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The study aimed to increase the body of knowledge regarding the impacts of tourism on Australia’s Indigenous people and to make recommendations that would minimise negative impacts and maximise economic and socio-cultural benefits for the Djabugay community. The Djabugay community of Far North Queensland was chosen, as it is impacted by tourism in three distinct ways. First, by living on traditional land in a tourist destination; secondly, by being an equity partner in the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park, which features its culture; and thirdly by its members working as employees in the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park. The impacts of tourism were found to be both positive and negative. The positive impacts are the revival of Djabugay culture; employment opportunities; working together; a decrease of stereotypical images and increased cross-cultural understanding and an improvement in material welfare. The negative impacts of tourism include the degradation of Djabugay culture; exploitation of the Djabugay community; lack of tourist interaction and a lack of improvement in material welfare.

Whilst the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park is owned and controlled by predominantly non-Indigenous, non-Djabugay people, the Djabugay community continue to have very little power and control over the decision making and operations of the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park. Therefore, the needs and aspirations of the Djabugay community is largely ignored, even though it is their culture that is featured there. Although the Djabugay people have perceived positive as well as negative impacts of tourism, as a community it is not experiencing enhanced economic or socio-cultural benefits from its involvement with tourism. As such, the legacy of disadvantage from colonialism is not reversed from its engagement with tourism.

Recommendations have been suggested for the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park and the Djabugay community to assist with the minimisation of negative impacts; to improve the quality of their relationship with each other; and to increase economic and socio-cultural benefits for the Djabugay community.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background Information

This study explores the impacts of tourism on an Australian Indigenous community, the Djabugay community, whose traditional land is near Cairns, Far North Queensland (see Figure 1.1). It identifies the Djabugay community as an equity partner in the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park (hereafter referred to as “the Park”), located in Smithfield, Cairns where some of the Djabugay community members are Board members and employees of the Park.

Figure 1.1 Map of Cairns Area

![Map of Cairns Area](image)

The word “Djabugay” identifies the community being studied and also refers to the language that is spoken in this area. “Tjapukai” is the name of the Park and was spelt as such by Dr Norman Tindale in 1938 (Bottoms 1999:1-2). “Community” is the term applied to Kuranda Aboriginal households ‘with commonalities based in historical and cultural practices, many of which owe much to the experiences of life on the mission’
(Finlayson 1991b:183). The “mission” was a reserve established for Indigenous Australians, near Kuranda by the Seventh Day Adventists (Bottoms 1999:47).

1.2 Genesis of Research

The original motivation for the study came from a chance encounter in 1996 between the researcher and a fellow airline passenger, who happened to be an Indigenous Australian woman from the Gabi-Gabi clan, enroute to Singapore. The passenger gave the researcher poignant accounts about the hardship in her life, which related to the history of Indigenous disadvantage and repression in Australia (for example, State policies and practices involving dispossession and the forcible removal of children from their communities from 1910 to 1970). This encounter appealed to the researcher’s own commitment to social justice and acted as a catalyst for her engaging in social research in tourism to further realise this commitment. As a result of this discussion and continuing reflection, the researcher became aware that any research aiming to explore cultural difference and avoid past pitfalls of paternalism and exploitation, would need not only to produce a faithful account, but also to respond with vigilant sensitivity to the continuing conundrum of difference (political, social and economic) between Indigenous Australians and the dominant settler society in Australia.

The Djabugay community has been chosen as a case study, to investigate tourism’s impact on its community for two main reasons. First, because of its involvement in tourism through its financial share in the Park and secondly because of the researcher’s links to the community, through having attended secondary school with some of the Djabugay community members in the 1970’s. This personal link to the Djabugay community was an aid to obtaining permission to work with this Indigenous Australian group.

The researcher is a first-generation Australian of German descent. Her parents are post-war immigrants who taught her German as her first language and schooled her in a German cultural home environment. She is not a descendant of the colonisers of Australia, who have left a legacy of disadvantage for its Indigenous people in the areas of health, housing, education, income and employment (Norris 1998:28, Rothwell 1999:21). Her background and experiences are different from those of the colonisers and the
Indigenous community that she is studying (Huggins et al 1997:232). Such difference and non-Aboriginality, non-coloniser background is acknowledged at the outset.

1.3 Objectives and Research Approach

The primary objectives of the study are:

Objective 1: To identify the impacts of tourism on the Djabugay community, from their perspectives as both employees of the Park and as community members.

Objective 2: To devise strategies to minimise negative impacts and enhance the economic and socio-cultural benefits of tourism for the Djabugay community.

Data collection, predominantly interpretive, occurred throughout the study in a cumulative manner, whereby information from the preliminary visits to Cairns in April and June 1997 was built upon for successive visits in September 1997. A search workshop (Weisbord 1987) and questionnaires were the result of earlier visits and primarily qualitative information obtained from personal interviews, observation studies and the analysis of legal documents and literature.

1.4 Limitations of the Study

Altman (1992:3) argues that ‘the impact of tourism on Aboriginal communities is under-researched’ in Australia. There is merit in such argument. Few case studies on this topic were found during the study. The researcher therefore accessed additional literature on the topic regarding tourism impacts on other Indigenous groups and host populations world-wide.
2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 Introduction

This chapter examines literature regarding the impact of tourism on Indigenous Australians and then more generally, tourism’s impacts on Indigenous people and host populations worldwide. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss issues found in the literature to provide a background for consideration of the impacts of tourism on Indigenous Australians.

The background chapter begins by providing information on the review’s main foci of tourism and tourism impacts on Indigenous Australians. Tourism impacts are then analysed broadly, based on host and guest interactions. The cultural context of Indigenous Australians and the Djabugay community is examined next. Ultimately, the phenomena of tourism and tourists are examined including what motivates tourists to travel in the first place.

2.2 Impacts of Tourism on Indigenous Australians

From an Aboriginal viewpoint, the cultural impacts of tourism cannot be separated from the economic, environmental and social impacts of tourism (Altman 1993a:7). Isolating one impact of tourism from another is very difficult, as ultimately each type of impact is inextricably linked with another type of impact. Regardless, various researchers have studied the economic or socio-cultural impacts of tourism on Indigenous Australian communities.

In the 1980’s several studies were conducted regarding the economic impacts of tourism on some of Australia’s Indigenous communities in Uluru (Ayers Rock), Northern Territory and East Kimberley, Western Australia (Altman 1987a, Altman 1987b, Central Land Council et al 1987). Other studies involved tourism in Kakadu National Park, Northern Territory; Lake Condah, Victoria and Kuranda, Queensland and its socio-cultural impacts on local Aborigines (Gillespie 1988, Lawrence 1985, Finlayson 1991a). Altman (1989, 1993a) also investigated the broad impacts of tourism in Kakadu, Uluru,
Gurig National Parks, Melville and Bathurst Islands, which are all located in the Northern Territory, Australia.

Altman (1989:470) argues that the involvement of Aborigines with tourism may leave them more economically disadvantaged than advantaged when taking into account economic costs. He also argues, in collaboration with Finlayson, that at Uluru the Aboriginal community does not gain ‘substantial direct economic benefits’ (Altman and Finlayson 1992:4), from greater income or employment and the non-Aboriginal people involved in the tourism industry gain most of the benefits of tourism (see Section 4.2).

Although environmental, social and cultural costs may also erode the economic benefits of tourism, Altman (1989:470-1) found that the economic impacts of tourism on four different Aboriginal communities in the Northern Territory was positive, but limited and dependent on ownership of tourism enterprises and employment opportunities. The ownership of an enterprise is difficult for Aboriginal people who are often poor, reliant on welfare and who can face major hurdles trying to raise capital (Altman 1989:471, Altman 1993a:8). Furthermore, when an Aboriginal community does own a tourist enterprise and receives income, it usually distributes funds among the entire community, making small individual returns (Craig-Smith and French 1994:132).

If successful in gaining employment, the levels of attainment of Aborigines are limited because they often lack the relevant skills required for the tourism industry (Altman 1989:471, Craig-Smith and French 1994:132). Employment in Australia requires literacy in English, communication skills and the adoption of cultural styles that may be difficult for Aborigines to attain. They may therefore have to conduct unskilled or semi-skilled work (Altman and Finlayson 1992:2-3). Altman’s (1987b:46) study of the impact of tourism on the Warmun Community in East Kimberley also highlighted that local community members had very little experience in commercial business. Of course, there are also Aborigines who have such business experience but they appear not to be concentrated in the tourism sector. They are a minority; thus non-Aborigines tend to dominate commercial tourist ventures with regard to ownership and/or management in Australia.
Lawrence (1985:2) in his anthropological report on tourism impacts on Kakadu Aborigines, comments that tourism employment is menial in nature and therefore employment for Aborigines is often in unskilled areas, with low pay and in the services sector. Although there are now Aborigines who have higher educational qualifications than their parents and grandparents (Finlayson 1995:12), few Aborigines own and/or manage a tourism enterprise, but rather work in menial positions within an enterprise. Nevertheless, Lawrence (1985:5) argues that tourism needs to be controlled so that tourism does not negatively alter or degrade Aboriginal culture and lifestyle. Alternatively, this may be possible if Aborigines refuse outright to have anything to do with tourism or indeed have control over tourism, so that it is conducted in a manner satisfying Aboriginal requirements.

According to Altman (1989:471 and 1987a:92), not all Aborigines want to have direct contact with tourists, and that may be a factor regardless of whether or not Aborigines have the required skills to work within the tourism industry. Some Aborigines wish to have limited or no contact with tourists and others seek to have contact with tourists (Altman 1989:471, Altman and Finlayson 1992:2-4). This is perhaps dependent upon an Aborigine’s level of confidence and may also depend upon whether or not the individual and/or their extended family is reliant upon the income associated with working in the tourism industry, or hopes to attain financial gain for the perceived improvement of their lifestyle. It is important to acknowledge therefore that different Aborigines and/or their community may have varying levels of interest in being engaged in tourism.

Altman (1989:47) argues that full-time employment was not a priority of Aborigines at Uluru and yet at Kakadu, several Aborigines were employed full-time for a few years in mid 1980’s. At Uluru (Central Land Council et al 1987:91) some of the reasons cited for lack of enthusiasm for full-time work included the pressure to serve tourists promptly and communication difficulties. No mention was made of the ‘differences between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal uses of English’ (Eades 1992:1) and how the different use of the English language can cause misunderstanding between the parties concerned. There was also no mention of the various cultural aspects of Aborigines and tourists with regard to time and its application (Ryan 1991:150) and therefore the possibility of why Aborigines feel uneasy with a tourist’s request and the expected rapid response to such a request.
Indigenous Australians may not wish to be involved with tourism throughout the year due to seasonal and ceremonial factors associated with cultural practices. Craig-Smith and French (1994:130) argue that ‘Aboriginal culture is rich in folklore, ceremony and language, and different activities are dictated by seasons or various significant stages in a person’s life cycle.’ Their culture of telling stories and creating drawings survive in modern times (Collins 1993:37). Also, if certain Aboriginal members forsake cultural activities, they may be ostracized (Craig-Smith and French 1994:133).

According to Gillespie (1988:243), one of the impacts of tourism on Kakadu Aborigines is the degree of loss of privacy, especially those areas used for recreation, socialising and gathering, but no elaboration is undertaken as to the effects of such loss of privacy. He further argues that the deprivation of privacy changes the way Aborigines recreate and socialise by limiting such activities or changing the meeting location, so that they can be themselves. One could argue that the threat of loss of privacy challenges Aborigines to consider alternative options of recreation and location or to take part in local government politics so that they can try to secure privacy for themselves through local government bylaws.

One of the subtle impacts of tourism concerns how tourism industry operators portray Aborigines and their lifestyle (Gillespie 1988:244). Such impacts are negative if Indigenous culture is trivialised, misrepresented or cheapened and tourists perceive Aborigines as exotic and inanimate curios rather than as members of a dynamic, complex culture (Burchett 1993:20, Harron and Weiler 1992:87). Burchett (in Harron and Weiler 1988:6) found that tour operators give inaccurate information to tourists about Australian Aborigines. If visitors are educated about Indigenous Australians in a negative manner and not factually, such visitors may maintain or develop stereotypical images of Aboriginal people. In such cases, there may be little opportunity for cross-cultural communication and understanding.

Hinch and Butler (1996:12-13) argue that governments that have minority populations are keen to alleviate Indigenous dependence on welfare by promoting tourism strategies. Hinch and Butler (1996:4-6) also argue that income derived from tourism can assist Indigenous people in becoming economically independent accompanied by greater self-
determination but they also give merit to arguments of early critics of tourism that ‘outside interests’ benefit most from tourism and not indeed the host destinations.

The Australian government in 1991 was also interested in Indigenous Australians participating in tourism. The Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody: National Report (Commonwealth of Australia 1991) identified such participation as a source of economic growth for Aboriginal communities (Altman and Finlayson 1992:1) and a possible reduction in welfare-dependency. Yet, Altman found that even though some Aborigines own land which they lease back to government departments, they gain little economically from tourism on their land and whatever is gained economically may be outweighed by cultural costs (Altman 1993a:7).

Ryan and Crotts (1997:900) argue that dominant groups advance their own interests by manipulating less powerful groups by using power and control. They also point out that tourism for Indigenous people enables such usually less powerful people to ‘achieve legitimacy in the struggle for political and economic recognition’ (Ryan and Crotts 1997:900). If Aborigines own a tourist destination to a large degree or outright and therefore have power and control over it, then they might achieve greater economic and socio-cultural benefits. It is also possible that if Aborigines have control over their land, they may reject tourism totally, or only allow limited tourism such as restricting the numbers of visitors and when and where they may visit (Ryan 1991:148).

According to Finlayson (Altman and Finlayson 1992:6), Aborigines who own land at Lake Condah, Victoria do not gain economically from a tourist venture on their land which they have leased to the Victorian Tourism Commission in 1990, nor do they have control over the venture. Ideally, the lease terms could have specified some proportion of Aboriginal representation in a tourism policy decision making committee or similar as owners and lessors of the land, but Aborigines are rarely involved in tourism developmental issues (Clements and Rose 1996:62). The owners of the land could be employed at the tourist site, rather than the employment issue at Lake Condah being left open and therefore no commitment to employ the local Indigenous landowners (Altman and Finlayson 1992:6).
Finlayson (1991a:93-4) informally interviewed Aborigines regarding their perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of tourism in Victoria and Queensland. Finlayson found that often they did not know how tourism would impact on them, nor the type of work that needed to be undertaken to make a venture a success, nor the lead time to make financial gains. Unless an Indigenous Australian was involved with a tourism or business venture, it must be difficult for any member of a community to understand the issues outlined above, and therefore how it would impact on them and their community.

In Kuranda, Queensland, Finlayson (1991a:94-5) interviewed an Aboriginal man who stated that Aboriginal people locally lacked the skills required within the local tourist industry. Furthermore, they lack the financial skills to secure a loan, and an understanding of the strategies of budgeting or financial planning. The Aboriginal man saw the benefits of tourism as promoting business ventures controlled and run by Aborigines as role models for the community. Such role models might perhaps encourage other Aborigines to work in such ventures, or to establish a venture of their own, or to undertake business training to prepare themselves for such employment or ownership. Yet, the development of role models for Aboriginal tourism enterprises is difficult, as Aboriginal communities are culturally diverse (Altman and Finlayson 1992:7-8).

Unfortunately, a few Kuranda Aboriginal community schemes for enterprises had failed, for example, ‘a community farm to produce fruit for Aboriginal households’ (Finlayson 1991a:95) and Finlayson found that Aborigines, in general, lack knowledge about how to instigate or maintain an enterprise. Such lack of knowledge may also leave Aborigines socially, culturally and economically disadvantaged when dealing with tourism operators who wish to develop their land and/or feature their culture. Aborigines may not understand the impacts of tourism and therefore, based on insufficient information, agree to the use of their culture and/or land. They may then become disillusioned with how their land is developed; how their culture is portrayed; how their people have to work in such an enterprise; and how it may alter community relationships through unequal wealth distribution.

The Tjapukai Dance Theatre was an example of the positive impact of tourism for local Kuranda Aborigines (Finlayson 1991a:96). However, the Tjapukai Dance Theatre was a
partnership between an Aboriginal man, his non-Aboriginal partner and an American couple, the latter couple having had experience in establishing ethnic theatre productions around the world (Finch 1998:12). If business and financial management skills and capital are lacking for Indigenous Australians, then there are obviously many hurdles to overcome to establish a business venture, particularly a viable one.

Finlayson (1991a:97) argues that there are opportunities for Kuranda Aborigines to diversify and set up alternate tourist ventures, other than dance troupes, but that they do not think of alternatives beyond their personal experiences with tourism. She also argues that the Aboriginal people consider similar existing tourist ventures, rather than unknown tourist ventures. If Kuranda Aborigines perceive dance troupes as successful, then that may be their preferred tourist venture. They may not understand that increased competition can reduce tourist numbers and therefore revenue at the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park at which some of them or their families are employed. If no market research is undertaken, it may be difficult for local Aborigines to know what tourists expect from them, and they may instead offer services that are not in demand.

Aborigines may benefit economically from the demand made to experience their culture but negative social and cultural impacts may emerge through the commoditisation of their ‘cultural artefacts, identity, and performances, …’ (Hall 1995:251). Already, many Aboriginal groups fear that Aboriginal culture may be devalued through contact with tourists (Hall 1995:244). Of concern are the impacts of tourism on Aboriginal culture but also how to gain economically from tourism without a loss of tradition. For example, Indigenous communities are faced with the question of how to balance commercial considerations with environmental and cultural considerations (Finlayson 1993:80) and Aboriginal elders have concerns about how to become more economically advantaged through tourism without losing their traditions (Craig-Smith and French 1994:130).

Altman (1989) and Altman and Finlayson (1992:8-9) acknowledged tourism successes whilst identifying commercial, environmental and socio-cultural trade-offs in providing authenticity in Aboriginal tourism endeavours. The success of Indigenous tourism was dependant upon the largely non-Indigenous tourism industry understanding Indigenous culture (Hollinshead 1992), but little effort appears to be made with regard to
understanding Indigenous culture and even if it were the case, success cannot be guaranteed.

From the literature surveyed, it appears that the positive aspect of one type of tourism impact is often countered with the negative aspect of another type of tourism impact. This is exemplified by the perceived positive economic impact of tourism versus the negative social, environmental and cultural impacts of tourism. It is difficult to totally isolate one type of impact from another, due to the interrelationship between tourism impacts and therefore this study will deal primarily with the range of tourism’s impacts on a particular Indigenous community. The review of tourism impacts on Indigenous Australians indicated negative and positive impacts.

The preceding section, which concerns tourism’s impacts on Indigenous Australians, is particularly relevant as background information for the case study, which is the focus of this research. The next section considers the general negative and positive impacts of tourism on host communities worldwide. ‘Hosts are people of the visited country who are directly and indirectly employed in the tourism industry and provide service to tourists’ (Reisinger 1994:743).

2.3 Tourism Impacts on Indigenous People or Host Populations

In this section, the broad impacts of tourism are addressed regardless of whether the host is Indigenous or non-Indigenous. The reason for this is that some of the impacts addressed here have not been able to be examined in the context of Australia’s Indigenous people, due to a lack of sufficient broad coverage of tourism impacts in the literature, specifically regarding Australia’s Indigenous people.

There are various types of tourism impacts, which affect Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. The impacts are broadly placed under the headings of economic, environmental, social, cultural, socioeconomic and socio-cultural impacts. Less mentioned terms of tourism impacts include physical, political and psychological impacts (Ryan 1991:146, Hohl and Tisdell 1993:11). It is difficult to separate tourism impact types as the social, cultural and economic effects of tourism cannot be considered in isolation (Harron and
Weiler 1992:88) and worldwide, the impacts of tourism often have ripple effects that are ultimately ‘social’ in their outcomes (Mercer 1994:128-9).

Traditionally, tourism has been studied on a regional or national basis in terms of its economic impacts (Snaith and Haley 1994:826) such as financial and employment benefits to a host community (Mathieson and Wall 1982:133). In the 1970’s awareness emerged, amongst researchers, of additional impacts of tourism such as social, cultural and environmental impacts (Snaith and Haley 1994:826). Initially, socio-cultural impact studies portrayed primarily negative tourism impacts (Mathieson and Wall 1982:133, Williams 1998:152).

Studies have inferred various relationships regarding the impacts of tourism (Snaith and Haley 1994:826). This may be the result of researchers in the area placing different emphases on the same data and therefore interpreting impacts differently. Harron and Weiler (1992:87) argue that the impacts of tourism on hosts and societies are only possible on a ‘case-by-case basis’. This claim appears to be justified in that every case study reviewed here indicates differences in the types of host, guest, tourist site and the interaction between the three with regard to control and ownership issues.

Researchers assess problems differently but there are costs and benefits of tourism (Hohl and Tisdell 1993:8, Craig-Smith and French 1994:25, Harron and Weiler 1992:88). Overall, authors tend to agree that tourism development leads to economic, environmental and social changes (Holden 1994:850, Altman 1989, Altman and Finlayson 1992:8-9) and that tourism presents positive and negative impacts (Crick 1991:10) in the form of physical, economic, cultural and psychological impacts (Hohl and Tisdell 1993:11).

The literature shows broad support for two different scenarios about positive and negative tourism impacts, particularly with regard to tourism impacts on culture. First, there are either negative impacts of tourism (Preglau 1983, Altman 1993a) or positive impacts of tourism (Snaith & Haley 1994, Williams 1998). Secondly, there are both negative and positive impacts of tourism (Ryan 1991, Butler 1992, Harron and Weiler 1992, Mathieson and Wall 1982, Craig-Smith and French 1994, Crick 1991).
A tourism impact table has been developed from the review of literature (see Table 2.1). The table sets out tourism impact types and whether that type of impact was considered negative, positive or both by the author/s concerned.

Table 2.1 Positive and negative tourism impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Author/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic, social and cultural:</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brokensha and Guldberg 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater No. of visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate international tourists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilise cultural resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic:</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brim 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher standard of living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and cultural:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural practices revived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists wanting education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcome racial problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some culture commercialisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic, social, cultural, physical and psychological:</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hohl and Tisdell 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boo 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instable tourist demand</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental degradation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and cultural:</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survival (nd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers of visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviving a culture</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and economic:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finlayson 1991(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic, environmental and sociocultural</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pearce and Moscardo and Ross 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hinch and Butler 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic independence</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside interests benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation from land</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural understanding</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathieson and Wall 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obliteration of culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural communication</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commoditisation of culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Author/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revival of artifacts</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ritchie and Zins in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staged cultural attractions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurgence of art forms</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenwood 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art form commercialisation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion of language</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration of traditions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastronomical rejection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastronomical acceptance</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music incorporation into popular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and other music types</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional work vs tourism work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commoditisation of culture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Social:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redistribution of wealth and power</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No use of land has cultural impacts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Altman and Finlayson 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little employment or more income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of power/control</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and cultural:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious beliefs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Altman 1993(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low financial return</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of tourism participation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional authority structures</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender relations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational relations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailoring authentic products</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: - negative  + positive

(Sourced from literature review herein)

The terms ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ are used by researchers but not defined. It appears that researchers determine which impacts of tourism are positive and/or negative for host communities, rather than the host communities themselves. This could be problematic if a researcher subjectively classifies an impact of tourism as a positive and/or negative impact and yet the host community perceives that impact differently. For example, a resurgence in local art forms for the host may be viewed as a positive impact by tourists.
and yet be perceived as a negative impact by the host if they perceive tourist-demanded art forms diminish cultural background (Ryan 1991:138). Positive and negative terms in this chapter will be used according to the perceived purported meaning given to the terms by authors referred to. These terms in Chapter 4, which presents the results of this research, will be used according to the perceived purported meaning given to the terms by the respondents of the study, that is, the members of the Djabugay community.

2.3.1 The Nature of Tourism Impacts

The various types of tourism impacts and whether they are positive or negative have been presented in the previous section. In this section, the nature of those types of impacts is discussed.

Regarding economic impacts, Altman (1993a:7) argues that tourism can provide economic benefits but that there can also be economic and other environmental, social and cultural costs. Even so, tourism does not operate within a vacuum but as part of a broader environment, which influences Indigenous and non-Indigenous tourism activity. Non-Indigenous interests at a destination often dictate services and infrastructure within the parameters of a global tourism industry (Hinch and Butler 1996:11) including requirements for transport, accommodation, meals, guides and entertainment. Income and employment are the outcome of such requirements.

A community’s social and financial status may change because of tourism. Harron and Weiler (1992:88), French (1990:23) and Preglau (1983:56) argue that the positive impacts of tourism are usually economic including more employment, high incomes and higher standards of living. But does it provide such benefits for Indigenous people and does more employment go to Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal participants? Tourism may provide employment to locals, but they are usually menial, unskilled jobs which pay very little (Crick 1991:10-11). High incomes are normally associated with managerial and professional jobs and not many Indigenous people hold such positions in tourism. Usually, non-locals are employed in managerial and professional positions with superior salaries compared to locals (Mathieson and Wall 1982:174). Yet, tourism may offer the only new industry that generates service positions for those with ‘minimal educational skills’ (Smith 1996:286-7).
Education and the degree of proficiency in language are identified in the literature as having impacts regarding employment. Higher degrees of language proficiency may result in a person obtaining a better job, whilst those with lesser language skills may be relegated to menial jobs (Hohl and Tisdell 1993:10-11) or no job at all. Tourism may provide positive economic impacts but negative socio-cultural impacts if there is gradual erosion of Indigenous language as locals increasingly speak the visitors’ language (Mathieson and Wall 1982:174). This may occur because the locals wish to be more proficient at speaking with visitors and enhancing positive cross-cultural exchange. Being bilingual or multilingual may be a requirement of employers to obtain a position and/or whilst in employment to be able to interact with tourists. The use of the Indigenous language may therefore diminish or be lost.

Dickmann (1989:181) argues that locals may reject their culture if it is laughed at, or seen as quaint or curious. He suggests that the locals may then become embarrassed, ashamed or hostile and if they also reject their own culture, by emulating the visitors, the cultural problems become more serious. For example, locals could become attracted to other cultures, at the expense of learning their own (Davidson 1989:170) if they sense their own culture is being trivialised, or they do not see any value in their traditional culture. In such cases, the Indigenous people may neither wish to listen to or learn from their elders, nor practice cultural behaviour and certainly not pass on any knowledge or skills to their offspring (Davidson 1989:170).

There are impacts of a power-based relationship that the societies involved have to deal with (Nash 1989:38). When developed societies exercise power over less developed societies in the development of tourism, unfavourable impact distribution occurs (Hinch and Butler 1996:11-12). It is not often that local communities control tourism on their land as is the case with the Wanegal or Eora Aboriginal people with regard to the National Aboriginal Cultural Centre in Sydney (Zeppel 1998d:6). A few exceptions include Kakadu National Park and Uluru National Park where local communities are represented on a Board and are able to have some control over their land (Gillespie 1988, Altman 1987a). The needs and aspirations of Indigenous people are often ignored (Survival nd:10) especially when they are not in a position of power or control.
The literature indicates that tourism provides economic stimuli but that it also results in wealth being distributed unequally and in different ways in communities located in tourism centres (Greenwood 1982, Hohl and Tisdell 1993:12). Tourists displaying wealth amidst poverty may cause explosive situations (Mathieson and Wall 1982:174), for example, host societies that view tourists with expensive possessions may demand such possessions but availability may be negligible because of their economy (Craig-Smith and French 1994:42).

Host societies may not be able to obtain expensive possessions, yet still engage in tourism. Butler (in Mathieson and Wall 1982:139) believes that the majority of the host population either accepts impacts of tourism because of its benefits or because they cannot see a means of reversing the trend. If Indigenous people are not in a position of power or control, they may have no choice regarding the development and the impacts of tourism on their community and their culture. If they are not aware of the realities of tourism impacts, they may accept tourism as inevitable due to their lack of knowledge and/or business acumen.

Hinch and Butler (1996:5) argue that income from tourism enables Indigenous people’s greater economic independence, which would lead to self-determination and a pride in their culture. There is not unreserved agreement in the literature reviewed that tourism provides economic independence, but rather that welfare programs, and/or government labour programs appear to provide much of the income for Aborigines. It appears that tourism income is not substantial enough to provide economic independence in most cases (Altman 1989).

The broad economic effects of tourism on host communities’ leads to socio-cultural impacts, according to the literature surveyed, which warrant further discussion.

‘Social impacts of tourism refer to the changes in the quality of life of residents of tourist destinations’ (Mathieson and Wall 1982:137). Social impacts include ‘increased social tension and sociocultural breakdown’ (Harron and Weiler 1992:88). Examples include the break down of community cohesion when less time is spent on traditional ceremonies (Burchett 1992:74), and when locals are removed or denied access to tourist areas in their own countries, and therefore treated as second class citizens (Crick 1991:11). Local
culture can be destroyed or changed when treated as a tourist attraction (Greenwood 1989:173, Mowforth and Munt 1998:5) but such destruction or change of culture may be viewed differently by researchers and those being researched. Culture is presented in a form to meet the expectations of the tourist, for example, didgeridoo making and playing. Didgeridoos are not a traditional instrument of every Indigenous community in Australia. They are a strictly male artefact and originated in northern Australia (Bourke et al 1998:159).

Table 2.2 sets out the positive and negative sociocultural impacts of tourism derived from case studies, ethnographies and review sources by Pearce and Moscardo and Ross (1996:104). Not all of the sociocultural impacts listed are covered in detail in this thesis, except for the perceived major sociocultural impacts of tourism from the perspective of the Djabugay community.

Turner and Ash (1976:130) argue that minority cultures are able to retain their ‘ethnic individuality’ when they are isolated from majority cultures but once an airport is established, tourists arrive and impose their own values on the societies they visit. The tourists’ superior economic wealth tends to erode the sensuous and aesthetic wealth of cultures that have developed isolated from the western world (Turner and Ash 1976:130). Minority cultures may maintain ethnic individuality but Turner and Ash (1976) do not take into account that minority cultures do change over time, whether or not they are exposed to tourism. Neither do they consider that sensuous nor aesthetic wealth may possibly be adapted in a way viewed as positive by the minority culture.

Ryan (1991:165) argues that culture changes because the environment (built, natural and social) within which it exists changes – and that environment may or may not include a tourism industry. Factors that play a part in impacting on a culture include modernisation and development (Harron and Weiler 1992:88), contact with explorers, missionaries, increased mobility and urbanisation (Mathieson and Wall 1982:161). Even though culture changes over time, it may be quite different from the changes brought about by the impacts made as soon as interaction occurs between the host and guest, whatever the role each plays.
Evans (1994:840) argues that the cultures of the world have been ‘fundamentally and forever altered by the movements of peoples’ but Crick postulates that ‘cultures are invented, remade and the elements reorganised’ (cited in Urry 1990:9). Culture, it appears, changes regardless of the movements of peoples, but perhaps in a different way and not so quickly.

The quality of change is understood to not necessarily be “bad” if the host culture can ‘withstand, and absorb, the change generators whilst retaining its own integrity’ (Ryan 1991:146, Craig-Smith and French 1994:127). The host culture may protect itself by

---

**Table 2.2 Summary of Tourism Impacts from Case Studies, Ethnographies and Reviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociocultural Impacts of Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Changes to family structure and gender roles: often creates new opportunities for women and younger people, but also tension and loss of self-esteem for men and older generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstration effect: copying of tourists and loss of traditional values and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support for a revival of traditional culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support for demonstration of ethnic identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Changes to arts, craft, dress, festivals, etc. as a part of production for tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Drugs and alcoholism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Loss of privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Changes in morals, values, and attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Introduction of commercialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Begging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Invasion of traditional/sacred sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Breaking of cultural taboos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Recreational conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Community conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Creation and maintenance of stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Breaking down of stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Increased social inequity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Loss of language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Support for language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Increased recreational opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. External political control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Better education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Loss of artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Cultural exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Introduction of disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Prostitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Loss of access to various places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Interference with/disruption to traditional practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Pearce and Moscardo and Ross 1996:104)
withdrawing from tourism altogether or confining tourism to some degree such as
nominating the type of visitors allowed, numbers of visitors allowed, and controlling
where they may visit (Ryan 1991:148). This is only possible if the host culture has the
power to control such factors. Provided that members of the community respect them,
and their opinions, the ‘opinion leaders’ in a community are an important component of
how the host culture is protected against tourism (Ryan 1991:148).

The socio-cultural impacts of tourism include changes to ‘value systems, individual
behaviour, family relationships, collective life styles, safety levels, moral conduct,
creative expressions, traditional ceremonies and community organizations’ (Fox 1977:1).
Culture may change when tribal people are treated as objects, to perform when expected,
for the tourists. The type of performance and timing of it may not accord with tradition
when different types of ceremonies are arranged to coincide with certain times of the year

Handicrafts are required and expected by tourists to be made for sale, not for original use
and adjustments are therefore made to respond to tourism demand (Ryan and Crotts
1997:911). For example, they might sell well if they are embellished with non-traditional
colours and paints. Non traditional colours and commercially produced paints may be
easier and quicker to use but may also diminish the tradition involved with searching for
and making up traditional colours and paints. Tourists may see culture superficially as
dance, song and art and not get to know the cultural basis for beliefs, values and customs.
Such experiences re-enforce a visitor’s stereotype of Indigenous culture (Survival nd:12)
and the visitor is not educated about the diversity of a particular culture.

Education may change the stereotype image visitors have of Indigenous culture. This
may occur through tourists visiting the hosts and the social relationships that develop
between the two (Hohl and Tisdell 1993:8, Mathieson and Wall 1982:135, Hall
1995:243). Such relationships tend to affect the hosts’ cultures, rather than that of the
visitors (Nunez 1989:268) although the literature identified that there is evidence of some
effect on the visitors through exposure to the food, lifestyle and values of another culture.

Lifestyle and values may be impacted upon by tourism. Preglau (1983:57) argues that
this may occur because family labour may become wage labour and because traditional
structures are replaced by capitalist structures. The difference between those supplying family labour as opposed to wage labour may lead to social conflicts. Social conflicts may occur because of the widening gap between those who are economically advantaged by an income and those economically disadvantaged without an income, but possibly operating on an exchange or bartering system. He also argues that the seasonality of the tourism industry also impacts on family and neighbour interaction time, as the tourism industry requires employees to work at regulated times, on specific days and times of the year, which can disrupt cultural practices at particular times of the year.

The following table developed by Ritchie and Zins in Ryan (1991:137-140) represents some of the positive and negative impacts of tourism on various cultural factors.

Table 2.3 Positive and negative impacts of tourism on culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Factors</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Handicrafts</td>
<td>Resurgence in local art forms.</td>
<td>Local artist may change handicrafts in such a way not consistent with tradition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Way in which host society can maintain its distinctiveness from the tourist.</td>
<td>Erosion of language which implies an outside culture has supplanted the host’s culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions</td>
<td>Employment opportunities.</td>
<td>Employment type may be inconsistent with past work practices/patterns/pace. Tourist engaging in shocking behaviour against the hosts norms and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and music</td>
<td>Cultural change incorporating music from tourist-generating countries.</td>
<td>Rediscovery of its own musical values through appreciation of it from “others”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourist-generating countries incorporating “others” music.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Ritchie and Zins in Ryan 1991:137-140)

Tourism may also have a broader impact on culture if it revives a culture because of renewed interest in Indigenous tradition. The next section examines two potential positive impacts of tourism on culture: cross-cultural communication improvement and the revival of a culture.
2.3.2 Positive Impacts of Tourism

Cross-cultural communication

At least two of the positive effects of tourism on culture are cross-cultural communication improvement and cultural revival.

Arguing from a Foucaudian perspective, Urry (1990:1) states that tourists gaze at what they encounter on their travels. The gaze is socially organised and systematised and is shaped by factors such as sex, age, ethnicity, culture, class, the media and other factors (Mowforth and Munt 1998:7). The tourist gaze ‘varies by society, by social group and by historical period’ (Urry 1990:1). Tourists may therefore influence cross-cultural communication with a host community based upon how their “gaze” is shaped.

Though there are arguments supporting and opposing enhanced cross-cultural communication, certain factors play a part in the type of cross-cultural communication experienced by hosts and guests (Reisinger 1994:745). Factors identified in the literature which influence interactions are the tourists’ length of stay, contact time between hosts and tourists, the physical and social space shared by the groups, and linguistic capability and willingness of both groups to share their values, attitudes and experiences. These may determine positive or negative cross-cultural communication. Reisinger (1994:746) argues that language and cultural background are determinants for whether or not social contact is made and to what extent.

Contact between different social groups, nationalities and cultures, may remove social or national prejudices and promote a change in attitudes and understanding and positive social change (Mathieson and Wall 1982:163, Davidson 1989:170, Reisinger 1994:743, Mowforth and Munt 1998:269). Craig-Smith and French (1994:127) argue that tourism may have positive impacts when it promotes mutual co-operation and understanding. According to the literature surveyed, attitudes are not easy to shift, but perhaps exposure to another culture enhances understanding and learning and a shift to a positive attitude about that culture.
Mathieson and Wall (1982:134) argue that tourism does not promote cross-cultural communication and understanding between different nationalities and cultures. In cross-cultural exchanges, locals do not glean much about the visitor’s culture nor does the visitor experience much about that visited. Crick (1991:10) argues that mutual respect and understanding is difficult if the visited and visitors do not have ‘common goals and equal status’. Also, that such respect and understanding is difficult as tourists usually do not spend a lot of time with the Indigenous people they visit, nor do they stay in their homes to get a better chance at knowing one another.

Reisinger (1994:747) and Mathieson and Wall (1982:175) argue that individual and “non-institutionalised” tourists, who want “authentic” experiences with hosts, have a greater opportunity of intercultural communication than tourists who are in large groups and organised tours. Mathieson and Wall (1982:163) argue that the cultural broker (who plays a role between the host and tourists in the form of translator, guide, and/or retailer of goods and services) can also influence cross-cultural communication. Cultural brokers can positively or negatively portray and/or sell the culture of the host. It therefore seems important that cultural brokers break down negative stereotypical images of those visited by portraying the positive cultural features of an Indigenous community.

Attitudes and perceptions of each party may determine positive or negative cross-cultural communication (Reisinger 1994:745). Negative attitudes may result from contact between tourist-host participants, as well as prejudices and stereotypes (Reisinger 1994:744) because tourists with stereotypical images of hosts, usually select stimuli which reinforces those images (Mathieson and Wall 1982:164) and may even induce hosts to present or perform to those expectations. If the tourist and/or host have a positive attitude, the chances are greater for developing positive attitudes (Reisinger 1994:746). The level of desire to socialise may determine positive or negative cross-cultural communication (Reisinger 1994:745) between both the tourist and the host. Some of Australia’s Indigenous people have no desire to meet with tourists at all (see Section 2.2) and therefore there is no communication. Obviously, different people within a community may have different attitudes about tourists (Crick 1991:13). Cross-cultural communication may preserve or revitalize ‘local ethnic and cultural identity’ (Evans cited in Mathieson and Wall 1982:163). Tourism may objectify, commodify and trivialise a culture, but also revitalise and rehabilitate a culture or create
an artificial presentation of the superficial trappings of a culture, whilst losing the real depth and dignity of culture. This raises the issues of what is “real” as a result of cultural dynamism or what is simply commercialised representation. Nevertheless, if the revival of a culture were possible, it would appear to be a positive benefit of tourism, if that was the catalyst for the revival.

**Cultural Revival**

Tourism may have the positive impact of reviving a culture, therefore protecting and maintaining Indigenous history and culture (Preglau 1983:56, Harron and Weiler 1992:88) including the safeguarding of historical sites, the environment, old traditions, and Indigenous arts and crafts (Craig-Smith and French 1994:39). There is no guarantee that the revival of a culture will indeed protect it, as it may be interpreted differently by different people and therefore be portrayed incorrectly. A culture can also be commoditised in order to suit the tourist in which case the culture is revived and moulded for the tourism industry. Therefore arts, crafts and traditions may be changed (Craig-Smith and French 1994:42).

Greenwood (1989:183) argues that the objectification of culture can transform and stimulate its proliferation. The transformation and proliferation of the host’s culture, according to Greenwood, may provide benefits to the host, such as economic benefits but may come at a socio-cultural cost, through the objectification of its culture, as mentioned above.

Mathieson and Wall (1982:175-6) and Harron and Weiler (1992:88) argue that tourism may be the conduit for a renaissance of local culture and for that culture to be known throughout the world. They argue that a renewed interest is shown in local arts and crafts when tourism contributes to the local economy, and such arts and crafts, in whatever style, may be lost if there is no revival of an Indigenous community’s culture. There is a relationship between cultural survival contributing to economic success and economic success contributing to cultural survival. If culture was not in demand and paid for, the survival of culture may be more tenuous unless a community is relatively isolated from the mainstream or actively chooses to protect its culture.
Some of the positive impacts of tourism have been covered but consideration of negative impacts regarding authenticity and commoditisation indicates that these may limit the potential benefits of tourism impacts.

2.3.3 Negative Impacts of Tourism

Authenticity

In a world of change, tourists’ travel to experience authenticity, that is, to experience something that is genuine (Selwyn 1994:733). Urry (in Ryan and Crotts 1997:900) argues that tourists do not seek authenticity, but rather experiences. MacCannell (1976) also believes all tourists seek authenticity in times and places away from their everyday life but tourists may or may not experience authenticity in the location they visit. Some travellers pursue authenticity in foreign cultures and yet may have doubts about authenticity when visiting destinations. Modern tourism has exacerbated the trivialisation of culture and with it the presentation of contrived experiences (Hall 1995:245). Ideally, a situation is authentic for host and tourist. Hall notes that the host can present an inauthentic experience which the tourist believes is authentic, or an authentic culture is presented by the host, but the tourist perceives it to be inauthentic, or the tourist industry presents a contrived scene and the tourists see it as such (245-6). It is possible also that the tourist industry presents a representation of the real, which is not claimed to be the “real”.

When demand outstrips supply of tourism, destinations will stage attractions for the viewing and experiential benefit of the tourist (Mathieson and Wall 1982:172) resulting in positive and negative impacts. It is positive if it keeps tourists away from locals, relieving pressure on them and preserving their culture. Staging of cultural events is negative if it manipulates the product or the traditions and customs of the people for the benefit of the tourist (Mathieson and Wall 1982:173). Alternatively, tourists may be willing to accept a replication of a cultural event if they understand the negativity of impacting on the authentic.

Local response may be positive to tourists who demonstrate genuine interest in local culture, artifacts, history (Greenwood 1989:185) but such arts and crafts may become
commercialised for tourist consumption and become less authentic in the process (Dickman 1989:180). Traditional Indigenous artifacts may therefore be adapted to suit tourism demands. If locals make an income from their products, the income may be at the expense of cultural deterioration. Sometimes, tourists buy local goods to inject funds into that economy (Craig-Smith and French 1994:128). The demand for arts and crafts and other cultural representations to be adapted to suit tourists’ needs may further dilute the authentic, for example, objects in suitcase size for the tourist to take home with them (Craig-Smith and French 1994:42).

Regardless of the arguments of the negative impact of tourism regarding authenticity, it is difficult to establish authenticity of cultural elements and performances in the first place. Definition of traditional culture is problematic, as culture is diverse (Greenwood 1989:183) and therefore authenticity questions become more complex to address (Hinch and Butler 1996:14). Given that tourists are exposed to Indigenous cultures within the context of staged, inauthentic portrayals of traditional life styles (Hinch and Butler 1996:3) it is possible that there are no authentic tourist experiences (Urry 1990:9).

Other negative impacts of tourism concern the commoditisation of a host’s culture, which in turn impacts on the authentic representation of a culture.

Commoditisation

The commoditisation of culture means that tourists are led into believing they are experiencing authentic culture from those who are being paid to perform. The argument is that authentic culture cannot be purchased. Authentic culture, rather, is found at the back of the stage or elsewhere (Selwyn 1994:730) where social interaction takes place and members of a community play their respective roles according to their culture. On stage, ‘social customs and culture become commercialised’ (Craig-Smith and French 1994:42). Ritual dances lose much of their significance when performed on the hour to suit the local tour bus operators. Songs and dances may be westernised and sometimes performed in English to suit western tastes and aid understanding if the local language differs from that of the tourists.
The souvenir industry is a good example of the commercialisation of culture (Turner and Ash 1976:140). When a traditional artisan values his/her work as being dependent upon its commercial retail appeal, then traditional artistic formulae may be superceded. The best-selling artifacts are then those that have been created in a ‘diluted and westernised form’ (Turner and Ash 1976:141). Traditional artisans have great pressure exerted on them to make objects suitcase sized and cheap so that visitors feel they got a bargain. Greater emphasis is then inevitably placed on salability, rather than authenticity (Craig-Smith and French 1994:42).

Culture is therefore a commodity, as it is moulded into a few recognisable characteristics for tourist consumption. A commodity is anything for sale produced by production variables such as land, labor and capital (Greenwood 1989:172) and history, ethnic identity and culture of host populations (Greenwood 1989:180, Pretes 1995:2). Culture is packaged and priced and sold as any other commodity available in the market. Everything, including culture, has a price and if someone is willing to pay the price, they can see what they want (Greenwood 1989:179).

Tourist centres and theme parks may survey visitors to gauge their level of satisfaction with what they experience (Pearce et al 1997, Zeppel 1998a:3). Adjustments may be made to cultural content to ensure visitor satisfaction, thereby further diluting a culture. Studies of non-material cultural manifestations have found that ‘cultural forms lose their traditional meanings when they are modified for tourist consumption’ (Mathieson and Wall 1982:172). Negative consequences identified include a neglect of traditional occupations to work within the tourist industry and boredom with presenting artificial representations of tradition. The tourist industry will cater for year round tourists and long working hours whereas traditional occupations may coincide with the seasons of the year and include community interaction rather than being isolated at a tourist destination (Mathieson and Wall 1982:172).

Greenwood (1989:179) argues that ‘…commoditization of culture in effect robs people of the very meanings by which they organize their lives’. The socioeconomic effects of mass tourism are an unequal distribution of wealth and power and therefore social stratification that destructively alters local culture. Greenwood’s argument, however,
does not incorporate consideration of the natural transience of a culture, whether or not it is influenced by tourism, or the possible benefits arising from tourism.

Ryan (1991:152-53) argues that a host community is able to ‘retain the meanings of its own events’. It might be simplistic to argue that tourism undermines a host culture’s integrity (Ryan 1991:152-53) and perhaps it is paternalistic to suggest it. ‘Some societies may even seek to use tourism as a means of reinforcing their uniqueness to both themselves and to the tourist’ (Ryan 1991:156). According to Ryan therefore, host communities need to acquire particular social skills, which enable them to retain the best attributes of their culture and absorb those of the visiting culture and to be able to move with ease between those two worlds. Although Ryan argues that host communities need skills to absorb those attributes of the visitors they find appealing, he does not suggest that perhaps visitors could also retain the best attributes of their own culture and those of the culture of the host.

Ryan (1991:153) argues that over time, the presence of tourists changes the ambience and then the significance of an event, for the host community. Perhaps it is not change that tourism brings that is the problem, but the type of change, should it not support the host’s culture. He also argues that culture may not necessarily contain norms and values that should remain unchanged. ‘In the final analysis, it may be that those cultures that have modes of life that have meaning for their citizens will prove to have the tenacity to meet any challenge that tourism poses’ (Ryan 1991:153).

‘Treating culture as a natural resource or as a commodity over which tourists have rights is not simply perverse, it is a violation of the peoples’ cultural rights’ (Mathieson and Wall 1982:172). While some aspects of culture have wider ramifications than others, what must be remembered is that culture in its very essence is something that people believe in implicitly. ‘By making it part of a tourist package, it is turned into an explicit and paid performance and no longer can be believed in the way it was before’ (Mathieson and Wall 1982:172). No arguments were found, from the literature surveyed, that some people may not be aware of their culture and therefore they may not have a strongly held belief about what it should be like, or how it should be presented.
Hewison (in Ryan 1991:154) points out that myths of the past are created in a way we would like to see them, rather than the way it was. The myths contained in a culture presented to tourists may not be distinguished by subsequent generations. The ability of a host community to distinguish between real and contrived portrayals of their culture is important for that culture’s survival (Ryan 1991:154), particularly if there is a tradition of oral communication of culture. A challenge exists to ‘conceptualize communities as a complex process of stability and change, and then to factor in the changes tourism brings’ (Greenwood 1989:182) but tourism impacts cannot be measured against a static background.

2.4 Indigenous Australians

To identify those elements of Australian Indigenous people and culture that attract tourists, it is important to contextualise Australian Indigenous people and their culture.

2.4.1 Background

In 1996, the estimated resident population for the Australian Indigenous population was 372,052, which represents 2.0 per cent of the total resident population of Australia (Australian Bureau of Statistics 1997:6). Queensland has the second largest Indigenous population in Australia (Australian Bureau of Statistics 1997:6), the majority of which is located in Cape York Peninsula, North Queensland. Cape York Peninsula stretches from the west and north of Kuranda and Cairns, where the Djabugay reside, to the northern tip of Australia.

The Indigenous people of Australia are referred to by many different terms. The Commonwealth working definition of Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islander is as follows:

An Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander is a person of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent who identifies as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander and is accepted as such by the community with which he or she lives (Australian Bureau of Statistics 1997:5).
The way an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person would identify himself or herself may be different from the Federal Government’s definition. Historically, the South Australian Government classified some Aborigines as white people if they were considered to be of certain character and intelligence (Bourke et al 1998:41). Other State Governments also had “exemption” arrangements. Government laws defining Aboriginal identity have changed over the years depending on what policies the Government was trying to pursue and enact (McCorquodale 1997:24).

The terms used by various authors to refer to Indigenous Australians are diverse (see Table 2.4). Various disciplines, for example, history, law, education, arts and tourism, give different definitions of Aboriginality. The meanings of Aboriginality are therefore diverse, varied and contradictory (Fiske and Hodge and Turner 1987:126).

Table 2.4 – Terms used for Indigenous Australians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elkin</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Australian Aborigines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burchett</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Aboriginals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altman and Finlayson</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Aborigines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harron and Weiler</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Australian Aboriginals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altman</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Indigenous Australians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altman</td>
<td>1993(a)</td>
<td>Indigenous Australians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brim</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Australian Indigenous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Northern Development</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Indigenous people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Department of Tourism</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Indigenous communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clements and Rose</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Aboriginal people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeay</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Indigenous populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Tourism, Small Business and Industry</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Indigenous people of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollinsworth</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Australia’s Indigenous peoples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sourced from literature review)

The words “Aborigines” and “Aboriginals” used from the 1970’s to early 1990’s appear to be less popular and largely replaced with “Indigenous people” and “Indigenous Australians” from the early 1990’s. Indeed, Hollinsworth supports this argument with ‘In the 1990s the term Indigenous as in “Australia’s Indigenous peoples” is becoming widespread’ (1998:345). The term “Aborigine” is defined as the primitive inhabitants of a country (Delbridge and Bernard 1995). The connotation of the word “primitive” has been viewed as disrespectful and therefore negatively by Indigenous people amongst
others. This might explain their preference for the word “Indigenous” meaning originating in and characterising a particular region or country (Delbridge and Bernard 1995). The definitions and meaning attached to “Aborigine” and “Indigenous”, to some degree, provide an argument that the word “Indigenous” is gaining prominence over the words “Aborigine” or “Aboriginal”. This may change over time as ‘identity is always incomplete or in the process of formation’ (Hollinsworth 1998:66).

In Australia, Aboriginal communities specifically relate to the traditions associated with their local area (Ballantyne 1995:15). Therefore, relevant literature regarding Australian and particularly Djabugay Indigenous culture was reviewed.

2.4.2 Australian Indigenous Culture

Mathieson and Wall (1982:158) define the term “culture” in tourism literature as ‘behaviour as observed through social relations and material artifacts’ which includes ‘patterns, norms, rules and standards which find expression in behaviour, social relations and artefacts’. Giddens (1993:57) describes it as ‘Culture consists of the values held by a given group, the norms they follow and the material goods they create’. Culture can incorporate art, literature, music, dance, ways of life of members of a society (the way they dress, their family life and customs, language) and goods produced that are meaningful for them (Giddens 1993:31). Richardson (1996:333) concurs to a large degree with Giddens by defining culture as ‘the basic beliefs, values, symbols and artefacts created by a society and handed down from generation to generation’.

Historically, 700 Indigenous tribes spoke greater than 250 languages throughout Australia (Bottoms 1999:1). More recently, the Australian Bureau of Statistics (1995) found that Indigenous Australians speak an Indigenous language in Queensland, South Australia, Northern Territory and Western Australia. Yet, the Australian Bureau of Statistics (1995:4) found that 80 per cent of Indigenous Australians spoke English as their main language. The largest number of Aboriginal people identifying with a clan, tribal or language group were aged 45 years and over (65 per cent) and amongst rural residents (74 per cent) (Australian Bureau of Statistics 1995:4). The statistics seem to suggest that limited numbers of urban, under 45 year old Indigenous people would possibly not
Aborigines today often call themselves by the name of their language or territory group (Australian Info International 1989:Vi). “Djabugay” is the name of the language group of the Cairns rainforest region Aborigines. These Aborigines speak the Djabugay language and consist of five groups (Bottoms 1992:3). The five groups are the Djabuganydj, the Nyagali, the Guluy, the Buluwanydj, and on the coast, the Yirrganydj (Bottoms 1992:3). Communication and interviews with the Djabugay community disclosed how four of the five groups refer to themselves. The Djabuganydj, Nyagali, Guluy and Buluwanydj refer to themselves as the ‘the Djabugay’ and the Yirrganydj refer to themselves as the ‘the Yirrganydj’.

Aborigines may also identify themselves according to the State or Territory they come from by using a general term like Murri (Queensland and northern New South Wales), Koori (Victoria and New South Wales), Nunga (southern South Australia), Nyungar (southern Western Australia) or Yolgnu (Arnhem Land) (Hollinsworth 1998:346). “Murri” is the word now used to identify Aboriginal people from Queensland (Horton 1994:738). The Djabugay people sometimes refer to themselves as “Murris” in a similar vein to “Brisbane-ites”, from the City of Brisbane, also calling themselves Queenslanders and Australians.

Oral tradition differentiates many Indigenous societies from those societies relying on the written word (Evans 1994:836) and the Australian Indigenous people’s culture is strongly based on oral tradition. Knowledge and information is passed down through the generations by telling stories. The Djabugay explain the earth’s origin through stories that deal with the creation of the universe and its inhabitants. ‘The telling of a creation story is the occasion of a re-creation, a re-presentation, a confirmation of the essential relations between BAMA (people of the rainforest) and BULMBA (the Djabugay’s homeland), the people and their world, their country, their homeland’ (Bottoms 1992:4-5).

The knowledge of the relationship between Aborigines and their homeland and its use is passed on by the Aborigines, as part of their ‘cultural and spiritual heritage’ (Clements
and Rose 1996:61) and they therefore ‘have a strong sense of place’ (Hall 1995:247). Aboriginal land may be used traditionally (hunting and gathering, ceremonies) and non-traditionally (mining, tourism, pastoralism, conservation management) (Clements and Rose 1996:62). The non-traditional use of their land may partially or totally disrupt traditional use. In some circumstances, they may not enter the land at all to carry out traditional practices, or be restricted by what they may do and where.

It is generally believed that the Australian Indigenous people were nomadic (Rowley 1970:19). Djabugay speakers were not, however, considered to be nomadic people. They did not need to travel far for food as the river and mountains where they lived provided life sustaining food. The Djabugay’s activities were regulated by the seasons and the changes brought about by each season (Bottoms 1992:7). Tribes would come together when there was an abundance of food sources. At the same time, ceremonial rituals would take place and disputes would be officially settled (Bottoms 1992:7).

The Djabugay were able to procure vegetable foods and flesh foods for their sustenance. They were knowledgeable about material culture ensuring survival as hunters and gatherers and about how to make weapons, traps, tools, utensils, shelters, the techniques for hunting various types of game and for preparing a diversity of food-stuffs (Bottoms 1992:7). Most Djabugay members now live in towns or villages where they buy food from convenience stores or supermarkets.

Australian Indigenous culture is far more complex and diverse (Zeppel 1998a:1) than commonly accepted and far too complex to be explained in detail here. ((See for example, Rowley (1970), Berndt and Berndt (1988), Cowan (1992), Edwards (1997), Hiatt (1996)). Acknowledgement of this complexity is essential if tourism impacts are to be fully recognised but first it is important to identify what is meant by tourism.

2.5 Tourism

2.5.1 Background

Tourists are those people who leave their usual residence to visit another location, whether in their own country or a different country. Tourism is about people being away
from their own homes and work, on short term, temporary visits, for particular tourism purposes (Davidson 1989:2) such as ‘leisure, recreation and holiday’ (Reisinger 1994:743).

Tourism represents the world’s largest single industry and can generate a large proportion of revenue for a country’s economy (Mowforth and Munt 1998:189). Worldwide, 450 million international tourist arrivals generated receipts of $278 billion in 1991 (Survival nd:1). The World Tourism Organisation forecasts that there will be 600 million international arrivals worldwide by the year 2000 (Mowforth and Munt 1998:93). In Australia, over 1.85 million international tourists visited Queensland and they spent $2.4 billion of the $7.7 billion generated in 1995 (Department of Tourism Small Business and Industry 1996:35). Domestic tourists spent the balance of $5.3 billion in Queensland in 1995.

The tourism industry in Australia is growing (Craig-Smith and French 1994:167) and as such, provides an important revenue-generating industry for Australia. The Federal and State Governments of Australia acknowledge tourism as a major growth industry suggesting tourism should be vigorously promoted (Mercer 1994:128). In the State of Queensland, tourism is important economically as it contributes to 10 per cent of the Gross State Product (Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation 1996:2) and represents Queensland’s second largest industry employing approximately 122,000 people (Department of Tourism Small Business and Industry 1996:35). As well as revenue, tourism provides employment in areas such as accommodation, food services, infrastructure, transport, travel and tour services and retailing (Lickorish and Jenkins 1997:2).

Views about the future of tourism are that it is likely demand will increase, domestically and internationally, and more countries will participate in the international tourism market (Holden 1994:851), as more countries become industrialised (Craig-Smith and French 1994:164).

The following section briefly overviews the diverse range of descriptors used for the various categories of tourism.
2.5.2 Categorisation of Tourism

There are various categorisations of tourism. They include mass tourism, alternative tourism, special interest tourism, ecotourism, Indigenous cultural tourism, cultural tourism and ethnic tourism. Tourism categorisations and the definitions of such categorisations vary enormously (Mowforth and Munt 1998:98). The literature defines and examines the different categorisations of tourism (Harris and Howard 1996, Richardson 1993) and/or its impacts on Indigenous people (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission and The Office of National Tourism 1997, Harron and Weiler 1992). However, the categorisation of tourism is not at all insightful when it comes to impact analysis and evaluation. There is no mention of whether a host community or Indigenous community themselves define different types of tourism, or whether they view them as one and the same. Therefore the categorisations of tourism will not be dealt with specifically as they do not engage with the focus of this thesis. The motivation of a tourist to visit Indigenous Australians may provide an insight into how tourists might impact on them, positively and/or negatively.

2.5.3 Motives for Visiting Indigenous Australians

There are numerous motivations for tourism, some of which are outlined below, primarily with regard to a tourist’s motivation to meet Indigenous people and/or to experience their culture.

Some sections of the international community have always been aware of Australia’s Indigenous population and such awareness may have provided a motive for tourism. Burchett (1993:21) argues that the international community’s awareness of Indigenous people in Australia was heightened with the advent of land rights. Whether or not this is the case, Burchett further argues that when international demand for Indigenous tourism rose, the tourism industry was keen to meet that demand.

Regardless of land rights issues, demand by international visitors for a cultural experience with Aboriginal people on their homelands is increasing (James 1996:15). The Australian Office of National Tourism (1997) documented that approximately 380,000 international visitors to Australia visited Indigenous sites and attractions in 1995. Tourists from Hong
Kong and Indonesia want to meet Aboriginal people and learn about Aboriginal culture; the Japanese tourists fancy seeing Aboriginal art and the Germans wish to ‘see native/Aboriginal people’ (Hudson 1993:67). It appears that it is the Aboriginal people and the representations of their culture that is sought by overseas visitors, therefore possibly providing the catalyst for cultural revival and/or maintenance or its commercialisation.

The unique culture of an Indigenous community provides an attraction and reason to travel. The purpose of international tourism is to sell culture and countries to those with a different culture (Crick 1991:11, Davidson 1989:165). Culture is a motivator for travel (Mathieson and Wall 1982:158) as people are fascinated by how others live, their customs and their culture (Craig-Smith and French 1994:126). ‘Culture is shown to be a major determinant in the attractiveness of a destination for tourists…’ (Hall 1995:251).

Visitors engage in tourism for various reasons. Cohen (1974) claims that the tourist seeks pleasurable experiences through the novelty of cultures different from his/her own. Tourists from developed countries seek escape from ‘uniformity and complexity’ and hope to find ‘the exotic and the simple’ (Turner and Ash 1976:130). It is believed the exotic and simple is found in cultures that are different from the home culture (Turner and Ash 1976:130, Graburn 1989:36). The tourists’ home country might contain its own diverse cultures other than the dominant culture of the country. Turner and Ash (1976) and Graburn (1989) do not specify whether a tourist seeks a culture different from their dominant culture and/or other cultures in their country.

Graburn (1989:22) argues that the major characteristic of the tourism concept is one of recreation, to renew oneself from the working world. Graburn (1989) does not focus, however, on the tourist intent of finding a culture different to the dominant home culture, in another country. Perhaps a tourist travels to exotic locations to renew himself or herself and to experience a different culture, or one or the other.

Holden (1994:849), Harris and Leiper (1995:Xx) argue that demand for travel has risen because of demand for different types of experiences; increased disposable income and leisure time; access over greater distances via jet propelled aircraft; and awareness through the media. Graburn (1989:36, 848) argues that tourists of developed countries
are affluent and wealthier than developing nations, and are therefore able to travel to less developed countries. In such cases, an attractive exchange rate and/or anything that provides a new experience, whether or not it includes visiting Aborigines and experiencing their culture, may motivate tourists.

The ability of a destination to supply different experiences ‘is dependent upon a given community’s stock of natural, constructed and socio-cultural attributes which lend themselves to the satisfaction of tourist needs’ (Harris and Leiper 1995:Xx) and the ability of the tourist entrepreneurs and the Indigenous populations ‘to produce ever-more extravagant displays for the gullible observer who is thereby further removed from the local people’ (Urry1990:7). The more the traditions of local people are adapted for displays for the observer, the more the observers are removed from the authentic representations of local people. Such reasons for travel can cause positive and negative impacts on local people, which is the subject of Section 2.3.

The next chapter will discuss the Djabugay community, ethical considerations for this study and methodology.
3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The Djabugay community is an Indigenous Australian group whose traditional homeland is located in the rainforest region north west of Cairns, Queensland. Its members are involved in the representation and presentation of their cultural heritage to tourists, from a wide variety of international and national destinations, through the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park at Smithfield, Cairns, which was formerly the Tjapukai Dance Theatre located in Kuranda. The 25-acre Park showcases Tjapukai Aboriginal culture (see Appendix E) through a museum; history, creation and dance theatres; a traditional camp; and a retail area that encompasses an art gallery. Interaction between tourists and the Park’s employees produces, amongst other things, encounters with cultural difference, which encompasses variations and discontinuities in appearance, behaviour, belief and history between social groups.

To date, research in this area has mainly focussed on one group, namely the tourists about the tourists’ satisfaction at the Park (Moscardo and Pearce 1998, Pearce et al 1997). Research centring on the Djabugay community and tourism has examined impacts of tourism on the Djabugay (Altman and Finlayson 1992, Finlayson 1991a, 1992, 1995). Factors other than tourism may impact on Indigenous groups (Ryan 1991:146) which are taken into account in the current research.

Any attempt to undertake research with the Djabugay people themselves needs to be mindful of the history of colonialism and dispossession of Indigenous Australians which has left them as a socially and economically disadvantaged minority. One of the legacies of this ongoing disparity is that Indigenous people have been over-researched by non-Indigenous people in ways which have benefited the researcher but not those being researched (Muecke 1992, Goodall 1997). Consequently, contemporary researchers, especially non-Indigenous researchers may encounter understandable wariness and suspicion when researching Indigenous groups. Therefore, it was crucial in this study to ensure that Djabugay needs and concerns were kept in the foreground and the likely benefits of the study to them explained by the researcher from the outset through an ongoing process of consultation. The cultural and personal sensitivity called for, in
projects involving Indigenous people, are not simply passive sentiment but a mode of ethical engagement with them, which underpins research practices.

3.2 The Djabugay Community

The year 1997 was eventful for many Indigenous people of Australia. The Australian Government introduced a contentious legislative proposal (the 10-Point Plan) to limit native title claims under the Native Title Act 1993; the findings of an inquiry into ‘The Stolen Generation’ of Aboriginal children forcibly removed from their families, were released; it was the 30th anniversary of the successful 1967 referendum which empowered the Australian Federal Government to enact laws for Aboriginal people heralding a turning point in Aboriginal affairs; and a national Reconciliation Convention took place in Melbourne, Victoria. It was during this year that the researcher had an opportunity to pursue the study of tourism impacts on Indigenous Australians. Having regard for the importance of community ties for Aboriginal people, the researcher was fortunate to have previously developed personal associations with members of the Cairns Indigenous and non-Indigenous community and was well positioned therefore to seek to undertake research with the local Djabugay community.

The Djabugay people number approximately 900 throughout Australia (Duffin 1996:12). An estimated 700 of them live in the mountainous lush tropical forests in far north Queensland in three communities: Kuranda, Mantaka and Kowrowa, located northwest of Cairns (see Figure 1.1). An estimated six Djabugay families live at Mona Mona (known as ‘the mission’), which was previously a Seventh Day Adventist managed mission in the area. Kuranda, popularly known as the rainforest village, is approximately 20 kilometres northwest of the City of Cairns, on the Kennedy Highway, and is a key tourist attraction and service centre regularly visited by coach tours (see Figure 1.1). Kuranda and Cairns together provide the main services for the resident local communities. Mantaka and Kowrowa are primarily small housing developments with about 20 houses in each town, situated along the Barron River, and are located approximately five and seven kilometres northwest of Kuranda, respectively. They have few community or commercial facilities apart from community halls and a small general store in Kowrowa. At the time of the research, a secondary school was being built such that most Djabugay children will need
to travel no more than about four kilometres from their homes to attend school. This is closer than their present school in Cairns or Smithfield.

The historic lack of access to formal education for Indigenous Australians (Groome 1998) is evident amongst the nine Djabugay people identified as elders whose schooling usually ceased before completing the final years of primary school. Few Djabugay people are currently educated at a tertiary level, however, at least one Djabugay person had attained her undergraduate degree and four or five others were undertaking undergraduate studies. English is not always the first language of the Djabugay community. Clearly, variable levels of literacy and fluency in English have implications in regard to the selection of research methods such as questionnaires, which presupposes reading comprehension in English.

As Finlayson (1995:8-11) has noted, the employment opportunities for the Djabugay have been diminishing in agriculture and transport due to mechanisation and broader social changes. Currently, the main sources of paid employment for the adult Djabugay population are the tourism industry and the government. Typical employment in tourism at the Park in Cairns is in dancing, playing and demonstrating didgeridoo, story telling, cultural interpretation, and stage managing and customer services. Djabugay employees at the Park are predominantly male, about 3:1. The major government positions are in agriculture through the Federal Government labour employment program and as rangers in the Barron Gorge National Park, Cairns.

It is important to realise that the Djabugay are not only employed by the Park, but also have a financial interest in it through Buda:dji Aboriginal Development Association (BADA) which holds equity in the Park. This entity enables independent administration of the Park’s revenue. At the time of the study, a Djabugay elder was the Chairperson of BADA. In addition, the majority of the Djabugay community are members of the Djabugay Tribal Aboriginal Corporation (DTAC) which was established in 1992 under the Commonwealth of Australia’s Aboriginal Councils and Associations Act (1976) for the purposes of making land claims (Duffin 1996:12).
3.3 Ethical Considerations

Given the previously mentioned history of colonialism and the anthropological research associated with it, ethical issues are particularly important to consider in the area of Indigenous research. This is especially so within Australia in the current nexus of recognition of the Stolen Generation, politicization of native title issues, and a Federal Government sponsored policy of reconciliation with Indigenous Australians.

The first step in this research, therefore, was to have discussions with colleagues and those who work with Indigenous groups, and to review the relevant literature. University (James Cook University of North Queensland 1995) and the Centre for Indigenous Natural and Cultural Resource Management (CINCRM), Northern Territory University, ethics guidelines for the conduct of Aboriginal research were followed, as well. Following Fordham (1994:17-19) and McGarvie (1985:12-15), the researcher listed a number of cultural practices in regard to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. These were important for the researcher to be aware of in order to communicate with the Djabugay in a culturally sensitive manner. However, the researcher did not assume that Indigenous cultures are homogenous (Eades 1992:7, Malezer 1997:99), nor hermetically sealed off from other cultural influences in our increasingly global society. Therefore, not all practices identified by Fordham and McGarvie were necessarily pertinent to the Djabugay, yet can be manifest in other Australian Indigenous cultures. The practices identified found useful to varying degrees included:

- using silence when considering a question and answer;
- story telling as an important way of conveying information;
- perceiving time, distance or sequence in a holistic sense;
- gratuitous concurrence, that is, to agree to something as a matter of good manners while harbouring reservations.

A number of the major ethical issues dealt with in designing and implementing this study were: reciprocity; protocol; informed consent; confidentiality; and data access and ownership (Patton 1990:356-7).
Preliminary discussions with the Djabugay revealed that they had been exposed to cultural insensitivity and allegedly unethical research. Therefore, the researcher needed to establish her credibility and develop reciprocal ties with the Djabugay, if the research was to take place. In seeking research permission, the researcher committed to appropriate sharing of research output in consultation with the Djabugay, for instance, a ‘Plain English’ copy of the report supported by an oral interactive presentation could be given to the Djabugay. The possibility of reciprocity issues arising during the fieldwork was minimised because of the ongoing dialogue about such matters between the researcher and the Djabugay from the outset. The dialogue was enhanced by guidance given by a number of Djabugay people to the researcher with regard to cultural protocols.

Australian Indigenous communities in common with many traditional cultures, characteristically share the principle of reciprocity, so that if one person or group gives another person or group food, for example, then something is expected in return (Bourke and Edwards 1998:106). This was evident throughout the course of the study. For example, the researcher brought food to the Djabugay people at meetings and at their most recent encounter, a prominent elder asked Djabugay people to share their food with the researcher at the next meeting. Consideration of food was important given that the Djabugay elders conveyed to the researcher that it would be necessary for food to be available at meetings in order to ensure attendance. They explained it was difficult to forget that in earlier times in the missionary period they were often hungry.

When not visiting Cairns, the researcher maintained regular (fortnightly) written communication, often in the form of postcards, with the Djabugay which was supported by telephone calls in recognition of the importance of oral communication within the Indigenous community. Typically, many of these calls were personalised and covered issues about family members and community matters. Often, the research itself was not discussed in order to focus on fostering broader personal and community relationships with the Djabugay.

The Djabugay people recognise their links to the Djabugay traditional land as fundamentally important to their identity. The researcher, having attended school with many Djabugay people in the area was encouraged by the elders to stress her own links to the locality when seeking permission to do research. Also as a sign of respect, titles were
used to address people until, as relationships developed, the courtesy titles “Aunty” or “Uncle” were used for the elders, as is customary, regardless of a blood relationship (Bourke and Edwards 1998:113-4). The researcher was told that a Djabugay person becomes an elder after attaining the age of 60 years. She found that the elders have a major role to play in that they give advice and counsel to members of their community. For this reason, it was essential that the elders’ permission be given for the study.

In addition, an Indigenous friend (non-Djabugay) helped the researcher particularly by offering her home as a base, which enabled learning through discussions and observation. She also provided introductions to two Park managers, one Indigenous (non-Djabugay) and one non-Indigenous.

It is interesting to note that no-one asked for written credentials from the researcher but rather enquired about her personal ties to the area or its people. Two examples of this system of personal referral illustrate this point about gaining acceptance. Firstly, the researcher was able to gain acceptance to conduct an interview if she named an elder or relative that the respondent knew. Also, respondents themselves would encourage and support a potential respondent’s participation by telling them to give the interviewer their time. Secondly, most of the Park’s Indigenous employees interviewed asked her ‘Where do you come from?’ or ‘Do you know so-and-so?’ Answers to these questions, which established the researcher’s place of origin and local connections, were beneficial in establishing rapport with the respondents.

The researcher’s credibility was validated by the fact that she sought permission from the elders before approaching individuals within the community. Establishing personal ties, before approaching the business at hand, was important. The need for this sensitivity of approach has been shown to be necessary also for Indigenous researchers when researching their own or other Indigenous communities (Malezer 1997:102). The researcher encouraged all respondents and participants to ask questions whenever she met with the Djabugay people. For example, at the conclusion of interviews with Djabugay Park employees, the researcher invited respondents to ask questions at any time they saw her at the Park. Some people acted on this invitation.
Given the absence of regular communication between members of the various interest groups, the researcher found it was very important to obtain informed consent, whether it be oral or written to facilitate co-operation amongst participants. Respecting the oral heritage of Indigenous cultures where formal written agreements were not traditional, the researcher, in line with the example set by McClean et al, ‘… viewed the verbal agreement(s) as a contract’ (1997:11). This served to minimise any area of potential conflict between the Park’s respondents and their managers; the Djabugay respondents at work and at home in the community; and the elders and the balance of the Djabugay community. Formally, this entailed:

- four hours of interaction with Djabugay elders and family members concerning the study and the nature of their concerns;
- a written agreement from the Djabugay elders to proceed with the study;
- a written agreement from the Park’s Managing Director to go ahead with the research;
- a verbal explanation provided by the researcher to respondents and both meeting and workshop participants about the purpose of the study;
- arranging meetings with selected Djabugay members to discuss and evaluate the search workshop outline and seek feedback on the methodology;
- organising the production, approval and display of A4 sized colour posters which invited the Djabugay people to attend the workshop;
- providing an information sheet outlining: the researcher’s credentials; the guaranteeing of confidentiality, anonymity and security of data; the right of participants to withdraw from the study, at any stage, and contact details of the researcher.

No one refused to be interviewed, although one Djabugay person avoided being interviewed by giving reasons for having to do other things at the time on three occasions. Several respondents sought reassurance that what they divulged would not be conveyed to the Park’s managers. Guarantees were not made or sought by other Djabugay community members, but confidentiality was maintained, regardless.

3.4 Methodology
There is a plethora of texts which present a wide variety of research methodologies from which to select the most appropriate for a particular research project. From these texts, it would be easy to assume that the research process is linear, involving academic consideration of the topic, a choice of the best methodology and administrative planning followed by the execution and analysis of the project. Moreover, ethical procedures derived from positivist conceptions of research are neither easily adapted to, nor always relevant to, qualitative techniques (Winchester 1996:128). However, in this case it soon became apparent that whatever methods were chosen, they would need to be continuously rethought and redesigned in response to Indigenous concerns and to what was happening in the fieldwork situation.

As Walle argues, most tourism research lies on a continuum (1997:532) between positivist and interpretivist epistemological paradigms. This research is located towards the interpretivist end on this continuum in that it attempts to study social reality ‘from the inside’ by reconstructing in narrative form the lived-experience, motives and meanings of those who constitute or participate in that reality. This approach is at odds with those informed by positivist philosophy of science, which gives a privileged position of knowledge and represents social reality in the form of empirically verifiable, “law-like” propositions. This is almost exclusively a form of knowledge developed by “disinterested” experts, concerned primarily with investigating the patterns and uniformities of group behaviour in analogy with abstract systems like geometry. The weaknesses of this latter position in the social sciences have been effectively critiqued by a host of theorists (Mills 1959, Schutz 1967, Habermas 1968, Adorno 1976, Heidegger 1977, Giddens 1977, 1982, Derrida 1978, Foucault 1980). For the purposes of this study the researcher found the former tradition of an interpretivist approach to research grounded in the hermeneutic – phenomenological tradition more amenable to working with the Djabugay community.

In assessing ‘what the situation allows’ (Douglas 1976:8) and ‘cultural appropriateness’ (Berno 1996:393) for the present study, it was determined that access to Djabugay employees would be most appropriate at one of their most accessible places of employment: the Park. Permission to conduct research was granted by the Park’s managers. A recent methodological variant of the interpretivist tradition to which this study was closely aligned is that of participatory action research as it involves the active
collaboration of those being researched in the overall project (Stringer 1996:15). This was evident in the recognition of contingency and response to feedback within the research process, however, this research did not implement its findings and engage in a process of further research collaboratively with those being researched as in participatory action research.

3.5 The Research Design Process

The research design for an interpretivist methodology may incorporate a combination of various techniques such as participant observation; interviews; analysis of documents and artefacts (Yin 1994:78). To answer the research question for this study of how and why tourism impacts on the Djabugay, two research methods were initially adopted. These were participant observation and interviews (see Figure 3.1). Figure 3.1 represents the proposed research design that was planned at the outset and Figure 3.2 demonstrates how this design was applied in the Djabugay case study.

Participant observation was carried out at formal and informal social situations such as at homes, workplace, and meetings and was incorporated throughout the project. A detailed diary of the researcher’s observations of and interactions with the Djabugay people was kept. The interviews, which incorporated structured and open-ended questions in a ratio of approximately 25:75, were to be conducted with Djabugay elders, other Djabugay community members and Djabugay employees of the Park. This ratio fits with the qualitative orientation of the study as endorsed by Winchester’s argument that structured interviews have ‘… less significance in qualitative studies where interviews are being undertaken with not only consenting but interested, and sometimes locally powerful, adults’ (1996:128).

In particular, the research design had to be open-ended to allow for practical flexibility and contingencies of cultural difference. Endeavours were therefore made to design and incorporate culturally appropriate questions, the responses to which could be quantified to enable statistical analysis, as required, to support the qualitative themes and insights, which emerged through the interpretivist approach.

Figure 3.1: Map of Proposed Research Process
Complexity of interpersonal relationships with regard to cultural difference necessitates a research design, which can be responsive. Problems in developing collaboration with Indigenous individuals or communities were mentioned by colleagues but was not often mentioned in the tourism research literature. Carter (Carter and Yibarbuk 1997:290) initiated contact through writing to Aboriginal communities about herself and her experiences. Further, Carter and Yibarbuk argue that there is no rigid formula for establishing networks, but rather, that contact procedures ‘should be flexible and developed in conjunction with local people, as their needs require’ (1997:292).
Research permission was sought from the Djabugay community along two distinct avenues. Firstly, the Djabugay elders, who are ‘the most important and respected people within our community’ (Malezer 1997:102) were approached to seek permission to conduct research with themselves and their families. Secondly, permission was sought from the Park’s managers to interview all employees of the Park for research purposes. In the event of the Djabugay research permission being unattainable, contingency plans were also made to locate another Indigenous group that would be willing to be involved in the study.

A methodology had been planned initially to suit the Djabugay’s requirements as understood by the researcher. However, this plan had to be modified subsequently to accommodate the Djabugay’s revised requirements for a management plan utilising the researcher’s background in business research. The strategic options considered by the researcher in relation to the proposed modification included abandoning the study,
disregarding the Djabugay community’s request for a management plan or to find a compromise between the initial methodology and the Djabugay’s need for a management plan.

After some discussion, the researcher reached a compromise with the Djabugay by incorporating an interactive group process known as a search conference (Weisbord 1987:281) (hereafter referred to as the ‘search workshop’) into the research design (see Figure 3.2). The researcher concluded that this was reasonable and appropriate given the economic situation and aspirations of the community, and in recognition of the cultural obligations of reciprocity and of the trust and information being granted to her by those Djabugay people whom she subsequently observed and interviewed. A flexible approach was therefore necessary and desirable in developing relationships with members of the Djabugay community that began with an intensive preparation phase.

Marvin Weisbord argues that search workshops ‘… search out desirable futures together’ and promote ‘dignity, meaning and community’ through interactive processes, which access peoples ‘thoughts, ideas, perceptions, attitudes and reactions’ (1987:293-4). Participants work towards agreeing on what their future together will be and may therefore commit to taking action for the achievement of that future. This approach particularly appealed to the Djabugay people who had indicated to the researcher that they were eager to see their community make its own choices for its future, rather than being beholden to external government agencies.

One particularly pertinent aim of a search workshop, as advocated by Weisbord, is for its use as an aid at a turning point when participants are unsure about what next to do (1987:285). The Djabugay themselves were at a turning point with regard to the prospective amalgamation of seven Aboriginal Corporations, two of which were DTAC and BADA. They were looking for alternative choices to the amalgamation and that may have been the impetus for the idea of a management plan.

The structure of the workshop typically includes a range of activities that build upon one another to find out about the past, present and the future. For example, history is looked at first; then the sort of ‘events, trends and developments’ which will shape the future; the things that the organisation feels good or bad about now; and detailed future scenarios
(Weisbord 1987:284). Based on the findings of the pilot workshop, the researcher customised this methodology to suit the Djabugay community by only focusing it on history, the current situation and the future they were seeking.

3.6 The Research Experience

3.6.1 Preparation and Planning

The initial preparation and planning phase began with a review of existing literature to investigate any previous studies with the Djabugay community. At the same time, those who had worked with or had contact with Indigenous people were contacted and asked for referrals, introductions and/or sources of information regarding appropriate approaches.

Preparatory activities involved developing a list of Djabugay and other contacts that provided a network of potential respondents; and, through reviewing the literature and communicating with other researchers, investigating Aboriginal cultural mores that might be important to know about when researching within the Djabugay community. The lists of contacts and cultural practices, which were not always exclusively Djabugay practices, were updated and vetted before each field trip and this information assisted the researcher with regard to culturally sensitive behaviour and language.

3.6.2 Reconnaissance Trip

Once preparatory materials and sources had been thoroughly investigated, a reconnaissance trip was made in April 1997 to establish contact and links with the Djabugay community and other appropriate individuals. Specifically, the researcher aimed to meet the chosen representatives of the Djabugay community, find out how to get research permission, meet Djabugay elders, visit some of the Park’s managers and employees and observe the Park’s operations. In addition, she planned to make enquiries about any other Indigenous group that may be keen to participate in a study of tourism impacts, and to learn about Indigenous cultures and protocols for research purposes.
At the Park, the researcher made enquiries and was then introduced to one of the Djabugay community representatives, who was a member of DTAC. As a result of this introduction, the community representative then arranged for the researcher to meet his spouse, who was also one of the Djabugay community’s representatives, and a member of DTAC. Given that both these representatives held executive positions in DTAC, it was understood that DTAC itself was supportive of the research. The subsequent informal meeting with this individual took the form of a free ranging and lengthy (that is, three hours) discussion in a local Kuranda café, The Strangled Mango. Through listening and asking, the researcher was able to learn about protocols such as how to meet the elders and whether the Djabugay might be interested in the research proposal, before handing a copy of the draft research proposal to this community representative.

On the last day of the seven-day trip, one last visit was made to the Park. Whilst there, the community representative introduced the researcher to a Djabugay elder. The Djabugay elder was given a copy of the draft research proposal and advised that the proposal could be amended or changed by the researcher so that it incorporated the concerns of the Djabugay people.

Whilst in Cairns, the researcher was alerted to the fact that the Djabugay people are regularly requested to attend numerous meetings by the North Queensland Land Council (NQLC), the Park, the Cairns City Council and others. Typical meetings are about native title claims; amalgamation of seven Aboriginal corporations; facilities at the mission; DTAC and BADA agenda items; and the Park’s Board issues. Fortunately the researcher was welcome to attend some of these meetings as an observer. They proved to be a valuable source for informing her about the life of the Djabugay community. However, for the Djabugay themselves the frequency of these meetings appeared to have left them with ‘meeting fatigue’. This is evidenced by the fact that the elders have appointed two Djabugay members to be the public face of the Djabugay people. Therefore, the researcher learnt that the research design would need to avoid exacerbating this ‘meeting fatigue’ by minimising the use of and request for meetings.
3.6.3  Research Permission Trip

Before a second trip to Cairns in July 1997, during which permission to perform the research was sought, the researcher phoned the Djabugay elder and a community representative about the possibility of undertaking research within their community. The researcher was asked to prepare a letter to the Djabugay community outlining the benefits to them of such research. A letter was prepared and faxed to them and circulated to members of the community by the Djabugay community representative. Subsequently, the researcher was advised by telephone that she would need to speak to the community in person, to seek research permission.

The organisation for holding such a meeting was complex as it involved selecting and hiring a meeting venue; transporting participants; providing sustenance; and informing participants of a meeting time and place. This was compounded by the fact that the researcher’s institutional base on the Sunshine Coast, Queensland was located some 1400 kilometres from Cairns, requiring long-distance communication. The organisational tasks required for the meeting were undertaken jointly between the researcher, a Djabugay elder and a Djabugay community representative. The success of this close collaboration was made possible by the relationships already established between the researcher and the Djabugay people. The means of communication between the researcher and the Djabugay had to be varied and adaptable because of changing circumstances. For example, an elder ceased to have a telephone connection during the latter stages of the study and the researcher’s facsimiles had to be sent to a third party and await collection. The importance of word of mouth communication could not be overlooked. For example, a Djabugay elder was instrumental in assisting the researcher by telling the community about the workshop and appealing to its members to attend.

The meeting was held at Kowrowa Hall, which was chosen by the community representatives and elders because of its close proximity to the majority of Djabugay households, many of which do not have an independent means of transport. For the same reason and because the Djabugay people appeared to be comfortable in and around it, the Kowrowa Hall was chosen by the researcher for the search workshop.
Twenty Djubugay people including some elders and their families attended the meeting. The Djubugay attendees required an explanation as to the reasons for and the subject and timeframe of the research proposal. Questions asked of the researcher included, ‘How long will you commit yourself to us?’ The researcher asked the Djubugay people about their involvement with tourism, whether or not tourism had any impacts on them and their concerns with regard to such matters. Many concerns were raised such as remuneration for their work in the Park and Djubugay representation in the composition of the Park’s workforce. These initial concerns formed the basis of the type of questions asked at later interviews with Djubugay elders and the Park’s employees.

The process of four hours of discussions, deliberations and questions about Djubugay concerns was fruitful in that permission was unanimously granted to the researcher to conduct the study. This was particularly welcome news to the researcher given the elders were known to have previously refused such permission in other cases. It is surmised that the researcher’s previous links with the Cairns community assisted with the gaining of permission.

3.6.4 Sensitivity to Contingencies

The advantages of being open and responsive to the contingencies of difference were soon to be realized by the researcher. Five days after receiving approval for her proposal, the researcher participated in a BADA meeting where the Chairman declared that the researcher was going to undertake a management plan for the Djubugay people. This was no minor modification. She was faced with the dilemma of having received approval to study tourism impacts only to have the emphasis of the research shifted to assistance with a management plan. The original intention was to develop and provide baseline information that could be utilised in a management plan.

To gauge the meaning of a ‘management plan’ to the Djubugay community, meetings were organised by the researcher with the BADA Chairman and, at another time, the Djubugay community representative. Both Djubugay members had different definitions of a management plan. One was for how to expand participation in tourism opportunities. The other was for a strategic direction for DTAC and BADA for the next five to ten years.
There was no evidence of bad faith in this change requested by the Djabugay. Rather, it appears to be a case of differing expectations where the researcher had to re-negotiate the situation through improvisation. This unexpected development challenges the standard norms of social research where ‘social life appears to be regulated by clear-cut, uniformly shared programs for behaviour’ (Rosaldo 1993:92), whereby one can simply clear up ambiguities with more detailed verbal explanations. The researcher felt that in this case any attempt to impose her original understanding of the research proposal could risk being seen as a violation of trust on her part, possibly resulting in scepticism about her intentions and commitment to the Djabugay.

The change in focus required adaptability and restructuring of the research design. Therefore, the initial research design was varied to include a pilot study of a search workshop to test its suitability as a methodology for the Djabugay people in response to the Djabugay request for a management plan (see Figure 3.2). The researcher had previous experience in facilitating search workshops in the past and determined that such a method was appropriate for the Djabugay community and their needs. It became in effect an additional research technique at the behest of the researched themselves. Accordingly, permission was sought from the Djabugay elders to conduct a search workshop, so that a ‘preferred future’ (Weisbord 1987:291) and tourism impacts on their community could be elicited. The outcome of the search workshop would be an action plan, devised by the researcher, that would be sent to the Djabugay elders for their community’s use and as a base for a management plan, should they wish to use it for such a purpose.

Whilst securing permission to conduct the workshop, the Djabugay elder advised that research permission had already been given by the elders, and that the researcher could proceed in whatever manner she considered appropriate. Having had the process and outcome explained by telephone and a letter, the elder fully endorsed the search workshop as a methodology for his people.

A search workshop was incorporated into the final stage of the responsive research design (see Figure 3.2). It was chosen because the Djabugay community representative had advised the researcher that the Djabugay people had participated in workshops in the past and felt that they were effective because they allowed full participation and in small
groups, people would contribute more. A workshop fulfilled the Djabugay elders’ wishes of getting their people together as a group. It also provided a research method they were familiar with; enabled them to contribute to their ‘desired future’ and the outcome of an action plan was useful for the development of a management plan that identifies the Djabugay’s vision for the future and ways of achieving it.

It was decided by the researcher that there was no longer a need to interview the Djabugay elders individually as they would be attending a search workshop along with their families. Their input would be fully gathered from the search workshop. However, the Park’s Indigenous employees, a Djabugay elder and a community representative who collaborated with the researcher in gaining research permission because of their acknowledged roles within the community, were still to be interviewed individually.

3.6.5 Pilot Study: Search Workshop

Following the reconnaissance trip, the researcher was asked by one of her Indigenous contacts in Cairns to carry out a search workshop in Brisbane on another project that involved Indigenous participants. The objective of such project was to establish an economically independent enterprise focussed on holistic healing programs for Indigenous Australians. This offered the opportunity to incorporate this search workshop as a pilot study for assessing its methodological feasibility and further refinement of the research design. It proved invaluable for conducting the search workshop with the Djabugay people. Although the Indigenous participants were not Djabugay, the researcher understood that communication with Indigenous people within a search workshop experience would elicit relevant responses and advice that would enhance refinement of the design.

The pilot workshop (see Figure 3.2) was conducted on 16 and 17 August 1997 with an Indigenous elder and community leaders, and non-Indigenous participants, to provide information as to whether a search workshop was feasible when researching amid, across and between cultural differences. Feedback forms were designed by the researcher and distributed to all participants. The forms completed by Indigenous participants were analysed to gain insights into how to mould the search workshop to suit the Djabugay’s
needs. The framework of the pilot workshop was then adapted and enhanced for a search workshop with the Djabugay participants in September 1997.

Adaptations from the pilot study for the Djabugay search workshop included increasing participant numbers by encouraging the Djabugay elder and community representative to personally invite community members and designing a poster that invited Djabugay community members to attend the workshop. Papers for participants to be read before the workshop were not to be circulated, as such papers were not read prior to the pilot workshop. Malezer (1997:100) expresses a similar view with regard to written materials when researching Indigenous cultures.

The flexibility of the program was to be maintained as this was commented on as a very positive feature of the workshop. It was found that no audio-visual materials were needed as pilot workshop participants paid scant attention to them. Verbal practical examples would be necessary to illustrate what was required for each task. A shorter timeframe was necessary for the desired future, perhaps one to three years, as participants found it difficult to determine a future five years ahead.

3.6.6 Search Workshop

Weisbord (1987:285-6) proposes a series of guidelines for organising a search workshop. Two to three days should be set aside as half a day is not recommended and three days is most productive. Thirty to sixty people should be gathered as twelve people are considered too few and 100 people is feasible, but difficult. Sequential task building strategies should be designed and participants are to be engaged in a series of structured tasks.

The researcher adapted these guidelines to conduct a two-day workshop with 20 Djabugay community members. In this instance, the process involved listening to the Djabugay elders’ history and then asking younger Djabugay people to talk about 1997 and the issues that they felt their community faced. All participants were asked to discuss the future that they wanted in a two to three year timeframe. However, the researcher observed that the daily struggles with issues of family, housing, health and education seemed to render impossible the achievement of a desired future state. Nevertheless, the
Djabugay participants had firm ideas about what was important to them and what goals they had for the future, although not time related. The outcome was an Action Plan of what the Djabugay goals are, how they will be achieved and a structure to attain the stated aims, and the identification of a number of tourism impacts (see Appendix A).

3.7 Findings about the Research Method

A pivotal feature of the methodology was in its requirement for the researcher to develop and maintain local knowledge and social networks and to incorporate these into the research design in a flexible and responsive way. Firstly, it began with the initial intensive planning and preparation phase that involved the researcher learning about the Djabugay community, through discussions and surveying relevant literature. This sensitised her to the different cultural nuances and practices that she might encounter in the field and gave her an awareness of the diversity of Australian Indigenous cultures. This approach is similar to that advocated by McClean et al where research with Indigenous communities ‘should be undertaken in the spirit of partnership’ (1997:9).

Secondly, the reconnaissance trip provided an opportunity to begin the practical work of building social networks in order to gauge the feasibility of the proposal to study tourism impacts with the Djabugay community or another Indigenous group. The researcher found that by staying with an Indigenous family (non-Djabugay), she gained favourable access to several Djabugay people. The knowledge gained from this trip enabled the researcher to prepare an initial research design that incorporated interviews and participant observation (see Figure 3.1).

Thirdly, a second trip was made by the researcher to seek research permission from the Djabugay elders and their families at a prearranged meeting with them. During this trip, the researcher identified a lack of regular ongoing communication between the various parties who were to be involved in the field research. Such a finding alerted the researcher to the possibility that there was not a clearly identifiable dialogue or debate within the Djabugay community about the nature of tourism impacts.

Following the granting of permission to conduct the study an unexpected request emerged for a management plan to be provided by the researcher. This represented a challenge to
the initial research design although the request for this revision was not in retrospect, given that the researcher had asked the Djabugay for their input into the research proposal, allowances having been made for contingencies from the outset. It resulted in the subsequent modification of the research design to include a search workshop with which the researcher had experience through her business background. Such adaptability was possible because there was no third party, such as a funding body, requiring that the original research design envisaged could not be varied (Aberdeen 1995).

Fourthly, the researcher felt it was necessary to pilot the search workshop (see Figure 3.2) to assess its suitability in a Djabugay context. This was conducted with another Indigenous group in Brisbane and although it was understood that they might have different cultural practices to the Djabugay, it was anticipated that adaptations from the pilot could be made to suit the Djabugay.

Fifthly, the planning for the search workshop with the Djabugay had to take place over a distance of 900 kilometres. Means of communication were important to enable the researcher to enlist the support of the Djabugay community representatives in organising this event. While the researcher had at her disposal telephone, facsimile and e-mail, this appeared not to be the case for the Djabugay. Allowances had to be made for the additional time that was required for telephone messages to be conveyed; facsimiles to be collected for members of other Djabugay households; mailing letters; and the relaying of information generally.

Sixthly, drawing upon the findings of the pilot study, the researcher identified a number of ethnocentric assumptions apparent in the search workshop advocated by Weisbord (1987). While his approach suggests a universal applicability, the researcher found the process, including the sequential task building strategies, had to be adjusted according to the concerns and material circumstances of the participants involved. These adjustments drew upon the researcher’s localised knowledge of the Djabugay community, which she had developed throughout the various stages of the study. In addition, although not discussed by Weisbord (1987), the researcher found that in order to conduct the workshop, its facilitator needed to possess the skills that made participants feel at liberty to contribute without fear of retribution; that no response is wrong; and that every
contribution is valuable. The researcher chose this form of enquiry in order to avoid the exacerbation of meeting fatigue, discussed earlier.

3.8 Conclusion

While it is important to plan any research work, particularly for research involving Indigenous communities, it became apparent in this case that the most important thing to plan for is contingency and this requires a disposition of cultural sensitivity and responsiveness. Such responsiveness is only possible if the researcher is prepared to work collaboratively with and be responsible to those with whom they are researching. In practice, this means being flexible enough to change basic research plans, as and when the circumstances demand. The final research design in this case reflected the need for community-specific methods for the Djabugay people and was deemed to be the most appropriate because it met the needs of all concerned and fulfilled reciprocal obligations.

The research design used for the Djabugay community could be instructive when constructing a research design for researching within Indigenous communities or cultures. The methods adopted within this primarily phenomenological research paradigm might also be reconfigured to suit another Indigenous community’s needs and their particular cultural context, provided the basic emphasis upon context-specific contingency remains more important than a formula-driven approach to research.

The next chapter details the results of this study in order of trips made to Cairns throughout 1997.
4.0 RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to detail the results of the research, based on the flowchart of research methods used in Figure 3.2 (refer to Section 3.5). Section 3.5 contains two figures outlining the proposed research process (see Figure 3.1) and the actual research process as applied in the Djabugay case study, and Figure 3.2 illustrates the latter.

The research process actually occurred in a flexible and cumulative manner whereby information obtained from initial interviews and observation studies was used to assist in the formulation of a search workshop and subsequent interviews with managers and Djabugay employees at the Park. Therefore, as each research visit took place, the findings from that visit provided foundation information for subsequent research visits. The key themes that emerged from the data from the reconnaissance trip, and which were often reiterated in subsequent trips, include confusion over Djabugay equity in the Park, whether the Djabugay are managers at the Park and their employment conditions at the Park and elsewhere. Other relevant themes included the lack of Djabugay community resources, a lack of consultation with the Djabugay with regard to the use of their culture and issues regarding ethical research.

4.2 Reconnaissance Trip: 26 April to 2 May 1997

Numerous interviews were conducted by the researcher on this visit but there were six people, in particular, who provided pertinent information regarding, broadly, the impacts of tourism on Indigenous Australians and/or on the Djabugay community. They were Djabugay employees at the Park; an Indigenous non-Djabugay Park employee; a non-Indigenous Park manager; a Djabugay elder and a Djabugay community member. The following summation represents the results of such interviews.

4.2.1 Individual Interviews

There is a perception that the Djabugay people cannot fill the Park’s management positions in the foreseeable future and their ability therefore to manage the Park when
they become major shareholders. One Djabugay Park employee believes the Djabugay employees need training in management practices and hopes that the Djabugay will own the Park outright in ten years time. However, he is concerned that ten years is not sufficient time for the Djabugay to learn what is needed to manage the Park. Reference was again made about the lack of Djabugay Park employees equipped to undertake managerial roles, although they are trained in other areas. This interviewee, a non-Indigenous Park employee, said that Park managers are hoping to bring the Djabugay through into managerial ranks in the long term and that at the moment managers are non-Indigenous and non-managers are Indigenous.

With regard to the background of Park employees, another Djabugay Park employee stated that there were no other Aboriginal employees other than those from the Djabugay community but this is not the case (see Section 4.3.1). Actually, this person was the only Djabugay respondent who consistently held perceptions in contrast to those of his community.

Perceptions of employment conditions, in regard to equal pay emerged as an issue. A Djabugay community member believes that Djabugay rangers are not paid as much as other equally qualified non-Djabugay rangers. Such perception is inconsistent with a Djabugay Park employee who commented that Djabugay rangers who show tourists Djabugay rock art in Kuranda are paid the same as non-Indigenous rangers. This person was mentioned in the previous section for holding opposing views to those of his community.

The overriding concerns expressed by the Djabugay community were that there are insufficient employment opportunities and a lack of managerial opportunities at the Park. These factors, as well as the absence of the selling of their art at the Park, may have been the impetus for some of the Djabugay community alluding to their desire for economic independence through alternative employment avenues. One of the Djabugay elders was certain that alternative employment opportunities would provide his people with positive economic impacts, which he had hoped the Park would provide, but he felt did not.

A Djabugay Park employee offered alternative employment strategies. He may have been aware of the Deed of Partnership (1995:31) (hereafter referred to as the “Deed”) between
the Djabugay and the Park disallowing cultural activities that compete with the Park. The employee’s alternative: backpacker tours through Kuranda, where backpackers learn about and view Djabugay rock art. Even though he makes boomerangs, spears, shields, body paint colours and gunyahs (humpies), he did not mention them as alternative tourism strategies for his community. Such cultural activities are disallowed by the Deed to be practised by the Djabugay community (see Section 4.3.2).

The Djabugay community expressed concerns that its own art is not displayed or sold at the Park. A non-Djabugay Aboriginal employee at the Park said the paintings for sale in the retail area, which contains an art gallery, are sourced Australia-wide but no mention was made of Djabugay art. When asked on another occasion whether Djabugay art was displayed and sold at the Park, the same person answered in the affirmative, which is contrary to what the Djabugay believe. Therefore, although a Park employee believes and states that Djabugay art is sold at the Park, members of the Djabugay community disagree.

Cultural themes emerged including the difficulty of Indigenous and non-Indigenous cultures working together; the benefits of tourism for the Djabugay community and their culture and how powerful authorities can have an impact on the cultural practices of the Djabugay people. The following three paragraphs elucidate such themes.

The issue about the difficulty of two cultures working together arose. The non-Indigenous Park employee gave the example of a Djabugay Cultural Officer who used to work with the Park, and who used his authority with the Djabugay employees at work only to be ostracised for doing so when he went home in the evening to his community. She said that the Djabugay deal with each other in a consensual nature, rather than in an autocratic manner, by remarking, ‘Djabugay way is consensus, not autocracy’.

A Djabugay community member included as the positive impacts of tourism the revival of their culture, for example, the Djabugay language is now taught at Kuranda State Primary School, Kuranda State High School and Strathfield State High School (Bottoms 1999:93, Pulley 1998:37). More generally, when the decision was made to build a centre showcasing her community’s culture, the Djabugay community member was determined that her people should benefit economically and socially from participating in such a
venture. She negotiated a Heads of Agreement (hereafter referred to as the “Agreement”) between her people and the Park, to ensure the Djabugay would benefit from tourism. A Deed was also signed between her people and the other Park shareholders and both documents set out respective benefits and restrictions for all parties concerned.

Historically, authority figures such as government officials have had a powerful impact on the Djabugay people. For example, the Djabugay people were sent away from their family and traditional land if they were thought to be misbehaving because of federal and/or state government policies in place at the time (Bottoms 1999:60-1). The Djabugay community member said that as a consequence, they still find it difficult to speak up, for fear of retribution. For example, when the local council removed the seating under a mango tree in Kuranda where the Djabugay people used to meet, no protest was voiced officially by the Djabugay. Communication between her people takes much longer now as many of them live on the fringes of Kuranda and they do not have a convenient central location where they can gather freely.

One ethical issue that emerged at an early stage concerned the Djabugay being pestered by researchers and the dilemma of how not to make the same mistake. Apparently, researchers often approach the Djabugay about working with them. For example, one Djabugay Park employee has often told local researchers to ‘go away’ and he has had a negative experience with a particular researcher whom he describes as a ‘mad woman’. The Djabugay elders, however, “loved” another researcher because ‘she had been around for a while and is okay’. The Djabugay Park employee did not accept this researcher’s offer to ‘go away’ after mentioning negative encounters with researchers but instead set up an appointment for her to meet his partner the next day.

In regard to obtaining research permission from the Djabugay, a non-Djabugay Indigenous Park employee felt the researcher would probably have a better chance than someone from a non-Djabugay Indigenous community. He explained that it could be more problematic for an Indigenous researcher to get research permission from a tribe other than her own, than is the case for a non-Indigenous researcher.

The reconnaissance trip highlighted which Djabugay members were important to establish a relationship with in order to successfully gain research permission. The
information from individual interviews alerted the researcher to issues that the Djabugay were facing. These were expanded upon in meetings, individual interviews and observation studies in the permission trip.

4.3 Permission Trip – 25 June to 4 July 1997

In light of a general perception in the area that the Djabugay have been over researched, little output has appeared in the literature. In spite of this, research permission was granted to the researcher at a meeting with Djabugay elders and their family. The decision was unanimous in keeping with the consensual decision-making process of the Djabugay.

The following represents the outcomes of meetings, interviews and observation studies.

4.3.1 Meeting to Request Research Permission

Organising this meeting with the Djabugay community involved a prolonged series of letters, faxes, and telephone calls, in particular on the day before the meeting (see Section 3.6.3). The issues that emerged from the meeting were often similar to those highlighted on the reconnaissance visit. They included, for example, Djabugay dissatisfaction with the Park’s Managing Director, diminished voting rights at the Park and a lack of training for Djabugay employees. The Djabugay community were also concerned about their lack of resources; their perception of a lack of consultation with them over use of traditional land; and a lack of reciprocity from researchers.

The Djabugay elders and family members are disgruntled with the Managing Director of the Park. They believe he makes promises to them that are not kept. These views are reflected by remarks such as, ‘He makes promises to us but is not keeping them’ and ‘we are not getting what we were promised’. For example, the elders believe the Managing Director promised that the majority of the employees at the Park would be Djabugay people but believe they are not as they believe that the Park also employs other Indigenous people, Filipinos and others. The Djabugay had also been made promises in the past by government officials which were subsequently broken (Bottoms 1999:89).
Regarding share ownership in the Park, a Djabugay community member believes the Djabugay have the first option to buy any shares that are sold in the Park. One Djabugay community member said that the Djabugay could purchase a 28.4 per cent share in the Park, which accords with the Agreement, by selling their shareholding in Skyrail, a 7.5 kilometre cableway from Cairns to Kuranda, located next to the Park. There is no timeframe as to when this might happen, if at all. The Agreement specifies that the Djabugay community may acquire 100 per cent equity in the Park ‘over an agreed time period at fair market value’ (Holden and Duffin 1998:31). She also explained that the only power the Djabugay had at the Park was represented by a Djabugay Board member and a Yirrganydji Board member who get half a voting share each at board meetings (see Section 4.3.3 for elaboration on voting strength).

There is general dissatisfaction about employment conditions, for example, the issue of unequal wages for Djabugay rangers and Djabugay employees at the Park. The elders believe that even though all Park employees receive similar training, the Djabugay are paid less than others doing the same type of work. For example, they said ‘At Tjapukai Park the Djabugay are paid less than others doing same type of work even though they all have similar training’ and ‘Djabugay rangers are trained like European rangers but not being paid same amount of money when they start work at Barron Gorge National Park’.

The lack of training and employment at the Park is of concern to the Djabugay elders. They said that young Djabugay people working for the first time at the Park have no idea of what to do, how to do it and should have counselling if they need it and added, ‘they need someone to teach them’. It is their desire that someone at the Park teaches the young Djabugay people about these matters. They also want Djabugay Park trainees to obtain full-time employment at the Park at the end of their traineeship. They believe this does not happen and one of them said, ‘Djabugay youth are trained at Tjapukai Park, given a certificate, and then given no work’.

To create alternative employment, an elder told the participants that self-management is important and ‘it’s time to start now’. He said that the Djabugay could not rely on the Park and have to look after themselves. A management plan was desired by the elder so that they had a plan to expand tourism opportunities and perhaps have alternate and/or additional income opportunities (refer to 3.6.4). He is adamant that the Djabugay people
expand tourism on their own terms and that it be completely different from what is presented at the Park. He said, ‘We do something completely different, not with the Park. We do it ourselves’.

A lack of finances and resources is an issue for the Djabugay people. They assert that they cannot obtain Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander Commission funding, have no common meeting place, office, computer, finances or staff and are forced therefore to conduct business affairs and commerce with little supporting infrastructure. For example, one Djabugay community member has worked for her people for more than ten years for no recompense. She uses part of her home as an office. The elders also believe banks will not loan money to Indigenous Australians.

There is concern about the general lack of consultation with the Djabugay community about cultural issues and that the Park does not sell Djabugay art. An elder explained that a tour company takes tourists to ‘Bare Hill’ in the Davies Creek National Park that contains important galleries (Bottoms 1999:11). It is traditional Djabugay land, and the tour operator has not asked the Djabugay for permission to enter their land. The Djabugay elders believe that art displayed at the Park is not from Djabugay artists but is sourced Australia-wide. They are displeased that their art is not sold nor displayed. This is consistent with concerns expressed by other Djabugay community members (see Section 4.2.1).

Another ethical issue emerged when a Djabugay elder who complained that ‘many people write books all the time but do not help us and we never see them again’ alluded to the lack of reciprocity from researchers. The issue of many researchers wanting to work with Indigenous Australians also resurfaced when a Cairns solicitor mentioned to the researcher that there were researchers ‘running all over Cairns’ and that many Indigenous Australians were tired of them.

4.3.2 Individual Interviews

There was general uncertainty amongst the Djabugay community regarding the Djabugay’s equity in the Park. A Tjapukai Aboriginal Partners’ Newsletter (1997) describes the Park’s shareholders as presented in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1 Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park shareholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Shareholder</th>
<th>Background of Shareholder</th>
<th>Proportion of Equity (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Djabugay</td>
<td>Local rainforest Aborigines whose culture is used at the Park</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yirrganydji</td>
<td>Local coastal Aborigines</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman, D &amp; J and</td>
<td>1 non-Djabugay local Aborigine and non-Aborigines</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson, D &amp; C and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, T and Channer, D:</td>
<td>Tjapukai Dance Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nganydjin</td>
<td>Long term Aboriginal staff of old Tjapukai Dance Theatre in Kuranda</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyrail</td>
<td>Primarily non – Aborigines</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATSIC CDC</td>
<td>Government authority</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
ATSIC – Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission
CDC – Commercial Development Corporation

(Source: Tjapukai Aboriginal Partners’ Newsletter 1997)

Table 4.1 presents an overview of how much equity each shareholder owns in the Park. The proportion of ownership in the Park provides some insight into the degree of power and control each shareholder carries (see Section 5.2). But additional issues of power and control emerge because of the Agreement signed by the Park and the Djabugay community (see Holden and Duffin 1998:31-2).

The Park has negotiated an agreement with the Djabugay to pay the nine Djabugay elders involved with initial negotiations, $20,000 per annum for three years, to be reviewed after three years (Holden and Duffin 1998:31). The elders’ state that they have not been paid any money. A Djabugay community member stipulated that many elders do not have the funds for their own funeral, and the annual payment of $20,000 would provide such a social benefit. She said, ‘I think Uncle X is waiting for it for his funeral’.
Another issue to emerge regarding the Agreement is that a Djabugay community member believes it specifies that Djabugay people should be employed at all different levels at the Park. She said, ‘The Agreement states that Djabugay at Tjapukai Park should be at all levels’. She believes that this is not the case. The Agreement, however, does not specify such a condition.

The Djabugay people are upset with the Park’s Managing Director as their own community is not allowed to undertake cultural activities in Kuranda or surrounding areas, because of a Deed between the Park’s shareholders. One Djabugay elder said, ‘Whatever they got at the Park – dance, boomerang/spear throwing, bush food, didgeridoo playing – we can’t do up here’. This proved to be the case as the Deed between all the shareholders contains a non-competition section and part of clause 17.1 stipulates that all parties to the Deed agree:

‘(a) whether as owner, manager, shareholder, trustee, beneficiary, licensee, lessee or otherwise howsoever, conduct or be involved in any business or other activity which materially involves Indigenous dance or culture for tourist purposes which is in competition with the business of the Partnership; or

(b) engage in any conduct which will or will be likely to have the effect of materially adversely affecting the business of the Partnership,’ (Deed of Partnership 1995:31).

The only activity that is not in breach of clause 17.1 for the Djabugay is if DTAC design, produce and market clothing, particularly T-shirts (Deed of Partnership 1995:31). However, no Djabugay person mentioned an interest in manufacturing clothing throughout the duration of the research project.

There was a perceived need to establish employment alternatives, for economic and other benefits. The elders said busking is an alternative as Aboriginal buskers in Kuranda were making and sharing money that they were getting from tourists. Another employment alternative suggested by them was the possibility of having dancers perform in Kuranda. Some dancers could work at the Park when needed there. They were also keen to have female dancers, as they perceived that there was a demand for them by tourists. Other
employment alternatives suggested by the elders included driving tourists to Bare Hill to show them Djabugay cave art. The elders were also very keen to demonstrate bush food and medicines to tourists and taking them on tours to Mona Mona mission and building a gunyah there and making and supplying them with damper, tea and honey.

Again, the lack of community resources was mentioned, for example, the lack of transport options for the Djabugay community. The train between Kuranda and Cairns for tourists is relatively expensive and many of the Djabugay people do not have a car. Although one of them owns a bus and offers transport to his people, most Djabugay people would rather take taxis costing $35 per round trip to Kuranda because they can get to where they want to go when they want to.

The lack of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission funds was reiterated (see Section 4.3.1) although the Djabugay knew that the Federal Government had reduced the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission’s budget and other Aboriginal funding (Zeppel 1998a:5). Yet, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission gave BADA $40,000 to fund their negotiations with the Managing Director of the Tjapukai Dance Theatre. The funds were used to engage professional advisers to assist with such negotiations (Duffin 1996:14). Since then, a Djabugay community member insists it has been impossible to get Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission funding.

The issue of who a Djabugay person is was raised often. The definition of a Djabugay person can be problematic. Such definition of Djabugay people seemed important to two elders in particular who said ‘Djabugay are traditional people here. Historical people were those sent to Mona Mona mission run by Seventh Day Adventists, not from this area, not from this traditional land of the Djabugay’. So there was a distinction made between the Djabugay who came from the traditional land and those who were sent to the traditional lands of the Djabugay people, even though they are all called Djabugay BAMA, or people. A Djabugay community member reinforced the importance of the distinction, saying of historical people, ‘Historical people have adopted Djabugay culture – they do not know any other culture’. She explained that such distinctions cause rifts, for example, ‘when deciding on issues you stick to one or other group, and never cross over’ and she thought it would be better if all the Djabugay were referred to as one people, for example, Mona Mona people. Also, the distinction between historical and
traditional Djabugay people was becoming blurred over time because of intermarriage, further obscuring such distinction.

The issue of researchers, making a nuisance of themselves, was again referred to. One Djabugay interviewee, for example, talked about a researcher from Melbourne who had apparently been ‘pestering’ the Djabugay people and the NQLC to get the Djabugay to give research permission because she was qualified to do research. The Djabugay interviewee said of this researcher, ‘She has the wrong attitude – she does not even ask if she can do the research. She tells us she will be doing it’. Apparently, an arrangement was made for the researcher to meet the elders at the NQLC meeting to ask them for research permission. Nevertheless, research permission was not given to this person.

4.3.3 Observation Study

Again, problems between the Park’s managers and the Djabugay were exposed, at a BADA meeting attended by the researcher. The Djabugay perception is that the managers are not complying with the Agreement. Some BADA representatives spoke about legal recourse against the Park because it was not adhering to the Agreement. BADA’s solicitor had apparently told the BADA executives that the Park’s Managing Director had broken the Agreement and that the solicitor would send a letter to him regarding the breach of terms. Another breach of the Agreement referred to was that new advertising for the Park was not checked first with the Djabugay people.

The Djabugay people are concerned about rumours that the Park almost went into receivership. For example, one person said ‘Rumour around town is that Tjapukai Park is broke’. As there appeared to be many perceived problems with the financial situation of the Park and the lack of its adherence to the terms of the Agreement, BADA representatives suggested that the elders speak to the Managing Director of the Park about such issues, for which they exhibited no enthusiasm. Again, this could be for fear of retribution, such as loss of jobs and/or other perceived benefits.

The following section elaborates on the share the Djabugay have in the Park and provides a guide to the level of power and control they have in the Park. The media reports that local Aboriginal tribes own 51 per cent of the $9 million Park located in Smithfield,
Cairns (Hay 1997:3, Finch 1998:13). Indeed, “The Australian Financial Review” goes as far as reporting that it is 51 per cent ‘owned by the Tjapukai people’ (Dodd 1997:37). The Park’s Information and Showtimes brochure also refers to the Tjapukai communities and elders ‘substantial equity interest in the venture’.

Alternatively, a Tjapukai Aboriginal Partners’ Newsletter (1997) circulated to BADA representatives indicates that the equity of combined Aboriginal interests in the Park equals 50.7 per cent. Yet, Holden and Duffin (1998:28) report that nearly 50 per cent of the new Park will be owned by Aboriginal interests, but do not specify that they are Djabugay interests. That is difficult to justify because even if the Djabugay, Yirrganydji, Nganydjin and ATSIC CDC shares are added up, they only amount to 44.9 per cent shareholding of the Park (see Section 4.3.2). Further probing reveals that the quoted figure of 51 per cent Aboriginal shareholding of the Park comes about through the inclusion of the Hudson shareholding with Freeman, Martin and Channer (see Table 4.1), as David Hudson is a Cairns-born Aborigine (Holden and Duffin 1998:20). It must therefore be assumed that the Hudson share of the 28.4 per cent equals 5.8 per cent, to bring the Aboriginal ownership of the Park to 50.7 per cent.

Djabugay ownership of the Park is therefore at least 15.8 per cent and if most or all of the Nganydjin members are Djabugay, then at most 19.4 per cent of the Park. The Newsletter suggests that the Djabugay and Yirrganydji will be able to buy out the ATSIC CDC’s share over time. The Djabugay shareholding would therefore increase to 28.7 per cent (the Djabugay/Yirrganydji Working Agreement 1995:2 specifies that ownership of partnership shares be split 60/40 respectively therefore 60 per cent of ATSIC CDC’s 15.5 per cent equals 9.3 per cent, added to 19.4 per cent). Thus, the Djabugay people are in fact minority shareholders of the Park, and as such, have minimal power and control and voting rights associated with the business of the Park.

Non-Aboriginal interests dominate the Park’s Board through the number of voting rights they have compared to all the parties that have signed the Deed. This can be illustrated in the representation of the Park’s Board members. The Djabugay, Yirrganydji, Nganydjin and ATSIC CDC partners have one representative each but the old Tjapukai Dance Theatre has three representatives and Skyrail has two representatives (Tjapukai Aboriginal Partners’ Newsletter 1997), which tips the scales in favour of non-Aboriginal
Board members. According to one of the Board members, the Djabugay and Yirrganydji Board members only get half a vote each. The Djabugay/Yirrganydji Working Agreement (1995:1) specifies that ‘the Djabugay and Yirrganydji will vote as a block in partnership meetings and management committee meetings unless agreement cannot be reached between Djabugay and Yirrganydji on a particular matter’. Therefore there is a lack of strength when voting on issues at Board meetings, that is, three to five.

Even though the Djabugay share in the Park and its voting rights are minimal, the Agreement they signed sets out terms and conditions that are sometimes advantageous for the Djabugay people, if such terms are adhered to. Some of the terms and conditions of the Agreement are highlighted and then discussed.

- **There is an opportunity for the Djabugay community to purchase 28.4 per cent of the Park, which represents the shareholding of the previous owners of the Tjapukai Dance Theatre in Kuranda.** Djabugay community members expressed their desire for part ownership of the Park during negotiations, before the Park’s creation, with the view to working towards full ownership in the future. To ensure a part ownership of the Park, particular members of the Djabugay community and a consultant (Holden and Duffin 1998:21) became involved in negotiations with the then Managing Director of the Tjapukai Dance Theatre, which resulted in various agreements between the Managing Director and the Djabugay community.

- **The Djabugay elders receive $20,000 per annum for three years commencing with the opening of the Park and a review thereafter, to be used for granting social benefits, at the discretion of the elders.** Although this was agreed to, the elders had to wait to receive their first payment for over a year (see Section 4.3.2). The Agreement did not make the annual payment contingent upon profits or anything else and yet no payment was made to the elders in the first year of operating in a new location. On 30 September 1997 the Djabugay elders were presented with their first cheque for $5,000 from the Park but it should have been at least $20,000 by then, in accordance with the Agreement, as 15 months had elapsed since the opening of the new Park. This particular condition was not adhered to as the first payment was not received ‘with the opening of the Park’ by the elders.
• That the shareholders other than the Djabugay community enter into an agreement with the Djabugay to acquire 100 per cent equity in the Park over an agreed time period. The Djabugay could own 51 per cent of the Park to have a majority share and voting rights at the Park but such a figure was never referred to by anyone during the research for this study. The community is able to have a shareholding in the Park through a shareholding gift from the Park’s Managing Director and a loan from the ATSIC CDC (Holden and Duffin 1998:31-2). No timeframe is stipulated in the Agreement for the Djabugay to own 100 per cent equity in the Park, although ten years was often referred to in conversation with the Djabugay people.

• That a Djabugay Committee be established with Djabugay members to supervise authentic Djabugay cultural representations at the Park and to vet the Park’s advertising material. The primary objective of the Djabugay Cultural Co-ordinating Committee (the “Committee”) is to ‘promote and protect the integrity of Djabugay and Yirrganydji culture’ (Holden and Duffin 1998:33-6). The Committee and the Djabugay Ranger, Land and Natural Resource Management Agency (the “Agency”) formally work together for the protection and presentation of Djabugay culture and associated values (Holden and Duffin 1998:33-4). Time and again, the Djabugay people complained that this condition was not adhered to (see Section 4.4.1).

• That the Djabugay community is given first preference in training and employment opportunities given equal level of skill and experience with other applicants. This will be addressed in Section 5.4 on employment conditions. With regard to employment conditions, a Djabugay ranger at a NQLC meeting, attended by the researcher, objected to unequal pay for Djabugay rangers compared to non-Indigenous rangers. This perception of unequal pay is consistent with the perceptions of a Djabugay community member (see Section 4.2.1) and Djabugay elders (see Section 4.3.1).

Again, the issue of a management plan as a guide to alternative employment options was raised, at a BADA meeting attended by the researcher. An elder said, ‘Djabugay have to help themselves and need a management plan, separate from Tjapukai Park. We can’t
rely on Tjapukai Park’. The Djabugay elders want to take control of their own destiny, put things in place for their youth and provide for themselves without being reliant upon government-sponsored programs or the Park. Djabugay elders had hoped that the Park was going to bring them economic independence, numerous employment opportunities and control over their own lives but feel that this is not proving to be the case.

BADA representatives, at a meeting attended by the researcher, suggested that the Djabugay get involved in tourist ventures that do not conflict with the Park’s cultural activities and then get the Park to promote such ventures. Under such arrangements, tourists could still go to the Park and then be informed of additional attractions run by the Djabugay community separately. This is in sharp contrast to how a Djabugay elder wishes to expand tourism, that is, without any assistance from the Park (see Section 4.3.1).

At a BADA meeting that the researcher attended, an ethical issue emerged regarding a non-Djabugay person undertaking research into tourism impacts on their community. A BADA representative said defensively, ‘Rhonda, Andy and me – we got education – we can do this!’ There was a pause until the chairperson said ‘Djabugay have to help themselves and need a management plan, separate from Tjapukai Park. We can’t rely on Tjapukai Park’ and that seemed to be the end of the matter. No other Djabugay person challenged the researcher or BADA representatives about the research being undertaken by a non-Djabugay non-Indigenous person.

Again, the abundance of researchers was mentioned. An anthropologist at a NQLC meeting, which the researcher attended, said, ‘there is a researcher under every blade of grass in Kuranda’. She then went on to say that I should contact the NQLC to ask them for permission to work with an Indigenous community. The anthropologist also made the point that many people want to work with the Djabugay because they are renowned through their affiliation with the Park, and other Aboriginal groups also need research assistance but are not as well known, and therefore not approached.

Many of the issues, which emerged in the first trip, were apparent also on this one. Examples include breaches of the terms of the Agreement between the Djabugay and Park, by the Park management and the Deed condition that the Djabugay could not
conduct cultural activities competing with those presented by the Park (see Section 4.3.2). These curtail the Djabugay from pursuing a range of employment alternatives and may be the reason they sought a management plan, to assist them with a guide to what is and is not feasible. Yet, on the other hand, they have very few resources to commit to such an undertaking, which may have provided the prompt to ask the researcher for such a plan. There were also various accounts of the relationship, or lack thereof, between the Djabugay and researchers that provided pointers on how to establish an appropriate relationship with them. An example is not to assume that one can work with the Djabugay people without seeking permission from the relevant members of the Djabugay community.

4.4 Field Research Trip – 15 to 28 September 1997

The permission trip provided the researcher with unanimous approval from the Djabugay community to conduct research. The Park’s managers also gave permission to the researcher to interview them and other employees of the Park. Additional data was collected that extended the data of the individual interviews from the reconnaissance trip. Data from the permission trip were used to guide the preparation of the questionnaire to be used for interviews with the managers and non-managers of the Park for the field research trip. The information obtained from observation studies and open-ended interviews from earlier visits to Cairns, assisted in the design of a questionnaire for this trip in a more structured manner.

4.4.1 Individual Interviews

The issue of restrictions of the Deed resurfaced during the interviews with various individuals. Though the Djabugay community cannot perform cultural activities that compete with the Park’s activities, a Djabugay community member wondered whether it was possible for the Djabugay to take tours and work with the Park in referring tourists to each other’s ventures. This is consistent with similar remarks on earlier trips (see Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.3). Also, members of the Djabugay community believe a condition in the Agreement is that they get first employment preference at the Park. They believe this does not occur.
Again, the lack of consultation between the Park management and the Djabugay Cultural Co-ordinating Committee was referred to (see Section 4.3.3). One Djabugay community member explained that the Agency and the Committee were responsible for how Djabugay culture was presented at the Park and what was portrayed in the media about the Park and the Djabugay people. This particular community member was adamant that the Park’s advertising material was not passed through such vetting committees.

In regard to Park management, there was little consensus about who is and is not a manager at the Park. The Managing Director provided the researcher with a list of eleven names to identify managers at the Park. Five Indigenous names were amongst the six non-Indigenous names. Another manager insisted that there are six managers (Managing Director, Marketing Manager, Operations Manager, Retail Manager, Food and Beverage Manager and Finance Manager), that they attend fortnightly management meetings and that they are non-Indigenous people.

Again, the lack of resources in the Djabugay community was alluded to. Some Djabugay elders who are self-employed were concerned about their lack of funds. For example, in one such household, the elders said that they struggle to make monthly loan payments and commented that they were unaware that when starting a business, additional funds were needed for ‘things that go wrong’. They said that they now have no electricity and telephone and yet, ‘Our people think we’re rich but they don’t know!’

Also, in this particular household, because the rent was overdue, its members were afraid that they would be evicted from their property. The engine had blown up on one of their motor vehicles and they did not know how they would pay for such damage. Even though they appeared to be in possible financial ruin, they continued to offer hospitality to the researcher. For example, one household member said, ‘You come here any time and have a coffee with us’.

Business transactions with banks may be seen as an obstacle for Djabugay elders. For example, they asked that the researcher visit some banks to enquire about opening an account for particular Djabugay elders so that they could receive their first payment from the Park. The elders explained that they were reticent to visit the banks because they feel uncomfortable in a bank.
4.4.2 Search Workshop

The outcome of the workshop closely paralleled the information obtained from the Djabugay community members on other occasions.

Again, alternative employment opportunities are preferred by the Djabugay to reduce their reliance on the Park and/or government welfare. Such employment is sought primarily in tourism and the Djabugay suggested that employment might incorporate markets, bush walks, artefact making and the teaching of culture (see Section 4.3.2). Elders and other Djabugay community members who teach their culture would be compensated, although it was not suggested by whom, and the Djabugay want to expand employment opportunities for their rangers as well.

Some of the Djabugay elders stated that they wanted economic independence (see Sections 4.2.1, 4.3.1, 4.3.2 and 4.3.3) but non-elders cannot imagine a future without government funding. Alternate funding options were presented to the Djabugay people, such as international and private enterprise funding organisations, but the non-elders continuously referred to revenue from government funding bodies.

The lack of resources was again referred to and the Djabugay’s desire is to have an office, office equipment, staff and transport, to enable them to have a central location from which to plan and implement strategies for their preferred future.

The matter of opening a bank account resurfaced at the end of the workshop. A Djabugay elder approached the researcher asking if she would draft a letter to a bank requesting a savings account in a particular name for which four account holders could be co-signatories. When the draft was completed, the elder explained he would have a relative type the letter and submit it to the bank so that the Park’s Managing Director could make the first payment to the elders through such an account.

The outcome of the workshop is available in the form of an Action Plan for the Djabugay community in Appendix A.
4.4.3 Park Interviews

Interviews were conducted with the Park’s 49 non-management employees (see questionnaire in Appendix B) and seven managers (see questionnaire in Appendix C). Less than half of the employees interviewed were Djabugay people (20 out of 49). The answers to some of the questions in the questionnaire were not of much consequence as they did not address the impacts of tourism on the Djabugay community, and are therefore not included in the next section. The following represents, initially, the Park’s manager’s perspective of the impacts of tourism on its Djabugay employees and/or the Djabugay community.

4.4.4 Park Interviews: Managers

Although the Djabugay community has equity in the Park, at the time of interview, it was nervous about the Park’s liquidity and the fact that it had not received any dividends from it. The managers also referred to the liquidity position of the Park when asked if the Djabugay community were paid a dividend for its share of the Park. A few mentioned that once the Park was liquid, or making a profit, the Djabugay would be paid a dividend. One particular manager responded by referring to the Park’s Board of Directors appointment of a Finance Manager. This occurred because the Managing Director was thought not to have corporate expertise, the Park was floundering financially and to avoid liquidation, a Finance Manager was appointed. Without access to the Park’s financial records, it is difficult to confirm or deny whether the Park is having financial difficulties. However, at least one Park manager and several Djabugay community members perceive this to be the case.

In response to the question of how often the Djabugay were paid a dividend, a few managers said annually, but only if profitable. One manager responded that a $5,000 payment was being made to the elders within a week, and this indeed occurred. Another manager referred to a royalty to the elders in exchange for services of the Cultural Coordinating Committee for overseeing the presentation of Djabugay culture. Therefore, at the time of interview, the Park had not paid the Djabugay any dividends or other money.
The Park managers have conflicting views about those responsible for how Djabugay culture is presented at the Park. There is a lack of consensus amongst the managers concerning who is responsible for how Djabugay culture is presented at the Park and in the media. Primarily, various managers, Board Directors and/or the public are believed to be responsible, but the elders and/or the Cultural Co-ordinating Committee were also mentioned, but less so. One manager mentioned the input of the public as the Park’s marketing department examines visitor surveys and makes adjustments to cultural presentations accordingly. This conflicts with the Djabugay view of who decides how their culture is portrayed (see Section 4.4.6).

When asked whether the Park provides benefits for the Djabugay community, one manager reiterated the Djabugay employees’ comments, that is, that it provides the basis for employment (see Section 4.4.6), and, he added, assimilation into western culture. Other benefits according to the managers included material advantages; the education of the public about the Djabugay’s history and culture, and training opportunities. One manager believed that when the Park became profitable, it would provide a genuine economic base for the Djabugay people. Another advantage identified by the managers was the renewed interest in Djabugay culture amongst the young Djabugay people and an increase in the respect for the elders as keepers of their culture. One manager suggested a strong international profile was a benefit, as the Park’s Aboriginal dancers were recognised in many overseas countries (see Appendix D for performances by Tjapukai dancers).

Six of the seven managers agreed that the management team has regular meetings with employees, for example, once a week for dancers; once a month for retailers; every three to four months for general staff meetings; once a fortnight for managers; monthly for the food and beverage department. One manager said meetings were held on an ‘as required’ basis. Yet, Djabugay Park employees, particularly the dancers, often refer to a lack of communication between the managers and the employees (see Section 4.4.6). The Managing Director, when told by the researcher that employees desired better communication between them and management, gave the researcher a newsletter “Murriexpress” that was recently given to his employees, which he intimated would address the lack of communication issue.
The issue of the number of people in the management team again produced varying responses. Most said eleven although one said seven and another said eight. This is inconsistent with one manager’s earlier statement that there are only six managers at the Park (see Section 4.4.1). All the managers believe that there are one or two Djabugay managers at the Park and five to seven non-Indigenous managers. Even though there are Djabugay Park directors, no Djabugay employees were found in managerial positions. The two Indigenous managers who were interviewed were on the Managing Director’s list as Indigenous managers but they are not included in the fortnightly management meetings and other managers do not define them as managers.

Regarding the small number of Djabugay Park employees, the Park managers disagreed on the numbers of Djabugay employees. To ascertain the total number of employees and their makeup, the managers were asked the number of non-management employees. Again, there was little convergence of responses. The numbers ranged from about 77 to 93 although one manager had no idea and others counted full-time, part-time and casual employees to arrive at a figure of 105-106 employees. There is also a discrepancy in media reports about the number and category of employees at the Park, that is, whether they are Indigenous or Djabugay. For example, of approximately 100 employees at the Park, 85 per cent are from the Djabugay community (Pulley 1997a) and 80 per cent are Indigenous (Meade 1998:44). Finch (1998:13) believes the Park employs greater than 80 staff, 85 per cent of whom are Aboriginal. Holden and Duffin (1998:28) argued that 113 Djabugay people were employed at the new Park that opened in 1996.

Managers gave varied responses to the question of categorisation of employees, due possibly to the perceived complexity of classifying/categorising Indigenous Australians into specific community groups. Four managers did not know the ratio of Djabugay and other groups employed. Although one manager thought 60 per cent of employees are Djabugay, another said it was difficult for an outsider to tell the difference between Murris (the term used for Queensland Aborigines). He stated, ‘Can’t tell you (difference) between Djabugay, Yirrganydji, Murri’. One manager thought that of 100 employees, 70 might be Murris and the others Maori, Islanders and non-Indigenous people. It is unknown whether the term “Murris” was used by the latter manager, as defined or as a term for all Indigenous employees. The seventh Manager said that they were led to
believe the majority of employees were Djabugay or Yirrganydji. It appears that the managers cannot tell the difference between Djabugay and other Indigenous employees.

With regard to employment conditions, Djabugay employees are given on-the-job training, according to six managers but one manager argued that all staff receive such training, not just Djabugay employees. Traineeships are offered; department heads train within their departments; dancers teach other dancers and TAFE, Lorraine Martin College and Aussie Host also provide training programs for the Park. Training is provided in hospitality, retail skills, stage management, horticulture and management. Alluding to liquidity problems, one manager mentioned that ‘finances are tight at the moment. We will start up (training) again in the future’. Though the managers referred to such training, the elders believe basic training is not available for their people (see Section 4.3.1).

The managers’ perspective on whether the Park economically benefits the lives of the Djabugay generally was positive because of its provision of employment opportunities, for example, ‘given them jobs they never had before’ and because they have a shareholding in the Park. One manager acknowledges that the Djabugay community has not as yet benefited economically from such a share, and said that ‘the community has substantial shareholding but has not affected community yet’.

In matters concerning cultural issues, the managers referred to the exploitation of the Djabugay people as a disadvantage of tourism. One manager thought that tourism benefits should outweigh any thoughts of exploitation of the Djabugay people. Another manager said that exploitation is a disadvantage and that ‘not everybody is out there to help them’. Another manager said the Park was moving away from what it originally set out to do culturally, thus exploiting the product at the Park and the Djabugay people.

The managers perceived commercialisation of culture as another disadvantage as the Park’s cultural presentations are not in accordance with the traditional organisation of Djabugay culture. For example, one manager said that the Djabugay people work in an industry that operates every day and the mixing of business with culture breaks down Djabugay culture. This manager argued that ‘to present and live culture at the same time
is quite difficult’. One manager said that a product is commercialised to some degree by what a tourist wants and there is therefore an amount of exploitation by the Park.

Some managers saw the Park’s positive impacts on the Djabugay community through a revival of their culture and employment opportunities. This is consistent with the views of some of the Djabugay employees and a Djabugay community member (see Sections 4.2.1 and 4.4.6). One manager talked about the existence of the Park stimulating Djabugay people and others to investigate historical records to find out what is and is not Djabugay culture. Initially, he said, Djabugay culture was made up for use in the Tjapukai Dance Theatre. The manager believed that since then and over the past ten years research was undertaken about Djabugay culture because the productions at the Tjapukai Dance Theatre influenced the Djabugay people and others to investigate such culture (see Pulley 1998:36-7).

4.4.5 Park interviews: Non-management Employees

The next section contains the responses of the non-Djabugay and Djabugay Park non-management employees. Section 4.4.6 details the results of the Djabugay respondents so that they can be analysed for the purposes of establishing their perceptions of the impacts of tourism on their lives and community.

In matters pertaining to the management of the Park, a few non-Djabugay Indigenous respondents thought that there should be more Aborigines in management positions and/or that a qualified Djabugay person should occupy each department head position. One non-Indigenous respondent stressed that the Park’s Board of Directors aim is to employ Aborigines and that it does not care whether they are Djabugay or not, but no evidence was offered to substantiate such a claim.

With reference to culture, the non-Djabugay Park employees spoke in glowing terms about the positive impacts of tourism, or specifically the Park, for the Djabugay community. The Djabugay pride in themselves and in their culture was often referred to. For example, ‘their spirit and love for their culture’ and ‘how it makes people feel – being proud of it’ and ‘it has given people pride that their culture is shown’. Employment was seen as the primary positive impact of tourism as well as the reduction of dependency on
alcohol for the Djabugay community. Negative impacts included the lack of communication between Djabugay employees and the Park’s managers, as well as the Djabugay disregard for managers who try to tell them how to present Djabugay culture.

When the Park’s non-management employees were asked to define a Djabugay person, the majority responded that it was through having Djabugay parents and grandparents. The balance of respondents’ felt one would know from Djabugay elders, “bloodline”, “looks” and language and some did not know. When asked whether the respondent is a Djabugay person, the answers seemed to correspond with different perspectives. Seventeen respondents were confident in saying they were Djabugay and three not so confident, as in each of the three cases, only one of their parents is Djabugay, not both. They have been included as Djabugay respondents for the purposes of this study. Some respondents, 29, said they were not Djabugay but some felt they would like to be classified as such, as they had lived in Kuranda or in and around the Djabugay community for much of their lives. See Table 4.2 for a breakdown of the various types and numbers of respondents interviewed.

Table 4.2 Numbers and types of respondents interviewed at the Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Respondent</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Djabugay</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yirrganydji</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indigenous Australians</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maoris – New Zealand</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealanders – non-Indigenous</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guineans – Indigenous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balinese – Indigenous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian – Indigenous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians – non-Indigenous</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown origin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The six female and 14 male Djabugay answers to questions asked of non-management employees of the Park will be addressed from hereon.

4.4.6 Park Interviews: Djabugay Employees

The following information was obtained by interviewing 20 Djabugay employees at the Park.

Again, the Djabugay employees spoke about the Park’s lack of adherence to the Agreement between themselves and the Park (see Section 4.3.3). ‘If people took it (the Agreement), they would find out most things are hidden. No rights – no this and that.’ Additional matters of concern included a lack of first employment preference and that the Park has not paid the elders what is owed to them (see Section 4.3.2). Also, of concern was that the Djabugay community cannot show its own culture in its own town or it would be taken to court and found liable for breaching the Agreement with the Park (see Section 4.3.2).

The issue of non-Djabugay employees at the Park was raised repeatedly, for example, ‘Any Islander or Aborigine can work here’ (see Section 4.3.1). As gleaned from meetings, interviews and observation studies, the Djabugay want Djabugay dancers at the Park, not non-Djabugay dancers. They complained that non-Djabugay employees do not know their culture and language and that they have to be taught such culture by the Djabugay. One of the respondents was particularly unhappy about non-Djabugay employees, ‘If place to be called Tjapukai, we need Djabugay people – it is not a multicultural park. This is what really pisses me off.’

The opportunity of employment for the current Djabugay employees and also for the next Djabugay generation is perceived as a positive impact of the Park. This is consistent with the view held by the managers at the Park (see Section 4.4.4). Comment was also made that, ‘Jobs for us – for Djabugay people – keeps us off alcohol’. They said that employment enables them to buy their own homes and ‘not pay dead rent money’. Yet, some Djabugay community members apparently make excuses for not working at the Park. When told they too can work at the Park, excuses are given such as lack of transport although transport is provided to and from the Park every day. They are told, ‘If
you want to do it, you can.’ One respondent’s son was working at the Park but ‘dropped out’. He did not know whether it was because of his son’s age or another reason. It appears that some Djabugay people do not wish to work at the Park.

With regard to management responsibilities, 18 out of 20 Djabugay employees said they knew who made the decisions about what is presented at the Park but their response was opposite to that of the managers (see section 4.4.4). Most Djabugay respondents thought that the dancers or elders made such decisions. Apparently, most respondents are unclear about who decides what is presented at the Park.

Djabugay employees often referred to the tenuous relationship between the Djabugay employees and managers. Arguments with management about how to present Djabugay culture at the Park were also commented on regularly by Djabugay employees. The Djabugay performers did not appreciate the Park’s managers asking them to perform in a certain way. The Djabugay employees would also prefer managers to tell them when they are doing a good job, not just when they are doing something that is wrong.

With respect to employment conditions, the Djabugay employees confirmed that cross-cultural training was conducted when the Park opened. Yet, they also mentioned the negative aspects of working at the Park such as the continuing divisions between the various departments, occasional arguments and their dislike of supervisors telling them what to do and how to do it.

Alcohol consumption and employment seem to have interwoven impacts on the Djabugay people. A Djabugay employee said, for example, ‘jobs for us … keeps us off alcohol’ and ‘others do no work and drink alcohol’. A fifth of the Djabugay employees mentioned alcohol consumption and its impacts, for example, of how the Djabugay ‘used to hang around pubs’ and that most Djabugay people in Kuranda do not want to work. They believed that employment presents the option of getting their people off the street, abstaining from alcohol and having something to look forward to everyday. One of the Djabugay Park employees said that he had to look after his culture or ‘I’m still in gutter drinking alcohol’.
Again, the positive impacts of tourism for Djabugay culture emerged. Positive impacts of tourism that emerged from interviews with the Djabugay employees is their perception that their culture is unique, they are proud of it and it is well known around the world. For example, ‘You can feel the spirit around you when you dance’ and ‘Knowing and understanding culture makes us aware of who we are’. The majority thought that the Park’s exposure to the world, the revival of their culture and the feeling of pride in themselves were all positive impacts. For example, Djabugay employees made the following statements: ‘proud of our culture’ and ‘well known overseas and in Australia itself’ and ‘still proud of our culture even though living in today’s world’. There were also a couple of respondents who felt that the Park had done nothing that was good for the Djabugay people, but they did not elaborate on such sentiments.

Many people who work at the Park are related and this aspect of work seemed to be pleasing to the Djabugay. Statements by Djabugay employees such as, ‘Just about everybody is related here’ and ‘Feel pretty comfortable working here with my relatives’ encapsulated comments made by non-Djabugay Indigenous employees as well.

Djabugay employees raised concerns about commercialisation. Dancers are told by managers to change the style of dance, but stress that it was taught by their grandfathers. If the dancers themselves try to change anything, arguments ensue, presumably with management. A Djabugay employee said ‘Culture handed down to people by granddad so will not change dance to suit whoever, or if management tells us to’. Another spoke about how only 70 per cent of Djabugay culture is shown at the Park, ‘because of money, taking short cuts, painting bodies, things like that’. A further concern expressed is that the performers in the dance theatre try to represent Djabugay culture, ‘not fully but close enough’.

A Djabugay employee argued that everything had to be done to schedule such as making boomerangs and spears and quickly painting bodies in preparation for dance performances. However, if everything was done in a cultural and traditional manner, tourists would be at the Park for weeks and one employee’s hope is that eventually the Park could get to the stage where true Djabugay culture is presented in a traditional manner. ‘Money or making money overrides spiritual thing and culture side’ said another
Djabugay employee who felt that the Park management was more interested in ‘keeping head above water’ or liquidity.

Another negative impact, according to Djabugay employees, is the misrepresentation of Djabugay culture. The didgeridoo is used as a musical accompaniment for the dancers and tourists are taught how to play it. Yet, the Djabugay people are very clear about the fact that their people never made, nor played the didgeridoo in the past as ‘The didgeridoo belonged only to one tribe ever, but not Djabugay’. Only men are allowed to play the didgeridoo (Zeppel 1998b:19), although the Djabugay men told the researcher that the women were allowed to play it in their home if they wished to, but not at the Park. There could therefore be a false perception amongst tourists that such an instrument is a traditional part of Djabugay culture.

A stereotypical portrayal of Aborigines was an issue but the Djabugay employees perceived that the Park was providing positive images of Aborigines, rather than often media-led negative images. One of the Djabugay employees said, ‘People are negative about Aborigines till they see what an Aborigine can do and they understand more.’ They went on to talk about a lot of people who have stereotypical images of Aborigines as ‘dole bludgers, drunks and people who cannot do anything for themselves’. The Park provided the opportunity of ‘Showing we are not lazy bums – culture exists and still exists today.’

Talking to tourists enabled cross-cultural communication to be enhanced. One Djabugay employee mentioned how he liked to see tourists at the Park learning more about the Aboriginal way of life, leaving with knowledge and ‘spreading the word’ when they return overseas. The visitors learn about Djabugay culture and the effect ‘is just a bit more understanding of Aboriginal way of life’. The tourists arrive knowing nothing about Aboriginal people, but the Djabugay employees believe the tourists leave with knowledge. The Djabugay employees at the Park see such interaction and enhanced understanding as beneficial.

The Djabugay employees desire more tourist interaction. A Djabugay employee stated that ‘Tourists want to mix more with Aboriginal people. They should talk to us more’. Examples were also given of tourists who would ask ‘ridiculous questions’ such as why
the Djabugay were not living in the gunyahs full-time at the Park. But overall the feeling was that the Djabugay employees are happy to talk with the tourists and that the tourists should approach them.

A change in lifestyle for the Djabugay employees was an impact of employment at the Park. Some of them live life as they used to and others change their ways because they feel they have to ‘keep up with the Jones’s’, that is, trying to maintain a lifestyle that is materially similar to those in the neighbourhood where they live. Djabugay employees said some Djabugay people feel they need to buy cars, stereos and more alcohol to keep up appearances of being the same as those living around them. The trouble, some believed, was that with more money some of the Djabugay employees have more parties, more alcohol, and days off work and then they stop going to work altogether. If too many days are missed, the Park dismisses them. One of the Djabugay employees concluded, ‘Some of them are destroyed by too much money and some of them by not enough money’.

Again, many matters raised on the previous visits were highlighted. Positive and negative impacts surfaced, for example, the increase in cross-cultural communication but a lack of internal communication at the Park. A positive impact is the revival of Djabugay culture, although the presentation of such culture is commercialised and the Djabugay are exploited to some degree. A lack of agreement exists between managers and non-managers as to who constitutes a manager at the Park and whether Djabugay managers exist, but then there was also the problem of defining a Djabugay person.

Although such findings point to positive and negative impacts on the Djabugay community, they cannot be isolated by the specific economic, social and cultural impacts on their community. The impacts of tourism on the Djabugay community will therefore be discussed in an integrated manner in the next chapter, regarding the relatively questionable benefits of tourism for the Djabugay people.

The next chapter will discuss the results of the study and their implications.
5.0 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to discuss the five major themes that emerged from the results of this study. These include the lack of Djabugay equity in the Park and their management of the Park; a lack of formal management structures; and Djabugay dissatisfaction with employment conditions. Additional major themes include the lack of community resources for the Djabugay and the lack of consultation and participation with them regarding cultural issues; and ethical research issues.

The discussion focuses on how the Djabugay community is impacted by tourism, primarily through its association with the Park, and how other Indigenous groups in Australia and world-wide may experience similar impacts of tourism, to those of the Djabugay community.

Rather than isolate impacts from each other in this chapter, they are addressed in an integrated manner. As Altman (1992:3) argues, the impacts of tourism on Aboriginal people cannot conveniently be separated from each other as the economic, social and cultural impacts of tourism are intertwined (Altman 1992:3). Therefore, the impacts are not specifically categorised by type.

5.2 Equity in Management of Park

Members of the Djabugay community, through their membership of BADA, own a share of the Park. Such ownership necessitated that the Djabugay community signs an Agreement with the Park. The requirements of the Agreement have and continue to have impacts on the Djabugay community. In particular, due to the Agreement’s terms and conditions, which determine minority shareholding, the Djabugay community has diminished power and control over the Park.

When there is little control over the Park’s business through minority shareholding and voting power, there is not much power that can be exerted by the Djabugay people. Economic advancement for Aborigines is limited when they do not own a tourism venture
outright and are not the majority of employees (Altman 1989:471), as is the case for the Djabugay. Therefore, in this instance, an Indigenous community’s needs and aspirations are being overlooked, or redefined or both by the more powerful corporate culture of a tourist enterprise. Similar concerns have been noted in Survival (nd).

The Djabugay community will only be majority shareholders if it buys the 28.4 per cent share and the ATSIC CDC share of 9.3 per cent (see Table 4.1), bringing the Djabugay share to 57.1 per cent (see Section 4.3.2). No timeframe has been included in the aforementioned condition of the Agreement and the Djabugay have no immediate funds to buy such a share. However, if or when the opportunity arises for such a purchase the Djabugay are able to obtain such funds by selling their share in Skyrail (see Section 4.3.1). The responsibility of a majority share might be overwhelming for the Djabugay at this time (see Section 4.2.1). DTAC and BADA are financially poor, therefore 51 per cent or 100 per cent ownership of the Park may be difficult to attain for the Djabugay community.

Regardless of the accuracy of the understanding of the Agreement, many Djabugay members know from each other of conditions not being met and are angry that such conditions are not being complied with by the Park’s managers (see Sections 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.4.1, 4.4.6). A few Djabugay community members do not know what is set out in the Agreement but have ideas about its terms, but some do, particularly the signatories to it (see Section 4.3.2). Although such issues are brought up at BADA meetings and solicitors are consulted, the Djabugay seem reticent to approach the Park’s managers about their concerns. They may be afraid of repercussions if they speak out, having come from a history that banished them from their traditional land, as a form of punishment for wrongdoing (Bottoms 1999:60-1). Yet, it is imperative that the Agreement’s terms are adhered to otherwise Indigenous people will continue to mistrust tourism operators and be sceptical about potential positive benefits of tourism espoused by such operators.

If the Djabugay vetting organisations are not consulted about cultural representations, the Park’s managers are able to portray Djabugay culture in any manner they perceive commercially viable and palatable to tourists. Although one Djabugay person said that such organisations are not consulted, Holden and Duffin (1998:28) report that the Djabugay do have ‘full control of the cultural content of the Theatre’. The Committee
and Agency represents Djabugay organisations established to ensure that their culture is represented in an appropriate manner at the Park, but requires the Park’s managers to pass cultural material to them first for vetting. Although the Agreement stipulates this condition, the lack of adherence to it by the Park’s managers ensures diminished power and control of cultural representations at the Park by the Djabugay people, and results in claims by them of exploitation and commercialisation.

When the Djabugay own at least 51 per cent of the Park, they will have the power to control how their culture is represented at the Park. This may enable the Djabugay to have a culture that becomes more resilient through control of how it is portrayed. The appropriate representation of Djabugay culture at the Park enables the Djabugay community to enthusiastically participate, view and engage in such representation. Djabugay employees at the Park would then be able to continue to portray an authentic culture in their community, abroad and in their interactions with every person with whom they come into contact. Others would then be educated about authentic Djabugay culture, rather than the commercialised version of Djabugay culture. An outcome may be that some of the tourists prefer the commercialised version of the Djabugay culture whereas other tourists prefer the non-commercialised portrayal. Altman (1987a:87) found that Anangu culture in central Australia is resilient but also that the Anangu ownership of land has reinforced such resilience. The Djabugay do own a share of the Park, and 51 per cent ownership of the Park would enhance the opportunity for resilience of their culture.

Altman (1989:470-1) argues that ‘the two main avenues for economic advancement are the ownership of enterprises and employment in the tourism industry’ but he also acknowledges that both options are limited. Without sufficient capital resources, Aborigines are unable to start a venture and if able to, through loans or gifts, are still left with loan repayments, which may be very difficult to honour. Many Indigenous people are unable to finance capital-intensive resources and support infrastructure (Ryan and Crotts 1997:912). The minority share of the Djabugay in the Park means they do not have substantial power and control to affect the business of the Park, including employment conditions. The Park has economically disadvantaged the Djabugay community, as no payments have been made to BADA for their share in the Park, and the elders have not been paid their full entitlement of $20,000.
• **Recommendations**

*It is recommended that:*

• *The Park managers adhere to the terms and conditions of the Heads of Agreement with the Djabugay community.*
• *The Park managers develop a timeline and market value for incremental increases in Djabugay ownership of the Park.*
• *The Park managers pay the Djabugay elders the balance of social benefits funds still owing.*
• *The Djabugay community discusses adherence of the Heads of Agreement terms and conditions with the Park managers.*
• *The Djabugay community prepares funding initiatives for incremental increases in Park ownership.*

### 5.3 Management

There are issues to be resolved regarding the relationship between the Park’s managers; the Djabugay employees and the Djabugay Committee and Agency. Until the Park’s managers understand and acknowledge which of their employees are Djabugay, they are not able to recognise the custodians of Djabugay culture. On the other hand, the Park’s managers need to decide who is and is not part of their management team and their portfolio, so that Djabugay employees and others know whom to refer to for managerial decisions.

Altman and Finlayson (1992:2) found few Aboriginal employees in managerial positions but it is imperative that Djabugay employees are trained to undertake such positions for when they are the majority shareholders of the Park. Whilst the non-Indigenous management team does not train and bring the Djabugay people into management positions, it is able to retain control of the business of the Park. The implications for the Djabugay of a lack of control at the Park include discontentment about employment opportunities, career advancement and about their ability to eventually own and operate the Park as major shareholders.
Altman argues that a factor of success for the Tjapukai Dance Theatre was that Aboriginal men danced and non-Aboriginal partners managed, that is, the Tjapukai Dance Theatre operated ‘on the basis of division of labour by specialisation’ (1992:11). Such division of labour between Indigenous and non-Indigenous employees does not allow Djabugay people to assume managerial roles if they are not encouraged and trained to take on such roles. There also seems to be the assumption that dance is the preserve of Aboriginal men, whereas there are currently male and female Aborigines who are in management positions and more could be with the educational qualifications and skills that they have. Crick (1991:10-11) argues that locals are usually employed in menial, low-paid positions in tourism. It is important that if individuals within Aboriginal communities wish to engage in tourism, they enhance their education and skills base so that they may undertake advanced and higher-paid positions.

Difficulties must arise for the Park managers to train Djabugay employees for managerial positions in preparation for the formalised take-over of the Djabugay of the Park when there is insufficient understanding of the categorisation of Park employees by the Park managers. If the managers wish to have Djabugay employees as managers, they need to provide managerial training to them to attain such positions but there may be little incentive for the Park’s managers to train others to fulfil their roles for fear of the loss of their own jobs. It is recommended that the Park put a succession plan and timeframe for that plan in place. The succession plan should include which Djabugay employees will fill managerial positions; what training they will require to be suitable for such positions; and a timeframe. Such succession planning and timeframe should be incorporated into a Strategic Plan by the Park managers, in consultation with all staff members of the Park. The lack of such training for the Djabugay might be because the managers do not have knowledge of their employee’s self-identification in regard to their indigeneity, or such managerial training is not on the Park’s agenda. It is possible the Park’s managers are not complying with some of the terms and conditions of the Agreement due to a lack of understanding about which of their employees are Djabugay people, or which applicants for jobs are Djabugay applicants.

The Djabugay community’s perception of a minority of Djabugay employees at the Park appears to be the reality as only 20 of 49 Park employees were Djabugay at the time of interview (see Section 4.4.5). It is recommended that the Park’s managers categorise its
employees according to self-identification. The outcome is relevant statistics for the Park and for the media, which addresses the incorrect statistics given by the media in the past, particularly with regard to the supposed large numbers of Djabugay employees (see Section 5.4). The Park’s managers are then in a position to train and promote Djabugay employees into managerial positions to prepare the Djabugay for majority ownership of the Park.

Discrimination and equity issues may arise from the Park categorising its employees and particularly from developing management career paths specifically for Djabugay employees. Yet, if it does not make a concerted effort to guide Djabugay people into management positions, the Djabugay may have problems becoming a majority shareholder without the experience of operating the business at hand. The community might then need to rely on outsiders to manage the Park, who may or may not make decisions in their best interests. This must pose a quandary for Indigenous people around the world involved with tourism. Do they obtain business expertise to operate a business enterprise from the dominant culture and/or incorporate elements of their own culture to manage such an enterprise and/or hire others with such expertise to run the business for them? At the time of study, the Djabugay seem intent on managing the Park but cautious about their level of skills to do so.

It is recommended that communication be enhanced between both parties. The managers need to acknowledge the cultural expertise of the Djabugay employees and the Djabugay employees need to acknowledge the business expertise of the managers. The approach of managers to date seems to have provided negative impacts on the Djabugay employees, particularly when telling the Djabugay employees how to portray dance and other forms of Djabugay culture. Requiring the Djabugay to perform their cultural activities in an inappropriate manner fuels the Djabugay’s arguments about the commoditisation of their culture. The irony is that if the performances are not pleasing to the tourists, tourist numbers may drop, causing a fall in revenue and diminished opportunity for the Park to pay BADA members their proportion of profits, once profits are achieved.

To alleviate allegations of the commoditisation of Djabugay culture and a lack of adherence to the Agreement, it is recommended that the Park’s managers negotiate any proposed changes of Djabugay presentations at the Park with the Djabugay Committee.
and Agency. Initially, the Park’s managers could meet with Djabugay employees to discuss the employees’ ideas about changes to cultural representations and therefore appeal to the consensual style of decision making of the Djabugay people. Such ideas could then be passed through the Djabugay Committee and Agency, and if approved, be implemented by all parties. Such endeavours ensure terms of the Agreement are being met, and the Djabugay employees may be more committed to cultural changes to which they have contributed and that have been vetted by the Djabugay Committee and Agency.

The Djabugay employees may have a lack of opportunity of working elsewhere or indeed progressing in employment status at the Park. Although managers of the Park and Djabugay employees perceived employment as a positive impact on the Djabugay people (see Sections 4.4.4 and 4.4.6), such employment is primarily in relatively low-skilled positions, as is the case for many Aborigines involved with tourism (Altman and Finlayson 1992:2). The long term repercussion of this is that if and when the Djabugay people purchase a majority share in the Park, they may not be ready to undertake the responsibilities required of them as majority shareholders. Also, low skilled opportunities at the Park may restrain employees who would otherwise seek out employment with better career development potential. It is recommended that the Djabugay are trained to be managers and Board members of the Park in the future, to protect the interests of all shareholders when the Djabugay own a majority share in the Park. Such a recommendation could be incorporated into a strategic plan.

It is suggested the Park prepare a strategic plan, as mentioned earlier, and work towards achieving the objectives, strategies and tactics of that plan. The strategic plan could be based on the theoretical methodology of this study. If a strategic plan already exists, then the methodology used in this study could be utilised to further develop the plan and its implementation. The strategic plan would need to be reviewed regularly and take into account the Indigenous decision making process, especially reciprocity and contingency. One of the strategies of the Strategic Plan needs to be to define what constitutes a Park manager to remove the apparent confusion over who is a manager. Then most employees, including the managers, understand who is a manager, whether they are Indigenous and/or non-Indigenous and which manager is responsible for which portfolio in the Park. Once established, managers and employees can deal with each other based on a manager’s portfolio or area of responsibility, and an employee’s known
categorisation. Once this is determined, the Djabugay community and employees may also be able to deal with the manager/s who are ultimately responsible for the Park’s representations of Djabugay culture (see Sections 4.4.4 and 4.4.6).

- **Recommendations**

*It is recommended that:*

- *The Park managers develop a strategic plan or business plan.*
- *The business plan proceeds when the Djabugay community and all the Park’s employees have been consulted regarding the plan’s strategies.*
- *The business plan incorporates the definition and portfolio of each manager; self-identification and categorisation of all employees; training for Djabugay employees for management and Board positions; career development programs for Djabugay employees; a succession plan and timeline; communication policies for staff (particularly oral communication policies); cultural negotiation policies.*
- *The business plan aims and objectives are reviewed regularly.*
- *The Djabugay community offers support to the Djabugay Park employees undertaking management and Board training.*
- *The Djabugay community supplements existing cultural skills with business and management skills.*

### 5.4 Employment Conditions

The Djabugay community perceives the conditions of employment for their people as inadequate. Whether such perceptions translate into reality or not, the Djabugay people feel there are negative impacts on their people concerning inequality of employment conditions. One such concern relates to the lack of numbers of its community at the Park and another concerns unequal pay conditions. Djabugay community members represented the majority of employees in the old venue at Kuranda (Holden and Duffin 1998:20) but now appear to be representing the minority of employees at the Park.

Hunter and Taylor (1996:9) argue that ‘poor mainstream employment outcomes reflect the historical legacy of entrenched structural disadvantage in an increasingly competitive labour market’. If Indigenous Australian employees wish to enter or remain in
employment, it is imperative they are educated and trained for it, so that they can present
themselves competitively in the tourism labour market, and/or any other labour market.

Regardless of the exact number of Djabugay employees, the community perceives them
to be fewer than other employees, which apparently was not the case at the old venue in
Kuranda. At the time of field research in September 1997, total employee numbers were
estimated at about 100. To assess the number of Djabugay employees it is necessary to
ask who is a Djabugay person and therefore how many of 100 or so Park employees are
actually Djabugay employees? Again, it is important that the Park’s managers identify
Djabugay employees for management training and career progression.

There are at least three ways in which the Park could define or identify a Djabugay
person: from the Rules of BADA and from the membership rules of BADA and DTAC.
For example, the Rules of BADA (Rules of BADA 1995) define Djabugay people in the
following manner:

all persons of Aboriginal descent who identify themselves as being part of the
Djabugay community and who are recognised as such by the Djabugay
community whose tribal territory is located near Kuranda, Queensland.

There appear to be two prerequisites in this definition of being a Djabugay person. The
person must want to take on the identity of the Djabugay community as well as being
permitted to be part of that community. Such a definition is more inclusive allowing
historical as well as traditional Aboriginal people to claim membership of the Djabugay
community (Bottoms 1999:96).

Membership rules for the two Djabugay incorporated bodies, DTAC and BADA, differ.
The reasons for this could be that DTAC was formed before BADA, and that DTAC has
objectives for all Aborigines in the area whereas BADA has objectives for the Djabugay
Aborigines only. Membership of BADA (which owns equity in the Park) is much more
restrictive than DTAC membership rules.

To be a member of BADA, the adult persons have to be of ‘Djabugay Aboriginal descent
who are recognised as such by the Djabugay Elders who are themselves members of the
Association’ (Rules of BADA 1995). BADA membership rules might preclude historical
Djabugay people, unless the elders allow them membership. Whereas, eligible membership of DTAC requires that a person be an adult Aborigine normally and permanently resident in the specific area stipulated, as well as other locations as may be determined from time to time. Therefore, the area stipulated could have Aborigines living there from other communities and other areas of Australia.

If membership into the Djabugay community varies by the organisation into which a person wishes to become a member, then the definition of a Djabugay person could incorporate the rules of both organisations: DTAC and BADA. Historical and traditional Djabugay people could then be known as Djabugay people. The Park’s managers would then know whom to classify as belonging to the Djabugay community, as would the Djabugay themselves. Unfortunately, such a solution would undoubtedly cause political problems for the Djabugay community, which already has to make decisions on who can and cannot be a member of either organisation, depending on whether they fit the membership description. Also, the DTAC membership rules appear to be broad enough for non-Djabugay Aborigines to become members. It might be inappropriate to allow non-Djabugay Aborigines BADA membership as the Djabugay are keen for their own people, historical and traditional, to own the share in the Park, not non-Djabugay Aborigines.

It appears from the Aboriginal Councils and Associations Act 1976 that an Aboriginal incorporated body can establish the rules as to who can and cannot be a member of an incorporated body. It is possible non-Djabugay Indigenous people may wish to be members of BADA and therefore own a financial share of the Park. Were this to occur, it seems that the Djabugay community would experience a further reduction in revenue, if it were also shared with non-Djabugay BADA members. This might pose a moral and economic dilemma for the Djabugay people, even though they had not received revenue from the Park at the time of the study.

If the Park’s managers are genuine in their attempts to meet the terms of the Agreement, it is suggested they use the Djabugay definition from the Rules of BADA (Rules of BADA 1995) to assess who are Djabugay employees. Such information would be useful for discussions about Djabugay cultural representations, training for managerial positions and to be able to formalize takeover procedures. Also, the Park’s managers would then be in
a position to prepare a list of who are Djabugay employees and the number of Djabugay employees (see Section 5.3).

In Section 4.3.3, a condition in the Agreement between the Tjapukai Dance Theatre’s Managing Director and the Djabugay stipulated:

That the Djabugay community is given first preference in training and employment opportunities given equal level of skill and experience with other applicants.

The lack of adherence by the Park’s managers to the terms and conditions of the Agreement have impacts on the Djabugay community. In some cases the Djabugay believe terms exist which have been found not to exist, or terms do exist but the Djabugay people do not believe such terms are adhered to by the Park’s managers. For example, one Djabugay community member perceives that Djabugay applicants do not get first preference in training and employment opportunities if equally skilled to other applicants. Such disbelief, whether legitimate or not, would lead to mistrust of the Park’s managers because of the perception that they are not adhering to the terms and conditions of the Agreement. Indeed, the Djabugay community spoke often about the Park’s Managing Director breaking promises (see Section 4.3.1).

How does one assess whether the Park managers give first preference to the Djabugay community compared with other applicants for training and employment opportunities? This is difficult to assess but it is recommended that this condition of the Agreement become a strategy in the strategic plan. For example, the tactics could include that the Djabugay Board member also vet the applications of all applicants for advertised positions at the Park and/or an elder or other respected Djabugay person could be on the interview panel. It is important that if such procedures are put in place, to ensure adherence to the Agreement, the Park’s managers and employees and the Djabugay community should inform each other of such procedures. Such information further enhances communication between all parties and might reduce the level of distrust between the Djabugay community and the Park’s managers.

An additional recommendation is that the strategic plan be communicated to the Djabugay community and all of the Park’s employees. Misconceptions need to be
clarified, for example, that the Agreement between the Park and the Djabugay does not specify that the majority of the Park’s employees are to be Djabugay people. The Djabugay community needs to be informed that such a term does not exist in the Agreement. Nevertheless, it appears that the Djabugay employees do not represent the majority of the employees at the Park and it is important the Park’s managers or the media does not propagate such misconceptions. Formalizing the definition of and therefore the number of Djabugay employees at the Park would provide all parties with information about the actual numbers of Djabugay employees.

The perception of unequal pay for similar work has an impact on the Djabugay community. At the Tjapukai Dance Theatre, income scales were based on performance indicators such as years of service, regular and reliable work attendance and loyalty to the theatre (Finlayson 1995:5). The Djabugay elders perceive that Djabugay Park employees are paid less than those doing similar work and training and are angry about this. Without access to employee data, it is difficult to realistically assess the situation. It is recommended that the strategic plan incorporates the employees rights to enterprise bargaining, should they desire it, and that assistance with such a process be sought from, for example, the Queensland Chamber of Commerce and Industry (QCCI). Alternatively, an employee share acquisition plan could be implemented where all employees are allocated shares in the Park and are paid a dividend for such shares. Such plans involve legal and tax ramifications.

A reduction of traineeships and employment opportunities might explain the Djabugay perception of their people being trained and then not given employment (see Section 4.3.1). When the Park opened in 1996, it offered 45 traineeships to Aborigines (Rogers 1996:39). In 1997, the Park had only two trainees. This could be the result of a deteriorating economy and hence reduced job prospects. Regardless, the number of traineeships have been reduced as well as the number of employees since the Park’s inception. The reduction of both has an impact on the Djabugay community’s traineeship and employment opportunities at the Park. When the Djabugay community or any Indigenous community is disadvantaged in employment opportunities, and the resultant lack of income, it is difficult for them to improve their living conditions (Norris 1998:29).
The Park has two conflicting objectives: first, to make a profit, and secondly, to showcase and adjust Djabugay cultural presentations for the tourists’ pleasure, in order to make profits through their patronage. Which objective takes precedence? It appears to be the profit objective because of the Park’s lack of adherence to the Agreement with the Djabugay and the Park’s managers’ requests of its performers to adjust their performances, based on tourist surveys and feedback, as do other cultural centres in order to protect commercial viability (Zeppel 1998a:3). Again, the Djabugay Committee and Agency should be consulted for any cultural changes proposed by the Park’s managers, and as they are apparently not doing this, it is recommended that such a strategy be included in the strategic plan. It is possible that the managers believe that the corporate culture at the Park does not need to adapt to take into account Indigenous concerns or issues. As this condition in the Agreement was not adhered to, it may again not be implemented if formulated as a strategy in the business plan.

BADA representatives are concerned about the potential impacts of the Park’s demise. Their perception is that the Park is having trouble breaking even (see Section 4.3.3). As the Park is a private company, its accounts are not available to the public, and therefore liquidity cannot be assessed. Yet, one manager referred to problems with the economic viability of the Park, and therefore the Park Board’s decision to employ a Finance Manager. If the Park is floundering financially, the BADA representatives are justifiably concerned, as they may not ever realise any financial return from the Park, if it actually goes into liquidation.

Employment at the Park is viewed as positive by many Djabugay employees as a benefit now and for future generations of Djabugay people (see Section 4.4.5). Brim (1993:48) and Finlayson (1995:12) also provided evidence of improved economic status for Aborigines from long-term employment at the Tjapukai Dance Theatre. Yet, the Djabugay share of ownership in the Park does not appear to be providing positive economic impacts for the Djabugay community. Altman (1992:5) argues that economic opportunities are not guaranteed from Aboriginal ownership of tourist destinations, and maybe less so if Aborigines own a small share of a tourist venture, as is the case for the Djabugay community. Though some Djabugay Park employees are more aware than others of status through ownership of material goods and the possibility of travel, few spoke of greater economic benefits through working there.
It appears that a few Djabugay employees, through employment at the Park, have achieved positive economic and social benefits. They include overseas travel to perform dance, and the purchase of a car and/or a home. Yet, there appear to be no flow-on effects for the Djabugay community. BADA at the time of the study had not received revenue from the Park. Some Djabugay community members have no telephone, electricity, independent transport or homes of their own. The Park has not provided the majority of their community with greater economic, social or cultural benefits and they therefore do not realise benefits from their involvement with it. If Indigenous people realise little benefit from their involvement with tourism, then they will most likely continue to ‘display all the characteristics of a dispossessed people’ (Holden and Duffin 1998:7). Such characteristics include poverty, unemployment, poor health, high rates of mortality, including teenage suicides, and substance abuse and this appears to be the case for the Djabugay community.

The Djabugay employees spoke about the positive impact of employment at the Park, not only with regard to employment but also with regard to the associated reduction or cessation of drinking consumption (see Section 4.4.6). But others alluded to increased consumption of alcohol (see Section 4.4.6). It was found that the consumption of alcohol presented a problem for the Anangu at Uluru as drinking bouts resulted in them being unable to work regularly, resulting in dismissal (Central Land Council et al 1987:101). The Djabugay employees also mentioned that they are dismissed if they are not reliable in presenting themselves for work (see Section 4.4.6).

**Recommendations**

*It is recommended that:*

- *The business plan incorporates an employment strategy that a Djabugay Board member reviews all job applications and also interviews applicants.*
- *The Park’s managers inform the Djabugay community and the Park’s staff of the terms of the Heads of Agreement and the new business plan.*
- *The business plan incorporates enterprise bargaining for its employees and QCCI assistance and/or an employee share acquisition plan.*
The Park managers adhere to the terms of the Heads of Agreement with the Djabugay community, particularly concerning cultural representations at the Park.

5.4.1 Skills

The level and type of skills possessed by the Djabugay people are an important criterion for assessment and suitability for employment for the different roles at the Park, and/or elsewhere. Skill can be defined as ‘a type of work or activity, which requires special training and knowledge’ (University of Birmingham 1995).

Altman (1992:2) argues that the tourism industry requires communication skills, high levels of literacy and cultural styles from Aborigines that are daunting and foreign to them. Despite such requirements, Finlayson (1995) argues that Aboriginal people with limited formal education have been given opportunities for skilled work at the Tjapukai Dance Theatre, and concurrently at the Park. Questions about education were not asked of the Djabugay employees but the researcher observed that spoken English varied markedly from Standard English to Aboriginal English (Eades 1992:4). Indeed a Djabugay Park employee expressed anger that the managers would continually tell him to speak better English. He asserts that he speaks English the way he does naturally and feels it is better for tourists to hear the way he really speaks, rather than the way the managers want him to speak. If the Aboriginal use of English is misunderstood, it may be more difficult to enhance cross-cultural communication and to reduce negative stereotypical images of Indigenous Australians. The demand of the tourism industry for Aborigines to speak ‘better’ English may diminish the Indigenous Australians use of Indigenous language and/or Aboriginal English.

Management concern about Aboriginal employee’s language skills might relate to the tourists who have a marginal grasp on English. Such tourists may not comprehend the Aboriginal accent. It might also be possible that the concern is related to the employees contact with tourists who do have a good command of English but may nevertheless not understand Aboriginal English. Allowing Djabugay employees to speak Aboriginal English, if that is the case, presents tourists with authentic representations of Aboriginal English. Although Mathieson and Wall (1982:174) argue that Indigenous language may be eroded if locals have to speak a visitor’s language, this may not occur if such language
is taught in schools (as is the case for the Djabugay) or by an Indigenous community to its people. Aboriginal performers at the Park speak and/or sing the Djabugay language at the Tjapukai Dance Theatre and the Creation Theatre at the Park, therefore sustaining the Djabugay language, to some degree.

Regardless of the Djabugay level of education, the Djabugay way of solving problems appears to be through consensus, rather than autocratic decision making. This form of decision making might pose a challenge to the Park’s managers in dealing with the Djabugay employees, although they did not mention it. Therefore, it is recommended that the strategic plan be developed in a consultative manner in keeping with Djabugay culture, and indeed modern management practices. Such consultative practices allow ownership of the strategic plan by all those associated with its development and its application will have far greater support, than non-involvement by staff members. The managers could confer with the Djabugay employees with regard to any changes that affect the Djabugay people or their culture, agreeing to changes in a consensual manner rather than the Djabugay employees becoming upset with an autocratic style of decisionmaking (see Section 4.4.5 and 4.4.6). It is also recommended that the strategic plan incorporate regular staff meetings to enhance communication and regular reviews of the aims and objectives of the plan to assess whether targets are being met.

Again, a lack of communication was a major issue for Djabugay Park employees, for example, a lack of communication between the dancers and management, little management feedback and a lack of management response to employee requests. The Park’s Managing Director intimated that a newsletter “Murrixpress” was designed for the employees at the Park to quell communication breakdown. It is, however, personal communication the Djabugay are seeking, based on their oral heritage, rather than a written communication. As the Djabugay prefer to operate in a consensual manner, rather than in an autocratic manner, it is recommended that the Park’s managers consider consulting the Djabugay employees on all matters of cultural significance, personally.

Low educational attainment means the Djabugay and the Indigenous workforce as a whole, may not be as competitive as other potential employees (Hunter 1997:18). The Djabugay people receive little formal training at the Park and until constructive formal programs are put in place, they will remain semi-skilled with little opportunity of working
in the Park’s management positions or elsewhere in private or public enterprise. Tourism employment for Indigenous people everywhere is frequently unskilled and low paid (Lawrence 1985:2) and unless training and promotion is provided for Djabugay employees they will remain semi-skilled and receive relatively low wages. It is therefore important that the Djabugay community support their people in the attainment of higher educational qualifications, if they wish to compete for employment opportunities in the labour market.

A need for training was raised at the Tjapukai Dance Theatre (Finlayson 1995:13) and again at the Park. Training regarding Djabugay culture at a Park that promotes such culture would seem invaluable and is recommended for the strategic plan. Cross-cultural awareness training has now been formally introduced through an agreement between the Park and the Federal Department of Education & Training and Youth Affairs (Finch 1998:13). The agreement includes two additional programs at the Park. One of them is to recruit persons to permanent positions in a diverse range of occupations (Finch 1998:13). There is no mention of whether those recruits are Djabugay, other Australian Aborigines or non-Aborigines, or a combination of all such people. The other program involves developing skill enhancement and career development programs for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employees (Finch 1998:13). Still, there is no mention of specific training for the Djabugay to prepare them for their role as major equity shareholders.

The programs referred to above might alleviate, to some extent, concerns for the Djabugay as skills are to be enhanced and careers developed, according to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander needs (Finch 1998:13). Yet, there appears to be no mention of the Djabugay people and their needs in the agreement with the Department of Education & Training and Youth Affairs. Without explicit strategies to train and advance Djabugay employees into management positions, they may not be able to control the business operations of the Park. As the Department of Education & Training and Youth Affairs agreement with the Park does not mention training and career advancement for the Djabugay, it is suggested the strategic plan incorporate such strategies.
Recommendations

It is recommended that:

• The Park’s managers allow Djabugay employees to speak Aboriginal English, whenever possible provided that enunciation and articulation clearly communicates meaning.
• The business plan incorporates the acknowledgement and inclusion of Indigenous decision making processes.
• The business plan incorporates regular staff meetings.
• The business plan incorporates cross-cultural training programs.

5.5 Community Resourcing (Alternative Employment)

Some of the Djabugay community seems to have benefited positively from tourism (Brim 1993:48) but overall, the resources of the Djabugay community do not seem to have improved through tourism (see Sections 4.3.1 and 4.4.4). It may be for such reasons that the Djabugay community, particularly some of its elders, has decided that the community must not rely on anyone else but itself to achieve economic independence. Other traditional Aboriginal leaders are also deriding ‘the corrosions of the dependency culture’ (Rothwell 1999:21). The Djabugay issues of controlling their own future were also addressed by Aboriginal groups at a National Industry Business and Economics Conference in 1993 where Aborigines expressed their desire for the reduction of income support dependency, greater ownership of resources and quality of employment (Finlayson 1995:6).

With a view towards economic independence, the elders had many alternative employment strategies in mind, but unfortunately, lack the funds, resources and possibly the business acumen to turn ideas into viable business ventures. Ideas that would not conflict with the Park’s Agreement are plentiful but there was no discussion about how to bring such ideas to commercial reality. This correlates with arguments by Finlayson (1991a:95) and Altman and Finlayson (1992:13) that Aborigines generally lack knowledge about how to initiate or maintain a business enterprise, and that they have limited management or business experience (Altman 1993a:8).
The elders say that banks will not loan money to Indigenous people. If this is the case, then trying to get any new tourism venture started may be very difficult for the Djabugay people. The Djabugay community may perceive discrimination by the banks not granting them a loan but the banks cannot be seen to be discriminatory for fear of anti-discrimination laws in Australia. Yet, a bank granting a loan requires assets as collateral from the lender. A Djabugay person’s assets are often minimal and therefore indirectly it is the case that the banks would not loan funds to a Djabugay person, fuelling their perception that the banks will not fund them.

If the Djabugay share in Skyrail was sold so that they could engage in alternative employment strategies, they will forfeit their chances of buying the 28.4 per cent share in the Park in the future. Should the Djabugay community sell its Skyrail share to fund alternative employment strategies and it fails, then it assumedly has no other means of buying a share in the Park. This must pose a dilemma. If an Aboriginal community engages in tourism but does not see any returns, it can wait longer hoping for such a return. Another option is to withdraw from such a venture and reinvest in another venture that may or may not return a dividend for their investment. Alternatively, it could withdraw completely from tourism. The impacts of changing course would be largely unknown and may indeed produce further negative impacts for the Aboriginal community.

Altman (1989:470) argues that the economic impact of tourism on Aboriginal people is limited, but positive. If the Djabugay do not perceive positive economic impacts from the Park, then it might be difficult to have them believe that their continuing association with the Park will bring them economic rewards in the future. Regardless, the alternative employment strategies they are talking about, with the view to economic independence, are all related to tourism. Altman (1989:470) found that the choice for economic opportunities for Aborigines often was tourism or nothing. This might explain why at least some of the Djabugay community members believe that tourism provides economic independence, as they cannot envisage employment alternatives in any other industry. At least some of the employment alternatives mentioned by the Djabugay were in areas other than dance performance, which contrasts with Finlayson’s argument that that is the only alternative Kuranda Aborigines can think of (1991a:97) (see Section 2.2). Possibly over
time and with exposure to various employment alternatives, some of Australia’s Indigenous people might envisage a broader range of employment opportunities.

Perceiving tourism as a provider of economic independence may be a misconception. The Djabugay experience with tourism and its potential rewards in Cairns, renowned for its tourism industry, may result in the Djabugay people perceiving that tourism is the only choice they have for potential economic and social benefits. Yet, at the time of the study, very few Djabugay people had benefited economically, socially and culturally from their association with tourism. It therefore seems incongruous that the Djabugay should perceive that other forays into tourism would result in more positive impacts. A strategy for the community might be to consider other avenues for economic gain. For example, to design, produce and market clothing that can be sold to international tourists in Australia and overseas, due to the international tourists showing more interest in Aborigines than Australian tourists. This strategy might contravene the Djabugay agreement with the Park as the non-competition clause states that such a strategy may occur but specified ‘in particular T-shirts’ (Deed of Partnership 1995:31). It is unclear whether only T-shirts can be manufactured and/or other clothing as well. Another strategy could be the harvesting and processing of bush foods for distribution to restaurants, bistros, and retail outlets.

Can the Djabugay community adopt a commercial mindset; find alternative employment in tourism or another industry; and reduce their dependency on welfare to achieve economic independence? Various Djabugay community members are enrolled in the Community Development Employment Projects (CDEP) scheme, which is a Commonwealth Government initiative that provides jobs for Aboriginal people in low-skilled part-time occupations (Finlayson 1995), primarily in the public sector. The Park provides Aborigines with work in the private sector but if Aborigines no longer wish to work in such an environment, they know they can go back to CDEP work or welfare. However, it has been found that welfare dependency has not been significantly reduced through government-sponsored employment programs (Finlayson 1995:3, Bernardi 1997). Altman (1989:471) found that at Uluru Aboriginal people would work for short periods and then return to welfare, as full-time employment apparently is not a high priority. Reducing overall dependence on Commonwealth labour schemes and welfare, to
which they have been subjected through colonisation (Bernardi 1997), may be difficult for the Djabugay community, or indeed any other Indigenous community.

The Djabugay community had two of its representatives and an external consultant negotiate the Deed on its behalf, yet the terms of the Deed were drawn up so narrowly as to exclude other forms of tourism for them. This has been to the detriment of the Djabugay community and such terms continue to have a negative impact on the Djabugay people, particularly with regard to alternative employment strategies. The Djabugay elders are therefore particularly keen to undertake a management plan with the objective of expanding into alternative tourism ventures and employment opportunities and have asked for assistance with such a plan (refer to Sections 3.6.4 and 4.3.1). It is imperative Indigenous communities do not sign away their rights to conduct their own cultural events, as the promise of positive tourism benefits from a tourism venture may not become a reality.

- **Recommendations**

*It is recommended that:*

- *The Djabugay community maintains its Skyrail shareholding.*
- *The Djabugay community considers viable alternative employment avenues.*
- *The Djabugay community does not forfeit its rights to the community’s use of Djabugay cultural activities.*

5.5.1 Welfare or Economic Independence

One strategy to facilitate economic independence could involve assisting the Djabugay to envisage a life-style more independent from government funding than has been the case since colonisation. It was difficult for the Djabugay workshop attendees to consider strategising a Djabugay-led agenda, rather than a government-led agenda. It is recommended that a management plan, consultancy advice and implementation assistance for alternative employment strategies be undertaken to assist the Djabugay people towards economic independence. Such a plan must incorporate the Djabugay traditional
patterns of obligation and reciprocity, which has been distorted by the welfare culture (Rothwell 1999:21).

- **Recommendations**

  *It is recommended that:*

  - *The Djabugay community engages a consultant/other to prepare a management plan, offer advice and implementation assistance for tourism strategies, and alternative employment opportunities.*

5.6 **Community Consultation and Participation (Cultural Issues)**

There are both positive and negative impacts of tourism for the Djabugay community. Positive impacts, perceived by the Djabugay, include the revival of Djabugay culture; employment opportunities; working together; a decrease of stereotypical images; increased cross-cultural understanding and for some, an improvement in material welfare. Negative impacts include degradation of Djabugay culture; exploitation of the Djabugay community; a lack of tourist interaction and a lack of improvement in material welfare. The commercialisation of their culture may have long-term impacts on their community where their culture is changed according to the Park’s managers’ wishes, rather than those of the Djabugay community.

When the Djabugay found out that the new Park’s show was to incorporate the language, dances and songs of the Djabugay to a greater extent than it had at the Tjapukai Dance Theatre (Holden and Duffin1998:21), they wanted revenue in exchange for the use of Djabugay intellectual and cultural property. The Djabugay certainly did not want economic opportunities to be missed, but nor did they want their culture exploited by others (Duffin 1996:14). Altman also found that many Aboriginal people and Indigenous minorities world-wide want to gain financially from tourism, but also wish to minimise the cultural and social costs of tourism (1989:457). It appears that the minimisation of negative socio-cultural impacts from tourism have not been achieved by the Djabugay’s involvement with the Park.
To avoid the exploitation of their culture, alluded to by Finlayson (1995:17) regarding the Tjapukai Dance Theatre, an agreement between the parties was to specify the setting up of the Djabugay Cultural Co-ordinating Committee to ensure that what was to be presented at the Park was culturally appropriate. It was also to ensure that the Djabugay would have equity in the new Park so as not to miss economic opportunities made from the presentation of their culture (Holden and Duffin 1998:26). The outcome of the negotiations between the Djabugay and the Tjapukai Dance Theatre’s Managing Director was that almost 50 per cent of the Park was to be owned by Aboriginal interests and that the cultural content of the Park be under the full control of the Djabugay people (Holden and Duffin 1998:28). Section 5.2 demonstrates that neither of these terms are being met.

Authenticity issues had already been raised at the Tjapukai Dance Theatre and were now also of concern regarding cultural presentations at the Park. For example, Aboriginal groups, other than the Djabugay, have criticized the Tjapukai Dance Theatre for representing Aboriginal dance and song in an unauthentic manner (Finlayson 1995:15). The Djabugay employees themselves believe that what is being portrayed at the Park is unauthentic. They are taught how to dance to accommodate the Park managers’ requirements although the Park managers explained that such dances are adjusted periodically to take into account comments from tourist surveys. Therefore the Djabugay performances are adjusted according to the needs of the market, resulting in the commoditisation of Djabugay culture. Cultural adaptations can oversimplify “Aboriginality” or homogenize it so that it is palatable to tourists (Altman 1992:7) and this appears to be the case as the dances performed at the Park are not authentic Djabugay dance. As Mathieson and Wall (1982:173) argue, there is a negative impact on Indigenous people when staged cultural events manipulate their tradition for the benefit of the tourist. It seems that the Park portrays Djabugay tradition in a manner that suits the tourist’s perception of what constitutes Aboriginal culture (Zeppel 1998b:21).

Although Williams (1998:163) argues that culture is dynamic, adaptive and not static, the Djabugay should be able to have influence over how their culture adapts and how it is portrayed. As the elders pass away, what is represented at the Park may be perceived to be authentic by some of the Djabugay people. Therefore, Djabugay culture may adapt again to take into account Park-represented contrived performances of Djabugay culture. If this is an anathema to the Djabugay community it can take various steps to minimise
such adaptations. As Mathieson and Wall argue, contrived performances have negative consequences for local culture (1982:173) when it results in culture being destroyed or changed (Greenwood 1989:173, Mowforth and Munt 1998:5). Therefore, if the Park’s managers do not consult the Djabugay Committee and the Agency regarding all advertising material and representations of Djabugay culture at the Park, then negotiation with the managers is necessary. If such negotiations are unsatisfactory, mediation with an independent body or legal recourse is recommended.

The Djabugay community can maintain its core values and belief with or without control over Djabugay cultural representations at the Park. Altman and Finlayson (1992:18) argue that cultural sustainability is dependent upon Aboriginal control. Djabugay ownership and control of 51 per cent of the Park could enhance such cultural sustainability. Yet, social impacts from frequent contact with other societies will cause difficulty in pinpointing a long-standing traditional lifestyle of any community. Even so, Kelly and Nankervis (1998:83) argue there is still usually ‘a distinguishable core of values and beliefs to which other elements have been added’. It is important that an Indigenous community have a majority share in a tourist venture, to enable their power and control over the cultural representations of such a venture. An Indigenous community may withdraw from tourism (Ryan 1991:148) but perhaps the Djabugay have not thought about such an option, that is, selling their share in the Park. They would then have no voting rights and the Agreement with the Park may become void, meaning no legal rights over the cultural representation of the Djabugay at the Park.

Most Djabugay Park employees are positive about tourism because it gives them the opportunity of learning about a culture that was repressed. Such learning was enhanced through research about Djabugay culture undertaken before the Park opened and through representations of it at the Park. Michael Quinn learnt and revived the Djabugay language with the assistance of a Djabugay man by teaching the language at a Cairns High School and a local Kuranda primary school (Finlayson 1995:16, Pulley 1998:36-7). Although the revival of Indigenous culture is a positive impact of tourism, its revival does not necessarily protect and maintain Indigenous culture (Preglau 1983:56, Harron and Weiler 1992:88).
Nunez (1989:266) argues that ‘the alteration of one culture by another has always been a fact of existence’. The Djabugay people and their culture have already been affected by their removal from their home and transference to a mission where they were not allowed to practice their culture and language (Finch 1998:13, Bottoms 1999:57). Indeed, they were flogged if they spoke their own language (Pulley 1998:36). They were involved with selling artifacts to tourists there and surrounded by tourists when they went to live in and around Kuranda, a tourist village. The Djabugay became further involved with tourism by becoming an equity partner in the Park and by working there. Djabugay culture will have altered over the years in general and through exposure to other cultures and lifestyles. They present some of their culture as the culture of their ancestors, acknowledging that they now live a very different lifestyle influenced by westernised practices. The Park adds a further dimension to their culture, in that it presents elements of unauthentic Djabugay culture, thereby further diluting such culture. Some Djabugay people may perceive such representations as authentic, thereby altering their perception of what is authentic Djabugay culture. Such a misconception must surely be considered by traditionalists as a negative impact of tourism.

If tourists do not understand that what they see is unauthentic, they may not demand cultural authenticity. Even if they do, it may not be a source of concern for them, but it is for the Djabugay people. But what is the “true” culture of the Djabugay? Is it what the elders remember from stories told to them at the mission by their parents or grandparents; is it an amalgamation of culture from the past and its adaptations in the present, or will it become what is represented at the Park, as the elders pass away? Culture may be an amalgam of all of these dynamics.

• **Recommendations**

*It is recommended that:*

• *The Djabugay elders teach the Djabugay community about authentic Djabugay culture.*

• *The Djabugay community institutes legal action if the Park’s managers continue to breach the Heads of Agreement.*
5.6.1 Stereotypical Images of Indigenous Australians

Gillespie (1988:244) argues that the incorrect purveyance of information about Aboriginal people and their lifestyle can promote stereotypical images of Australian Aborigines rather than positive images of them. For example, the dancers at the Park are portrayed wearing loincloths in newspaper articles (see Hay 1997, Pulley 1998) and in the Park’s promotional brochure (see Appendix E). Someone who does not know anything about Aborigines and their culture may indeed be under the illusion that all Australian Aborigines wear loincloths and carry spears with them, as a matter of course, misrepresenting the dynamism of Aboriginal culture (Harron and Weiler 1992). Therefore, the Park’s promotional brochure and media representations actually promote the stereotypical images of Aborigines, which can have a negative impact on the Djabugay people. Representing Australia’s Indigenous people in loincloths may promote an image of an exotic (Burchett 1993:20), primitive people and therefore have negative consequences. Tourists with such a perception towards the Djabugay employees at the Park may either not engage in conversation with them or do so in a condescending manner, therefore limiting the chances of positive cross-cultural communication and understanding.

Representations of Australia’s Aborigines are changing and therefore the impacts of such representations may become less negative. As Aboriginal land ownership and tourism involvement increases, more contemporary images of Aboriginal people are shown in tourist marketing (Zeppel 1997b:218). Indeed, an article about a senior dancer and Board director of the Park shows a Djabugay person in jeans and T-shirt (Pulley 1997b:8) which is more representative of the attire of Djabugay people today, except for the Djabugay female elders who wear dresses. Contemporary representations of the Djabugay are more accurate compared to them dressed in loincloths, unless they are performing dance or other traditional activities at the Park.

The relationship between hosts and guests is affected by stereotyping (Nunez 1989:271) and in the case of the Park, the Djabugay employees believe guests are affected in a manner that reduces negative stereotyping. They believe the Park gives the Djabugay employees the opportunity to communicate with the rest of the world at the Park and when they travel overseas. Enhanced cross-cultural communication can create positive
impacts for an Aboriginal community by breaking down the negative stereotypical image of them.

The preference for knowledge about the Djabugay from international visitors’ more so than Australian visitors, has a negative impact on the Djabugay. Williams (1998:160) argues that the sustenance of another’s culture is possible because of the interest and support of visitors. A non-Djabugay Indigenous employee at the Park, Hay (1997:3) and Southgate (1999:5) find that international tourists are most interested in Aboriginal culture, whereas Australian tourists are not so interested. Willie Brim, a long term Park employee also found that other nations respected ‘the oldest living culture in the world’ but not his own countrymen (Pulley 1997b:8). To appeal to Australian tourists, a Djabugay community member is examining ways to make the History Theatre film footage more palatable for Australian tourists. The Board of Directors apparently wants to remove the film, as they believe it is blatantly negative. It seems Australian tourists and Park Board Directors are more sensitive to Australian history in the History Theatre, which portrays Australian history from the Indigenous perspective, than international tourists.

The existence of the Park may educate visitors about Aboriginal history, “dreaming” and culture and improve their understanding of Aboriginality. The Anangu at Uluru identified one of the best things of tourism being that tourists were able to ‘see and learn about Ayers Rock’ (Altman 1987a:81). If cross-cultural communication and understanding can enhance relationships between visitors and Aborigines, attitudes between both groups should change and hopefully improve. Djabugay employees like to converse with tourists and believe most tourists, particularly international tourists, leave the Park with a positive attitude about them and their culture. Yet, there are arguments for (Davidson 1989:170, Reisinger 1994:743, Mowforth and Munt 1998:269) and against (Crick 1991:10, Mathieson and Well 1982:134) cross-cultural communication benefits (see Section 2.3.2). It would appear that international tourists are much more interested than Australian tourists in enhancing cross-cultural communication with Australian Indigenous people.
• **Recommendations**

*It is recommended that:*

• *The Park’s managers liaise with the Djabugay community regarding potential adjustments to the History Theatre film footage.*

5.6.2 Minimisation of Tourist Contact

The Djabugay people made no mention of wishing to have no or little contact with tourists although Altman argues that the tourism industry demands social interaction with tourists ‘which many Aboriginal people are unwilling or unable to undertake’ (1992:2). This does not appear to be an issue for the Djabugay people. Indeed, quite a few of them had ideas as to how to expand tourism, which included the prospect of the Djabugay dealing with tourists more frequently. Exposure to international tourists may continue to have positive impacts on Indigenous people but there may be negative impacts from Australian tourists who do not hold Indigenous people in the same esteem as international tourists.

The Djabugay community and Djabugay Park employees appear to genuinely welcome some researchers into their homes and tourists into the Park. Many Anangu liked talking to tourists (Central Land Council et al 1987:103) and Djabugay Park employees mentioned that they felt that the tourists should mix more with Aboriginal people and talk to them at the Park. Pearce et al (1997:17) found when researching satisfaction at Tjapukai, that visitors perceived that they had limited contact with Aboriginal people. Therefore, both visitors and Djabugay employees like more contact with each other, rather than less.

Although the Djabugay elders are weary of countless meetings and numerous researchers seeking permission to work with the Djabugay people, the Djabugay employees appear to seek additional contact with tourists. Yet the reason the Djabugay are inundated with requests by researchers and government authorities is as a result of tourism. They have become known throughout Australia and the world through their association with the Park and their native title claims (refer to Sections 3.3, 4.3.3, 4.4.4 and 4.4.6).
An additional recommendation for the strategic plan is the provision for interaction between tourists and the Djabugay and other Aboriginal employees at the Park. For instance, there could be a ‘Getting to know Aboriginal Australians’ segment during the day where visitors can ask questions and listen to stories by Aboriginal staff. One of the Aborigines would need to be a Djabugay person for questions specifically relating to them and their culture. Such a strategy and its application would meet the objectives of Djabugay employees and tourists and suit the Djabugay oral tradition of telling stories.

- **Recommendations**

*It is recommended that:*

- The business plan incorporates a strategy for interaction between tourists and the Park’s Indigenous Australians.

### 5.6.3 Ethical Research Issues

Since the research of this study was completed a report has been published. The report *Research of Interest to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples* (National Board of Employment, Education and Training and Australian Research Council 1999) identifies, amongst other things, the protocols necessary for conducting research with Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. Although this report was not available at the time of research, it confirms the approach taken in this research and concurs with much of what was found from the study.

Issues, which emerged regarding research being conducted in an ethical manner, included the nuisance factor of a glut of researchers; reciprocity arrangements; the challenge of meeting the altered requirements of the Djabugay community; and the issue of research being conducted on the Djabugay by non-Indigenous researchers. Ethical research practices regarding reciprocity are referred to in Section 3.3 and contingency in research design to cater for a change in the needs of the Djabugay is referred to in Section 3.5.

Nothing in the literature concerning the Djabugay community or the Park alerted the researcher to the Djabugay concern about being approached regularly by researchers.
Knowing that the Djabugay are meeting weary (see Section 3.6.1), and approached frequently by researchers (see Section 4.2.1), it is recommended that researchers working with Indigenous Australians develop strategies to minimise the need for meetings. Also, they should approach the Djabugay or other Indigenous Australian groups with the “right” attitude when requesting research permission; “seeking” permission rather than “assuming” permission to conduct research.

The Djabugay people do not seem to appreciate researchers who expect the Djabugay to give them permission to work with them (see Section 4.3.2). It seems that if questions are asked about whom to approach for research permission and endeavours are made to meet with and seek permission from those individuals, there is a greater opportunity of success for research with the Djabugay. What is appropriate for other Indigenous Australian groups is difficult to assess but it seems that often the elders of an Indigenous Australian community are the decision makers for their people and therefore may be the appropriate body with whom to establish contact. See Creamer (1983:13-14) for additional commentary on establishing initial contact with Indigenous Australians and appropriate behaviour when dealing with them.

Recommendations to reduce ‘meeting fatigue’ include holding a meeting before or after a meeting the Indigenous Australian community is already attending. Organisational efforts for transport do therefore not occur on two separate occasions but only once. Of course, they might be tired from having already attended a meeting if the meeting follows another meeting. Another suggestion is to meet the Indigenous Australian community at their respective places of abode, in the Djabugay example, Mantaka, Kowrowa or Kuranda. The negative aspect of this is that they are not all together and the possibility of misinformation or lack of communication between all the parties may occur. Another is to meet them at a common meeting place if the Indigenous Australian community has one.

There are various theories about who constitutes an Indigenous Australian leader. One is that leaders or elders are male, 45 to 60 years of age and are respected and deferred to though individuals are still left to form their own opinions and act accordingly (Edwards 1998:162). Djabugay elders are role models for those who bestow them with the esteem of respect and deference. Their community seeks their advice and their opinions are
respected, even though there are complaints about youth not wanting to learn from the elders, as there are in non-Indigenous societies. Indeed, one Djabugay community member said she would not go against the elders’ wishes, out of respect for them, even if she disagreed with them. Although Edwards (1998:162) describes elders as male, in the Djabugay community they are both male and female and predominantly in their sixties and it is important to establish relationships with them based on mutual trust and reciprocity.

Issues regarding the ‘politics of representation and speaking positions: who can speak and with what authority’ (Huggins et al 1997:227) has an impact on the Djabugay people (see Section 4.3.3). The researcher accepts that not being of the Djabugay people, she would not be able to understand Djabugay culture and nuances, as would a Djabugay person. Acknowledging that, the researcher set out to assess the impacts of tourism on the Djabugay community, through asking them about such impacts and endeavouring to portray such impacts as the Djabugay community explained them to the researcher. The researcher’s goal was to identify impacts and to make suggestions for minimising negative impacts for the Djabugay community, and any other Indigenous community engaged in, or about to engage in, a tourism venture.

Research outcomes of tourism impacts on an Indigenous Australian community can provide benefits to it regarding the tourism situation they are in. It may inform its members how other cultures perceive them and this can be empowering for them if done properly. Research may also highlight misinformation and communication gaps between Indigenous Australian communities and a tourist provider, as well as an awareness of cross-cultural misinterpretation. Such areas of knowledge can empower all parties involved in a tourist venture and enable them to negotiate areas of difficulty to a mutually beneficial outcome for all parties concerned.

Huggins et al (1997:231) argue ‘Non-Aboriginals must understand their cultural and ethical limitations in studying, researching and writing about Blacks.’ They argue that different people have different experiences of the world and therefore it is important that non-Aboriginals do not put Aborigines in a ‘conceptual framework’ which is not their own (Huggins et al 1997:232). It would be possible for a non-Aborigine or an Aborigine from a community other than the one being researched, to have experiences that may be
different from the Aboriginal community being researched. But how does the body of knowledge increase if Aboriginal communities do not have the resources to conduct research or do not want to? Cultural research can be informative to Indigenous Australians as they can identify misconceptions of the non-Aboriginal interpretation of their culture.

Information cannot be made available if no one is able to or does not want to undertake research to provide such information. If an Indigenous Australian community does not want non-community members to undertake research, then they can tell the prospective researcher not to proceed. If they do wish to have someone not from their community undertake such research, then such permission from the community’s elders (if that is the case) is sufficient for that researcher to conduct research provided they adhere to ethics guidelines and deal with ethical issues (refer to Section 3.3). This is important to ensure that those giving permission are sufficiently knowledgeable about the implications of any research and to negate a means of unethical exploitation.

The lack of resources for Indigenous Australian communities may be a motivation for them to have someone with resources undertake research, at little financial cost to that community. For example, Indigenous Australian elders and community members already have many issues to be dealt with on a regular basis (see Section 3.6.2) which depletes the limited resources they possess. Other motivations might be a lack of research skills in their community or a reticence of those in the community with research skills to undertake such research.

The next chapter provides an overview of the conclusions derived from this study regarding tourism impacts on the Djabugay community.
6.0 CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction

The conclusions contained within this chapter are derived from research that is concerned with tourism impacts on an Australian Indigenous community, the Djabugay community.

6.2 Tourism Impacts

Tourism impacts on Indigenous Australian communities are varied, broad ranging and complex. What is perceived by one Indigenous person in a community as a positive impact, may be perceived by another member of the same community as a negative impact. Sometimes, Indigenous Australian employees may agree on impacts with an enterprise manager, or disagree, or dispute the degree to which a particular impact affects them and/or their community. Their perceptions are different and they experience impacts in different ways. Also, the perception of an Indigenous Australian employee who may be experiencing economic gain may be quite different from that of his/her community if such community is not benefiting economically from tourism. The complexity of tourism impacts therefore involves the nature of the impacts, whether they are social, economic or cultural, and the different perspectives of the individuals involved with tourism.

Tourism impacts may be perceived as similar. At times, the Djabugay Park employees and Park managers agreed on issues concerning the impacts of tourism. They agreed that positive impacts include employment and cultural revival. Yet, when giving their perspectives of Djabugay culture and its representation, the Djabugay Park employees and community members had opposing views to the Park managers about the details of such representations and just which of these were positive. The Djabugay people believe the Park’s portrayals of Djabugay traditions have negative impacts on them as their culture is represented in an inauthentic manner, and is therefore commoditised to make it commercially viable and palatable to tourists. The assessment of impacts is therefore not simple when there are multiple perspectives. It is further complicated by the idea that positive impacts may also have negative consequences.
Impacts were found to counter one another. Although negative tourism impacts are predominantly negative, some positive tourism impacts have negative aspects. For example, employment opportunities are recognised by most as the positive impacts of tourism but employment types tend to be in menial, low paid jobs with little chance of advancing into managerial, more highly paid jobs. These are viewed as negative impacts of tourism. The positive tourism impact of cultural revival is countered by the negative tourism impact of the commoditisation of such culture and the exploitation of Indigenous Australians. Therefore, the revival of culture may not protect and enhance Indigenous culture, but rather dilute such culture.

6.3 Cause of Tourism Impacts

A conflict was found to exist between corporate cultures and traditional cultures. Tourism enterprise operators work within a capitalist corporate framework responsible to shareholders, whereas Indigenous Australian communities work within a traditional Indigenous framework responsible to their community. A corporate framework encompasses business expertise but a traditional framework involves Indigenous cultural expertise. There are therefore different cultural nuances and practices within and between the two models. As a consequence of the differences between the corporate framework and the traditional framework, it is important that all parties involved develop the ability to work amid, across and between cultural differences. Tourism enterprise operators may resist such a strategy because of the power they possess and because their primary objective is commercial viability. Good will can, at times, be blocked by a lack of knowledge and experience in specific cultural concerns.

Cross-cultural understanding is crucial for success in tourism enterprises involved with Indigenous Australians or where they feature Indigenous culture. Without extensive cross-cultural education and familiarity, there is little motivation for the Park’s managers to develop the ability to work cross-culturally, and therefore to enhance positive tourism impacts and/or minimise negative tourism impacts for the Djabugay community. Owners and managers of tourism enterprises are endowed with power through the corporate culture. Therefore management is not beholden to meet the needs and aspirations of Indigenous Australians who are less powerful. The Djabugay people are in a less powerful position in the Park because of the Djabugay minority shareholding, minimal
voting power, small number of employees and lack of managerial representation. The lack of power of those representing the traditional framework has severe negative impacts for such Indigenous Australians, or indeed Indigenous people everywhere who are engaged in, or wish to engage in, tourism.

When agreements are not honoured, the Djabugay community loses. The Park’s managers exercise their power within a corporate context, which results in negative tourism impacts for the Djabugay community. Examples of how a powerful corporate culture has dominated and impacted the less powerful traditional culture of the Djabugay community include Park managers not honouring the terms and conditions of the Agreement with the Djabugay community. An outcome of such behaviour is that the cultural representations of Djabugay culture at the Park may be inauthentic. Yet, the aims and objectives of a corporate culture are achieved by ensuring commercial viability. But this is at the expense of the protection of cultural values. It is therefore difficult for an Indigenous community with limited power within a traditional framework to minimise negative tourism impacts or enhance positive tourism impacts when there are conflicting agreements due to differing objectives.

6.4 Minimisation of Negative Tourism Impacts

Power and control are necessary for Indigenous communities engaged in tourism enterprises, or indeed any other type of enterprise. With power and control they can influence the type and degree of tourism impacts on their community. To achieve such power, Indigenous communities need to have access to management skills and capital and/or own the majority of the land and/or tourist enterprise. Ownership of such assets and/or power and control affects the level of tourism impacts on Indigenous communities. The Djabugay community could achieve power and control with respect to their traditional culture by achieving native title to their land. This could provide an alternative to their employment at the Park and enable greater control of their own destiny.

Any alternative employment avenues for the Djabugay community must be considered in the context of their involvement with the Park. The Djabugay community has forfeited its rights to undertake the majority of its traditional activities, for commercial purposes, and it is therefore restricted from undertaking most alternative employment avenues in
tourism. For example, every aspect of Djabugay culture that is demonstrated at the Park may not be demonstrated elsewhere by the Djabugay community. This results in a situation, in which the powerful corporate culture of the Park may have little interest in minimising the negative tourism impacts on the Djabugay community, as its first priority is commercial viability. The lack of power and therefore control over the destiny of the Djabugay community diminishes the community’s opportunities to minimise negative tourism impacts. However, the Djabugay could conduct mission tours; guided walks to their rock art; harvest and process bush foods; and design and manufacture T-shirts and other items for sale that are not outside the agreement.

The Djabugay Park employees and the Djabugay community were found to be experiencing negative tourism impacts and relatively questionable benefits of tourism. It is therefore important that Indigenous communities and tourism enterprise operators contemplating a foray into a new tourism venture, consider the type, range and complexities of tourism impacts. Impacts are unclear, confusing and complex. It is, however, pertinent that all parties are aware of prospective impacts and understand them. There is then a possibility that the gap between a capitalist corporate culture and a traditional Indigenous culture may, to some degree, be reduced.

The reduction of the gap between the corporate culture and traditional culture will remain unattainable whilst a predominantly non-Indigenous corporate culture exercises power over the traditional culture of Indigenous Australians, or any other Indigenous group. Whilst corporate owners and managers have the objective of commercial viability and traditionalists have the objective of cultural protection, there will continue to be complex, broad ranging and varied impacts of tourism on Indigenous communities. As the corporate owners and managers have most of the power, it is imperative they consider means of minimising the negative impacts of tourism on Indigenous communities for the long-term success of tourism for all parties involved. Ultimately, it is in the corporate owners and managers best interests to nurture the culture that they promote for commercial gain.
6.5 Recommendations for Further Research

There are several topics that are recommended for further research. First, an examination of the impacts of tourism in Indigenous cultural centres that have an Indigenous manager. Such a study could also examine the differences between how an Indigenous manager and non-Indigenous manager lead such cultural centres. Secondly, longitudinal studies of the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park or Indigenous cultural centre which investigates if and how tourism impacts change over time. Thirdly, there is a real need for additional tourism research regarding other Indigenous communities at other attractions, to get a better understanding of how tourism impacts Indigenous communities.
**Postscript**

*It is relevant to note that a recent newspaper article refers to the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park achieving $7 million annual turnover (Southgate 1999:5). It is assumed that the annual turnover of $7 million is a gross annual figure rather than a net annual figure that has had operating expenses deducted from it. As such, it is unknown whether the Park was able to achieve profits in the same year. Regardless, unless dividends from such potential profit are filtered through to the Djabugay community, they will continue to perceive negative impacts of tourism, in at least the area of economic impacts.*
APPENDIX A

OUTCOMES OF SEARCH WORKSHOP 18 AND 22 SEPTEMBER 1997
FOR THE DJABUGAY COMMUNITY
ACTION PLAN

OBJECTIVES FOR THE FUTURE - 2000

1. Secure land claim over Barron Gorge National Park (BGNP) and extend to Mona Mona (MM) and tribal areas.
2. Seek funding from international sources, ATSIC, Gaming Fund, Vittel and Corporations.
3. Expand employment opportunities to cover rangers and cultural teachers.
4. Plan for enterprise developments in:
   - Tourism (markets, bush walks, advertising)
   - Making artefacts (skirts, beads, bags, spears, hats)
   - Teaching (foods and medicine)
5. Establish resources:
   - Office facilities
   - Staffing
6. Secure and expand available housing
7. Implement succession planning
   - For key positions
   - To select individuals with particular aptitudes
   - To prepare Djabugay for key positions
8. Secure respect for traditional authority.

ACTION PLAN - 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Land Claim – Barron Gorge National Park (BGNP)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>NQLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Land Claim – Mona Mona (MM)</td>
<td>22/9/97</td>
<td>NQLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Land Claim – Djabugay Tribal Land</td>
<td>When BGNP &amp; MM owned</td>
<td>NQLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Funding</td>
<td>Dec. ’97</td>
<td>Siggy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide list of funding sources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gwyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• (Philanthropic Association and Internet)</td>
<td>I’national</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fundraising</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Djabugay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission to potential funders</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhonda, Dianne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td>CES/CEDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural teachers: pay elders and others for teaching culture such as survival skills; basket fibre location; medicine; hunting; language, gunya making; history</td>
<td></td>
<td>To be decided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Enterprise Development
   • Cultural Tourism: Permits from Dept of Environment
   • Tours to Mona Mona/Davies Creek
   • Bush foods/farm
   • Medicine
   • Artefacts: demonstration/sales
   • Cooking: demonstration/sales
   • Art

7. Resources
   • Bus, drivers, petrol
   • 1 computer
   • Office in Mantaka
   • project coordinator
   • $200,000 first two years

8. Housing – secure current and obtain additional housing

9. Succession Planning
   • Conduct skills audit of all Djabugay
   • Census of Djabugay numbers

10. Traditional authority: elders to be Advisory Council.

The attendees acknowledged that the population of the Djabugay was 1200 people. The workshop presenter explained to the Djabugay where potential resources were available. They included:

1. Skills and expertise of people and organisations that the Djabugay are involved with: Elders, Djabugay Tribal Aboriginal Corporation, Buda:dji, Rangers, North Queensland Land Council, Dagil Nyan Nya.
2. 200,000 locals who can offer funding, educational, legal, financial and auditing assistance; volunteers; and buyers of Djabugay goods and services.
3. 1,000,000 plus visitors who can offer funding; volunteers; and buyers of Djabugay goods and services.

The workshop attendees were also presented with a business structure to illustrate one approach to “staffing an organisation” to implement the items listed in the Action Plan. The group was advised of the necessity to incorporate to enable it to receive funding.
APPENDIX B

CONFIDENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRE TO NON-MANAGEMENT EMPLOYEES

Name: ____________________________________
Job: ____________________________________
Date: ____________________________________
Start: __________
Finish: __________

I would like to tell you two things before we start.
Anything that you tell me will be kept confidential (secret).
When I talk about culture, I am talking about the ways of your people.

Question 1:
How long have you worked at the Tjapukai Dance Theatre and/or the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park?

Less than 1 year                  1 to 2 years                  3-4 years                  5 or more years

Question 2: How does a person know they are Djabugay?

Djabugay mother and/or father     Married to Djabugay person     Djabugay grandmother and grandfather
Other Djabugay Relatives
Other, please explain? ________________

Question 3:
Are you a Djabugay person?  YES/NO

If yes, skip to question 5.

Question 4:
How do you identify yourself?       Yirrgandyji                  Other, please specify

Question 5: What is special about Djabugay culture?
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
Question 6: What things best represent Djabugay culture?
Examples: intangible: Language and tangible: Arts

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Question 7: What Djabugay culture does the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park show to tourists?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Question 8: What, if any, have been the positive things of the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park?
Examples: Have you heard about the Park reviving Djabugay culture?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Question 9: What, if any, have been the negative things of the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Question 10: Overall, has the Djabugay way of life changed since the Tjapukai Dance Theatre and/or the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park started?

Yes/No/Do not know

If no/do not know, skip to Question 12.
Question 11: If yes, in what ways?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Question 12: Do you know who makes the decisions about what is shown at the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park?

Yes/No/Do not Know

If no/do not know, skip to Question 14.

Question 13: If yes, who?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Question 14: Is there anything else you would like to tell me?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much.
CONFIDENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRE TO MANAGERS

Thank you for taking the time and effort to fill out this questionnaire. Please remember the information in this questionnaire remains confidential.

Please place a tick through the most appropriate answer.

1. How long have you worked at the Tjapukai Dance Theatre and/or Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park?
   < 12 months                     1-2 years                     3-4 years                     5 or more years

2. What is special about Djabugay culture?
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________

3. What things best represent Djabugay culture? Examples: language, arts
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________

4. Who has control over what is presented at the Park as Djabugay culture?
   Tjapukai Board                     Tjapukai Management                Djabugay elders
   Tjapukai Board and Management     Tjapukai Management and Djabugay elders
   Do not know                       Other, please specify _________________

5. The Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park management makes decisions on how Djabugay culture is presented to tourists.
   Strongly disagree                  Disagree                        Agree                      Strongly agree
6. The Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park management makes decisions on which elements of Djabugay culture to show to tourists.

If you disagree or strongly disagree, please explain.

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
10. Please list the advantages of tourism for the Djabugay people.
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

11. Please list the disadvantages of tourism for the Djabugay people.
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

12. How does the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park impact on the Djabugay community culturally?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

13. Are non-Djabugay employees given training regarding Djabugay culture? 
   Yes/No/Do not know

14. If yes, by whom? ________________________________________________

15. Are Djabugay employees given on-the-job training?
   Yes/No/Do not know

If no or do not know, please proceed to question 17.
16. What type of training is provided?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

17. Are Djabugay employees given training away from the Park?
   Yes/No/Do not know

   **If no, please proceed to question 20.**

18. If yes, where?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

19. If yes, what type of training is provided?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

20. Does the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park training incorporate the Djabugay ways of learning?
   Yes/No/Do not know

21. If yes, how? _______________________________________________________

22. Does the management team have regular meetings with employees
   Yes/No/Do not know

   **If no or do not know, proceed to question 25.**

23. How often does management meet with employees?

   1 x week                                           1 x fortnight                                            1 x month

   Other, please specify ________________________________________________
24. What items are typically on the agenda for discussion?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

25. How is the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park managed?
    Please explain whether managed on a team basis or other basis.

_____________________________________________________________________

26. Are there any Djabugay people on the management team?
    Yes/No/Do not know

27. How many employees are there in the management team?_______________

28. How many employees are there in the non-management team?___________

29. Of the management team, how many of them are in the following groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers?</th>
<th>Numbers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Djabugay</td>
<td>Yirrganydji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indigenous Group</td>
<td>Non Indigenous Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Of the non-management employees, how many of them are in the following groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers?</th>
<th>Numbers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Djabugay</td>
<td>Yirrganydji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indigenous Group</td>
<td>Non Indigenous Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. The Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park has made it possible for the Djabugay community to be in a better economic position.

Strongly disagree               Disagree               Agree               Strongly agree
32. How does the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park impact on the Djabugay community economically?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

33. Are the Djabugay community paid a dividend for their equity share of the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park?
Yes/No/Do not know

**If no or do not know, proceed to question 35.**

34. If yes, how often are they paid a dividend?___________________________

35. How does the Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park management impact on the Djabugay community politically?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

36. What is your position? ________________________________

Name (Optional) ________________________________

**Thank you.**
APPENDIX D

PERFORMANCES BY TJAPUKAI DANCERS

Tjapukai Aboriginal Cultural Park Dancers
Firemaking Demonstration

Playing the Didgeridoo
APPENDIX E

TJAPUKAI ABORIGINAL CULTURAL PARK
PROMOTIONAL BROCHURE

IT'S THE MOST COLOURFUL EXPERIENCE IN THE WORLD

The Tjapukai Cultural Park is the only authorised presentation
of Aboriginal culture to the Tjapukai Tribes area. The Tjapukai communities and their elders have approved and
confirmed the material presented in the park. They own the land the park is situated on, and have a substantial
economic interest in the venture. There is no other presentation of Aboriginal Culture in the area which provides
any benefit to the communities or which has requested or received the authority to present our culture for profit.

Tjapukai Tribal Aboriginal Corporation.
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