exciting of these is the Australian Tourism Data Warehouse. This database maintains the GPS coordinates of all business listed on it; in Tasmania this includes all those who have Tourism Accreditation with the TICT. Using this data, we have been able to assess how tourists move between businesses in close to real time. In 2018, the Tracer team worked with researchers Dr Gemma Lewis and Dr Fiona Kerslake to assess tourists’ behaviour in vineyards across Tasmania. This has revealed which type of tourists move between vineyards and sub-regions within

![Figure 3. Example of eight popular itineraries undertaken by tourist travelling in Tasmania, including the Linear East.](image)
the Tamar wine region and precisely how long they stay at each vineyard. The co-
marketing opportunities that this data offers the tourism industry can give Tasmania a significant marketing advantage.

**FUNDING AND COMMERCIALISATION**

Following its first tranche of funding in 2016 by Sense-T, the Tourism Tracer project was granted a second round of funding to continue its data collection and further develop its dashboard and app by UTAS, the TICT, the DSG and the Federal Group. During this time, a standalone app was developed and trialled. In early 2018 the
Tourism Tracer app was placed on the App and Google Play stores and a further 200 tourists were recruited using this method: tourists were no longer recruited in person and were not given free data on a study phone as an incentive. Signs placed in strategic positions around our entry ports simply encouraged tourists to place the app on their personal mobile phones. The success of this second phase proved the potential for the technology to be rolled out in other jurisdictions and in a far more efficient manner.

Given the intense interest in the project and the cessation of Tasmanian funding in May 2018, it became apparent that one option for continuing the project on a sustainable footing would be through commercialisation. The research team and UTAS signed a non-exclusive licensing deal with a bootstrapped company that had spun off from Ionata Digital, called Tourism Research Technology. This agreement meant that Tourism Research Technology, as well as UTAS, could use the Tourism Tracer data. It has resulted in the employment of three local information technology professionals and the creation of a lean and nimble version of Tracer, substantially reducing the costs for end users. Royalties, and in most instances data from the work undertaken by Tourism Research Technology, return to the project team, allowing them to conduct research and further the benefits to Tasmania. Concurrently, UTAS can also continue to use the Tourism Tracer technology as detailed below.

**SPIN-OFFS FROM TOURISM TRACER**

The Tourism Tracer technology has gone global. It has been used to track cyclists in Sweden for the past two summers and interest in the technology is intense. It is likely that other jurisdictions will make use of the technology in the near future.

Further, in Tasmania, the technology has been used in several forms outside of tourism. It has been used in the Menzies Research Centre’s ‘trips4health’ trial, as part of their ‘Health by Stealth’ study that is assessing the most efficient ways to encourage people to increase their physical activity through the use of public transport. Later in 2019 it will be used to track visitors to Tasmania and assess the well-being benefits of tourism. And most significantly, in late 2019 the Tourism Tracer technology will be used by Tourism Tasmania to work alongside the TVS and track the movement of tourists throughout Tasmania. The latter will be managed entirely by the commercial licence holder, Tourism Research Technology.

**ARE INNOVATIONS A GOOD THING?**

Tourism Tracer is changing the way that tourism research is conducted both in Tasmania and beyond. It has challenged the traditional assumption that all survey research is good research, by highlighting what surveys cannot do – track exactly
where tourists go, day by day, in fine detail. But innovations are not always enjoyed – they challenge systems and change is expensive. Governments want data that is perceived as being reliable and safe for many; a tangible paper-based survey has traditionally represented this safety net. Moreover, while university academics may be celebrated for creating physical products such as bomb detection devices, medical devices and lobster breeding techniques (all examples of work done by UTAS staff) the commercialisation of Tourism Tracer was not universally accepted. There were misconceptions that the intellectual property was ‘sold’. This is not the case; the intellectual property of Tracer will always remain with UTAS and the licence deal did not involve a sale. Moreover, the Tourism Tracer team has made a commitment to assist the Tasmanian tourism industry first and foremost. The competitive advantage of Tourism Tracer remains with Tasmania where it has been used almost continuously since 2016; no other jurisdiction in the world can lay claim to this activity.

One of the risks of technological innovation is that its newness is perceived as risky for early adopters. Christensen argues that innovations must ensure they are sustaining technologies. It is very important that the pace of technology does not outstrip the market’s ‘need’. This is a risk for Tourism Tracer. Sales are hard to make when there is little previous experience to sell and furthermore, a keen eye needs to be kept on what the research market needs. The technology could easily be adapted to be filled with bells and whistles such as augmented or virtual reality. But currently, what is required in the field of research are solutions that provide cost-efficient and automated data. The challenge for Tourism Tracer is to ensure it stays relevant, so that employment from the project increases and royalties flow, to ensure that that data can continue to deliver Tasmania the insights and competitive advantage that it needs.

A second risk of innovation is that it attracts competition. Since the inception of Tourism Tracer, several companies have emerged with rival technologies. Tourism Tracer, as with any new innovation, will need to keep at the head of its game by selling its benefits: the research rigour that underpins its data and the interpretation of it, the fact that Tourism Tracer produces GPS data that has rich tourist behavioural data and demographic data integrated with it, and the fact that the technology has informed consent at its core.

THE FUTURE IN TASMANIA

Tourism Tracer still has much work to do to assist the Tasmanian tourism industry. On a regular basis, the team provides the industry with updates on topics of pressing interest. Members of the team are soon to embark on research that seeks to assist the contentious issue of overtourism. Over the past five years, there has been significant
media coverage regarding tourism hotspots such as Freycinet National Park. Debates have emerged over the best way to alleviate the crowding that occurs over the summer period. The Tourism Tracer team are currently working on the development of push notifications that can redirect segments of tourists who tend to visit the National Park in busy times (these segments were determined in early phases of Tourism Tracer research) to alleviate what many refer to as overtourism.

The team is also currently working in the Huon Valley, following the loss of its key demand driver, the Tahune Forest Airwalk, to bushfire in January 2019. Tourism Research Technology has devoted the time at no cost, as have several UTAS academics, in order to assess where tourists are travelling since the fires. It is hoped that the impact of the newly announced Project X in the Huon region will also be able to be tracked, assisting the region with their recovery efforts.

The team is also busy working on dispersal measurement techniques and the incorporation of expenditure measures into the app. Tourism Tracer offers a means to determine, in great detail, where and how visitors to our state travel and what they spend. There is a lot to be done. As with all innovations there is always a risk that another innovation will follow and supersede ours. But for now, Tourism Tracer has a bright future and has given Tasmania a competitive advantage far beyond its mainland counterparts.
Chapter 16

AIRBNB IN TASMANIA
Scourge or saviour?

Anne Hardy

ABSTRACT
Barely a week goes by without the issue of Airbnb making the media in Tasmania. Initially lauded as the saviour for the under-supplied summer accommodation market in Hobart, it is now despised by many and blamed for causing housing shortages and social disruption. Yet despite this fierce debate, Airbnb is now Tasmania’s – and the world’s – largest accommodation provider. This chapter explores the growth of the Airbnb phenomenon in Tasmania and the impact it has had upon those who host via Airbnb and those within the traditional tourism industry.

INTRODUCTION
One of the most contentious issues facing the Tasmanian tourism industry in the past ten years has been the rise of the sharing economy. The sharing economy has been described as having six characteristics: platform dependence, access to underused resources, the involvement of peer-to-peer interactions, collaborative governance where buyers and sellers make decisions, an emphasis on non-monetary
It has challenged the structure, regulation and marketing of the state of Tasmania by allowing anyone with a space to list their place and offer it to tourists, with no regulatory requirements or tourism certification. Platforms that make up the sharing economy include HomeAway (formerly known as Stayz), HelpX, couch surfing, Uber and FlipKey. But in Tasmania the most vigorous discussion has centred around Airbnb. This platform has been described as either the devil or the saviour of the tourism industry. It is an itch that cannot be scratched and for better or worse, depending on where your opinion lies, this will not go away. This chapter will explore the size, nature and impacts of the Airbnb phenomenon in Tasmania and in doing so, will explore some possible future approaches for engaging with this new economy.

THE AIRBNB PHENOMENON

Airbnb had its beginnings in San Francisco, formed by school friends Brian Chesky and Joe Gebbie in 2008. Since its inception it has quickly turned into a global juggernaut, with offices in 21 cities, more than US$1 billion in revenue in the third quarter of 2018 and an estimated value of US$30 billion. In Tasmania, as with many other destinations, Airbnb has experienced an enormous 205% growth rate between July 2016 and June 2018 and there are now over 5245 listings across the state. According to Inside Airbnb, a data-scraping company that seeks to uncover the earnings of Airbnb properties, the average yield of Airbnb properties across the state is $185 per night for an entire property. While there is a heavy concentration of Airbnb listings in Hobart, other significant clusters also occur in the following council regions: Launceston, Glamorgan Spring Bay and Break O’Day. The nature of these listings varies enormously: guests can choose from ‘entire places’ where guests will have the entire listing to themselves, ‘private rooms’ that share common areas, ‘hotel rooms’ in a boutique hotel or hostel, or ‘shared rooms’ where guests stay in a common room.

In the early days of this platform’s arrival in Tasmania (around 2014–16), Airbnb was welcomed by the tourism industry and Tasmanian Government as it appeared...
to ease accommodation shortages which occurred over the summer periods in our tourist hubs, particularly Hobart. The welcome was so warm that the Premier of Tasmania, Will Hodgman, announced in 2017 that the state would not regulate Airbnb, but rather embrace the sharing economy as it helped the state meet demand. But as numbers of hosts grew, the tourism industry experienced growing pains, mostly caused by competition for bed nights between traditional tourism operators and Airbnb operators. The Tasmanian Government has changed its policy several times since its original embrace. The details of these changes are described by Grimmer and Vorobjovas-Pinta in another chapter within this volume. Most recently, the Short Stay Accommodation Bill 2018 has required that hosts with investment properties or more than four bookable rooms in their own homes must complete a self-assessment form, declare that the property meets minimum safety standards and gain relevant permits. It also requires hosts offering investment properties over 200 square metres to acquire building and planning permits.

Much has been written about the role of Airbnb hosting in contributing to a shortage in rental housing and rapid growth in housing prices. In many overseas cities, such as Venice and Barcelona, the situation has led to protests against the phenomenon.

The situation has become particularly acute in Hobart where rental vacancies are the lowest in the nation and house prices continue to grow, despite other capital cities

Figure 2. Anti-tourism graffiti that has occurred as a result of the impacts of Airbnb in Barcelona.
experiencing decline. While not the primary cause – the city of Hobart has been growing in size – UTAS continues to attract students from out of town, and Hobart continues to be a very attractive location for interstate real estate investors. There have been many stories in the media of families unable to secure stable accommodation, resulting in UTAS increasing its housing capacity for students in 2018–19 and the Tasmanian Government earmarking $500,000 in late May 2019 to provide emergency accommodation options.

In addition to impacts on housing, there are also impacts on the industry. To tourism operators who have had to pay accreditation fees to the Tourism Industry Council of Tasmania (TICT), meet council regulations relating to safety and food preparation, and invest money in training staff, Airbnb is a slap in the face. In as little as 20 minutes, an individual can create their own tourism business on this platform without having undertaken any training or certification, and without any fees to industry bodies, inspections from council or public indemnity insurance. The platform’s perceived skirting of the system has challenged and offended many tourism stakeholders.

While offending those who have worked so hard to meet and exceed industry and regulatory standards, Airbnb has been applauded by others. It has given them money. Currently, there is a growing sector of middle-class poor in Australia, including Tasmania. These are families who apparently have it all – the house, two jobs and the car – but in fact it has been reported that many of them are struggling to make ends meet at the end of each fortnight. To these people, who may have a spare room under their house, a granny flat in the garden or a rental property, Airbnb has offered the opportunity to make some additional money. Moreover, it is no coincidence that many advertisements for Airbnb hosting feature single middle-aged women. Many women who have separated from their partners are left with little or no superannuation and Airbnb offers them the opportunity to make extra cash through hosting. The platform has created a quiet army of active micro-entrepreneurs who have set up Airbnb businesses in their spare rooms and granny flats, and who ‘meet’ regularly via a Facebook hosting forum and in the local hosting clubs that have emerged in Tasmania. The positive impacts upon these people’s lives are evident when speaking to them: hosting is a passion which they relish and for many, it has afforded them a multitude of unexpected opportunities that extend past the financial, including new friendships, the opportunity to travel and a hosting community that is able to support them.

But single middle-aged women and working parents are not the only types of hosts. What we know from research is that not all hosts are the same. Recent research into Airbnb in Australia asked hosts why they rented their properties out. Income, social interaction and sharing emerged as the three major reasons. Not surprisingly, income was very popular, but rather than seeking it for profit or return on investment, hosts
often framed their motivations as seeking additional income that could help them pay bills or purchase items they could not otherwise afford. Social interaction was also significant for many hosts along with sharing space that would otherwise be unused.

In addition to having differing motivations, we also know that hosts differ in their behaviour. In Tasmania, a recent study has delved into this. It suggested that three hosting types exist. The first type of hosts has been labelled ‘Capitalists’, who are hosts driven by profit and return on investment. These hosts join Airbnb to maximise their financial gain and are not emotionally attached to their Airbnb space. They do not hold any particular interest in socialising and meeting their fellow hosts. Moreover, Capitalists are not particularly risk averse in terms of ‘vetting’ the guests that stay in their property. Conversely, ‘Befrienders’ are motivated to socialise. While they welcome the money, they want to interact and vet each guest’s profile before the booking is confirmed and meet them upon arrival or during their stay. Many Befrienders also interact with other hosts. The third group, ‘Ethicists’ are what many regard as the original creators of the sharing economy: they engaged in Airbnb early on, with a desire to utilise their space and live sustainably. Ethicists are likely to feel disappointed with the massive changes that Airbnb has gone through since its inception, given their distaste for large corporations.¹³

In addition to differences in hosting, research in Tasmania has also revealed that Airbnb hosts often act as a unified, supportive neo-tribe.¹⁴ Many feel ignored or, even
worse, scorned by the traditional tourism industry as a result of the negative media surrounding Airbnb and the perception that they are not part of the ‘normal’ tourism industry. Therefore, they are not invited to be members of tourism organisations, nor do they feel comfortable asking to join. In response to this, they have formed their own support network. In Hobart, fellow hosts gather regularly at the Host Meetup and have a very active online support page. Fellow hosts share information on insurance, compliance requirements, tips for decoration and how to deal with problem guests. They gather together to lobby governments, lobby Airbnb when they disagree with it, and support tourists in finding accommodation during crises such as the recent Tasmanian bushfires.15

In as little as 20 minutes, an individual can create their own tourism business on this platform without having undertaken any training or certification, and without any fees to industry bodies, inspections from council or public indemnity insurance.

So, why is the activity of being an Airbnb host in Tasmania considered by some to be so offensive? There are several reasons for this, apart from the impact that hosting has had upon the housing sector. To traditional tourism operators, Airbnb hosting is an activity that has avoided the regulations and red tape that they have had to endure. In Tasmania, if tourism operators wish to be accepted by the tourism industry and have their product promoted by the TICT, they are required to be accredited by the Australian Tourism Accreditation system. This system is designed to ensure minimum standards are met and indeed exceeded, as they so often are in Tasmania. Operators who achieve this certification are rewarded by being promoted by TICT and Tourism Tasmania in their tourism campaigns for the state. But the 5000 Airbnb hosts in Tasmania are not required to meet these standards. This saves them money and denies the TICT an important source of revenue and control over the makeup of the industry’s accommodation sector. Furthermore, Airbnb hosts are not required to prove compliance with regulations in relation to fire safety, car safety, wilderness first aid, food handling, public indemnity insurance and a host of other requirements applicable to other accommodation businesses. Operators that have been required to meet these regulations as part of their TICT Accreditation would understandably be upset that they have been required to jump through hoops that Airbnb hosts have not. Sadly, this situation is not unique to the travel industry. Other innovations have been tremendously disruptive to tourism – price wars, new competitors, and the
introduction of low-cost marketing on social media have also left some operators out of pocket, while other early adopters have benefitted greatly.

Can we, and should we, stop this phenomenon? While precise numbers of those who use Airbnb are hard to find, it is estimated that in 2018, over 150 million people used Airbnb.16

Arguably, this is a behavioural tidal wave – the tourism equivalent of the introduction of Facebook. Like Facebook, it is likely that Airbnb will at some point be replaced by an equivalent, but what it has illustrated in the meantime is that to tourists, the perceived authenticity of Airbnb properties and their perceived value for money is enormously attractive. Importantly, research has demonstrated that those who use Airbnb are not a homogenous group: four core types of Airbnb guests have been identified.17 The first are ‘Costsavers’ – tourists who are motivated to save money and who are willing to stay further away from the main attractions in less luxurious accommodation with fewer utilities. They are not highly motivated to meet people, nor do they demand a highly authentic vacation experience. Conversely, ‘Socialisers’ are highly motivated by a desire to meet new people. They may be travelling alone and will use Airbnb in order to feel safe, or they may use Airbnb as a way to meet local people and gain a better understanding their culture. Socialisers will spend relatively large periods of time with their hosts, either online or face to face. The third group of guests that have been identified are ‘Localisers’. These are guests who are motivated to have what they perceive to be an authentic experience. They seek out places that they feel are akin to the way that people live in their destination, to feel what it is to live like a local. The aesthetic of the accommodation they are staying in is most important to these guests. The fourth group are ‘Utilitarians’, who are motivated by a need for specialised accommodation. They are often made up of large family groups who require a large property. Or they could be travellers who wish to travel with their pets or those with a disability. To these guests, price, perceived authenticity and the opportunity to meet their hosts are not as important.

What this research illustrates is that to some users of Airbnb, the traditional tourism accommodation sector may struggle to offer what they are looking for, and therefore cannot be regarded as competition. Airbnb guests often seek product characteristics such as larger spaces, self-contained accommodation and authentic, bespoke and local design at a low cost. Conversely, traditional Airbnb accommodation cannot offer a standard service along with a concierge desk. Previously, the guest who sought out authentic and bespoke accommodation may have travelled less frequently, been less satisfied, or not travelled at all. Arguably, Airbnb has opened up travel to those who may not have otherwise engaged in it.

Yet while some Airbnb listings may be regarded as adding to rather than competing with existing tourism product, we can also argue that many of them do compete in some
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aspects. Anecdotally in Tasmania, Airbnb has created a dip in occupancy for hotels and traditional bed and breakfasts, and in some cases fostered price wars. The Airbnb booking platform, with its low price point, has created considerable competition for traditional bed and breakfasts. Worse still, it has been blamed by opponents for playing a major role in overtourism in cities such as Barcelona and Paris. In Tasmania, it has also been blamed for creating overtourism – most notably in Coles Bay during peak tourism periods. But, with increased tourism numbers and a cohort of guests (e.g. Localisers and Costsavers) who are not highly motivated to stay in tourist hotspots, Airbnb can also bring significant benefits to regional areas which have previously struggled to attract tourists. Research in Tasmania has revealed that Airbnb guests do indeed stay outside major tourist hubs and ‘desire alternative sources of information in addition to mainstream tourism marketing’. Consequently, ongoing research in Tasmania is suggesting that retail businesses – especially those in regional areas – can benefit significantly from Airbnb recommendations. In addition to retail benefits, Airbnb-related businesses such as cleaning services, laundry services and gardening services have also benefitted enormously from Airbnb-induced tourism. These benefits are most acutely felt in remote and regional areas of Tasmania, where low employment remains a highly significant issue.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the Airbnb issue in Tasmania is not clear cut. Tasmania’s current domestic marketing campaign, called ‘A Quiet Little Moment’, is subtitled ‘Go behind the scenery’. The imagery of everyday moments, authentic ‘Tasmanian-ness’ and Tasmanian experiences, plays right into the hands of Airbnb’s own marketing campaigns whose tag lines include ‘book unique homes and experiences’ and ‘live like a local’, and ‘hear their [hosts’] experiences’. Moreover, without Airbnb, the supply of accommodation that caters to the needs of ‘Localiser’ and ‘Utilitarian’ guests would be severely compromised.

Airbnb has rattled the norm of regulatory compliance within the tourism industry in Tasmania. Prior to the government implementing short-stay regulations, Airbnb hosts could offer cheaper accommodation because they did not have costs involved with ensuring compliance. But perhaps one of the larger elephants in the room right now is the question of whether traditional tourism operators are being subjected to over-regulation. Is there too much red tape? Are the multiple costs involved with being accredited, along with compliance with regulations on food safety, guest safety and fire safety cumulatively too much for small and micro businesses to bear? And has the industry failed to innovate and provide what the market is demanding? Arguably the rapid rise of Airbnb is partially a result of tourists’ aversion to the costs created
through regulation and the generic product offerings that have become ubiquitous in the hotel industry. The rapid rise of Airbnb has exposed the view that while regulation is necessary to ensure safety, regulation for the sake of revenue generation is no longer acceptable. This debate has also exposed a weakness within Airbnb: while hosts are encouraged to provide appliances such as fire alarms, carbon monoxide detectors and fire escape instructions, and many indeed do this, Airbnb receives a lot of criticism for being non-compliant and exposing guests to potential risks. The challenge for the organisation is to prove itself a good corporate citizen that undertakes activities that reduce these (and other) potential negative impacts.

The recent introduction of Airbnb ‘Experiences’ – guided tours that individuals can create and offer via the Airbnb platform – will most likely challenge the traditional tour offerings in Tasmania. It will challenge regulation, existing training schemes for guides, and the industry’s perception of what a tour should look like and involve. When I began writing this chapter, nine ‘Experiences’ were on offer in Tasmania via the Airbnb website, but this number rose to 17 within six months and is highly likely to increase.

The challenge for the Tasmanian tourism industry is to accept and engage with this new tourism economy. VisitBritain recently announced a partnership deal with Airbnb Experiences to promote tours, trips and unique events. The TICT and the four regional tourism authorities would be wise to follow suit and consider engaging with Airbnb hosts and experiences. Airbnb hosts will provide these organisations with much-needed membership revenue, but more importantly, both traditional tourism businesses and new Airbnb businesses have the same core values. They are in the tourism industry to provide a great experience and there is much to be gained by joining forces and working together rather than creating ‘us’ and ‘them’ divides. However, the challenge to these industry organisations is to provide something in return. What can they provide Airbnb hosts that Airbnb Hosting Clubs do not? Moreover, what remains to be understood is the value that operating out of the mainstream provides to Airbnb operators. Perhaps they do not wish to join the traditional tourism industry? Further research is needed to explore this issue in detail. However, what we do know is that tourism operates in a business environment, so change is a constant. As such, Airbnb will change, morph and dissolve at some point, although it is unlikely that peer-to-peer platforms will ever disappear. In the meantime, a cohesive, integrated and inclusive industry will do nothing but assist in the ongoing sustainability of this island.
As a true home sharer host I believe that I help Tasmania show its true nature to people from all over the world and in turn I fully utilise my asset (my home)…And I believe it has assisted Tasmania to respond to the massive tourism boom! Without us short-stay (Airbnb) hosts thousands of eager tourists would have been turned away from Tasmania.

—Airbnb Host

For the last 18 months I have been trying to compete with Airbnb properties who pay residential rates, power prices, spend nothing on advertising their property or this region and were not required by Airbnb to provide proof of proper insurance or fire safety…And that is a totally unfair competition!

—‘Traditional’ Accommodation Business Owner

ABSTRACT

Airbnb has polarised the Tasmanian community. When Airbnb entered the Australian market in 2012, it is fair to say it did not create even a ripple; consumers were still
grappling with the concept of actually sharing resources, including homes. Fast forward to 2019 and Airbnb is a significant part of the Tasmanian tourism economy. At the same time, Airbnb has attracted criticism from stakeholders including tourism operators and community groups who want greater regulation. This chapter suggests that approaches to regulation clearly cannot be applied universally. Legislators must reflect upon the differences between towns, cities and regions, and take into consideration individual socio-economic status indicators.

Airbnb has polarised the Tasmanian community. On one hand there are those who champion the home-sharing behemoth and commend the opportunities Airbnb provides for hosts and local small businesses, as well as noting the positive impact Airbnb has on promoting tourism in regional areas and helping solve acute tourist accommodation shortages. On the other hand, Airbnb is subject to growing criticism for driving up house prices, reducing available housing stock for rent, and contributing to long-term tenants being forced out of rental properties.

Initially, Airbnb was lauded for helping address an acute tourism accommodation shortage in Tasmania’s capital, Hobart, but as its popularity with guests and hosts increased, Airbnb became the target of concerns about the state’s housing market. One of the first public forums to address the impact of Airbnb in Tasmania was hosted by the Institute for the Study of Social Change at the University of Tasmania in June 2017. ‘Sharing Hobart: Managing the Rise of Airbnb’ featured a panel of tourism and housing academics, as well as representatives from the Tasmanian tourism industry and Airbnb. Around 500 people attended the event, including Airbnb hosts, traditional accommodation operators, tenants, local residents and academics and researchers. The two quotes highlighted at the start of this chapter embody the polarisation of sentiment expressed at the ‘Sharing Hobart’ forum.

First identified in 2010 by Rachel Botsman and Roo Rogers in the book What’s Mine is Yours, the concepts ‘collaborative consumption’ and the ‘sharing economy’ were, in the main, entirely new phenomena for most of us. Humans have actually been sharing resources throughout history, but Botsman and Rogers were the first to recognise the role that technology could play in facilitating meaningful and economic sharing or exchange of goods and services. Airbnb markets itself as an opportunity for everyday people, as opposed to traditional tourism operators, to offer tourist and visitor accommodation. This point of difference, or unique selling proposition, has been instrumental in Airbnb’s appeal for both hosts and guests to engage in home sharing.

When Airbnb entered the Australian market in 2012, it is fair to say it did not create even a ripple; consumers were still grappling with the concept of sharing resources, including
homes. As a booking platform, Airbnb was at first adopted by users as an alternative to other competing online holiday accommodation booking systems such as Stayz.

Utilising a digital platform to facilitate sharing a room in one’s home (as opposed to a holiday shack) was a new and unique phenomenon, particularly in Tasmania. For a while, Airbnb was not in the sights of regulators and policymakers.

In fact, Airbnb was welcomed as a timely solution to the tourist accommodation shortage being experienced in the state, but mainly in the capital, Hobart. Initially the tourism industry was keen to support Airbnb as a much-needed fix for a shortage of beds, particularly during peak season. Historic low levels of investment in tourism infrastructure, particularly mid-level hotels in Hobart, was having a severe impact on the state’s ability to meet the demands of growing numbers of tourists. Moreover, with the growing popularity of David Walsh’s MONA, a range of cultural festivals and events, and improved infrastructure and facilities in national parks and nature-based visitor attractions, all of sudden Tasmania was ‘hot’ but simply didn’t have the required levels of accommodation for visitors and tourists.

The scale of the problem can be illustrated by visitation figures. Back in 2008, 897,100 people visited Tasmania. Fast forward ten years and that figure rose to 1.32 million in 2018, representing a staggering overall increase of 32%. Tasmania prides itself on its pristine wilderness and natural areas: 51% of the island state’s landmass is under
some form of reservation classification. Tasmania’s wilderness, food, drink, and its growing arts and cultural scene are the main features attracting visitors. The majority of visitors to Tasmania are from mainland Australia, with most coming from Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. The primary purpose for travel to Tasmania is for a holiday, but significant numbers also visit friends and relatives, as well as travelling for business and conferences. International visitors mostly come from China, the US and Japan. The 2016 visit of Chinese President Xi Jinping resulted in the number of tourists from China increasing by an astounding 40%. UTAS also attracts significant numbers of international students with the majority coming from mainland China.

One of the ways the impact of tourism is measured is through examining the number of nights that visitors stay in a location. The 2018 indicator shows visitors to Tasmania stayed a total of 10.83 million nights, each staying an average of 8.5 nights per trip. On average, each Tasmanian Airbnb host accommodates 15 bookings per year and the average length of a stay is 2.5 nights per guest.

Without a doubt Tasmania’s tourism industry has expanded significantly to meet tourist and visitor demand, and Airbnb has certainly played a major role in the past four or so years. The tourism industry in Tasmania is significant, indirectly providing 15.8% of total Tasmanian employment (38,000 jobs); tourism injects $2.8 billion per annum into the economy and represents 10.7% of Gross State Product. In response to the increase in tourist numbers, new tourism businesses are appearing across the state to leverage visitor demand, including world-class golf courses and mountain bike trails, and remote luxury accommodation offerings. Development applications for accommodation, infrastructure and attractions are at all-time high. Some of these developments are controversial, including a proposal for a cable car to the summit of kunanyi/Mount Wellington in Hobart and remote luxury accommodation offerings accessible only by helicopter. There is little doubt that the rise and availability of Airbnb accommodation in Tasmania has significantly influenced and perhaps even encouraged entrepreneurs, developers and business owners to think ‘outside the square’ in developing and proposing new visitor experiences.

In response to customer demand, over last two to three years, new hotels have opened, mostly in Hobart and Launceston. An additional number of new properties are under construction or approved for development. However, despite the increase in accommodation options, the number of visitors still choosing Airbnb continues to grow, it would appear, unabated. Since 2012 the number of Airbnb listings in Tasmania has increased to well over 3,000 with the majority of properties in Hobart.

In Tasmania, and other places experiencing visitor accommodation shortages, Airbnb is considered a significant factor in helping to address issues in the tourism sector associated with accommodation shortages. Importantly, peer-to-peer
accommodation providers such as Airbnb play a significant role in providing accommodation, particularly in rural, regional and outer suburban areas formerly with little or no accommodation offering.

In the main, Airbnb hosts are supportive of the peer-to-peer accommodation platform. They believe it allows them to operate entrepreneurially, and provides them with extra income, the opportunity to run their own business and to share their enthusiasm for Tasmania with their guests. Airbnb has tapped into the sharing economy zeitgeist and facilitated independent host-led home-sharing clubs which essentially provide hosts access to a supportive group of like-minded peers for sharing information and networking. Home-sharing clubs are arguably a canny public relations move by Airbnb because they provide an instant lobby group for the corporation which can be mobilised to advocate for Airbnb when required. In addition, the platform has provided benefits for small businesses in Tasmania. By opening up the accommodation market in many out-of-the-way locations, the flow-on effect of new visitors has resulted in increased foot traffic and sales for local
shops, cafes, bars and restaurants. In many remote and rural locations Airbnb is now providing accommodation where previously no traditional accommodation options existed. Similarly, in Hobart and other larger population centres, local small business owners also report increased visitation and spending from Airbnb guests. The positive impact on local shops and eateries is being leveraged by Airbnb in marketing campaigns featuring local owners extolling the virtues of the sharing platform for their own businesses as well as more generally for the area in which they trade. The ‘Midtown’ shopping precinct in Hobart is a good example where local traders are working with local Airbnb hosts to market collaboratively through hosting merchant walking tours designed specifically to introduce local hosts to the range of shops and services in the Midtown area.

However, critics of the home-sharing platform argue that Airbnb is not actually about sharing one’s home. Research from Inside Airbnb’s Murray Cox is often used to illustrate how many properties listed on the Airbnb website are actually entire homes, thereby negating the ‘sharing’ proposition put forward by Airbnb. Although investor activity in the state dropped from 19% of overall house sales in 2017 to 18% in December 2018, Inside Airbnb argues that significant percentages of Airbnb properties have been purchased with the sole intention of turning them into Airbnb accommodation. Inside Airbnb also estimates the percentage of Airbnb properties
that consist of entire homes or apartments is 76.9% throughout Tasmania and 76.5% in Hobart. Unsurprisingly, Airbnb disputes these figures and takes issue with the data collection methodology used by Inside Airbnb. Given the fact that Airbnb does not share data publicly, we may never know the true extent of room or home sharing versus entire homes, or the real number of properties that have been taken out of the housing and rental markets and turned into Airbnb properties.

Housing is of course a complex issue, but critics maintain that Airbnb must shoulder some of the blame for the current housing problems in Hobart. In some areas local residents are concerned about the comings and goings of strangers in their neighbourhoods, transient residents reducing the sense of community in their streets, and the associated problems with noise, parking and rubbish. Long-term accommodation operators believe the accommodation market is no longer a level playing field; while ‘traditional’ accommodation providers must comply with a myriad of regulations and accreditation requirements, Airbnb hosts are exempt from most local and State Government legislation covering accommodation provision.
As a result of the 2018 Housing Summit the government sought to respond to the state’s problems with housing supply by announcing a range of measures including taxation relief incentives aimed at first home buyers and encouraging pensioners to consider ‘downsizing’, thereby releasing family homes into the market. In addition, the government has rezoned government-owned land for building new dwellings, provided tax exemptions for converting short-term properties into long-term rentals and rewarding property owners who make their properties more affordable for low-income Tasmanians. Critics argue these measures do not go far enough, will not make a significant impact and will actually do little to ease the pressure on already vulnerable Tasmanians. Researchers from UTAS’s Housing and Community Research Unit argue that the impact of short-stay accommodation is far greater than just pushing up median house prices; it is actually increasing homelessness.12

…it may be that areas that experience a higher visitor intake… should impose stricter rules in relation to peer-to-peer accommodation to protect an area’s social, cultural and economic capital.

The government sought to address community concerns about Airbnb and its impact on the housing and social services sector through a 2018 Legislative Council Select Committee on ‘Short Stay Accommodation in Tasmania’. The select committee received in excess of 100 submissions from critics and supporters of Airbnb. Airbnb in Tasmania has now been the subject of a parliamentary enquiry, formal submissions and reports, and is of increasing interest for tourism, housing and business researchers. While the Airbnb ‘experience’ in Tasmania mirrors other jurisdictions around Australia, as well around the world, there has been no real attempt at legislating or regulating Airbnb in Tasmania. In fact, the Tasmanian Government’s response has been to effectively ‘deregulate’ Airbnb.

Originally, there was a non-permit cap of 42 nights per year was proposed, which was supported by Tasmania’s tourism and hospitality lobby groups. These groups have argued that an unregulated industry is unfair to accredited accommodation businesses, which must comply with extensive existing regulations. In July 2016, the Premier, Will Hodgman declared “[it’s] consumers that decide what services are best for them, not the Government’, ‘It [Airbnb and home sharing] cannot be legislated or even regulated out of existence’ and ‘[we] don’t want to regulate the market position
of an established market business, we want to regulate only to the extent to protect consumers and the broader public interest."^{13}

However, in 2017, somewhat surprisingly, the government scrapped the decision to implement the cap. Perhaps in response to the increase in visitation to Tasmania and the corresponding lack of accommodation options, the government announced a permit would be only required once the maximum number of rooms (four) was exceeded. Table 1 provides a timeline of the regulatory approach for peer-to-peer accommodation and Table 2 outlines the requirements for property owners renting out their home or investment property.

Despite growing community concerns, specifically around the issue of housing availability and affordability, the Liberal conservative government has indicated that their policy approach responds to market demand. Tasmania’s stance on the issue has been described as a ‘world first’ by Airbnb which intends to promote the Tasmania case as a ‘best-practice model’ for other jurisdictions around the globe.\(^{14}\)

The impact of Airbnb on local communities and economies provides fertile ground for academics and researchers, particularly those examining regulatory approaches in different jurisdictions with concurrent consideration of levels of reliance on, and the maturity of, each jurisdiction’s tourism industry. In 2019 housing researchers from UTAS’s Institute for the Study of Social Change released a comprehensive report on the short-stay accommodation sector in Tasmania, which included a number

Table 1. Timeline of the regulatory approach to peer-to-peer accommodation in Tasmania.\(^{15}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012–15</td>
<td>Peer-to-peer accommodation providers must comply with the same local authority regulations as traditional accommodation operators. Operators breaching regulations face substantial fines under numerous building, fire, planning and land use acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015–17</td>
<td>State Government introduces a statewide regulatory approach replacing local authority regulations. In response to increased tourist numbers, the State Government considers a raft of strict regulatory proposals including the 42-night cap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>State Government announces it will not introduce any of the proposed regulations. Instead, it deregulates the industry for homeowners with up to four bookable rooms and relaxes the legislative requirements for all other operators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of recommendations for regulating the sector.\textsuperscript{17} We believe the exploration of the interrelated phenomena of tourism accommodation, housing stress, housing demand and the role of short-stay accommodation is timely. It is also important for enhancing understanding of how regulation and legislation can be adapted to better suit prevailing social, economic and cultural conditions as well as the expectations of Airbnb users. In our view, it may be that areas that experience a higher visitor intake, such as capital or major cities (or even parts of cities), should impose stricter rules in relation to peer-to-peer accommodation to protect an area’s social, cultural and economic capital. On the other hand, less visited and less popular areas might benefit from less regulation and enjoy the economic benefits peer-to-peer networks may have to offer. Various approaches will no doubt be discussed and debated by researchers, communities and governments in Tasmania as well as in other jurisdictions as the industry evolves.

The astounding growth and popularity of Airbnb is proving to be its greatest liability, and in response, legislators are grappling with the impact on local communities. Local and state governments are increasingly seeking to regulate Airbnb and other peer-to-peer accommodation platforms. Around the world a variety of legislative and regulatory approaches are adopted, ranging from blanket bans (e.g. New York) to de-regulated environments (e.g. Tasmania). This is best illustrated by an overview of current international regulations presented in Table 3.

### Table 2. Accommodation sharing: Supporting Tasmania’s visitor economy.\textsuperscript{16}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of property</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Own home with up to four bookable rooms</strong></td>
<td>No permit required. Free to list own home.</td>
<td>Owners should ensure they have adequate insurance cover with their insurance company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Own home with more than four bookable rooms</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Investment properties, holiday homes/shacks less than 200m\textsuperscript{2}</strong></td>
<td>Permit required from the local council.</td>
<td>Owners are required to complete a self-assessment form declaring that the property meets the minimum safety standards and the council issues a permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment properties over 200m\textsuperscript{2}</strong></td>
<td>Permit required from the local council.</td>
<td>Building and planning requirements are required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Overview of Airbnb (de)regulation internationally. Adapted from Hajibaba and Dolnicar (2018). 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Maximum time a primary residence can be rented out un-hosted</th>
<th>Formal registration of property</th>
<th>Payment of a tourism-related tax (in addition to GST or equivalent)</th>
<th>Short-term hosted rental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>60 days (for up to four people)</td>
<td>Yes, if more than 60 nights</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unregulated and unlimited in duration (a room or under 40% of main residence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Entire home listings are illegal without registration</td>
<td>Yes, for entire homes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unregulated and unlimited in duration (as long as the rented space does not cover more than 50% of the floor space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>Entire home listings are illegal without registration</td>
<td>Yes, for entire homes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unregulated and unlimited in duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>90 days, for entire home listings no matter if it is primary residence or not</td>
<td>Yes, if more than 90 days</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unregulated and unlimited in duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unregulated and unlimited in duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>120 days</td>
<td>Yes, for all hosts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unregulated and unlimited in duration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued overleaf
In the context of increased tourism and accommodation shortages, the Tasmanian Government is certainly grappling with the opportunities and challenges presented by the visitor economy and Airbnb in particular. As illustrated in Table 3, the Tasmanian Government has taken a somewhat different approach from legislators in other jurisdictions, dictated by the state’s unique conditions. Approaches to regulation clearly cannot be applied universally. Regulation must reflect the differences between towns, cities and regions, and take into consideration individual socio-economic status indicators. Legislators should respond to myriad community concerns, tourism demands and urban planning and housing issues. In Tasmania, it appears at least for now, a stalemate regarding Airbnb regulation has been reached. The question is how long will deregulation remain the status quo?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Maximum time a primary residence can be rented out un-hosted</th>
<th>Formal registration of property</th>
<th>Payment of a tourism-related tax (in addition to GST or equivalent)</th>
<th>Short-term hosted rental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reykjavík</td>
<td>90 days a year at the legal residence of a host and/or one other property owned by that same host, intended for personal use</td>
<td>Yes, for all hosts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>90 days a year at the legal residence of a host and/or one other property owned by that same host, intended for personal use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>90 days</td>
<td>Yes, for all hosts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unregulated and unlimited in duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>Unregulated and unlimited in duration (if no more than 4 rooms in primary residence)</td>
<td>Yes, if not the primary residence or more than 4 rooms in primary residence</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unregulated and unlimited in duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>180 days</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>180 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5

TOURISM AND SOCIETY
ABSTRACT

Tourism is more than an economic resource. This chapter looks at how tourist attractions can serve the local community through the Children’s University Tasmania program. This program provides opportunities for young people to visit places, learn new things, be inspired and improve their educational outcome. By doing so the tourism industry supports local communities by increasing the cultural capital of young people.

Tourism brings jobs, revenue and other benefits. Unfortunately, the distribution of benefits to the local community is usually not even. Tasmania is no exception. The redistribution of tourism income through infrastructure, services and welfare aids residents. There are also other ways that the industry can support the community. For instance, there is a particular program – Children’s University Tasmania – that distributes benefits from tourism to the local community in a unique way. Tourism and increasing the educational aspirations of communities are not usually associated, but this chapter shows how they can be.
Many tourism experiences, such as going to museums or visiting parks, are free. These are common ‘trickle-down’ benefits. However, many residents in marginalised communities may not have the resources or ability to participate in these free tourism experiences. This section of the community has largely been ignored in tourism policy discussions even though policymakers and the industry often make claims that tourism will benefit society at large. In what ways can the local tourism industry work with children and their families to build up social capital and cultural capital so that these children will have a better foundation to succeed?

**EDUCATION, CULTURAL CAPITAL AND TOURISM**

Education is regarded as having a transformative power. Our study draws upon Pierre Bourdieu’s sociological concept of cultural capital. The research identifies non-formal learning as a rich site where aspiration, parental engagement and educational success can be fostered – if the social, economic and cultural barriers to participation can be removed. Bourdieu has highlighted the ways in which education, rather than being transformative, may function to reproduce inequalities and reinforce hierarchies of privilege.

Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital offers an explanation of the way social inequality is reproduced through the education system. While all modern societies espouse the value of equality and aim to offer every child the same chance to excel, the playing field is still not level. This unevenness, according to Bourdieu, is influenced by the family background of the children. Some children, he argues, have the types of
cultural capital valued by education systems, others do not. Bourdieu’s work helps us understand why this is so.

Bourdieu and his colleague Passeron considered the effects of children’s stock of cultural capital upon their educational outcomes. Bourdieu saw the educational system as a whole and universities in particular as sites of exclusion where children and adults learned their place.

[Education] is in fact the most effective means of perpetuating the existing social pattern, as it both provides an apparent justification for social inequalities and gives recognition to the cultural heritage, that is, to a *social* gift treated as a *natural* one.

It seems that Bourdieu’s work paints a fairly bleak picture of an education system that is deeply biased and highly resistant to change, but there is a less pessimistic approach to his work. Cultural capital is not fixed. It is valued differently in different circumstances, settings, and fields. The concept of

Figure 2. Role-play at Parliament House, as part of an excursion organised by the Children’s University Tasmania.
cultural capital provides a useful lens through which to understand the seeming intractability of educational inequality.

The work of Bourdieu offers a lens to consider the effect of the Children’s University Tasmania. The Children’s University aims to promote educational aspiration and attainment by providing high-quality out-of-school-hours learning activities to children aged 7–14. It aims to support children, irrespective of parental means, to access quality extracurricular learning activities. Studies have shown the ways in which socio-economic characteristics affect access and opportunity to engage in extracurricular activity and how, in turn, extracurricular participation has an impact on educational outcomes.⁶

Tourism resources, sites, and workers are mobilised and supported through the Children’s University to engage with local children and parents to create learning opportunities. This may be their usual product, or it may be developed and refined for the local children and include behind-the-scenes tours, the development of learning challenges, or talks about their pathway to into their role.

**CULTURAL CAPITAL IN ACTION**

There are different ways that cultural capital can be being transmitted. One of them is parental engagement. What have some studies informed us?

Lareau’s examination of the influence of class-related cultural factors on the parents’ compliance with teachers’ requests for parental participation in schools is relevant to our research given the key role that parents play within the Children’s University.⁷ Lareau conducted a qualitative study involving two first-grade classrooms located in two different communities. The participants include a white working-class community and a professional, middle-class community. The study reveals that both sets of teachers at the different schools considered parental involvement as indicative of the value which parents placed on education. During the study Lareau observed that working-class parents primarily placed the responsibility for education upon the teachers whereas the middle-class parents consider the process of education to be a shared, collective experience.

A study of parental involvement in Norway highlighted that in the same way as children enter schools with different capital, parents are also differently equipped in terms of economic, social and cultural capital in their interactions with school, and that these differences may determine the quality and degree of their involvement in school.⁸ A different study focused on mothers in the UK described how middle-class parents, who had experienced success at school, were more self-confident in asserting their opinions where there were disagreements or tension between home and school,
displaying certainty, self-assurance and an ability to counter opposing viewpoints, all aspects of cultural capital. In contrast, the working-class mothers were doubtful and anxious in their interactions with school staff, and their approach was apologetic and tentative. ‘It was cultural capital, which facilitated this weaving in and out of different roles and provided the middle-class mothers with options that were not open to their working-class counterparts.’

The narrative of travel is a tool that can stimulate the imagination and provide creative, fun and engaging ways to enhance learning about culture, history, science, natural and social environments.

It is important to understand differences in parental involvement among different groups of parents because parental involvement is a powerful determinant of the educational success of students. Gottlob concludes:

There is no magic strategy bullet to increase student achievement. Instead, we have to focus on building on the cultural capital of the community and helping parents gain the cultural capital they need to navigate the educational system. Schools need to work with, and in the context of the community. There has to be give-and-take and a mutually respectful relationship between them. It is imperative that schools find the way to build on the assets of the community to create genuine partnerships that benefit students, parents, and the community at large.

EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITY AND LEARNING

Learning, of course, occurs outside formal educational institutions. Self-directed learning and learning that is voluntary and beyond the formal curriculum, is also part of a process of cultural transmission. The acquisition of cultural capital is thus an ongoing socialisation process.

Kisida, Greene and Bowen suggest that children can be activated to acquire the type of cultural capital valued by educational systems and thus compensate for family background characteristics. Their study is based on a large-scale study of an art museum educational program operating across a set of American schools. Exposure to the institutional culture of the museum was seen to produce ‘cultural consumers’ who were then ‘motivated to acquire new cultural capital’.

Seow and Pan in their literature survey identify three frameworks to explain the impact of extracurricular activities (ECA).
First, the zero-sum framework posited that ECA participation has a negative effect on academic performance because students were devoting more time for their ECA activities at the expense of their academic studies. Second, the developmental framework theorized that ECA participation has a positive effect on academic performance indirectly as a result of the non-academic and social benefits associated with ECA participation. Last, the threshold framework hypothesized that ECA participation has a positive effect on academic performance up to a certain point beyond which participation leads to negative academic outcomes.

Seow and Pan noted a study which found that the students' performance declined with the higher breadth and intensity of ECA participation which, it is argued, is due to the stress of balancing the competing demands. Other studies showed a positive association between test scores and time spent on ECA, but at the highest participation levels, test scores declined.

It is important to observe that measures of cultural capital are imperfect since they are limited to describing behaviours, (e.g. participating in activities) rather than other type of cultural 'signals' such as attitudes, preferences, or credentials.14

In sum, everyone has cultural capital, however the education system may privilege some forms of cultural capital over others. This, according to Bourdieu, can account for persistently uneven educational outcomes. The ways in which non-formal learning, in the form of ECA, can support the twin goals of raising educational aspiration and attainment and increasing parental engagement in children's learning are key considerations of this study.
Tourism resources can be deployed to support education systems. Forging connections with local schools, parents and children and young people can foster learning, broaden children’s horizons, and support raising children’s aspirations and attainment.

TASMANIA AND THE CHILDREN’S UNIVERSITY

The continuing relative underperformance of Tasmania in areas such as Gross State Product, labour market participation, productivity levels, health and well-being outcomes and life expectancy have made a case for prioritising the state’s educational outcomes. Tasmania is home to 112,646 children and young people. Tasmanian families have higher levels of socio-economic disadvantage than the national average.

Within Tasmania, and nationally, there is a high-level consensus on the centrality of education as a policy lever to achieve broader social, economic and well-being goals. This consensus contributed to the creation of the Peter Underwood Centre for Educational Attainment at UTAS, where the Children’s University Tasmania is based. The Children’s University Tasmania uses ABS

Figure 4. Two graduates of the Children’s University Tasmania.
Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas to determine which government schools to partner with to implement the program.

The Children’s University Tasmania is a member of a social franchise that is currently implemented in the UK, Australia, Malaysia and China. The Children’s University identifies non-formal learning as a rich site to foster aspiration, parental engagement and educational success – if the social, economic and cultural barriers to participation can be reduced. It targets children and young people facing socio-economic disadvantage to ensure that every child, irrespective of parental means, has access to quality extracurricular learning:

Impact is...measured by three interrelated aspects – knowing, feeling and doing. It is concerned with questions such as...Does the Children’s University experience widen children’s conceptions of learning and ignite a desire to be more adventurous and self-directed?

Using the narrative of travel, when a child becomes a member of the Children’s University they are given a ‘Passport to Learning’ in which they record their participation in activities at Public Learning Destinations. After completing 30 hours of validated learning, their achievement is celebrated at a formal graduation ceremony, a significant cultural experience itself. The Children’s University builds a bridge for parents and guardians to expose children to diverse cultural experiences.

PUBLIC LEARNING DESTINATIONS
How the Children’s University can help tourism

As mentioned earlier, there is a significant body of literature that identifies the significance of extracurricular participation on educational outcomes, and the ways in which access and opportunity to engage in extracurricular activity is impacted by socio-economic characteristics. So, how does tourism fit into this discussion? Children’s University Tasmania has partnered with over 150 local services and attractions that serve residents and visitors. They include museums, historic sites, wildlife sanctuaries, regional galleries, and events such as festivals. Children’s University Tasmania encourages tourism services to become validated Public Learning Destinations by highlighting their potential to enrich the local community:

Being a Learning Destination is a great way to promote your organization to the local community and to engage with young people in your service delivery. Learning Destinations can enrich communities and build valuable networks that help support children and their families in their educational journey.
The authors conducted interviews with Children’s University Tasmania employees and Public Learning Destinations in 2017. An employee of Children’s University Tasmania observed that:

…it provides a structure for parents to understand how and what to engage in with kids outside of school... But I think that is important as parents struggle sometimes with knowing what to do.

The Children’s University Tasmania also highlights an avenue for the local tourism industry to be more proactive in using their social licence. While many of them serve visitors, they could use similar resources to serve residents. There are over 500 Public Learning Destinations across Australia and more than 150 in Tasmania. Some examples include the Richmond Gaol, Bridestowe Lavender Estate, West Coast Wilderness Railway, and Bonorong Wildlife Sanctuary.

Obstacles remain. It is important to observe that the economic and cultural barriers to participation in local tourism and non-formal learning opportunities need further analysis. It is evident that even where people have free access to tourist attractions, there are cultural barriers to visitation. The renowned MONA is free to Tasmanian residents but that may not be sufficient to encourage visitation.\textsuperscript{21}

**THE TRANSFORMATIVE OPPORTUNITY**

The Public Learning Destinations that are part of the Children’s University Tasmania are not all tourism sites. Nonetheless, the case suggests resources created for tourism can also be deployed to support broader societal goals, such as raising educational aspiration and attainment. During off-peak tourist seasons, more can be done to engage local children in extracurricular experiential learning through tourism-related services and attractions. The tourism industry has benefitted from skill-development initiatives funded by government. Fostering skills in inclusive and child-friendly practices within the tourism industry could be encouraged. The beneficiaries of this approach include the child-participants, but also the industry as connections are built with a new audience or customer base.

One Public Learning Destination notes they had done work training customer services officers. They observed:

...the staff are getting a really good basis in educational principles so that when they are actually teaching or showing students...they are able to give them the information that they need in a way that has meaning to them...it means that the kids are walking away with something a little bit more than just an experience which is fantastic....We want to engage with the Children’s University. For
one, in terms of pure numbers, it brings us a new audience. (Public Learning Destination officer).

In some instances, rich and interesting learning content on site at tourism attractions can also be harnessed to create online learning opportunities. This is particularly relevant for regionally dispersed communities. Tourism assets can be crafted into mobile ‘destinations’. These can be physical, digital, or a combination. For example, TMAG has an outreach program: they provide a box that contains items and information that schools can use, while a museum employee connects via video-link and discusses contents of the box. The museum becomes a mobile supporter of learning. Currently, this is used to support formal learning within the curriculum. There are opportunities to develop content that support non-formal learning.

While key public institutions such as museums, art galleries, and historic sites often have an explicit educational purpose and resources to support engagement strategies, the Children’s University Tasmania case suggests that similar principles can be extended more broadly across the tourism sector. The narrative of travel is a

Figure 5. Engaging with AR at TMAG.
tool that can stimulate the imagination and provide creative, fun and engaging ways to enhance learning about culture, history, science, natural and social environments. As such, it can support broader social and economic goals of improved educational attainment for the children and young people, as well as fostering an understanding of their place (self and community) in a globalised world.\textsuperscript{22}

Learning in this environment has really helped me to explore different parts of myself, and learn to be a positive role model in my community. (Children’s University Tasmania member, age 11).

Children’s University Tasmania is also about the adults. The role of parents, caregivers and home environments as influential agents on levels of educational engagement and attainment is well documented. As noted above, Tasmanian families have higher levels of socio-economic disadvantage than the national average. All parents have aspirations for their children. Yet, the pathway to achieve those goals can be hard to navigate, especially for socially excluded families. They may benefit from programs like the one described here to understand what experiences and events are available in their local community.

This study illustrates how tourism resources are being used for local and community development, enhancing individual, social and cultural well-being. Tourism policies often aim to bring tourism benefits to local society; this is easier said than done.
ABSTRACT

Tourism is considered the new engine of economic development for Tasmania, particularly its perceived role in job creation. Government, industry and the people of Tasmania all share aspirations for a prosperous state which provides opportunities for people to thrive. These aspirations are founded on the combination of a modern economy, which creates jobs for Tasmanians, and improving educational outcomes. Government policy focus to improve educational performance also anticipates future success across a range of social, health and economic domains. The promotion of tourism to achieve these goals is common and is considered a promising future industry in many regional places. However, evidence suggests a mismatch between the government’s education policies and industry development activities. Jobs created in tourism do not require high levels of educational attainment or skill. This chapter profiles the tourism workforce in Tasmania and discusses the promises and realities for improving the living standards of Tasmanians.
For many places, tourism growth is welcomed and celebrated. It is an industry promoted by the United Nations for developing countries since the 1960s and is identified by Deloitte as one of the top five super-growth industries of the future for Australia. Tourism has also become a new engine of economic development for Tasmania, particularly its perceived role in job creation. The promotion of tourism to achieve social and economic development goals is common and is considered a promising future industry in many places. Increasing economic growth, under the guise that such growth will improve the material living standards of all, has become the primary objective of most developed economies and societies, particularly in response to increasing economic, demographic, social and fiscal challenges. Tasmania is no different.
The Tasmanian Government, industry, leaders and the people of Tasmania all share aspirations for a prosperous state which provides opportunities for people to thrive. These aspirations are founded on the combination of a modern economy which creates jobs for Tasmanians and improving educational outcomes. Growth in tourism plays a central role in the government aspiration: ‘The Majority Liberal Government is the strongest supporter of tourism, and the jobs it supports right across the state’.2

In his State of the State address the Premier, Will Hodgman, asserted that ‘from day one, our Plan’s number one priority has been to build a modern economy and create jobs by backing our competitive strengths – like tourism…. As the Premier for Tourism, my Government will continue to strongly support a sector that is a pillar of our economy, and our beautiful island, our community, and our brand.’3 A record 1.32 million people visited Tasmania in the 12 months to December 2018, up 4% on the previous year; total spending increased 5% to A$2.46 billion.4

If the Tasmanian Government is to achieve its aspirations of the state reaching its full potential, it needs to recalibrate the intention of both education and tourism policy development so that expectations can be managed, and met, to achieve both economic and social prosperity.

In another area of the government’s policy focus, Tasmanian’s educational performance continues to languish, despite commitments to improve the school system and affect cultural change: ‘We’re increasing education funding to record levels, employing more teachers, investing in our schools and into a modern, more effective education system.’5 In the same speech, the Premier stated ‘There are no better foundation stones to build Tasmania’s future on, than education. It is the key to our future prosperity. Our young people are our greatest asset, and lifting educational results is critical to them being their best and our state reaching its full potential.’

The Premier, industry peak bodies, and other community leaders all suggest Tasmanians can anticipate future success across a range of social, health and economic domains if the state’s educational performance is improved. The authoritative discourses situate education as a crucial marker for the modernisation of societies but also as the requisite individual capital that is theoretically achievable by all.6
However, evidence suggests that there is a mismatch between the government’s education policies and industry development activities. Jobs created in the tourism sector do not require high levels of educational attainment. Neither are they high-paying jobs. Using data from the Tourism Satellite Account and the ABS, and applying the international standard for measuring tourism employment, this study confirms that while the economic contribution of the tourism industry to the state is growing, there is also evidence of job polarisation in the sector. Tourism employment is dominated by occupations that require low levels of educational attainment; two thirds of jobs in the tourism sector require no more than a Certificate II qualification. Three in five workers have either a Certificate I or no post-school qualifications at all. There is also a misalignment between educational requirements and educational attainment within the workforce, indicating both over-qualification (23.1%) and under-qualification (35.3%) of employees in the industry. While highly skilled jobs do exist, most are low skilled and precarious. This situation is unfortunately not unique to Tasmania.

**OUR APPROACH**

To explore the relationship between educational attainment and the tourism workforce in Tasmania, the ABS Census of Population Housing data for 2016 is utilised to enable quantitative analysis at a population level. To do that, the international standard for measuring the economic and employment contribution of the tourism sector, as set out in the ABS Tourism Satellite Account (TSA), is applied to Tasmanian data and analysed. In addition to ABS census data, data from the ABS Australian National Accounts: State Accounts for GVA by Industry Sector and the Tourism Research Australia (TRA) State Tourism Satellite Accounts is used. Employment in the tourism sector in Tasmania is calculated using 2016 ABS Census of Population and Housing industry and occupation variables and applying the tourism value-added industry ratios calculated from the State Accounts for Industry and Tourism.

To enable greater exploration of the educational achievements of Tasmanians working in tourism, further analysis of those employed in the sector is undertaken using the ABS occupational classification system.

For this research, employment in the tourism sector is disaggregated by occupation to the Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations four-digit level which provides the required skill level to undertake the job, and the corresponding workers’ highest level of educational attainment by Australian Standard Classification of Education three-digit level. This process enable analysis of whether the workers’ educational attainment matches the skill level requirement of the job they are employed in.
ABS census data is also used to analyse the level of attachment to the labour force by those employed in the tourism sector as well as those studying concurrently with employment and their field of study.

THE TASMANIAN TOURISM WORKFORCE

In 2016–17, the tourism sector (total of direct and indirect contribution) was the third largest contributor to the Tasmanian economy in terms of GVA. It contributed 9.9% – behind the health care and social assistance sector (13.1%) and agriculture, forestry and fishing (10.3%). The Tasmanian tourism sector’s contribution to the state economy is the highest of any state or territory, and 3.8 percentage points higher than that of the Australian tourism sector to the national economy (6.1%). Despite the sector’s substantial contribution to the state economy, compared with the Australian tourism workforce, Tasmania’s tourism workforce is considerably less skilled. This is likely to be explained by the industry composition of the sector as well as the educational attainment of the workforce.

In total there were over 20,000 people employed directly in the tourism sector in Tasmania in 2016, representing 9.8% of the Tasmanian workforce. Of those jobs, only 6.2% require a bachelor’s degree or higher qualification, less than half of the 12.7% of tourism occupations in Australia. While one third (32.3%) of the tourism jobs in Australia require no more than a Certificate I qualification, it is nearly two in five (37.6%) for the Tasmanian tourism sector (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Comparison of the percentage of jobs by their educational requirements in the tourism industry in Tasmania and Australia.
The largest employing tourism sub-sectors were cafes, restaurants and takeaway food services with 7916 workers, nearly two in five of all tourism sector workers (39.4%), followed by accommodation services (15.4%), and pubs, taverns and bars (8.4%): see Table 1.

Of the jobs in the tourism sector, over two thirds (67.2%) require no more than a Certificate II level qualification (e.g. waiters and baristas), with the largest proportion (37.6%) requiring either a Certificate I or no post-school qualification at all (e.g. sales assistants and kitchenhands). Only 6% of tourism workers require a bachelor’s degree or higher (Skill Level 1), 13.7% require an associate degree, advanced diploma or diploma (Skill Level 2) including management level roles such as retail or restaurant managers, and 13.1% require a Certificate IV or III (Skill Level 3), occupations such as chefs or cooks: see Table 2 and Figure 1.

While the tourism industry is dominated by occupations which require low levels of educational attainment, there is also evidence of mismatch between educational requirements and actual attainment within the workforce, indicating both over-qualification (23.1%) and under-qualification (35.3%) of employees in the industry. While highly skilled jobs are created, most are low skilled and precarious.

Figure 2 shows the proportion of the tourism workforce by educational requirements for the occupation (Skill Level) and the actual educational attainment achieved by the tourism workforce.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Sub-Sector</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cafes, Restaurants and Takeaway Food Services</td>
<td>7916</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>3085</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pubs, Taverns and Bars</td>
<td>1678</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket and Grocery Stores</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Freight Transport</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Education</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical and Other Store-Based Retailing</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Passenger Transport</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal and Courier Pick-up and Delivery Services</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs (Hospitality)</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While 29.6% of the tourism sector jobs are Skill Level 5 occupations, three in five (59.5%) of the tourism workforce have either a Certificate I or no post-school qualifications at all, indicating a substantial level of under-qualification in the tourism workforce. At the same time, 13.1% of the sector’s jobs are Skill Level 3, yet 20.0% of the workforce hold a Certificate IV or III, indicating considerable over-qualification. Similarly, for Skill Level 1 jobs, there is a higher proportion of the workforce with bachelor’s degree or higher qualifications than required (11.7% compared with 6.0%).
Also, there is a substantial level of under-qualification for workers employed in Skill Level 2 occupations and Skill Level 4 occupations.

Table 3 shows the proportion of tourism industry workers in occupation skill levels by their educational attainment. The highlighted cells show the proportionate correct match of qualification level to occupation Skill Level. The cells to the left of the highlighted cell indicate the proportion which are over-qualified and the cells to the right show the proportion which are under-qualified. This does not incorporate skill specialisation, or field of study, which could disguise over or under-qualification. The considerable levels of over-qualification and under-qualification does not necessarily mean there is a skill mismatch however, as over- or under-qualification measures can hide skill heterogeneity or tacit knowledge and skills acquired through experience and on-the-job training.

There are high levels of under-qualification for all occupational skill levels. Two in five workers in Skill Level 1 occupations were under-qualified, over two thirds of Skill Level 2 workers were under-qualified, over one third of Skill Level 3 workers were under-qualified as were three in five Skill Level 4 workers. This is likely to have a considerable impact on the tourism sector’s productivity.

On the other hand, there is also considerable over-qualification in the workforce. One in five (18.2%) Skill Level 2 workers were over-qualified, 14.5% of Skill Level 3 workers and over a third (34.2%) of Skill Level 4 workers. In addition, 5.0% of workers in Skill Level 5 occupations hold a bachelor’s degree or higher qualification where no post-school qualifications are required.
In addition to the tourism sector being dominated by low-skill occupations, the sector is also dominated by less than full-time employment. Over half of the sector’s workforce is employed part time (54.8%). Nearly two thirds (64.4%) of the workforce are employed in the accommodation and food services sub-sector and of those, 61.7% are employed part time. The retail trade sub-sector makes up 15.9% of the tourism workforce, of which 54.8% are employed part time. For the transport, postal and warehousing sub-sector, which makes up 10.5% of the tourism sector, 65.4% are employed full time.

Table 3. Highest level of educational attainment by occupation Skill Level, proportion, Tasmania.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Level</th>
<th>Bachelor Degree and over</th>
<th>Advanced Diploma or Diploma</th>
<th>Certificate IV and Certificate III</th>
<th>Certificate II</th>
<th>Certificate I and No Post-school Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Proportion of the tourism workforce by Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification industry sector and labour force status, Tasmania, 2016.
Promises and reality of the tourism sector workforce less than half (45.0%) had completed either vocational or tertiary qualifications following their schooling. One in ten had completed qualifications in food, hospitality and personal services (10.8%), followed by management and commerce (10.2%) and then engineering and related technologies (4.6%).

**WHAT DOES ALL THIS MEAN?**

Raising educational attainment and growing the tourism economy, while important, may not succeed in achieving the officially stated vision for the future unless there is economic reform and understanding of the implications of the mismatch between educational demand and supply in Tasmania and globally.

These findings confirm that the tourism industry in Tasmania is dominated by low-skill occupations; its workforce is polarised and skewed, and more so than Tasmania’s already polarised workforce\(^ {12}\). The large number of low skilled, mostly casualised, occupations in the sector does not currently provide an employment offering that facilitates sustainable career opportunities for those with higher levels of educational attainment. This lack of demand for more highly skilled occupations in tourism compromises the ability of the sector to contribute to the improvement of the social and economic well-being of Tasmanians through the combination of increased educational attainment and the provision of jobs.

In terms of the economic contribution of the tourism industry to the Tasmanian economy, the TICT sentiments survey provides an insight into the perception of the contribution of the tourism sector to the economy which contrasts with the
actual contribution. Currently working in the tourism sector, particularly the accommodation and food services industry, is often argued to be an employment option for those pursuing higher education opportunities. For that reason, the high proportion of the tourism workforce with no post-school qualifications could be explained by students supplementing their income and supporting their lifestyle as they study. However, evidence does not support this assumption. Just under a third (29.6%) of the accommodation and food services workforce was also enrolled in an educational institution: the remaining 70.4% were not studying at all. Of those workers, 12.7% were secondary school students, 10.5% were university students and 5.5% were vocational education and training (VET) students. This increases wage pressures on workers, as these jobs have low entry barriers.

This is not to say that there are not highly skilled and educated workers required in the tourism industry in Tasmania. In fact, many of the specialised and niche products and services provided by tourism operators in the state require high levels of education and skill (e.g. ecological guides), however, the scale and number of these roles is small in comparison to the whole tourism sector workforce.

WE PROPOSE FOUR STRATEGIES

If the Tasmanian Government is to achieve its aspirations of the state reaching its full potential, it needs to recalibrate the intention of both education and tourism policy development so that expectations can be managed, and met, to achieve both economic...
and social prosperity. We set out a four-pronged approach to a greater alignment of education and tourism industry development policies and their outcomes.

First, there is a need to acknowledge that not all jobs are the same. Quality jobs are needed to support a more highly educated workforce. What that means for the tourism industry is three-fold: attract and set up world-class and international tourism activities, such as big conferences, so that quality positions – such as in event and project management – can provide career pathways for workers to aspire to; encourage global international tourism firms to establish or develop their presence in Tasmania – headquarters and regional offices provide better jobs; and create a global think-tank and incubator for tourism service industries in Tasmania.

The second strategy is to address the inherent cost disease facing the tourism service industry. The cost disease arises when the costs of personal services, such as health care, live performing arts, education and other economic services are set to increase at a rate significantly higher than the economy’s rate of inflation. This is because the quantity of labour needed for these services is difficult to reduce. In contrast, labour-reducing productivity increase has grown exponentially in manufacturing activities post-industrialisation, resulting in cheaper goods and greater consumption. Pressures are mounting on many tourism service providers to reduce costs, of which labour is one of the biggest components. Their responses are to: employ fewer workers and

Figure 6. Kitchen staff at the celebrated restaurant, Agrarian Kitchen. Dishes are made from local produce and staff members are well-trained.
intensify the job responsibility; replace workers with technology or improved work processes; or suppress wages by employing less-trained workers. In the context of tourism, in which authentic, sincere and warm hospitality and tourism experiences are often appreciated, these strategies can be detrimental to quality. The solution is to stop a race to the bottom in the tourism industry by encouraging, if not subsidising, firms to improve the working conditions of their workers. Tasmania should not aim for the cheap tourism services market.

The third strategy, following the first two points, is to create a Destination Tasmania that is globally relevant and connected. Complementing current attractions with the MICE market, business meetings, global events and festivals (e.g. hosting international sports events) will not only create more quality jobs but also bring in expertise and know-how to the state and further reduce the seasonality of the industry. This is particularly important as the most recent visitation statistics show that conference attendance declined in Tasmania for the year ended December 2018 by 3%,14 yet this sub-sector of tourism is more likely to demand higher skilled occupations and smooth out the seasonal nature of the tourism industry in Tasmania.

The fourth strategy is to find synergies between tourism and other industries. The cost disease is not unique to tourism. Health care, education, the performing arts, elder care and the like face similar challenges to provide quality personal services. The extent to which personal touch can be replaced with emotionless machines and technology is limited, although Japan continues to create robots for lonely people. Research and development into enhancing tourism experiences with technology should be welcomed, thus creating new technologies for services. Tracer, a project led by Dr Anne Hardy at UTAS, is an example that shows how Tasmania can be a leader nationally and globally. The benefits will extend beyond tourism.

CONCLUSION

The numbers have shown that there is a mismatch between educational qualifications and the qualifications needed for jobs in the tourism industry in Tasmania. For many skilled jobs, many employees have not received the required educational training, and at the other end of the job spectrum, many workers in lower skilled jobs are over-qualified.

In the context of a prospering Tasmania visitor economy, it is also essential to pursue tourism business activities that can provide sustained skilled and lucrative jobs. We have proposed a rethink, suggesting that the state authorities pursue other kinds of tourism activities than those Tasmania is currently known for. Pursuing service expertise and excellence in the tourism industry will have greater statewide benefits to an economy and society dominated by other service sectors.
CONCLUSION
Tourism contributes about 5% towards Tasmania's economy. Tourism is not just about visitor numbers, showcasing our nature, revenues and hotels. Tourism is part of Tasmanian society.

This collection of chapters presents a picture of tourism in Tasmania in its glory as well as its warts. It does not address all aspects of tourism in Tasmania but there is plenty of material here to further the tourism conversation, and to start new ones.

Contributors to this volume are mainly researchers at UTAS who are affiliated with TRENd. Our first goal with this book was to engage with the industry and the community and broaden current debates by bringing recent research into the debate. We are all concerned with the sustainability of the industry. As scholars, we have taken a step back to evaluate the situation in Tasmania. Our academic distance offers the opportunity for longer-term assessment, acknowledging various interests and agendas of diverse groups and reflecting on scenarios.

A further goal of this book was to provide a range of academic perspectives to the public. In academia, debates often anchor what we do. We often challenge each other and disagree with each other. But robust debate and academic freedom underpins
what we do at UTAS; it is accepted and indeed expected that people have differing perspectives. Consequently, we have not tried to have a cohesive viewpoint. Rather we aim to present the diversity in opinions that exist amongst tourism researchers at UTAS. Together we present and celebrate the good, the bad and the ugly of tourism.

Tourism is part of Tasmania. Individual visitors come and go but as a group, they are part of the society.

While this collection presents differing viewpoints, there are also many synergies within this book. It is widely agreed that tourism brings about many benefits – jobs, revenue, infrastructural improvement, liveliness, new facilities. Many Tasmanians are also travellers ourselves: a better-connected island benefits us. Many chapters here show the business potential of tourism, whether in wine, heritage, culture, wilderness, film or the warm character of Tasmanians. There are many things that we can be proud of and want to share with our guests. Tourism is also a resource that can benefit the community, such as making attractions into learning destinations for children.

Along with the benefits of tourism, there are also negative impacts. Within this book, issues such as housing affordability, overcrowding, loss of environmental and heritage value, and job polarisation are tackled. We argue that addressing these issues is essential
if tourism is to be more sustainable. Other issues are raised in this book, such as the fact that Tasmanians are cognisant that tourism is not just businesses, increasing visitor numbers and more infrastructure. If a large portion of the community is not getting the benefits of tourism, or is perceiving tourism as more inconvenient than worthwhile, they will not be welcoming towards visitors. Neither will they support tourism projects. Developing a social compact with the community is necessary for the industry to succeed.

There will be sacrifices and trade-offs in tourism. It is not a nice message to suggest that short-term sacrifices are necessary for long-term goals. Not everyone will welcome the idea that we might demand larger tourism businesses plough their gains into the community. Lessons have shown that a comprehensive whole-of-community and whole-of-industry approach is the best way forward in bringing benefits to all.

Tourism is part of Tasmania. Individual visitors come and go but as a group, they are part of the society. They use our public spaces, visit our attractions, eat at our restaurants, stay in our hotels and homes, and buy things. It is not ‘them’ and ‘us’. Tasmania is attractive to us and to many visitors because it is a progressive and warm-hearted society. Let us not forget why we love Tasmania – it is the nature, the towns, the food, the air, the water, the cultural life, and most importantly, the Tasmanians.

We have an optimistic view of tourism in Tasmania.
Besides good tourism numbers, we have healthy – and often heated – discussions in the community on tourism development. Policies are in place to address housing affordability challenges and traffic congestion. UTAS has reviewed its tourism offerings and aims to produce graduates who can grab future opportunities in the industry. A longer-term tourism plan for the state is also being devised.
We are familiar with the democratic process of consultation and consensus-building. Society changes. And in Tasmania, tourism is contributing to that change. It will be a problem if members of the community are not interested in the future direction of the state. It is by being together that we will bring the state forward. We hope that this book will bring about more engagement.
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