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Abstract

Recreation conflict among visitors undertaking dissimilar activities in New Zealand's national parks can create dissatisfying wilderness experiences. Private jet boat activity in the vicinity of the Hollyford Track in Fiordland National Park has raised the ire of some trampers using the area, who have complained to the Department of Conservation about its impact on visitors' ability to experience natural quiet. Complaints have been fielded about the impact of large parties of private recreational jet boaters travelling with up to ten boats whose presence at the Department of Conservation huts on the Hollyford Track has created tensions with other visitors. This study aimed to ascertain the extent to which jet boating activity impacts on other visitors' experiences of the Hollyford Track. Facets of goal interference conflict, social values conflict and visitor satisfaction theory influenced the design of the research questions which examined visitors' motivations for going to the Hollyford, their level of satisfaction with the experience and the nature and extent of any dissatisfaction on the Hollyford Track. A survey administered on the Hollyford Track, interviews with key informants and an examination of submissions by jet boaters to the Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan revealed a number of sources of conflict surrounding jet boating activity in the Hollyford area. A degree of annoyance at jet boat activity was indicated by 19 per cent of the 44 per cent of survey respondents that noticed jet boats. More significantly, the intermittent appearance of the large jet boating parties has created a considerable degree of goal interference and social values conflict for some other visitors. The heart of the issue may lie in significant disparities in opinion about how the natural environment ought to be used. Positively, overall levels of satisfaction with the Hollyford experience are high. A surprising degree of conviviality exists between trampers and hunters using jet boats. The activities of both hunters and jet boaters provide a degree of interest and entertainment for trampers, despite a small degree of concern about hunters having guns in the Department of Conservation huts. However, the impact of large jet boating parties has significant potential to create dissatisfying wilderness experiences for others. This finding has important implications for the Southland Conservancy of the Department of Conservation as manager of the Hollyford Track.
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1 Introduction

A little lonesome space,
where nature has her own way,
where it is quiet enough to hear the patter of
small paws on leaves and the murmuring of birds,
can still be afforded.
The gift of tranquillity, wherever found,
is beyond price...

('The Real World Around Us', Rachel Carson, 1954)

Recreation and leisure are important elements of satisfying human existence (Moore and Graef, 1994). Critical prerequisites for having satisfying recreation experiences are individuals’ perceived freedom and their motivation in choosing the conditions under which they undertake recreation (Iso-Ahola, 1980). One of the most important choices made is the setting where the recreation should take place as this impacts substantially upon satisfaction (Williams, 1985). As a result, recreation settings such as national parks form a high priority for planners as they attempt to provide quality recreation and leisure opportunities for visitors.
The Department of Conservation (hereafter DOC) has dual responsibility for protecting environmental values and allowing appropriate recreational uses of protected areas in New Zealand (Cessford, 2002). DOC is charged with the management of almost 30 per cent of New Zealand’s land area. This responsibility encompasses the often difficult task of balancing protection with facilitating recreational use of the country’s conservation land, which is a requirement under the National Parks Act (1980). This will be outlined in more detail shortly.

For visitors to New Zealand’s backcountry, positive recreation experiences are reliant on a multiplicity of factors. For many people, the quality of natural quiet is inherent to wilderness experiences. Natural quiet is the term that DOC uses to describe natural ambient conditions or the sound of nature. This can range from silence to a thunderstorm (Graham, 1999). Additionally, some users of national parks consider other visitors’ activities to be inappropriate. Encounters with groups of individuals undertaking different activities can also affect visitors’ backcountry experiences. These factors can result in cases of recreation conflict among visitors, the management of which involves DOC.

1.1 Research Context

The Hollyford Track is a popular tramping destination in New Zealand’s Fiordland National Park. The track runs alongside the Hollyford River, Lake McKerrow and a section of Lake Alabaster. Private jet boat use on these waters has raised the ire of some trampers who have reported their disquiet to DOC’s Southland Conservancy, the authority responsible for managing the track. Complaints about jet boats have been generally twofold: jet boats are reportedly very noisy and are consequently considered by some to be an inappropriate use of a national park; and secondly, recreational jet boaters have been known to travel with large numbers of people in groups of up to ten boats. These parties have been said to ‘take over’ DOC huts, which are predominantly used by trampers.

Mechanised noise has become a problematic planning issue for DOC’s management of the country’s tramping tracks. A rapidly escalating number of aircraft using airspace above the tracks has become a matter of unprecedented concern. The issue of
aircraft noise has similarities to the focus of the present research, which examines in part the extent to which jet boat noise represents a negative intrusion on other visitors’ Hollyford experience. The social impacts of noise are not simply the occurrence of noise, but are “affected much more by the meanings and associations attributed to these noises by the people perceiving these impacts” (Cessford, 1999, p. 97). These subjectively defined social impacts go beyond simple expressions of annoyance. They are commonly related to perceptions of natural quiet, visitor enjoyment and safety concerns (ibid.). While DOC can influence aircraft landings and activity in airspace above national parks, control of airspace does not fall solely under DOC’s jurisdiction. DOC does control the surface of lakes and rivers in national parks however, giving it a greater degree of control over activities on these water bodies.

There is wide ranging diversity in the recreation opportunities that DOC may allow in protected areas (Cessford, 1999). Traditionally, recreational use of national parks has mostly been limited to foot access on tracks and unmarked routes (ibid.). However, jet boating also has a lengthy history in the Hollyford area. The social impacts of the presence of the current private jet boating visitors to the Hollyford may be of more significance than the noise created by their boats. Jet boaters arriving at DOC huts on the Hollyford Track have upset some trampers who have felt intimidated by groups of individuals often carrying guns for hunting and bringing with them large quantities of alcohol. DOC has also received complaints that such groups have exhibited rude behaviour, left behind rubbish and failed to recognise DOC’s hut etiquette, an informal code of practice displayed on many hut walls. Many of the recreational jet boaters using the Hollyford carry rifles and fishing rods. It has been recognised that hunting may embody a different ‘culture’ to tramping (McShea et al., 1993). Hunters’ guns propped around the walls of huts may be a source of unease for non-hunters and the possession of dead animals or pieces of meat may also denote a different set of values to those held by trampers. For these reasons, the impact of the presence of hunters was also investigated in this study as a possible factor creating conflict with other users, as the majority of the jet boating parties appear to carry guns with them. With the use of their boats, jet boaters are also able to bring large quantities of food, beverages and equipment, unlike a tramper who is confined to the size of their backpack. These differences may each be contributing factors in what appears to be a case of recreation conflict occurring on the Hollyford Track.
1.1.1 The Hollyford Track

The Hollyford Track lies in the Fiordland National Park and stretches from The Divide to Martins Bay on the West Coast. The track takes four to five days to walk in one direction. Most walkers elect to make use of one of several transport options for their return journey. These include helicopter and small aeroplane flights, and a commercial jet boat which runs between November and April from Martins Bay to the confluence of the Pyke and Hollyford rivers. Most trampers begin the Hollyford Track at the end of the Hollyford Road. The track follows the Hollyford River until it merges with the Pyke River. Lake Alabaster branches off to the east leading to the Pyke Route, while the Hollyford Track meanders around the edge of Lake McKerrow in the shadow of the Skippers Range before reaching Martins Bay. Figure 1.1 illustrates the location of the Hollyford Track.

Figure 1.1. Location map of the Hollyford Track in Fiordland, New Zealand
Visitor numbers to the Hollyford Track have been steadily increasing, perhaps as a result of the track’s reputation as the “World’s greatest mountains to the sea walk” (Hollyford Track, 2004). It is estimated that 2000 independent walkers and 700 guided walkers visit the track each year (DOC, 2005). Besides trampers, the area is also used by an abundance of hunters, particularly during the Roar hunting season in April. Some hunters use private jet boats to access the area and others are lifted in by helicopter to hunt on foot.

Hollyford Guided Walks, a Shotover Jet Ltd subsidiary company owned by the Ngai Tahu Holdings Group, operates two commercial jet boats in the Hollyford. The jet boats transport all of the guided clients as well as numerous independent trampers. The boats allow walkers to avoid a poorly maintained section of the track known as the Demon Trail, or to catch the boat on their return journey out of the track. Only 30 per cent of the annual visitors to the Hollyford Track walk the Demon Trail. DOC acknowledges that the jet boats operated by Hollyford Guided Walks (HGW) provide a valuable option for independent trampers wanting to shorten their trip. The boats also allow DOC to retain the Demon Trail in its present, slightly rugged state, which satisfies those seeking a more challenging experience.

Private jet boat access to the Hollyford can be difficult and expensive. Boating directly down the Hollyford River to access the lakes beyond is highly risky due to a stretch of dangerous water on the river known as the Little Homer Rapids, downstream of Hidden Falls Hut. Private jet boaters launch their boats into the Hollyford River at the Hollyford Road car park. The boats are driven down the river until the Little Homer rapids. Here they are either lifted over the 660 metre stretch of water by a commercial helicopter and deposited on the other side, or smaller boats can be winched through the bush alongside the rapid, by attaching the boat’s winch to trees and pulling it along a muddy track. From here, boats can access lakes McKerrow, Alabaster and Wilmot, and subsequently, an extensive area for hunting or cruising.

Helicopters portaging jet boats over the Little Homer Rapids require either a landing permit or concession from DOC, and even if the helicopter does not land, hovering below 500 feet also requires a one-off landing permit. Milford Helicopters and
Southern Lakes Helicopters both offer a jet boat portaging service. Milford Helicopters charge $1500 to lift up to four boats, and Southern Helicopters charge $1000 per boat. Figure 1.2 illustrates jet boats being portaged towards the Little Homer Rapids.

![Jet boats being portaged towards the Little Homer Rapids](source: Supplied by Key Informant)

Figure 1.2. Jet boats being portaged towards the Little Homer Rapids

DOC has several concerns regarding the use of private jet boats in the Hollyford. While jet boat use is sporadic throughout most of the year, boaters are often present at Labour Weekend, Christmas and Easter, when numbers of visitors to the Hollyford Track are high. During these times, jet boats are regularly both audible and visible to trampers. The Hollyford Track lies in close proximity to the Hollyford River until Hidden Falls Hut, and the track also runs alongside Lake McKerrow, where boats are easily observed and heard. Jet boaters can offset the cost of portaging by increasing the number of boats being lifted and the number of passengers in each boat. Both these factors have the potential to increase any conflict related to jet boat noise or hut congestion on the Hollyford Track.

Jet boat activity in the Hollyford raises a number of challenging planning issues for DOC as manager of Fiordland National Park. These issues are being addressed
through tools including the Fiordland National Park Management Plan and the Recreational Opportunities Spectrum concept.

1.2 Planning Context

The legislation pertaining to the planning and management of New Zealand’s national parks is guided by the principles set out in the National Parks Act 1980. Section 4 of this Act states that national parks are established for the purposes of

*preserving in perpetuity...for their intrinsic worth and for the benefit, use and enjoyment of the public, areas of New Zealand that contain scenery of such distinctive quality, ecological systems, or natural features so beautiful, unique, or scientifically important that their preservation is in the national interest.*

One of the five aims that guides the management of the parks states that they shall be “preserved as far as possible in their natural state”. Section 4 of this Act also states that the public shall have freedom of entry and access to national parks subject to “the imposition of such conditions and restrictions as may be necessary for the preservation of the native plants and animals or for the welfare in general of the parks...”.

In addition to the National Parks Act 1980, the Conservation Act 1987 directs the administration and management of all land and resources under DOC’s control. Section 6 of this Act sets out DOC’s functions, which include (e),

> To the extent that the use of any natural or historic resource for recreation or tourism is not inconsistent with its conservation, to foster the use of natural and historic resources for recreation, and allow their use for tourism.

Under the Conservation Act 1987 each conservancy must prepare a ten year conservation management strategy, which applies to all land administered by DOC in that conservancy. The purpose of the conservation management strategy is to implement general policies and establish objectives for the integrated management of natural and historic resources and for recreation, tourism, and other conservation purposes. The Mainland Southland/West Otago Conservation Management Strategy is the overarching document which sets the general direction for the management of
Fiordland National Park. The Fiordland National Park Management Plan must not be inconsistent with this conservation management strategy.

The conservation management strategy also provides an outline of the recreational opportunities applicable to its region. Recreational opportunities encompass activities, settings and experiences. The Recreational Opportunity Spectrum is a tool used by DOC to describe and map recreational opportunities. Using this mechanism, opportunities for outdoor recreation experiences are classified along a continuum of types of areas which range from urban to wilderness (DOC, 2005a). Seven different types of visitors to DOC areas have also been defined, each of which has a place within the Recreational Opportunities Spectrum. The distinct visitor types are defined by factors including the settings they prefer, the accessibility of the area, the activities they undertake, the experience and facilities sought and the degree of risk present (ibid.). In accordance with the Recreational Opportunities Spectrum, DOC aims to provide for a range of recreation opportunities within the park without compromising the natural and historic values (DOC, 2005). The visitor settings determine the type of activities and their effects that are appropriate within particular areas in order to protect the experience of those undertaking the activities there (ibid.). Fiordland National Park’s visitor management settings are Wilderness Areas, Remote Experience Areas, Backcountry Areas, High Use Track Corridors and Frontcountry Areas.

The Fiordland National Park Management Plan, the document that guides the management of Fiordland National Park, is a requirement under the National Parks Act 1980. The Fiordland National Park Management Plan 1991-2001 has expired, and the Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan was nearing approval by the Conservation Board at the time of completing this research. When the Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan was released for public review in November 2002, it contained a number of new policies affecting jet boaters. The draft plan stated that DOC would examine options for restricting non-commercial boat access beside the Hollyford Track corridor from the Hollyford Road end to the Little Homer Rapids. This was for the purpose of protecting the recreational walking opportunities on this stretch of the Hollyford Track. The draft plan also stated that DOC would recommend to the Minister of Conservation that commercial boat use should not exceed the use
levels of 2001 between the Little Homer Rapids and the mouth of Lake McKerrow on the Hollyford Track corridor. It also proposed that Lake Alabaster, a popular recreational jet boating destination, be classed as a Remote Experience Area. Changing Lake Alabaster’s visitor setting to remote would involve keeping boating activity at relatively low levels that were consistent with the remote recreation opportunities. This would require DOC to discourage motorised boat use on the lake. Part of Lake Alabaster is on the Hollyford Track, and DOC’s Alabaster Hut is situated at its southern edge. Lake Alabaster and Alabaster Hut are both popular with recreational jet boating parties, who often progress further up the lake into the Upper Pyke area and Lake Wilmot. These proposals drew a large volume of submissions in opposition from individuals representing the interests of private jet boaters, illustrating the contentious nature of DOC’s proposal. The draft plan also stated explicitly that a key attribute of the Fiordland wilderness experience should be the provision of “solitude, peace and natural quiet”.

1.3 Selection of Research Topic

Planning for visitors undertaking recreation in New Zealand’s national parks can be a contentious issue. Aside from the ongoing difficulties with balancing conservation and allowing recreational use, DOC is required to adjudicate on which uses are appropriate for particular areas without creating the perception that trampers have a monopoly over national parks. DOC aims to manage high use corridors, including the Hollyford Track, for the most favourable levels of use while protecting natural values and minimising conflict with other competing uses or demands (DOC, 2005). It aims to achieve these outcomes by monitoring visitor perceptions and satisfaction. This is in order to inform management decisions and ensure a quality visitor experience is maintained (ibid.). DOC’s proposal to investigate restricting access to private jet boats in the Hollyford has highlighted the issue of the appropriateness of motorised boating in the vicinity of the country’s major walking tracks. This creates a fascinating subject of inquiry for a planning thesis.

During the ten years that the new Fiordland National Park management plan will be in place, DOC Southland has stated that it desires to increase its understanding of visitor experiences of the Hollyford Track, and particularly the impact of jet boat activity on
other users. The considerable volume of submissions relating to jet boat activity received for the Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan has demonstrated the magnitude and relevance of this issue for a large number of stakeholders. This case study, with its obvious parallels to the problematic matter of aircraft noise over New Zealand's national parks, represents a classic debate between those pursuing recreational opportunities and those seeking the preservation of conservation lands. This matter characterises a planning issue of both contemporary and long-standing debate.

1.4 Research Questions and Aims

The impact of jet boat activity on visitor satisfaction with the Hollyford Track is situated within broader concerns about the occurrence of non-natural noise and recreation conflict among visitors in New Zealand's national parks. Consequently, it is relevant to investigate the extent to which visitors — whatever their primary activity on the track may be — are satisfied with their Hollyford experience, and if they are not completely satisfied, to examine the source of any dissatisfaction. The practical aim of this research is to provide DOC managers and planners with enough information about responses to jet boating activity in the Hollyford to enable them to select and implement policies that will reduce any conflict. It is important to also examine tramping visitors' interaction with hunters, to determine whether this element contributes to any perceptions of conflict. As a consequence, the general scope of this study is designed to answer the question:

- Are recreational jet boaters and/or hunters creating a negative experience for other visitors to the Hollyford Track and if so, to what degree?

This study draws upon theories of recreation conflict and visitor satisfaction to investigate the following research questions, while focusing on any matters relating to jet boating and hunters.

- What motivates visitors to select the Hollyford as a destination and what do they expect?
• Are visitors satisfied with their Hollyford experience?
• What, if anything, diminishes visitors’ Hollyford experience and to what extent?

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the extent to which jet boat activity is impinging on visitors’ experiences of the Hollyford Track with particular regard to mechanical noise and interaction between different user groups.

1.5 Research Structure

This thesis provides a narrative of my investigation into the impact of jet boat activity in the Hollyford Track area. The conceptual framework for this study and the relevant literature are discussed in Chapter 2, where it is illustrated how components of goal interference theory and social values theory shaped the development of the research questions. The outline of the conceptual framework is followed by a description and justification of the methodological approach adopted in this research. The findings of the investigation are presented in the subsequent three chapters, each of which corresponds to the three research questions. The interpretation and implications of the findings are analysed in Chapter 7, Discussion, and Chapter 8 draws the thesis to a close, providing conclusions and recommendations about the implications of jet boat activity in the Hollyford. We turn now to an examination of the conceptual framework to be used in this study.
Chapter 2: Conceptual Framework

The investigation of recreation conflict dates back a number of decades and has been embraced from a variety of perspectives. A kaleidoscope of conflicts has been explored in wilderness settings, ranging from non-traditional activities such as llama trekking to the more common divergences between mountain bikers and trampers. The underlying goal of outdoor recreation is high quality experiences, and the principal measure of quality has long been defined as visitor satisfaction (Manning, 1986). Motivational research suggests that recreational behaviour is goal-directed, or aimed at the need for gaining satisfaction. Prominent theorists Jacob and Schreyer (1980) drew a new understanding of recreation conflict with their goal interference model, which, despite a number of challenges in the past twenty five years, has persisted as the most commonly adopted explanation of recreation conflict. More recently, however, a new line of inquiry has redirected the focus of recreation conflict research toward examining differences in individuals’ social values as a potential explanation for the occurrence of dissatisfying wilderness experiences. These two theories have shaped my research objectives and form the basis of the theoretical framework for this study, which this chapter outlines.
The chapter sets out with a brief overview of satisfaction and motivations in outdoor recreation, before a short history of recreation conflict research is detailed. Jacob and Schreyer’s (1980) goal interference theory, and the profound impact it has had on recreation conflict research, is examined. Despite the influence of goal interference theory, problems of measuring and defining conflict have persisted and this problematic issue will be discussed before the more recent directional shift into social values theory is overviewed. An outline of a number of alternative theories of conflict conclude the chapter.

2.1 Satisfaction in Outdoor Recreation

The search for quality recreation experiences, and understanding the failure to attain these, has long been the focus of recreation conflict research. The notion of quality is contained in goals and policies governing most outdoor recreation experiences (Manning, 1986). The use of visitor satisfaction as a measure of quality recreation experiences has a lengthy tradition. According to Lime and Stankey (1971, p. 175) “...the principal goal of recreation management is to maximise user satisfaction consistent with certain administrative, budgetary, and resource constraints”. Most managers recognise the usefulness of visitor opinions in meeting the quality objectives of outdoor recreation areas (Manning, 1986). Measuring satisfaction has proven to be complicated however, due to the multi-dimensional nature of the concept and the fact that individual perceptions play a significant role in determining satisfaction (ibid.).

2.2 Motivation in Outdoor Recreation Research

The motivations for undertaking outdoor recreation comprise another focus of outdoor recreation research. The question of why people participate in outdoor recreation has been investigated by examining the satisfactions and rewards received from an activity, and querying how the quality of an experience could be enhanced (Driver and Toucher, 1970). A behavioural approach based on received psychological theory has most frequently been adopted in the examination of motivations in outdoor recreation. This approach suggests that most human behaviour is goal-directed or aimed at the need for satisfaction (Manning, 1986). Expectancy theory proposes that
people “engage in activities in specific settings to realize a group of psychological outcomes which are known, expected and valued”, and therefore they “select and participate in recreation activities to meet certain goals or satisfy certain needs” (ibid., p. 80). When individuals fail to achieve anticipated goals, recreation conflict can result.

2.3 Recreation Conflict

When visitors with different views on how to use a recreation resource interact with each other, conflict may also occur (Vaske et al., 2000). Researchers have found that recreation conflict is often asymmetrical – one group experiences conflict because of another group’s presence or actions, but this feeling is one sided. Asymmetrical recreation conflict often occurs when one group is using newer technologies and another conducting a more traditional activity (for example, snowboarding versus skiing), or when one group is using motorised equipment or transport, and the other is not (the recent proliferation of jet skis on New Zealand waters, for example). Conflict can occur between groups engaged in different activities (out-group conflict) and between individuals engaged in the same activity (in-group conflict). Both forms of conflict can result in perceptions of wilderness crowding and even displacement, where dissatisfied users may be ‘pushed’ to a new location (often further into the back country) to locate the wilderness experiences they seek (Hall and Kearsley, 2001).

The literature concerning the causes of recreation conflict is extensive. Understanding the sources of conflict is important for natural resource managers because the solution to the conflict will depend on the cause of the problem (Vaske et al., 1995). Much debate exists over which particular strands of recreation theory ought to be pursued and developed. While some authors argue that its conceptualisation, modelling and management have been sufficiently addressed, others are uncertain and see an abundance of scope for improvement (Schneider, 2000). This debate has persisted with little obvious progress into developing a recreation conflict model. Since 1980, Jacob and Schreyer’s goal interference theory has been the prevailing conceptual foundation of recreation conflict studies, although it has been tested with mixed results. We turn now to an examination of the rudiments of goal interference theory.
2.4 Jacob and Schreyer’s (1980) Goal Interference Theory

Goal interference theory states that conflict results when the behaviour of one group is incompatible with the social, psychological, or physical goals of another group. The theory is rooted in the goal-oriented view of human behaviour (Manning, 1986). Differences in individuals’ motivations to undertake outdoor recreation resulted in much support for the goal interference model (ibid.).

Jacob and Schreyer cite that for an individual, conflict is defined as goal interference attributed to another’s behaviour. This definition assumes that people undertake recreational activities to achieve certain outcomes or goals (Jacob and Schreyer, 1980). Corothers et al. expanded Jacob and Schreyer’s definition of conflict based on goal interference:

For interpersonal conflict to occur, the physical presence or behaviour of an individual or a group of recreationists must interfere with the goals of another individual or group (2001, p. 47).

Conflict may also occur when perceived differences in lifestyle exist. These differences arise partly because of one party judging the other’s activity to be unacceptable (ibid.). Dissimilarities may include different attitudes towards the environment, or motivations and expectations for coming to a particular place. While incompatibility of goals is not a requirement for conflict, and sometimes conflict exists between those with common goals, goal interference can result in dissatisfying backcountry recreation experiences.

2.4.1 Goal Interference Theory and Dissatisfaction

Goal interference conflict is derived from discrepancy theory which equates dissatisfaction with the difference between actualised and desired goals (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). Conflict therefore can be seen as a particular form of user dissatisfaction, where the cause of an individual’s dissatisfaction is identified as a result of another group or individual’s behaviour (Jacob and Schreyer, 1980). The goal interference model also draws on expectancy value theory. Applied to the outdoor setting, this theory claims that goal satisfaction is a psychological force
underlying activity choice. People engage in recreational activities in selected settings to achieve known, expected and valued outcomes (Manning, 1986). Goal interference occurs when the behaviour of another hinders one's achievement of social, psychological, or physical goals (Gramann and Burdge, 1981). This central thesis has shaped the research questions of the present study.

2.4.2 Jacob and Schreyer's (1980) Four Determinants of Conflict

Jacob and Schreyer (1980) identified four major determinants that contribute to recreation conflict. These determinants are activity style (the meaning individuals attach to an activity); resource specificity (the significance attached to using a specific recreation resource for a given recreation experience); mode of experience (the varying expectations of how the natural environment will be perceived); and lifestyle tolerance (the tendency to accept or reject lifestyles different from one's own). These four factors that influence recreation conflict deserve description.

Activity style refers to the personal meaning that individuals give to the activity they are participating in. Jacob and Schreyer (1980) proposed that the more intense an individual's participation in an activity, the greater the likelihood that contact with less intense participants would result in conflict. Secondly, resource specificity refers to the significance that recreationists attach to a specific resource. Jacob and Schreyer (1980) proposed that those people less attached to the physical resource they were using would disrupt traditional users. This represents a conflict involving varying definitions of place. Jacob and Schreyer (1980) note that a major component of recreation experiences is interaction with natural environments.

Thirdly, mode of experience recognises that the ways of experiencing the environment are different for individual users. This determinant was used by Jacob and Schreyer to explain why under identical conditions, stimuli such as the sounds of motor boats could be sources of conflict for some users and not others. They described mode of experience by using a continuum ranging from unfocused to focused. An individual in a focused mode points his or her senses on specific entities within the natural environment, and relies on complex input of sensory details associated with the recreation place, resulting in intolerance of those stimuli which threaten this process.
Conversely, an individual in an unfocused mode may depend more on the overall spatial aspects of the land but not its details. Movement, fleeting images and broad sweeping expressions characterise this mode. "As the mode of experiencing the environment becomes more focused, an individual produces more rigid definitions of what constitutes acceptable stimuli and is increasingly intolerant of external stimulation" (Jacob and Schreyer, 1980, p. 375).

Finally, *lifestyle tolerance* was proposed as an indicator of an individual's willingness to accept or reject lifestyles different from one's own. Tolerance is commonly linked with beliefs about a particular group rather than reactions to specific behaviours (Ivy et al., 1992). Jacob and Schreyer (1980) proposed that recreation in-groups and out-groups represent categories that an individual establishes based on imagined or perceived lifestyle differences. This can lead to unfounded generalisations of other groups (Ramthun, 1995). Vaske et al. (2000) also recognise the categorisation of people of an 'other' group or activity.

When recreationists encounter others, a cognitive processing of information occurs. This action often results in the categorization of others according to some group membership, which helps to simplify and order environmental stimuli (p. 300).

Lifestyle differences are often communicated through cues such as pieces of equipment - rifles used for hunting, for example (Vaske et al., 2000). This has relevance for the present research where jet boaters in the Hollyford are commonly hunters, and hunters on foot also use the area. Individuals with lower tolerance levels are more likely to experience conflict and to a greater degree.

These four determinants of conflict proposed by Jacob and Schreyer twenty five years ago are still relevant today (Vaske et al., 2000). While the focus of the present research is on ascertaining the nature and significance of any conflict occurring on the Hollyford Track, understanding the causes of it are equally important for the track manager, the Department of Conservation, as the cause of the conflict is critical to the nature of its response. While Jacob and Schreyer made a significant contribution to understanding the causes of conflict, they offered no advice on how it is best to be measured. We turn now to a discussion of this issue, and the problematic matter of defining conflict.
2.5 Defining and Measuring Conflict

While a significant band of post-1980 research has drawn on Jacob and Schreyer’s goal interference model, the operational definition of conflict has varied considerably (Vaske et al., 2004). Further perplexing matters has been a thorough absence of agreement concerning the best means of measuring conflict. According to Schneider (2000), recreation conflict research has been constrained due to conflict remaining uncertain and inadequately modelled. At the crux of the issue have been concerns surrounding the definition of conflict.

2.5.1 Defining Conflict

How best to define conflict has persisted as a key debate in conflict literature. The predominant definition used is that proposed by Jacob and Schreyer (1980, p. 369) of “goal interference attributed to another’s behaviour”. However, according to Owen (1985), conflict was a construct that remained relatively unknown. In an attempt to narrow the definition of conflict, Owen (1985) adopted an environment and behaviour perspective to suggest that if recreation was a social and psychological experience derived from goal-oriented behaviour then (recreational) conflict was a negative experience occurring when competition for shared resources prevented expected benefits of participation from accruing to an individual or group. Ten years after Owen’s comments, Watson (1995) perceived that there had been little agreement surrounding the definition of recreation conflict. Schneider (2000) considered conflict to be a researcher-defined construct. She declared that many researchers undertook conflict research with little reference to any definition of conflict, before announcing conflict either flourishing or in decline, based on their results.

The present research adopts the definition for conflict proposed by Jacob and Schreyer; that is, of goal interference attributed to another’s behaviour. The focus on goal interference is the most appropriate definition for this study as it utilises Jacob and Schreyer’s (1980) perspective on the causes of dissatisfying recreation experiences as the primary foundation for the research, in an attempt to understand the underlying causes of any conflict occurring among visitors to the Hollyford.
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The discrepancy in opinion concerning the definition of conflict apparent in the literature is, unsurprisingly, mirrored in discussion regarding the best means to measure conflict.

2.5.2 Measuring Conflict.

Measuring conflict has proven to be a matter of debate. Vaske et al. (2000) note a thorough absence of agreement surrounding the measurement of conflict. Jacob and Schreyer’s goal interference theory offered no explicit means of measuring conflict. Watson (2001) proposed that a variety of forms of measuring conflict are desirable in order to understand the implications of attempts to manage conflict. Two predominant means of measuring conflict in contemporary research are, firstly, measuring predisposition towards conflict by identifying the strength of an individual’s feeling towards encountering a person, activity or group. This has been done with the use of a scale indicating the likes of ‘extremely undesirable’ to ‘extremely desirable’ (Watson, 2001). Secondly, a goal interference measure adherent to the Jacob and Schreyer (1980) model has been adopted. Goal interference has been measured via a number of mechanisms. Some researchers have simply queried the degree to which, or whether respondents liked or disliked meeting certain types of users. Others have asked respondents directly about whether they felt there was conflict with other groups, and then asked them to elaborate on which groups were involved and what sort of conflict was experienced (Schreyer et al., 1994). Others have required an individual to indicate ‘yes’ or ‘no’ in response to being asked if the behaviour of someone else interfered with their enjoyment of their wilderness experience. If they answered ‘yes’ they were asked to explain the behaviour that caused the interference and who exhibited it (Watson, 2001).

Watson (2001) found that approaching conflict from a subpopulation or group perspective may be more revealing than approaching individuals.

Group level measures need to be employed that acknowledge conflict often is influenced by group dynamics and cumulative attitudes and experiences of groups of people...Evidence of conflict can be organised into position statements, articles written to be published in newspapers by identifiable interest groups, justifications for court
cases or simply a careful analysis of the meanings and attitudes placed on the wilderness resource by different interests (p. 65).

This presents an avenue of inquiry for the present study where an analysis of any submissions for the Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan by tramping, hunting or jet boating clubs may offer an organisational perspective of any conflict occurring on the Hollyford Track.

The measurement of conflict appears to have become a matter of preference, as little accord has been reached on the matter in recent research. In consistency with the use of the goal interference model for the present research, goal interference measures will be utilised to determine the extent to which the presence of other users or their activities may interfere with visitors' satisfaction with their experiences of the Hollyford Track. With regard to goal interference created by jet boats, the present study will adopt the Department of Conservation's 25 per cent threshold to measure visitor annoyance from noise. This threshold was utilised by Graham (1999) in his investigation of the impact of jet boats on trampers using the Dart Track, which will be discussed shortly.

Despite disagreement over the definition of conflict and the best means of measuring its occurrence and severity, the vast majority of contemporary investigations have drawn on some aspect of the goal interference model – many proposing changes to advance it. We turn now to examine the application of the theory to a broad spectrum of conflicts.

2.6 Application and Adaptation of Goal Interference Theory

Goal interference theory's impact on conflict research has been enduring and wide-ranging; however, a number of critiques and modifications to the conceptual model have been proposed due to its failure to describe the full range of conflicts within outdoor recreation.

Trout (1994) encountered difficulties with goal interference theory in his study of conflict in the caving environment. Trout found that there may be occasions where
people in a shared setting should not behave as they do, regardless of whether their behaviour interferes with their ability to achieve desired outcomes. For example, individuals may feel that loud and boisterous behaviour is inappropriate in a particular setting, even if their own goals were not to achieve quietness and escape. This view may have applicability to the present study, where complaints about jet boaters "taking over" a hut have been reported to the Department of Conservation. Trout (1994) suggested that goal interference theory focuses on causes and symptoms within a recreation setting, but conflict is often manifested in the policy arena through public debates or judicial actions. Trout (2001) proposed that much of what is termed 'asymmetrical' conflict is in fact two way conflict which occurs off-site later on, when one group attempts to influence policy to improve its goals (for example, by imposing restrictions on uses that are seen to be interfering with others). This also holds relevance for the present research, as different users of the Hollyford Track may attempt to influence policy through making submissions to the Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan, which may reveal that a degree of off-site conflict indeed exists.

Another advancement of goal interference theory saw the addition of safety to Jacob and Schreyer's (1980) four determinants of conflict. Vaske et al. (2000) used the four determinants, along with a measure of perceived safety, in their examination of recreation conflict among skiers and snowboarders, as they recognised that safety concerns represent a potential indicator of conflict. Safety may represent a concern in the present research in the Hollyford where hunters carrying guns use the same walking track and huts as trampers.

Vaske et al. (2004) based an investigation into the relationship between skill level and recreation conflict among skiers and snowboarders on Jacob and Schreyer's (1980) interpersonal model of conflict. They examined both in-group and out-group conflict and illustrated how individuals with varying skill levels reacted to normative beliefs about unacceptable behaviours. As perceived skill level increased, out-group and in-group conflict increased for both skiers and snowboarders. This research also has tangents with the present inquiry which potentially represents a case of asymmetrical out-group conflict where the norms of one group (jet boaters) may be considered unacceptable behaviour by the other (trampers).
The impact of place attachment and goal orientation on sensitivity towards conflict was examined by Gibbons and Ruddell (1995). Using Jacob and Schreyer’s (1980) goal interference framework, they investigated the extent to which goal orientation (the type of goals considered more important by recreationists that are presumed to drive or motivate an individual into a given recreation experience) and attachment to place, affected sensitivity towards goal interference. As goal-orientated aims are most salient, visitors may be more sensitive to interferences associated with them than goals of lesser importance (Gramann and Burdge, 1981). Examples of conflict relating to goal orientation may include individuals seeking nature-orientated goals such as experiencing nature, solitude, tranquility and escape (Gibbons and Ruddell, 1995) being interfered with by those seeking thrill seeking or socially oriented goals (Gramann and Burdge, 1981). Again, this resonates with the present investigation into conflict in the Hollyford.

Graham (1999) measured levels of annoyance at jet boat noise in an examination of the impact of commercial jet boats on passive recreational users of the Dart Track in New Zealand’s South Island in 1997 and 1998. The study examined whether passive recreational users of the Dart River valley were disturbed by the existing commercial jet boat movements, or would not want to see any increase in activity levels. Commercial jet boats were permitted to undertake a total of forty four boat movements daily on the Dart River, part of which runs alongside the Dart Track. Of the 198 visitors surveyed, 72 per cent had noticed jet boats. Of this total, 66 per cent of people had neutral feelings about the effect of the jet boat activity on their visit. However, 22 per cent said they were annoyed by the jet boats – just 3 per cent under the Department of Conservation’s 25 per cent threshold which indicates annoyance. Of those who indicated they were annoyed, annoyance was quantified on a scale of 1-7, with the mean degree of annoyance emerging as 4.5. Significantly, at a time when commercial interests were applying for increased numbers of jet boat trips, results revealed that an additional increase in jet boat activity would detract from passive users’ visits. According to Graham, “all trips have an adverse effect on the amenity value of the river by generating noise and disturbing its aesthetic coherence in relation to the surrounding environment” (1999, p. 105). This study’s focus on the interference created by jet boat noise has immediate applicability to the Hollyford Track research.
and it provides a model for measuring the extent of the interference on passive users of the area.

Goal interference theory has been applied to an array of conflict oriented situations and has demonstrated considerable endurance in conflict research. However, a number of researchers have moved away from the model to develop new perspectives on the causes of conflict. One such divergence has been the investigation into how an individual’s social values affect the occurrence of conflict.

2.7 Social Values Conflict

Social values conflict, also known as social acceptability conflict, represents a further expansion of recreation conflict research. Social values research emerged when researchers questioned the underlying importance of an individual’s social values in the occurrence of recreation conflict. Social values conflict can be represented in differences in values. Individuals may have varying meanings attached to a resource or differences in attitudes towards management policy to protect those meanings (Watson, 2001). Social value conflict can occur between groups who do not share the same norms and/or values even if there is no contact between them (Corothers et al., 2001). The potential for this to exist between different user groups of the Hollyford area who perceive the other’s activity to be unacceptable, bestows on this concept immediate relevance.

Social values that are associated with human activities at places have two distinct components, recreation experiences and socio-cultural perspectives (Cessford, 2002). The social values associated with recreation experiences are the outcomes anticipated from engaging in chosen activities at chosen places, whereas the social values associated with socio-cultural perspectives relate to the wider values that people attribute to different places for different reasons, derived from the natural, historic and cultural heritage features present at or associated with places (Cessford, 2002). Cessford states “The sound of a snow mobile, jet-ski, motorbike or helicopter can sometimes be interpreted as a strong indicator of differences in the motivations, goals, environmental values and behaviours of different recreation participants”, (2002, p. 72).
Watson and Landres (1990) suggested that understanding wilderness conflict required a broader conceptualisation of social value differences among individuals, as attitudes towards wilderness are diverse and constantly changing in parallel with societal changes. Differences can exist among incompatible human values and also within similar values. For example, values placed on a wildlife resource can range from trampers enjoying seeing deer roaming loose and hunters enjoying opportunities to shoot them (Vaske et al., 1995). Social value research provides an important broadening of conflict research from the sole dominance by the goal interference model. According to Watson (2001, p. 65), this has come none too soon. “A complex set of values exists across an array of demands on wilderness, and a goal interference approach is insufficient to understanding them or working towards solutions”. Watson (2001) advocated a social value approach that uses qualitative methods of data collection to further understanding. “The need is to understand the values that are driving the conflict and contributors to changing these values” (2001, p. 65). However, Watson maintained that conflict that did not necessarily involve onsite interactions and could be ascribed to value difference could still be attributed partly to the goal interference factors laid out by Jacob and Schreyer (1980), particularly lifestyle tolerance and resource specificity.

In New Zealand, conflict relating to the acceptability of aircraft over-flights has been well documented. While there is wide variation among individuals regarding sensitivity to noise, to many visitors to national parks, aircraft represent a disturbance of the solitude and sense of seclusion gained from accessing a remote area (Tal, 2004). For tourists, aircraft flights over scenic landscapes are becoming increasingly popular, and for the providers of these services, operations have been lucrative (ibid.). This conflict potentially exists as a consequence of social values differences and goal interference, and strikes at the heart of what sustainable planning for national parks ought to be. According to Tal (2004), the matter of aircraft noise represents the classic preservationists versus recreationists debate about what the purpose of national parks ought to be. Quoting Scheg (1998), Tal characterised preservationists as those who believed national parks should remain pristine, and advocated for limitations on the activities permitted in the parks to achieve this. Conversely, recreationists perceived national parks to be areas that ought to be available for anyone to use as they see fit. Recreationists often label preservationists as being elitist.
In an investigation which holds significance for the Hollyford study, Vaske et al. (1995) established that conflict occurring between trampers and hunters in the Mt Evans area in Colorado was a product of social values differences rather than goal interference conflict. The authors provided support for the distinction between interpersonal (goal interference) and social values conflict when they concluded that some non-hunting users who had not observed any hunting activity still experienced a conflict of social values. Simply knowing that hunting was occurring on the mountain was "sufficient to activate perceptions of conflict" (Carothers et al., 2001, p. 48). The authors concluded that this may have been a reflection of a different value orientation of acceptable uses of wildlife.

While hunting may be considered unacceptable by some, it has a long tradition in the back country. Little research exists on the social acceptability of non-traditional uses of the back country. The philosophical appropriateness of llama use in wilderness areas was examined by Blahna et al. (1995) by measuring traditional visitors' responses to llama packers. Conflicts relating to llama use were found to be minimal. Although the total number of people involved in non-traditional uses can be low, the consequences of ignoring these activity groups may be severe (ibid.). Conflicts between jet boaters and rafters in the United States, for example, have resulted in events as extreme as boat ramming and gun shots (Cole, 1989).

Social values research represents a different approach to understanding conflict from a goal interference perspective. However, a number of investigations have combined social values research with goal interference theory, profiting from the strengths and focus of each. Drawing on the social values model alongside goal interference theory provides an additional theoretical basis for the present study.

2.8 Combining the Social Values and Goal Interference Frameworks

Investigating both the social values differences of visitors to the Hollyford Track and any goal interference they may encounter duplicates a robust theoretical approach that has been employed in a number of investigations.
Corothers \textit{et al.} (2001) examined social value differences between trampers and mountain bikers in Colorado. All groups reported more interpersonal than social values conflict overall. Social value differences may reflect anticipated threats, according to Corothers \textit{et al.} (2001). Safety concerns, degradation of natural resources and diminishing the quality of an experience may be reflected in social values conflict. Research into hunter versus non-hunter conflict has revealed that conflict is generally based on value differences held by the respective groups. These findings may reflect broad social value differences towards consumptive and non-consumptive uses of wildlife (Corothers \textit{et al.}, 2001). These authors note that few investigations have examined social value differences among different types of non-consumptive recreationists.

Cessford (2002) provided a New Zealand example of social values and interpersonal conflict being played out in his review of walkers and mountain bikers’ use of the Queen Charlotte Track. Cessford proposed that perceptions of the impacts created by mountain bikers differed from the reality of on-site experiences. Interestingly, walkers who had contact with mountain bikers were more positive about them than those who had no contact, suggesting the occurrence of an ‘encounter effect’. This illustrated the distinctions between an individual’s perception of conflict and the actual outcome from an experience. Cessford concluded that this reflected the distinction between perceptions based on wider social values and those based on actual interpersonal encounters in the field, as described by Corothers \textit{et al.} (2001).

The combination of social values and goal interference theory allows the present study to investigate not only whether certain groups or activities are causing interpersonal conflict on the Hollyford Track, but also to examine user views of the philosophical appropriateness of allowing motorised activities such as jet boating in Fiordland National Park. However, these two theories are not the only explanations for recreation conflict.

2.9 Recent Developments in Recreation Conflict Research

A range of alternative theories for the occurrence of recreation conflict have been pursued, with recent foci turning to issues of place attachment, crowding and carrying
capacity, stress and coping and wilderness perceptions in an attempt to better understand conflict occurring in outdoor settings.

2.9.1 Place Attachment Theory

Incorporating the notion of place attachment into conflict research may provide a more comprehensive understanding of the topic (Vaske et al., 2000; Gibbons and Ruddell, 1995). Place refers to space that has been given meaning (Altman and Low, 1992). Some meanings create positive feelings that may result in bonds between an individual and a place. This is known as place attachment (Gibbons and Ruddell, 1995). Place attachment is often operationalised using two concepts, place dependence and place identity (Williams and Patterson, 1999). Place dependence (a functional attachment) reflects the importance of the resource in providing amenities necessary for desired activities (Vaske et al., 2000). The functional attachment is embodied in the area's characteristics. Place dependence represents an ongoing relationship with a particular setting. Place identity, conversely, is not the direct result of one experience but is instead a psychological investment with the setting that has developed over time (Williams and Patterson, 1999). Moore and Graefe (1994) found that a history of repeat visits to a place (because of place dependence) could lead to place identity.

Gibbons and Ruddell (1995) found place dependence to be among the sources of goal interference consistent with Jacob and Schreyer's (1980) research. The notion of place attachment could be applicable to the present research. Another new perspective in recreation conflict research has arisen from the use of norm theory.

2.9.2 Norm Theory

While place dependence has been offered as one suggestion for the increasing occurrence of recreational conflict, conflict can also arise when groups do not share the same norms (recognised standards). Conflict can result when individuals perceive the behaviour of others to be unacceptable. According to Vaske et al. (2000, p. 298) “Norms are evaluative beliefs (standards) regarding acceptable behaviour in a given context”. The authors examined skiers' and snowboarders' normative beliefs
regarding what they considered to be acceptable behaviour as an indicator of recreation conflict. Norm theory is closely associated with theories of social value conflict.

Norm theory and place attachment theory have offered new perspectives on the underlying causes of recreation conflict. Another significant avenue of investigation has turned to crowding and carrying capacity research in a further attempt to understand the origins of dissatisfying wilderness experiences.

2.9.3 Crowding and Carrying Capacity

A large proportion of recreation conflict research has been devoted to investigations of perceptions of crowding and social carrying capacity. Traditionally, the notions of crowding and conflict were bound up with the concept of social carrying capacity and the idea that there was an inverse relationship between recreational satisfaction and the level or density of users of an area or resource. This simplistic view prevailed prior to the 1980s, often leading to the “intuitive and colloquial interchangeable references to conflict and crowding in the literature” (Owens, 1985, p. 244). Later, research concluded that levels of satisfaction were not related to density measured by contact level. Following the breakdown of the satisfaction model, research turned to examine the social and psychological basis of the crowding and conflict experience rather than numerosity (Owens, 1985).

Goal interference has also been reported in the recreation crowding literature (Gibbons and Ruddell, 1995). Crowding can be interpreted as a form of goal interference when the presence of too many others interferes with achieving recreation goals. Those seeking solitude or escape related goals are more likely to report a setting as being crowded. The research into crowding and carrying capacity has undergone significant advancement since the 1970s. However, a more recent perspective has turned the spotlight away from crowding towards coping with stress created by outdoor recreation conflict.
2.9.4 Stress and Coping Theories

The evolving research into coping in outdoor recreation has focused on the causes and consequences of crowding and conflict. Coping mechanisms include displacement, product shift and rationalisation (Manning and Valliere, 2001). A high level of visitors adopts either behavioural or cognitive coping mechanisms when subject to recreation conflict (ibid., 2001). Problem-focused processes of coping with stress caused by recreation conflict may involve making changes to the environment to deal with the stress. Emotion-focused processes change the emotional impact of the stress and may involve distancing, avoidance or selective attention mechanisms (Schneider, 2004). Of the forms of coping, little is known of displacement processes. Schneider (2004) maintains that recreation area managers can improve communication processes to alleviate visitor stress. This can be best accomplished by education and information aimed at changing the behaviours of new, uninformed or unskilled visitors. The intricacies revealed in coping research data illustrate the complexity of managing outdoor recreation conflicts, of which the Hollyford case is no exception. Another equally complex point of investigation has examined visitors’ wilderness perceptions.

2.9.5 Wilderness Perceptions Research

Individual perceptions of what constitutes wilderness differ greatly among individuals (Hall and Kearsley, 2001). The role of perception in wilderness research holds relevance for the present study. While the Hollyford is not designated as an official ‘wilderness’ area in New Zealand, research has found that the word ‘wilderness’ is applied to a variety of settings and landscapes, creating expectations of what one may find there. Significantly, perceptions of appropriate use and management often depend on an individual’s perception of wilderness (Stankey and Lucas, ND). This suggests that if the Hollyford Track is perceived as being a particular type of ‘wilderness’ with aspects of solitude as a fundamental characteristic, then certain uses may not be deemed acceptable there.

The extensive range of theories discussed above illustrates that the investigation of recreation conflict has been pursued from a variety of angles. While each conceptual framework has its own strengths, the focus on satisfaction, alongside the goal
interference and social values theories, have particularly shaped the conceptual structure of the present investigation.

2.10 Conclusion

A number of factors may have contributed to what appears to have become increasingly contentious relations among user groups in the outdoors. Technological advances have made some forms of recreation more convenient, comfortable and consequently popular (Williams, 1993). Traditional users of a resource or domain may now feel they are in competition with new types of users whose equipment and activities challenge the traditional uses of the area. Studies of the conflict between motorised and non-motorised users have highlighted the differences between 'low impact' passive users and the 'high impact' aggressive users (Hoger and Chavez, 1998). One study concluded that high impact users are more likely to be louder, have a greater environmental impact and are perceived to be less courteous than the other user group (ibid.). Where there is no motorisation involved, conflict can become a matter of perception. A broad array of theoretical frameworks has shaped the exploration of recreation conflict. Of these, the satisfaction, goal interference and social values models provide an appropriate foundation for the present research.
3 Methodological Approach

A triangulation approach employing both quantitative and qualitative methods was adopted in the present study to address the research questions. The three components of the approach were a survey questionnaire, key informant interviews and informal qualitative analysis of the submissions made to the Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan. This chapter will detail how data collection was undertaken, outlining the rationale for the choice of data collection methods and identifying the strengths and limitations associated with each. Triangulation uses multiple sources of data collection to highlight different dimensions of the same issue. It serves to compensate for the deficiencies in one method by using the strengths of another, resulting in data with contains a higher degree of validity and reliability (Minichiello et al., 1990). Methods differ in their vulnerability to particular kinds of error, and triangulation acts as a strategy to overcome each method’s limitations by combining different methods in the same investigation (Brewer and Hunter, 1989).
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The present study provided an opportunity to examine the potential occurrence of recreation conflict resulting from jet boat activity in one part of the Fiordland National Park. This examination of recreation conflict may have applicability for other parks, or places outside of national parks where jet boats are present alongside other recreational pursuits. The present research therefore provides a case study example of the occurrence of recreation conflict. A case study is disadvantaged by the fact that it produces a singular view of particular activities. However, according to Yin (1989, p. 16) "even a single case study can often be used to pursue an explanatory, and not merely exploratory (or descriptive) purpose". The interpretive paradigm was employed in this research as the primary aim of the study was to understand the nature of any conflict occurring between hunters and private jet boat users and other users of the Hollyford Track (Eyles and Smith, 1998).

3.1 Scoping Exercise

A scoping exercise was undertaken prior to selecting the methodological approach. Scoping comprised meetings with DOC Southland Conservancy staff to discuss the nature of the conflict, walking the Hollyford Track to become familiar with the area, and taking a trip on the Hollyford Guided Walks jet boat, to experience this component of the track. Scoping provided a fuller understanding of the research problem and enabled the selection of a logical and appropriate methodological approach. The first component of the methodology to be undertaken was a quantitative survey.

3.2 Quantitative Analysis

Quantitative methodology is based on a positivist or neo-positivist philosophy. Its theoretical principles are based around a reality that is objective, simple and positive; that there is one reality or truth in nature (Sarantakos, 1998). This positivist philosophy is seen to establish a 'clear' direction and a systematic, vigorous and disciplined methodology which ought to allow a researcher to arrive at a theory that is free from "abstract speculation" and "everyday assumptions" (ibid., p. 42). The selection of a quantitative method aimed to gain data that was objective and value free.
3.2.1 Survey Questionnaire

A quantitative method in the form of a survey questionnaire was adopted to gather information through written questioning (Sarantakos, 1998). The questionnaire was conducted to examine visitors’ motivations for going to the Hollyford Track, what they expected of it and how satisfied they were with their experience. These factors were examined with close attention being paid to the occurrence of any conflict occurring between recreational jet boaters, hunters and trampers. The use of a questionnaire enabled a large number of user attitudes to be surveyed. It facilitated a wide distribution, minimised interviewer bias, was time saving and cost effective (Bannon, 1976).

The questionnaire (see Appendix A) gathered information relating to visitor experiences in the Hollyford area. The inclusion of user opinions of backcountry recreation areas has been fundamental to the planning and management of national parks in New Zealand. This ancillary purpose of the survey was made clear in its opening paragraph which stated that the survey would assist DOC in its management of the Hollyford Track and its facilities. This also formed a central part of motivating respondents to complete the survey.

3.2.2 Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was constructed to address the research questions within the conceptual framework of the satisfaction, goal interference and social values models of recreation conflict. It attempted to do this while maintaining a measure of consistency with previous surveys undertaken by DOC, for the purposes of comparison by DOC at a later stage. In an analysis of investigations of recreation conflict using the goal interference model, Schneider (2000) noted that surveys frequently ‘defined’ participants’ goals in closed ended questionnaires and created supposed ‘interference’ by the manner in which the questionnaire was written. Bultena and Taves (1961) suggested that responses to motivational items on a questionnaire can vary considerably depending on whether open ended formats are used or specific items are suggested to respondents. These findings influenced the writing of the questionnaire in the present study. The use of a box labelled ‘other’
Chapter 3: Methodological Approach

with a space for explanation was included where tick-box questions were used, to ensure all possible responses could be expressed.

The survey format was adapted from an instrument used by DOC to examine the impact of aircraft over-flights on recreationists in natural settings. The survey comprised two parts. Part 1, containing questions about expectations and demographic information was to be completed prior to respondents going on their trip, and Part 2, which questioned satisfaction and actual experiences, was to be completed after the respondents’ trip. Questions at the end of Part 2 of the survey focused specifically on jet boats and aimed to establish whether passive recreational users of the Hollyford Track were affected by the use of the boats, and if so, to what extent.

3.2.3 Survey Questions

The survey questions included open ended, closed ended and multiple choice questions to provide a balance between a concise survey that was straightforward to complete and allowing for respondents to expand or detail concerns where necessary to elicit a wide range of responses (Bannon, 1976). The questionnaire aimed to avoid leading questions (questions that were worded in a way that would encourage a yes or no response) (ibid.). Pre-testing was undertaken by DOC staff and several people familiar with the Hollyford Track to ensure that the questionnaire format was logical and coherent.

Part 1 of the thirty question survey aimed to gauge visitors’ expectations of the track prior to (or very shortly after) embarking on their trip. It queried their motivations for visiting the track, and the main activities they would be undertaking on it. It also gathered demographic data relating to respondents’ age, gender, group size and tramping experience, and asked whether they had visited the Hollyford before. Questions were in tick-box format to aid response speed. This was necessary as Part 1 of the survey was administered in a potentially time-sensitive environment from Hidden Falls Hut, from which many respondents continued on to Alabaster Hut to spend the night. Respondents took with them Part 2 of the survey to complete once they had finished the track.
Part 2 examined visitors' actual experiences of the track, and questioned whether components of their trip had been different to what they had expected (such as their feeling of being in the wilderness, the amount of non-natural noise they had heard and the level of any antisocial behaviour in the huts). They were then asked to note the three most satisfying and dissatisfying aspects of their trip, and to rank their overall level of satisfaction with their trip. Part 2 also asked whether visitors had noticed the presence of hunters, and left space for comments. It concluded with questions relating to jet boat activity. These were placed at the end of the survey in order to avoid increasing awareness of jet boating as a potentially problematic issue in the Hollyford, as increased awareness of annoyance being associated with a particular occurrence has been found to increase levels of annoyance. Respondents were asked whether they had noticed any jet boat activity on their trip (other than any boat they had travelled on), whether the amount of jet boat activity had been more or less than they had expected, and whether it had affected them in any way. For those that indicated they were annoyed by jet boats, a seven-point scale allowed respondents to quantify their annoyance, with a score of 1 representing being hardly annoyed by jet boats and 7 representing extreme annoyance. All respondents were asked to specify what level of jet boat numbers, if any, would spoil their trip to the Hollyford.

Separate surveys for hunters and users of private jet boats contained four additional questions about boaters' means of accessing the Hollyford, and whether facilities for hunters and jet boaters had been adequate.

3.2.4 Questionnaire Distribution

Part 1 of the questionnaire was distributed to respondents who either passed by or stayed at the Hidden Falls Hut for them to complete. Hidden Falls Hut is two and a half hours' walk from the beginning of the Hollyford Track. Respondents took with them Part 2 of the questionnaire, which included a reply paid envelope, to be completed at the end of their Hollyford trip. Seventy surveys were administered over seven days at Easter, a period that drew a large number of trampers and hunters to the Hollyford, as it coincided with public holidays and the Roar hunting period. By personally administrating the questionnaires, it was hoped a greater response rate would be achieved. Every willing respondent over the age of 16 was surveyed. After
Easter, surveys were left in the hut with an information sheet for respondents to complete. The distribution of the surveys to Hollyford Guided Walks trampers, who do not use Hidden Falls Hut, was undertaken by their tour guide.

To increase the sample size and avoid bias by administering surveys at a single location used mostly by trampers, questionnaires were posted to several organisations for circulation to track users. Surveys were sent to three tramping clubs (University of Otago, Otago Tramping and Mountaineering Club, and Southland Tramping Club). Efforts to reach the sometimes elusive hunting population using the track environs involved posting questionnaires to two deerstalkers associations (Otago and Southland) for distribution. Milford Helicopters, which provides a jet boat portaging service over the Little Homer Rapids and also flies hunters into the Hollyford area to hunt on foot, also agreed to distribute surveys. DOC’s Te Anau office also posted out surveys with any hunting permits that it administered over the month prior to the data collection phase.

3.2.5 Survey Analysis

Of the 131 surveys manually distributed, 117 surveys were returned. Guided walkers returned thirty three of the thirty five surveys distributed by their guide and independent trampers returned eighty four of the ninety six distributed. Together, this resulted in a response rate of 89 per cent. The tramping and hunting organisations did not distribute any of the surveys that they had been posted. It was not possible to calculate the response rate for surveys distributed by DOC with hunting permits, as hunters who received the survey may not have gone to the Hollyford. No surveys were returned by this group. Ninety five per cent of the completed surveys were returned by trampers. In order to balance the responses, qualitative data collection relied heavily on jet boating and hunting informants.

Quantitative data analysis was undertaken using the Statistical Program for Social Sciences (SPSS). This enabled the information collected during the study to be organised in a constructive way before it was manipulated to evaluate the findings and arrive at some valid, relevant conclusions (Sarantakos, 1998). Expressions of dissatisfaction with encountering any type of group or behaviour were considered to
reflect the occurrence of conflict. Encounters that elicited responses indicating enjoyment or neutrality towards other groups were not considered to be conflict. Based on Graham’s (1999) methodology, the total number of visitors who had noticed jet boats was tallied, before those who had felt annoyed by the boats were counted. The seven-point scale allowed respondents to quantify their annoyance with a score of five or more representing them being strongly annoyed by jet boat activity. The scores were averaged to produce a mean annoyance level. This was assessed against the 25 per cent annoyance level indicator used by DOC to determine the degree of annoyance from jet boat activity.

3.3 Qualitative Analysis

Qualitative research attempts to capture the meaning and regularities of social action (Sarantakos, 1998). It tries to capture reality in interaction, and often involves studying a small number of respondents. This was the case in the use of key informant interviews to gather data about visitor experiences of the Hollyford area.

3.3.1 Key Informant Interviews

Key informant interviews were employed to explore a social reality (Sarantakos, 1998). Key informant interviews have a long tradition in qualitative research. Interviews with seven key informants allowed the presentation of key questions surrounding potential recreation conflict on the Hollyford Track to gain an in-depth understanding of the matter. Interviews enabled informants to provide both background information and their particular perspective of the topic. A broad schedule of interview questions was determined prior to interviews (Appendix B). However, questioning was generally of an open nature where specific questions had not been determined in advance but developed as the interview progressed.

3.3.2 Selection of Key Informants

Informants were selected on the basis of them having either a lengthy or regular association with the Hollyford Track, or having significant knowledge of the area. Key informants comprised:
Two informants were approached on site, and the remainder were contacted through relevant organisations, although snowballing through early informants resulted in gaining an interview with the second recreational jet boater. An information sheet explaining the nature and purpose of the research was given to informants prior to conducting the face to face interviews. The remaining three interviews were conducted by telephone due to the geographical distance of the informants from the researcher.

Key informants were questioned about their expectations and experiences of the Hollyford Track. This included questions regarding visitor interactions among different party types, visitor behaviour, and levels of jet boat and hunting activity. Interview data was transcribed and coded into themes according to the three research questions, with a particular focus on the occurrence of any conflict relating to jet boat or hunting activity. Other prominent themes that emerged from the interviews were also noted to aid the interpretation of the data.

3.4 Informal Qualitative Analysis

Informal qualitative analysis of submissions to the Draft National Park Fiordland Management Plan was also undertaken in the present study. The submissions were provided by DOC and were analysed to gather any information relating to visitor expectations and motivations for going to the Hollyford, and any indication of satisfying and dissatisfying aspects of the track.

Informal qualitative analysis was also undertaken of eight trip diary entries belonging to members of a private jet boat party in the Hollyford that had been guided by one of
the jet boating key informants. Analysis of these was similarly guided by the research questions.

3.5 Limitations to Methodological Approach

Time constraints prohibited the taking of summer, mid winter and Labour Weekend samples of survey respondents, which would have provided a more representative selection of visitors at times when private jet boats were known to operate. Time constraints also disallowed the random sampling of visitors during the survey distribution period.

The sample size of the survey was relatively small, making the data slightly less reliable. Finding key informants who had walked the Hollyford Track and had made complaints to DOC about jet boat activity was immensely difficult. Had this been achieved, the selection of key informants would have been more balanced. However, complainants' contact details were not available. Of the tramping clubs contacted, numerous trampers had walked the Hollyford Track but most had used the Hollyford Guided Walks jet boat and none expressed annoyance at jet boat activity in the area.

With both the Alabaster and Hokuri huts being replaced during part of the data collection period, some visitors to the Hollyford may have adopted different patterns of use than those normally undertaken, such as choosing to use the Hollyford Guided Walks jet boat in combination with an aeroplane to avoid the parts of the track where huts were unavailable. This may have affected survey responses. The hut closures also prompted several visitors to comment on this irregularity in the dissatisfaction section of the survey.
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The present chapter examines visitors’ expectations of the Hollyford Track and their motivations for choosing that particular destination. The matters of expectations and motivations for going to a certain place are often intricately intertwined. However, at times, factors other than having a positive expectation of a destination may prompt an individual to choose a track, such as displacement from another track, or poor weather making other routes impassable. Specifically, this chapter addresses the first research question: What motivates visitors to select the Hollyford as a destination and what do they expect? This question is fundamental to assessing goal interference and satisfaction, as expectations have been found to play a critical role in determining satisfaction in outdoor recreational pursuits (Cessford, 1999). Results will be examined with reference to the differences between New Zealanders and overseas visitors and party types – independent and guided trampers, and hunters and
recreational jet boaters. Firstly however, it is important to detail the broad findings of the quantitative survey.

4.1 Survey Respondents

Of the 117 survey respondents, 64 per cent classed themselves as independent trampers, 31 per cent were HGW guided walkers, and 5 per cent described themselves as hunters. None of the survey respondents had a private jet boat with them, suggesting that the survey did not reach those jet boaters who were the subject of complaints to the Department of Conservation, or they chose not to respond to it. Of the total number of respondents, 64 per cent resided permanently in New Zealand and the remainder were from overseas. Demographic information relating to survey respondents' age, gender, nationality, place of residence and tramping experience appears in Appendix C. We turn now to examine trampers' motivations for choosing the Hollyford as a destination and their expectations of the track.

4.2 Trampers' Motivations for Choosing the Hollyford; Expectations of the Area

Trampers' motivations for choosing the Hollyford varied widely. For the most part, the allure of exploring a new area and expectations of majestic scenery enticed visitors to the Hollyford.

4.2.1 Trampers' Motivations for Choosing the Hollyford

The main reasons for all respondents to choose the Hollyford overall were scenery, the desire to explore a new track and wanting to experience wilderness, as illustrated in Figure 4.1.
When all the respondents’ motivations for visiting the Hollyford were separated into overall motivations for each party type, it became apparent that guided walkers had different motivations for visiting the area from independent trampers. While the top three reasons for independent walkers to visit the Hollyford were for its scenery, exploring a new track and getting away from it all, guided walkers’ motivations for choosing the Hollyford were based on the challenge they perceived it would provide, for its scenery, opportunities for solitude and to experience wilderness. While this survey question examined respondents’ multiple reasons for choosing the Hollyford, a further question asked them to clarify their one main reason for visiting the area.

The main reason for all respondent types to choose the Hollyford Track was ‘to explore a new track’. The main motivations for visiting the Hollyford differed significantly between independent trampers and guided trampers. Guided trampers’ overall reason for choosing the Hollyford was more likely to be ‘to encounter wilderness’ while independent trampers were more likely to choose ‘to explore a new track’ or ‘scenery’. ‘To get away from it all’ was the main reason for going to the Hollyford for independent trampers only – perhaps due to the fact that most guided walkers walk in groups. A graph illustrating this data appears in Figure 4.2.
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Results also revealed that motivations for visiting the Hollyford did not differ significantly between New Zealand and overseas visitors, other than those whose main purpose for visiting was for hunting and accessing the Pyke Route (all of these respondents were New Zealanders). The small number of survey respondents who selected ‘achieving goals’ and ‘viewing wildlife’ as their main reason for visiting the Hollyford were all from overseas. A graph illustrating this data appears in Appendix D.

Qualitative interviews also questioned informants’ motivations for visiting the Hollyford. The Recreational Tramper, who had not previously been into the area, elected to do the Hollyford Track in combination with the Pyke Route. The informant had read that the track featured a walk of several days in native bush, which appealed to him.

I do a bit of tramping and I’d read about the different tracks and I kind of liked the concept of walking in trees without views. I think that’s cool about the Hollyford, walking in the forest instead of just walking with having big kind of open views in front of you all the time.

The DOC Hut Warden informant felt that trampers chose to do the Hollyford because they were seeking a more remote experience than could be provided by other tracks such as the Milford. Additionally, he said that trampers chose the Hollyford because...
they were displaced from the three Great Walks - the Routeburn, Kepler and Milford, which each operate a booking system.

The Hollyford Guided Walks Guide said that the diversity of forest types on the track and the variety provided by the experience drew both New Zealand and overseas visitors. The range of forest types, the coastal environment, wildlife viewing opportunities and a relatively small amount of walking were factors that attracted tourists, he said. The absence of an alpine pass and the mixture of ‘adventure activities’ provided by the combination of tramping, jet boarding and a scenic flight were additional draw cards that the Hollyford Track offered guided visitors.

Trampers’ motivations for visiting the Hollyford sometimes differed between guided and independent walkers. The lure of exploring a new track and the Hollyford’s scenery topped the list of reasons for visiting the Hollyford, while for guided walkers, anticipating that they would experience a wilderness environment was an attraction.

4.2.2 Trampers’ Expectations of the Hollyford

Expectations of the Hollyford varied extensively among tramping respondents. Seventeen per cent of the independent trampers and 18 per cent of the guided walkers had been to the Hollyford before. Expectations of the physical environment and of the degree of wilderness also varied. Responding to a Likert scale where 1 represented an environment that was “wild, rugged and untouched” and 7 represented “developed and modified by humans”, the majority (34 per cent) of all respondents indicated that prior to visiting the Hollyford, they expected it to be a 2 on the scale (mainly wild, rugged and untouched). Seventy per cent of respondents imagined that the Hollyford would be more ‘wild, rugged and untouched’ than ‘modified and developed by humans’, by giving ratings of 1, 2 or 3 on the Likert scale. Three per cent of respondents did not know what to expect. Figure 4.3 illustrates respondents’ expectations of the Hollyford Track environment prior to their visit.
New Zealanders and overseas visitors differed in their expectations of the naturalness of the Hollyford environment. New Zealanders were more likely to expect it to be developed and modified by humans than overseas visitors. Similarly, party types also exhibited differences. Hunters and guided walkers were more likely to imagine that the Hollyford was wild, rugged and untouched than independent trampers. Hunters are more likely to go off the formed track into areas that are very rugged, providing an explanation for their responses. Graphs illustrating this data appear in Appendix E.

Expectations of the numbers of people seen per day also varied among respondents. The large majority of respondents expected to see between one and ten people on the Hollyford Track each day, as illustrated in Figure 4.4. Guided walkers were more likely to expect to see no-one (other than those in their own party), while independent trampers were more likely to expect to see more than 20 people on the track daily. New Zealanders and overseas visitors to the Hollyford did not have noticeable differences in their expectations of people seen per day.
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Key informants also expressed opinions about trampers expectations of the Hollyford. Recreational Jet Boater A believed that trampers expected that they would always find a bed in the DOC huts on the Hollyford Track. “They’ve paid for a ticket into the wilderness for a bed and they expect that no-one else should be there which is ridiculous, absolutely ridiculous”. This informant felt that trampers also expected a greater degree of wilderness than other users.

This section has illustrated that trampers’ expectations of the Hollyford differed among survey respondents. Guided walkers and overseas visitors were more likely to expect to see fewer people on the track daily and expected the area to be largely rugged, wild and unmodified than were New Zealanders or independent trampers. Trampers’ expectations of jet boat use and hunting practices in the Hollyford also revealed differences among visitors.

4.2.3 Trampers’ Expectations of Jet Boat Activity and Hunting

The non-jet boating or hunting key informants were questioned about whether trampers anticipated encountering hunters and jet boaters on the Hollyford Track. They were also asked for their views on these groups sharing the area with other users. The survey did not ask specifically if visitors expected to notice jet boaters or hunters in the Hollyford so as not to pre-empt expectations of its purpose or content.
Prior to going on his Hollyford Track trip, the Recreational Tramper felt that general jet boat use in New Zealand's national parks represented the commercialisation of the parks. The tramper had not known that either commercial or private jet boats operated in the Hollyford. While on the track, he injured his arm near Big Bay and was forced to use the Hollyford Guided Walks jet boat to leave the area. The informant enjoyed the experience and his opinion on the use of jet boats in the Hollyford changed to acknowledging their usefulness. The Recreational Tramper had recognised prior to his trip that there were numerous airstrips in the vicinity of the Hollyford Track and consequently, he had expected a significant degree of mechanised noise in the area. However, on the Pyke Route, which he envisioned would be a 'wilderness' environment with little evidence of human influence, he said he would have been surprised to see jet boats. The rugged and remote nature of the area made jet boats out of place there: "That would have been like 'Wow, what are they doing here?'" While he did not notice any boats other than the HGW boat while walking on the Hollyford Track, the informant felt that if he had noticed one other boat it would not have adversely affected him. However:

If it was a whole fleet of vehicles making noise then it would've been more a reduction of the experience we would've anticipated. Definitely if there were ten of them screaming past it would've been 'Woh - a bit more popular than we thought.'

Part 2 of the survey asked respondents if the jet boat activity they encountered on the Hollyford was more or less than they had anticipated. Figure 4.5 illustrates the findings.

Figure 4.5. Visitors’ experiences of jet boat activity in the Hollyford
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The graph illustrates that for the majority of respondents (49 per cent) the amount of jet boat activity they saw was as they had anticipated. However, one fifth of respondents noticed more jet boat activity than they imagined they would. Eighteen per cent encountered less than they had expected, and 12 per cent of respondents did not know how much jet boat activity to expect. Expectations of jet boat activity differed among party types. Independent trampers and hunters were more likely to say there had been more jet boat activity than they expected. There was little difference between New Zealand and overseas visitors about expectations of jet boat activity. These graphs appear in Appendix F.

At this point it is important to detail the number of survey respondents who saw or heard jet boat activity (other than any boat they travelled on). Of the total number of respondents, 44 per cent noticed jet boats, by either seeing or hearing them. Figure 4.6 illustrates that jet boats were noticed by visitors whose most distant destination from the Hollyford Road varied between Hidden Falls and Martins Bay.

![Figure 4.6. Detection of jet boat activity and distance travelled from Hollyford Road](image)

Thirty eight per cent of survey respondents used the HGW jet boat to travel alongside some part of the Hollyford Track. This finding may be a critical factor in the examination of annoyance towards jet boat use in the area, which will be discussed in Chapter 6. All of the guided walkers were transported by the HGW jet boat, but only 13 per cent of the independent trampers and hunters used the commercial jet boat. The
number of independent trampers who used the HGW jet boat is relatively low most probably due to the fact that 54 per cent of independent trampers and hunters surveyed only went as far into the Hollyford as Hidden Falls Hut.

These findings suggest that the majority of respondents did expect some level of jet boat activity on the Hollyford, perhaps through their knowledge of the Hollyford Guided Walks jet boat service, which many independent trampers use. Trampers’ expectations about jet boating may have also been linked with their knowledge of hunting in the area or their detection of a small sign indicating a boat ramp in the Hollyford Road car park.

Trampers’ awareness of hunting activity in the Hollyford was not explicitly questioned in the expectations section of the survey, so as to not pre-empt expectations of the survey’s purpose or content. Questions about trampers’ knowledge of hunting activity were posed to key informants, however. The DOC Hut Warden said that trampers were often warned at the DOC office in Te Anau that if they were tramping in the month of April during the Roar hunting season, they may encounter hunters on the track or in huts. They were often told “to wear bright clothing and things like that for their own protection”, he said. Survey respondents had the opportunity to comment on hunting activity in relation to their expectations of the Hollyford. No comments were made about the presence of hunters.

This section has presented the results relating to trampers’ motivations for going to the Hollyford, and their expectations as to what they would find there. Expectations of wilderness across party types varied. Hunters and private jet boaters were also questioned about their motivations for going to the Hollyford and their expectations of the area in order to gain insight into whether these differed from trampers’ motivations and expectations. Due to the low response rate to the survey by hunters, the majority of the information presented here comes from key informant interviews.

4.3 Hunters’ and Jet Boaters’ Expectations and Motivations

As just five per cent of survey respondents indicated that hunting was their main activity, key informant interviews were relied upon heavily to collect data from
hunters and jet boaters. Like trampers, recreational jet boaters and hunters also had specific reasons for choosing to undertake their hobby in the Hollyford. There appeared to be two groups of people using private jet boats in the Hollyford; firstly, those whose primary purpose for going to the area was for hunting, and secondly, those who went with family or friends with a number of jet boats. This group may have carried rifles, but hunting was not necessarily the primary purpose for their visit.

4.3.1 Hunters and Jet Boaters' Motivations for Choosing the Hollyford

Of the eight survey respondents who classed themselves as hunters, the principal reason for going to the Hollyford was for its hunting opportunities. Scenery, fishing opportunities and chances to view wildlife were secondary reasons for making a trip into the area.

Of the key informants, the Hunter's motivations for going hunting in the Hollyford Valley were primarily related to his long association with the area. He had been making trips into the Hollyford for over twenty years.

This informant used his small runabout dingy to access the land adjacent to the Hollyford River between Gunn's Camp on the Hollyford Road and the Little Homer Rapids. He either camped overnight alongside the riverbank or stayed at Gunn's Camp. In the Hunter's opinion, other hunters who travelled further down the Hollyford Valley in their boats were motivated to return because of the area's abundance of deer. Hunters generally used jet boats for ease of access and to enable them to carry out the meat from the deer that they shot in the bush-clad gullies of the long valley, he said. He suggested that carrying out a large quantity of meat would be laborious.

Because of the nature of the valley - it's quite a long way to walk out, it would take three or four days. You could walk it if you wanted to carry out 100 pounds of meat all the way from way down there...If you got a big stag they weigh 250-260 pounds, some more, and you'd easily get 100 pounds of meat off that (Hunter).
Motivations behind the two recreational jet boater informants’ visits to the Hollyford were different to the Hunter’s. Recreational Jet Boater A expressed a deep and enduring attachment with the Hollyford that spanned nine years. This resulted in him returning to the area approximately four times each year with his jet boat to go hunting, fishing and boating. His jet boat would be portaged over the Little Homer Rapids for each trip. With his boat, Recreational Jet Boater A would travel up the Upper Pyke to Lake Wilmot and as far down the Hollyford Valley as Martins Bay.

His motivations for returning to the Hollyford were based on the satisfaction gained from previous trips. The remoteness of the location, caused partially by the complexities involved in gaining jet boat access, and the fact that he had never met any other private jet boat users in the area when he had been in with his own party of boats, contributed to him returning to the area. “The chance of seeing anyone else is pretty remote...all the other rivers are easy to get to so you always see other boats. On the Dart there’s commercial boats as well”, he said. The informant also mentioned excellent weather and the adventure associated with gaining access as part of his reasons for returning to the Hollyford.

It’s hard to get in there. When I first went down there not very many people went in there and it was a bit of an adventure to go in there...I went in with some others and ever since then I’ve always gone back. It’s a great place. The weather in there’s beautiful sometimes. It’s not always raining. We’ve had some great days in there, there’s no cell phones, there’s only the people you take with you. You don’t see many people...There’s nowhere really the same! Like we boat the Wilkin and places like that, the Dart, Shotover, Waitaki, but there’s no place like in there (Recreational Jet Boater A).

The nature of the Hollyford River, with its abundance of protruding logs and submerged trees, created an additional challenge for private jet boaters navigating the river, he said. Going with a party of boats was advisable for safety purposes. “You want to be really experienced. If something goes wrong, it goes really wrong”.
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Recreational Jet Boater B had similar motivations for making trips into the Hollyford. Like Recreational Jet Boater A, Recreational Jet Boater B was a member of a jet boat association, and had owned a boat since he was about twenty years old.

Two years ago friends asked Recreational Jet Boater B to guide a group of private boats into the Hollyford, to which he agreed. Jet boating friends’ desires to explore the Hollyford had encouraged him to make return trips in as their informal guide. “Other people want to go really, I only lead the trip...other people went to see it and go fishing and do some shooting”. While in the area, the informant and his party went tramping and visited the Martins Bay seal colony.

Recreational Jet Boater B said that private jet boats parties were motivated to go to the Hollyford for the spectacular views they gained from having boat access. He described the scenery and the boating experience that motivated him to return to the Hollyford.

People don’t realise what it’s like. They think it’s all noise and all the rest of it but when you’re cruising along lakes that are just dead calm and there’s reflections in them, it’s an amazing feeling. It feels like you’re actually not moving. You’re doing say about 40 miles an hour and you’re sitting in this lake which is like a mirror and you’ve got mountains coming off and dead calm...It’s quite extraordinary. But you get to see it, you see the mountains, you see all the wildlife, you stop in the middle of the lake and have a chat, just turn the motors off and drift, it’s just beautiful. We like the peace and quiet as well (Recreational Jet Boater B).

Recreational Jet Boater B said that trampers, who often complained about the presence of boats, were missing out on experiencing the area’s spectacular views.

Trampers will only see a small portion of the area. Once you get on the track you’ve only got a few viewpoints...trampers are head down, going for it but they don’t actually see what we see. If you’re looking for viewing...the best thing to do if you’re going to walk is walk-boat-fly. Because then you’ll see it all. And what’s the point of going into the wop wops if you don’t actually see it? (Recreational Jet Boater B).

Recreational Jet Boater B also said that the fact that jet boats had been “shut off half the rivers that we can boat” also caused him to return to the Hollyford.
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Recreational Jet Boater B felt that hunters took their jet boats in to the Hollyford primarily to gain better access to the area. “The thing is, you’ve got this huge expanse and you can’t cover the area if you haven’t got a boat”. Fishermen also used jet boats in the Hollyford for the accessibility they offered, Recreational Jet Boater B said. “The only way to go fishing up there in a lot of cases is by jet boat because you can’t even get down to the river in a lot of places, because of the bush. You can get to a few spots but not that many”.

The issue of large private jet boat parties staying in the DOC huts, particularly Alabaster Hut, has been the source of complaints to DOC. On his first trip back into the Hollyford with eight jet boats in his party, Recreational Jet Boater B stayed at Alabaster Hut. The second time, the group booked out the Hollyford Guided Walks’ Pyke Lodge and stayed there, as there were “toilets for the ladies...nicer setting, easier boat parking, the whole lot”.

The DOC Hut Warden reinforced much of the information provided by the hunter and recreational jet boater informants. He said that the Hollyford, and particularly Hidden Falls Hut, were very popular with hunters. Hidden Falls’ proximity to the start of the track often saw hunters walking in on a Friday night and staying there. The abundance of game made the Hollyford area very attractive for hunters, who often had “their own peculiar hunting areas and favourite areas”. The informant said that hunters used their boats to gain access to a large area: “they can cover a lot of area up there, you know. They can hunt in a lot of places in a jet boat and they can spread themselves out”. The hunters with jet boats “don’t go up and down because they haven’t got the fuel to do it, it’s not like a race meeting with boats going all the time, or water skiing”. The informant said that hunters were usually “either exploring or out hunting so they go from A to B and walk off into the hills to do their hunting”. Other hunters flew in by helicopter to access the far reaches of the valleys off the Hollyford.

Jet boaters’ and hunters’ expectations of the Hollyford are not presented here as each of the informants and seven of the eight hunters who responded to the survey had been into the Hollyford on numerous occasions.
Hunters’ and jet boaters’ motivations for going into the Hollyford, and their behaviour while in there, appear to have depended on the primary purpose for their trip. When hunting has been the main reason for visiting the Hollyford, those with jet boats had reportedly used the boats to access the far reaches of the region rather than for “cruising” for pleasure. On the other hand, recreational jet boaters, who often visit the area for its scenery, appear to have been more motivated to visit the area to explore, take friends and view the scenery from the excellent vantage points that the lakes provide.

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter has illustrated that trampers and hunters visit the Hollyford for different reasons, although the area’s scenery is a common attraction across party types. Expectations of what the Hollyford would provide differed among New Zealanders and overseas visitors, and independent and guided trampers. This chapter has provided a foundation for understanding the aspects of the Hollyford experience that visitors considered satisfying or dissatisfying. Expectations have been found to be closely linked to experiencing satisfaction. It is the satisfying experiences that visitors reported in the Hollyford that we turn to examine in Chapter 5.
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Achieving satisfying outdoor recreation experiences can be reliant on an assortment of factors. The present chapter addresses the second research question: Are visitors satisfied with their Hollyford experience? The question is closely linked to the first research question, which examined visitor motivations for going to the Hollyford and their expectations of the area. Survey data revealed that most respondents were very satisfied with their trip to the Hollyford Track. A number of factors in particular appear to have contributed to both survey respondents' and key informants' positive experiences of their Hollyford trip. Spectacular scenery, remoteness, the feeling of being in the wilderness and hut quality each was important for visitor satisfaction. Other factors that received positive comments were noticing jet boats, encountering hunters and the adventure of taking a private jet boat into the area. This chapter will thematically present the satisfying aspects of the Hollyford Track as experienced by visitors. Firstly, however, the overall satisfaction levels of surveyed visitors will be outlined.
Overall satisfaction with the Hollyford was measured by asking survey respondents to indicate their degree of satisfaction on a Likert scale of 1-6. Measures of dissatisfaction were in the 1-2 range, 3-4 represented a neutral or ambivalent feeling towards a satisfying experience, and 5-6 represented positive or satisfying experiences. Almost 60 per cent of respondents marked a 6 on the scale, indicating that they were very satisfied with their Hollyford Track experience. A further 33 per cent of respondents marked a 5 on the scale. Eight per cent of visitors gave their experience a 4 on the scale, suggesting they had gained a very moderate level of satisfaction. One per cent of respondents gave their Hollyford experience a 3 on the scale, indicating slight dissatisfaction. No respondents indicated that they were very dissatisfied with their experience by marking either a 1 or a 2 on the Likert scale.

Figure 5.1 illustrates overall visitor satisfaction. This data is expanded in Appendix G where comparisons between party type, origin and whether jet boats were noticed are illustrated. All respondents who gave their experience a 3 on the scale, representing moderate dissatisfaction, were independent trampers from overseas and had seen jet boats.

The survey questionnaire asked respondents a number of questions relating to satisfaction. They were questioned about general issues in the Hollyford and whether they were more, less or the same as respondents had expected. This data provided a tentative indicator of satisfaction. For example, if respondents encountered a greater feeling of being in the wilderness than they had expected, this was considered to be a
positive indicator of satisfaction. In a similar manner, experiencing less non-natural noise, human influence or inconsiderate behaviour in huts, or seeing fewer aircraft or other people on the track than anticipated is likely to indicate a positive or satisfying experience. Survey respondents and key informants were also asked to detail the most satisfying aspects of being in the Hollyford area. The valley’s scenery emerged as the top response.

5.1 Scenery

The scenery of the Hollyford was rated favourably by most respondents. Different components of the mountainous landscape were regularly commented on. The blue colour of the Hollyford River was noted by one as very memorable. The “ruggedness” of the surrounding forest and trail also impressed. The track was described by one respondent as “wonderful with a bit of everything”.

When questioned about the three most satisfying aspects of the Hollyford Track, scenery or views were mentioned by nearly all respondents and emerged as the top response. This is an important finding, as scenery was one of the primary reasons that motivated visitors to go to the Hollyford. Figure 5.2 illustrates the most satisfying aspects of visitors’ Hollyford experience.

![Figure 5.2. Most satisfying aspect of Hollyford experience for visitors](image)
Other common reasons for satisfaction in the Hollyford were the favourable condition of the track and the absence of many other visitors. Meeting people, the weather and hut quality were prominent as secondary and tertiary causes for satisfaction. Graphs illustrating this data appear in Appendix H.

The recreational jet boater informants also expressed their appreciation of the Hollyford’s scenery, particularly the mirror-like reflections of the mountains and bush in Lakes Alabaster and Wilmot. Figure 5.3 illustrates the flat water of Lake Alabaster and the surrounding mountainous scenery that boaters experience from on the lake.

Figure 5.3. Jet boaters obtain spectacular views of Mt Tutoko from Lake Alabaster

Scenery was unsurprisingly the top reason for visitor satisfaction on the Hollyford Track across all party types. Another prominent contributing factor to the favourable overviews of visitors’ trips related to experiencing wilderness.
5.2 Experiencing Wilderness

Experiencing the feeling of being in the wilderness contributed to satisfying experiences for many respondents and key informants. Appreciative comments about wilderness encompassed concepts of remoteness, seeing few other people and being surrounded by natural vistas.

Data from the ‘General Issues’ section of the survey revealed that almost 30 per cent of respondents experienced more of a ‘feeling of being in the wilderness’ than they had expected they would, despite many noticing jet boats. Just over 60 per cent of respondents said that their feeling of being in the wilderness was the same as they had expected. When it came to experiencing non-natural noise, almost one quarter of all respondents experienced less non-natural noise than they had anticipated they would. Fifty eight per cent of visitors surveyed experienced the same amount of non-natural noise as they had expected. Interestingly, while many respondents experienced less non-natural noise than they had expected, a significant proportion of respondents heard more aircraft noise than they anticipated they would. This will be discussed in the following chapter. Graphs illustrating this data appear in Appendix I.

Also emerging from the ‘General Issues’ section was the fact that almost half the respondents (49 per cent) saw fewer people than they had anticipated they would. Almost a quarter of respondents also saw fewer guided groups than they expected and many overestimated the number of people who would be staying in the huts, with 36 per cent of respondents seeing fewer than they had expected. The extent of human influence on the Hollyford Track was also less than that which over a quarter of respondents had anticipated. Graphs relating to this data also appear in Appendix I. While the absence or lack of human influence or presence contributed to a sense of wilderness for some respondents, remoteness was specified as creating satisfaction for others, particularly recreational jet boaters.

5.2.1 Remoteness

Recreational jet boaters mentioned remoteness and an absence of other boaters outside of their own party as being a source of satisfaction on their Hollyford trips.
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They reduced the likelihood of meeting other boaters by going late in the season after the April Roar, Recreational Jet Boater B said. Both recreational jet boaters interviewed had made trips from the Hollyford into the secluded Upper Pyke and Lake Wilmot regions to fish and explore.

Recreational Jet Boater A said that he considered jet boating the Hollyford a first rate experience as the area’s difficult access meant there were never many others there.

When I first went down there not many people went in there, and it was a bit of an adventure to go in there. I was invited on the first trip. It would be nine or ten years ago. I went in with some others and ever since then I’ve always gone back. It’s a great place.

Recreational Jet Boater A said that he “never, ever” saw other boats in the Hollyford outside of those belonging to his own party, and the Hollyford Guided Walks jet boat. This informant said that he had had such great times in the Hollyford that he would rather go there than to Australia or Fiji on holiday with his wife. He had tried to buy land there and had gone to the lengths of contacting all the existing private land owners and asking if they would sell. The remoteness of the Hollyford, and the access further into the Upper Pyke and Lake Wilmot, provided a sense of adventure for boaters such as himself. “There are a lot of people worried about going in and out of there. It is remote – it’s not dangerous - but you’ve got to be careful about what you do...you want to be really experienced. If something goes wrong, it really goes wrong”, he said.

Private jet boaters were not the only visitors to comment on remoteness, a lack of human modification and the feeling of experiencing ‘wilderness.’ A pair of independent kayakers described the Hollyford as providing “the sense of being in the wilderness without having people and technology surrounding us”. A guided tramper who responded to the survey commented “This is a most special area of the world which should stay much as it is without too much influence from us. Just enough interference to make it possible for a few to explore, not mass tourism”.

Experiencing an environment dominated by natural landscapes was another major source of satisfaction for visitors to the Hollyford. While factors that impinge on this
sense of being in the wilderness will be presented in the following chapter, in the
main, satisfaction with the degree of wilderness was high. While encountering few
other visitors comprised a satisfying component of many visitors' trips, interaction
with others was simultaneously a positive factor for many individuals.

5.3 Interaction with Other Visitors

The nature of interaction between visitors and party types is of much interest to the
present study, as conflict between hunters/jet boaters and independent trampers has
become an increasingly concerning issue for DOC. Interviews and the survey found
there to be a significant degree of positive interaction occurring between both
independent and guided trampers and the boating/hunting fraternity on the Hollyford
Track.

5.3.1 Hunters / Jet Boaters Encountering Trampers

Recreational Jet Boater B reported both positive and negative interactions with
trampers. He believed that the nature of interactions between party types depended
exclusively on the individuals involved. He recalled one experience when his group,
travelling in four jet boats, shared Alabaster Hut with two trampers.

We'd shot a deer so they actually had meals with us, and they thought
that was marvellous. It was a girl from America and her boy/riend
from the North Island. He said it was great and she was absolutely over
the moon. Then we took them boating and she just couldn't get over it.
It was superb...We picked them up at the top of the lake and dropped
them down to Martins Bay. We actually took them right out to sea,
they thought it was amazing...They just totally enjoyed it.

On another trip, Recreational Jet Boater B again encountered trampers in Alabaster
Hut. "We invited them in...We said come on in and have some food, 'cause we had
plenty of everything. We had a really good night. Haven't had so many laughs in
years".

The Hunter informant, who was involved in possum hunting, also experienced
positive encounters with trampers. On one occasion he had given a pair of trampers a
lift back to the Hollyford Road in his boat. "They enjoyed the experience", he said.
Hunters and jet boaters reported positive encounters with tramping visitors. Similarly, a multiplicity of trampers gave an account of memorable interactions with the hunters that they had come across.

5.3.2 Trampers Encountering Hunters

Trampers’ encounters with hunters comprised another form of positive interaction on the Hollyford Track. The Hollyford Guided Walks Guide said that guided walkers were often fascinated when they encountered hunters. “They might give a ‘Hi’ or whatever and then sometimes if you’ve got a hunter who’s quite keen to have a chat and he’s got a deer then obviously the guests are quite interested actually”.

A number of tramper survey respondents commented about positive interaction with hunters. This often involved sharing venison shot by the hunters. “The meat was very good and the hunters very nice”, one respondent wrote. “The two we met were very friendly and chatty”, a guided walker said. A further guided walker said that encountering hunters had emphasised the “wildness” of the experience and added an “element of intrigue”. An independent tramper said that New Zealand needed more hunters to manage the possum and deer numbers: “They should be welcomed as part of New Zealand’s lifestyle”. Another tramper respondent, who stayed in the Demon Trail Hut, spent an evening with a pair of hunters and reported a highly entertaining encounter.

Great guys, they were friendly and fun. If the bush wasn’t so bloody marvellous they would have been the highlight of my trip. It was really good to experience good old fashioned Kiwi hospitality towards the visitor. They had come in a boat and shared their luxuries with us, and their stories.

Another tramper noted that it was positive to see non-trampers enjoying the Hollyford. The respondent said that she had found hunters to be “very good natured people who care more for the environment than many trampers I’ve met.”

A very positive response to hunters was recorded by a large number of trampers. Likewise, recreational jet boaters, many of whom were also hunting, reported positive interactions with trampers whom they encountered in huts. Another foundation for
satisfaction in the Hollyford Track that was reported particularly by survey respondents was the quality of the track’s accommodation options.

5.4 Satisfaction with Huts

A number of respondents mentioned satisfaction with the DOC huts and HGW lodges on the Hollyford Track. The survey produced a large number of comments about hut facilities, many of them positive. However, high hut quality was not always appreciated by those seeking a more remote or wilderness experience.

A segment of respondents obviously preferring a high standard of huts was very enthusiastic about Hidden Falls Hut, and complained about the standard of Alabaster Hut, which was due to be replaced shortly after the survey was administered. However, others questioned the need for replacing Alabaster Hut and preferred a more simple form of accommodation than that provided by Hidden Falls. The ‘General Issues’ section of the survey revealed that 43 per cent of respondents found the hut facilities to be higher than they had expected. Forty four per cent found them to be as they had expected, and 11 per cent found them to be lower than they had expected. These results are difficult to analyse in terms of satisfaction, as a high standard of hut facilities may not correspond to satisfaction, and because the standard of the huts varied considerably between the high quality Hidden Falls Hut, and Alabaster and Hokuri huts, which were due to be replaced. Hidden Falls Hut was the subject of numerous comments when respondents were asked to indicate what they had liked about the Hollyford Track. “Hidden Falls better than I thought” represented responses.

Guided walkers also expressed immense satisfaction with their accommodation in the Hollyford Guided Walks’ Pyke Lodge and Martins Bay Lodge. The recreational boating party taken into the Hollyford by Recreational Jet Boater B also stayed at Pyke Lodge. This provided the facilities and comfort requested by the female contingent of the group. “They loved it, it was just brilliant”, Recreational Jet Boater B said.
Hunters were questioned about their satisfaction with facilities that they required in the Hollyford. The small number of hunters who responded to the survey each indicated that they were self sufficient and did not require any additional facilities to those that were there, which they found to be satisfactory.

Satisfaction with huts emerged as an important factor in making visitors’ trips to the Hollyford worthwhile and memorable, with Hidden Falls Hut particularly notable in trampers’ opinions.

5.5 Trampers Encountering Jet Boats

Where survey respondents were asked to comment on how noticing jet boats had affected them, a number of respondents indicated that they had enjoyed sighting jet boats. Others indicated that they were appreciative of the presence of the Hollyford Guided Walks jet boat for the transportation options it provided trampers.

Of the 44 per cent of respondents who noticed a jet boat (other than any boat they were travelling on), 11 per cent found the experience to be interesting or enjoyable. Sixty eight per cent of respondents felt neutral about noticing jet boats and said they found them neither enjoyable nor annoying. When it came to detailing the top three most satisfying aspects of the Hollyford, two survey respondents wrote that their ride on the HGW jet boat had been the third most satisfying part of their trip.

Several trampers expressed satisfaction at the opportunity to take the Hollyford Guided Walks jet boat and avoid the notorious section of the track named the Demon Trail. The DOC Hut Warden informant confirmed this: “I’d have to agree with the commercial [boat], it gives people an alternative, and some of them are quite pleasantly surprised when they see the notice at the end of the road saying they can pay so much and go on the jet boat”. The Recreational Tramper informant also enjoyed the Hollyford Guided Walks jet boat and was glad to find the service operating when he injured his arm and needed to leave the Hollyford relatively quickly.
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The jet boat also provided the opportunity to view more of the scenery around the track, according to the DOC Hut Warden. Similarly, the HGW Guide said the jet boat provided a scenic alternative for trampers.

One of the things about the Hollyford walk, the first day going from the [Hollyford] road end to Pyke Lodge you’re in the forest so you don’t really see a lot of the mountains but once you’re on the jet boat of course it opens right up so it’s a great scenic trip. It provides more of a novelty experience for a lot of people (HGW Guide).

The boat also enabled the guided walkers to be collected from Long Reef after viewing the wildlife so they did not have to walk the same route twice, the HGW Guide said. The jet boat was also used to take guided groups to the Martins Bay beach environment across the other side of the river, which was otherwise inaccessible.

The HGW Guide said that sighting jet boats provided guided walkers with another item of interest on their trip. He said that over the three years that he had worked on the track he had seen private jet boats no more than six times a year. He described seeing jet boats as:

[S]uch an exception that they’re probably something to look out for...For the overseas guests they’re probably more of an item of interest really because you’d have a lot more pollution or whatever the words would be from the aircraft flying in the valley than you would from jet boats...They’re quite interesting because they’re the exception rather than the rule I think. It certainly is an experience, or something people take an interest in...They’re almost a novelty interest.

Noticing jet boats was an explicitly positive experience for a number of visitors to the Hollyford Track. For overseas guided visitors especially, seeing the boats may have been a novelty factor in a varied trip that included their own jet boat ride. For others, undoubtedly, jet boats represent a human generated intrusion into a predominantly natural environment. Tramper dissatisfaction with jet boats will be outlined in the following chapter. Firstly however, the findings relating to another prominent theme will be presented. Private jet boat use in the Hollyford provided an exciting form of adventure for the recreational jet boaters themselves.
5.6 Adventure Trip for Recreational Jet Boaters

The Hollyford undoubtedly provides an exhilarating jet boating destination for recreational boaters. Recreational Jet Boater B provided an informal trip diary that his party had compiled from their trip into the Hollyford in May 2004. The group of seventeen mainly Otago Jet Boat Association members and their partners were portaged into the area by helicopter with their seven jet boats. The group had booked out Hollyford Guided Walks’ Pyke Lodge at the completion of the guided walks season for their accommodation. Several of the group members detailed the excitement of boating down the Hollyford River and the helicopter portaging experience over the Little Homer Rapids in the trip diary.

The boating was great down the Hollyford River, a few logs to avoid and the odd boulder to miss, and the scenery was fantastic...The chopper arrived and the pilot gave the instructions. It was all very exciting. The lifting of the boats went to plan with no hiccups, it was quite amazing to watch the boats being lifted...The trip in the chopper was the first for some of us, so that added to the excitement of the day.

The portaging, undertaken by Milford Helicopters, is illustrated in Figure 5.4.

![Photograph: Supplied by Key Informant](image)

Figure 5.4. A jet boat is attached to a helicopter to be lifted over Little Homer Rapids.
The adventurous nature of this trip culminated when three of the boats decided to attempt to boat the Little Homer Rapids on their way out of the Hollyford, something rarely attempted by boaters. A Hollyford Trip Diary entry reported the event:

The view from the passenger seat of the boat was awesome. Huge boulders and massive power waves made for a breathtaking ride! Five minutes later three boats arrived on the other side with barely a touch between them. There were great smiles and handshakes all round.

Figure 5.5 illustrates one of the private jet boats on part of the Little Homer Rapids.

Figure 5.5. A private jet boat negotiates the Little Homer Rapids.

This illustrates that a dimension of high adventure was involved in producing a satisfying experience for members of this recreational jet boating party in the Hollyford.

5.7 Other Sources of Satisfaction

Survey respondents mentioned a medley of additional experiences which they found satisfying. All key informants mentioned viewing wildlife as adding to their
experiences of the Hollyford. Recreational Jet Boater A said that his party had seen seals near Alabaster Hut and McKerrow Island, and this had been confirmed by Hollyford Guided Walks. One survey respondent commented that his party had seen Hector's dolphins in the surf at Big Bay. Tales of hunting and fishing successes also contributed to providing satisfying experiences for visitors to the Hollyford Track. Members of the 2004 recreational jet boat party said in their Hollyford Trip Diary: "[I] started the day catching a lovely rainbow trout at the head of Lake Alabaster and kick started a fishing competition for the biggest, best, most..." Another diary entry read:

I had the opportunity to eat freshly caught brown trout cooked on the spot – divine! Not to be outdone some others set their sights on catching the biggest fish of the trip...I tried my hand at fishing both from shore and from a jet boat, adding two more things to my list of 'firsts' on this trip. Another superb day in the Hollyford Valley!

Other positive comments about the Hollyford Track included hearing stags roar, sighting deer and the quality of the Hollyford Guided Walks guides.

5.8 Conclusion

This chapter has illustrated that a broad array of characteristics about the Hollyford impressed or pleased visitors. Among these factors, and of particular importance for the present study, was a degree of interest in sighting jet boats and encountering hunters. The area’s scenery and interaction with other visitors ranked highly as creating favourable experiences in the Hollyford. However, some components of the track did not impress all visitors. Chapter 6 outlines the encounters, occurrences and infrastructural complaints that caused visitors’ Hollyford trips to be less than satisfying.
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Visitors' dissatisfaction with the Hollyford Track emerged in a variety of forms. This chapter will present the information pertaining to the third research question: What, if anything, diminishes visitors' Hollyford experience and to what extent? Survey data, analysis of submissions to the Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan and key informant interviews revealed a variety of themes relating to dissatisfying experiences in the Hollyford. Of much interest to the present inquiry was information relating to jet boats and encounters with hunters. However, also emerging as prominent concerns were considerable displeasure with aircraft noise and a significant degree of discontent expressed by recreational jet boaters about DOC management policies. In-group conflict between recreational jet boaters was also apparent. Overall dissatisfaction recorded by surveyed visitors to the Hollyford will be outlined first in this chapter before a detailed examination of conflict involving jet boats will be presented. This will be followed by an overview of conflict involving hunters. Finally, additional forms of dissatisfaction will be profiled.
Overall dissatisfaction in the Hollyford as recorded by survey respondents was very low. As identified in the previous chapter, the large majority of respondents were immensely satisfied with their visit. Only 1 per cent of respondents indicated any form of overall dissatisfaction. This dissatisfaction was slight, as it was recorded as a 3 on a Likert scale of 1-6, where 1 corresponded to immense dissatisfaction and 6 was complete satisfaction. Incidentally, each of these somewhat dissatisfied respondents had noticed the presence of jet boats. Despite this moderate figure, a number of respondents indicated in the latter section of the survey which related to jet boat activity that they were annoyed at noticing jet boats. Furthermore, the survey questioned respondents about the three most dissatisfying aspects of their Hollyford Track experience. Seventy per cent of respondents did not complete this section, suggesting they did not have anything dissatisfying to report. Of the remaining 30 per cent of respondents, a broad selection of complaints was fielded. The top complaint was from Hollyford Guided Walks trampers who felt the first day of their guided trip was rushed. Unsurprisingly, also in the top three complaints were the weather and sandflies. Aircraft noise was sixth on the list and jet boat activity was seventh. Visitors’ primary sources of dissatisfaction in the Hollyford appear in Figure 6.1.

![Figure 6.1. Primary sources of dissatisfaction in the Hollyford for visitors](image)

It is important to note here that the numbers of respondents detailing these complaints is a very small proportion of the total. The focus of the present study is on visitors’
discontent with jet boat activity and the possible impact of jet boating parties on other user groups. The data relating to jet boat activity revealed that a significant number of visitors were annoyed by the mere presence of jet boats and more specifically, their noise.

6.1 Trampers’ and Hunters’ Dissatisfaction with Jet Boat Activity

For the 44 per cent of survey respondents that detected the presence of jet boats, responses to sighting or hearing the boats varied. As illustrated in Figure 6.2, the majority of respondents (68 per cent) felt neutral about noticing the boats – that is, they neither enjoyed them nor were annoyed by them. Two per cent did not know how they felt about noticing jet boats, and 11 per cent enjoyed seeing them. Importantly, 19 per cent of those who noticed jet boats found them to be annoying – a statistic six per cent below DOC’s 25 per cent threshold for annoyance used by Graham (1999).

![Figure 6.2. Visitors’ responses to noticing jet boat activity in the Hollyford](image)

Minor differences existed between New Zealand and overseas visitors’ reactions to jet boat activity. However, when comparing party types, more obvious distinctions emerged. Figure 6.3 illustrates that one surveyed hunter who noticed jet boats was annoyed at their presence. This hunter was on foot and had not used a private jet boat or the Hollyford Guided Walks boat for transport. Of the seven hunters that completed
the survey, one saw jet boats, three did not see jet boats, and three did not complete the jet boating section, which may suggest that they were resistant to providing information about jet boat activity in the area. Also significant is that the other respondents annoyed at the presence of jet boats were all independent trampers. No guided walkers expressed annoyance at noticing jet boats – in all probability because a jet boat trip is a feature of their Hollyford package.

Figure 6.3. Comparison of party types and response to jet boat activity

None of the independent trampers who were annoyed at jet boat activity had used the Hollyford Guided Walks jet boat for transport, as illustrated in Figure 6.4.

Figure 6.4. Visitors’ reaction to jet boat activity and use of HGW jet boat
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Significantly, the large proportion of respondents that found noticing jet boats interesting had used the Hollyford Guided Walks boat. Taking the HGW boat did not predetermine enjoying the presence of other jet boats, however.

The degree of visitors’ annoyance towards jet boats is another dynamic of much consequence to the present inquiry. Annoyance was measured on a Likert scale of 1-7, with 1 representing very slight annoyance and 7 equating to extreme annoyance. Figure 6.5 illustrates that degrees of annoyance were at both extremes of the Likert scale, representing a polarised perspective of annoyance with jet boat activity. Once again there were no noteworthy differences among New Zealand and overseas visitors for this statistic. Party type comparisons however, revealed that the hunter annoyed by jet boats was extremely annoyed, marking a 7 on the scale. The mean score for annoyance was 4.4.

![Figure 6.5. Party type and degrees of annoyance with jet boat activity](image)

The numbers of jet boats noticed by respondents is also of considerable implication. The maximum number of jet boats seen by any one individual on the Hollyford Track was three, and this amount was noticed by two respondents. Several respondents could not identify whether the boats were Hollyford Guided Walks or privately owned, suggesting that they may have been heard rather than seen, or were some distance away. In total, the 44 per cent of visitors that noticed jet boat activity saw or heard the Hollyford Guided Walks jet boat twenty nine times, private jet boats eighteen times, and unidentified jet boats a further thirty times over the data collection.
period. The majority of visitors who noticed jet boats only noticed them once. Graphs illustrating the number of times that each jet boat type was detected appear in Appendix J. In Chapter 4 it was noted that jet boats were seen by visitors whose final destination was one of the four major sections of the Hollyford Track - Hidden Falls, Alabaster Hut/Pyke Lodge, the Demon Trail and Martins Bay. Key informants were also asked to estimate jet boat activity in the Hollyford. The Local Resident said that he saw one jet boat a week throughout most of the year heading towards the Hollyford Road car park, although many of these may not have progressed past the Little Homer Rapids. The Hollyford Guided Walks Guide said that the maximum number of boats he had seen in his three seasons on the Hollyford Track were six in the period between November and May. Recreational Jet Boater A estimated that there might be twenty private boats visiting the Hollyford each year. Recreational Jet Boater B estimated there would be ten parties of boaters going to the Hollyford each year, taking between two and ten boats per party.

Key informants had both positive and negative comments about the presence of jet boats on the Hollyford Track. Jet boat noise was perceived by some to impact on wilderness quality. For others though, jet boat activity, particularly in association with hunting, represented an interesting aspect of New Zealand life. The divergences in opinion about jet boat activity that were apparent in the quantitative survey results were backed up by comments that were equally as varied. A number of survey respondents and key informants expressed dissatisfaction at mechanised noise in general on the Hollyford Track. One hunter respondent wrote: “When I go away to places like this it’s nice to get away from all the noise like from the jet boats and helicopters”. Another survey respondent described the noise from jet boats and aircraft to be “very unacceptable” and a further respondent deplored that aircraft noise “will never leave us”. Alternatively, an independent tramper said that while jet boat noise had awakened her from a riverside nap, she found the boats entertaining to watch. Recreational Jet Boater B argued that private jet boats were not noisy. “We’re 70-80 decibels. It’s not loud...We’ve all got mufflers and things like that”.

Support for jet boat activity from other respondents came with some conditions. A guided tramper who used the Hollyford Guided Walks jet boat approved of the transport service it provided, but stated “Since there was only our boat, I’d hate it if
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there were many others – like more than one other”. An independent trumper who had used the HGW jet boat several times also supported its operation. He had never heard it operating while he had been walking on the Hollyford Track. However, his perspective on private jet boating parties was somewhat different. He recalled an occasion at Alabaster Hut when a party of recreational jet boaters arrived. The respondent felt the group “took over the hut” which he felt was “against the spirit of the track.” A DOC ranger provided an illustration of the scenario described by the survey respondent in a memo to DOC staff about the future management of the Hollyford Track. The individual was guiding a group of conservation volunteers from the Pyke Valley to Alabaster Hut. His party could detect jet boats as they travelled down from Olivine Hut to Alabaster Hut. A jet boating party with ten boats had “completely taken over” Alabaster Hut, according to the ranger. He said that the jet boaters’ gear, including boxes of beer, generators and “seemingly everything but the kitchen sink” filled the hut to the extent that he could barely get in the hut door. The conservation volunteers decided to walk on to the next hut, despite the fact that it was nearing darkness. The ranger described his time in the area as “completely dominated by the invasive noise” of the jet boats. On other occasions he had also encountered trampers who had chosen to move to the next hut to avoid conflict with large jet boating parties.

The findings pertaining to how much jet boat activity would ruin visitors’ trips to the Hollyford revealed important data relating to the degree of jet boat activity judged to be acceptable. A slim majority of respondents (24 per cent) believed that their trip to the Hollyford could not be ruined by any amount of jet boat activity. However, a drastically different response revealed that 13 per cent believed their trip would be ruined by seeing any jet boat activity at all. Moreover, 23 per cent of respondents felt that seeing double the number of boats they had seen would ruin their trip. (This equated to seeing two jet boats). It is important to mention here that for those visitors that saw no boats but indicated that double the amount they had seen would ruin their trip, this was taken to denote two boats. A small number of respondents were happy seeing up to fifteen boats in the Hollyford. When examining the statistics in view of whether respondents had actually seen jet boats on their trip, those who had not seen any jet boats on the Hollyford Track were more likely to believe their trip would be ruined if they saw any boats at all. For those who had seen jet boats, the threshold for
accepting jet boating activity was significantly higher. Figure 6.6 illustrates these findings.

![Diagram showing jet boat activity levels and how many would spoil a trip]

Figure 6.6 Degree of jet boat activity that would spoil visitors’ trips

This section has illustrated that a relatively small section of trampers and hunters surveyed considered jet boat activity in the Hollyford to be either slightly annoying, or very annoying. Dissatisfaction emerging from survey respondents appears to be based on the fact that visitors go to the wilderness expecting to get away from man made noises such as those produced by mechanised water craft and aircraft. This therefore represents a form of goal interference.

### 6.2 In-Group Conflict among Recreational Jet Boaters

Key informant interviews revealed that a significant degree of in-group conflict existed among recreational jet boaters using the Hollyford area. This centred around two main subjects: the behaviour of jet boaters from Canterbury, and some boaters’ disapproval of Recreational Jet Boater B’s attempt to boat the Little Homer Rapids, which was considered to be extremely reckless.

Disquiet about the negative effect that jet boaters hailing from Canterbury had on other visitors to the Hollyford Track was prominent in interviews with most key
informants. Both Recreational Jet Boaters A and B, the Hollyford Guided Walks Guide and the DOC Hut Warden expressed displeasure about the behaviour of these groups, who were said to frequent the area in large numbers, often causing conflict with other users. This was perceived by the recreational jet boater informants to create a bad image of jet boaters in general.

Recreational Jet Boater A described the jet boaters whom he had met from the Canterbury Jet Boat Association as a “disjointed outfit” and “different people”. The informant said that in 2003, his party of three boats was accompanied by five jet boats and their occupants from Canterbury, as the latter group wanted to know how to access the area. However, the informant described the Canterbury boaters as “up themselves” and felt that his party had been “used” to assist the Canterbury boats to gain access to the area. “They’d never been in there before. They didn’t know how it was done and that sort of thing”, the informant said. The Canterbury contingent of the party stayed at DOC’s McKerrow Island Hut, while the Otago boaters went to a private hut. Recreational Jet Boater A expressed disgust at the fact that the Canterbury boaters had brought with them deck chairs and sun umbrellas, which the Otago boaters considered to be unnecessary. More importantly, the informant expressed resentment about the Canterbury party’s consumption of a large quantity of alcohol before they continued to boat on Lake McKerrow after dark. “Something could’ve gone really wrong which would’ve been really bad for everybody”, he said, describing the individuals as “idiots”.

The Canterbury boats caused a bit of trouble...They’re just bloody clowns. We go and do our own thing and keep away from them. We take our time and we’d rather be up there with three boats and not have them tagging along. They had their own agenda...They wouldn’t even have a beer with us.

Recreational Jet Boater B had also made negative observations about Canterbury jet boaters. He said that their tendency to travel in larger groups and stay in the DOC huts had often resulted in conflict with other hut users. Similarly, the DOC Hut Warden said that the only occasion that he had heard of conflict occurring on the Hollyford Track was during an incident involving jet boaters from Rakaia. The group of recreational boaters, who were also hunting, had camped outside Alabaster Hut with
their eight boats and used the hut facilities for cooking and drying their clothes. This put pressure on the other hut users, as the hut was already full. On receiving a complaint about the situation in Alabaster Hut via the DOC office in Te Anau, the DOC Hut Warden walked to Alabaster Hut to ask the jet boaters to disperse themselves around other huts.

Trampers are limited. If they walk all day and get to the hut just about before dark they can’t move on if the hut’s full, whereas the guys in jet boats are pretty mobile, and I told them to spread themselves out around all the huts because they could get to about five or six huts.

The DOC Hut Warden encountered some resistance from some younger members of the jet boating party, so he returned the following day to check on the situation.

I struck some young ones on the first day and they were a little bit smart and probably a bit primed up with alcohol... I had to go back the next day and check them again... There were a few older guys there and they had straightened the guys out, ’cause the other guys had given me a few problems.

The DOC Hut Warden said that to his knowledge, no verbal interaction had taken place between the jet boaters and the other hut users to prompt the complaints. They were based solely on the hut being over full and the fact that campers were also using the hut. The Rakaia jet boat party stayed in Alabaster Hut for “a few days”, the informant said. Other jet boating parties who had stayed in Alabaster Hut had “made room” for other hut users and had not been problematic.

The disquiet about jet boaters hailing from Canterbury represents a case of in-group conflict among the recreational jet boating fraternity using the Hollyford. Another form of in-group conflict was expressed by Recreational Jet Boater A, who criticised the party of jet boats that attempted to boat the Little Homer Rapids in 2004. Three of the group of seven boats decided to navigate the rapid, which they succeeded to do. Recreational Jet Boater A described them as “bloody clowns.”

You probably could do it. But if anything ever went wrong, that would be the end of it...We all think they’re idiots, we wouldn’t do it unless it was an emergency and you had to get up there because if you get it wrong...If it went wrong you’d lose your boat.
The following year a Canterbury jet boating party attempted the same feat. Recreational B, one of the boaters who had succeeded to boat the rapid the year before, described the event.

They told me they were thinking about boating out and I said "Oh, well be wary" and the first boat they damaged before they even got to the start of the rapid, the second boat they got into the first part of the rapid and he sunk, and the third boat, he just got through and he was quite badly damaged.

In-group conflict among jet boaters in the Hollyford has appeared here in two forms. A further form of conflict involved trampers expressing concern about sharing DOC huts with hunters who carried guns.

6.3 Concern about Hunters and Guns

Apprehension articulated about encounters with hunters was primarily based on unease with their firearms. One respondent was a former US serviceman who expressed his concern about individuals carrying weapons in New Zealand’s national parks.

I don’t like weapons or killing...I don’t feel comfortable with a weapon. I don’t like them around and you don’t know the type of person carrying them and you’re there and you are vulnerable. Weapons have a place. The Hollyford Track should be a scenery walk.

Similarly, a young female Japanese tramper wrote "I noticed hunters in huts only but I imagined if I met them on the track I would be scared a bit. I wish they’ve been told to fire with great caution". Another independent tramper commented on seeing guns sitting in the huts which she found "a little frightening". In a similar vein, another tramper wrote "I think it’s good to have hunting for conservation purposes, but people with guns make me a bit nervous".

Recreational Jet Boater B said that the members of his boating parties usually kept their rifles in their tents when they were camping beside Alabaster Hut. However, if the guns were left in the hut, they were unloaded and were "stashed in the corner". The party did not handle the guns when other visitors were present. In light of the fact that many of the members of Recreational Jet Boater B’s party were consuming
alcohol, the presence of guns for those unfamiliar with them may have been concerning, and it may not have been obvious that the guns were unloaded. A sign on the wall of Alabaster Hut requests that hunters keep their guns unloaded.

While a small number of trampers expressed unease about encountering strangers with guns, the large majority of survey respondents were positive about their encounters with hunters, as was detailed in the previous chapter. Another form of conflict emerging in the Hollyford surrounded perceived differences between user groups. These appeared to be founded on stereotypes rather than actual encounters.

6.4 Conflict among Party Types

One private jet boater interviewed was vociferous in his view that a significant proportion of the trampers visiting the Hollyford Track were “greenies”. These “greenies” were supported by the Department of Conservation in sharing the opinion that jet boats had no place in national parks, he believed.

Recreational Jet Boater B felt that trampers’ expectations of finding pristine wilderness in the Hollyford created their dissatisfaction with jet boats. Trampers expected the “wop wops” to be “totally nothing around, no mechanical bits and pieces”, which meant that they were upset when they detected the presence of jet boats. However, the informant was quick to point out that most trampers had used vehicles of their own to drive to the start of the track and many would fly out once they reached Martins Bay. He described what he considered to be profound differences between jet boaters and trampers, the latter whom he described as “ignorant”.

Everyone can be totally green and I think a lot of the trampers are totally ignorant of what else is out there. They expect peace and quiet and no-one else there. But how can you do that? They expect the facilities to be there when they get there, don’t they? Well those facilities didn’t arrive on someone’s back. A lot of that stuff was flown in and boated in, so they seem to be a group that – it’s all about them.

The informant stated that trampers were “not the only ones that count because they’re so green, but there’s other people out there too that want to enjoy the area.” He
recalled a situation when trampers and members of his jet boating party had shared the same hut. The jet boaters had already installed themselves in the hut when the trampers arrived. Differences between the groups became quickly apparent.

These [trampers] arrive and they’ve got nothing! They’re on their dried food and we’re eating venison and all sorts of steaks and stuff and they’re digging their wee dried food thing out and cooking it up...I think it’s quite a bit of jealousy actually. It’s funny; they come in and go “Oh! What are you eating?” “Venison stew, spuds and veges, do you want some?” “Oh, no. No, no, no, no.” Some of them are quite weird.

Recreational Jet Boater B recalled another incident when he had to use his jet boat to rescue some “die hard” trampers stranded on an island after flooding.

You get die-hard trampers and they would never take a jet boat until they were stuck and then the first thing they’ll do is call for the jet boat...They would’ve been perhaps some of the people that would never want to see a jet boat because it’s supposed to be the wop wops. But it’s either a chopper or a jet boat that they call on to rescue them when they get into these situations yet they don’t want to see them or hear them. It’s ridiculous. That’s what I get annoyed with.

A submission in support of jet boating to the Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan also suggested that DOC co-operated with ‘greenies’: “Our park is for all New Zealanders, not just greenies and overseas tourists”. This suggests that some jet boating visitors to the Hollyford may stereotype some visitors as being more preservationist than others, and believe that they consequently oppose jet boat activity in the Hollyford. DOC was also accused by jet boaters of favouring its conservation mandate over providing for a variety of forms of recreation in the area. This conclusion appeared prominently in submissions by jet boaters to the Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan.

6.5 Recreational Jet Boaters’ Dissatisfaction with DOC Policies

Private jet boaters’ dissatisfaction with DOC policies for the Hollyford emerged through key informant interviews and via an analysis of submissions to the Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan. While this form of conflict did not strictly represent a form of visitor conflict, the detail provided by the informants and submitters cast light on the nature of the differences in social values between trampers and private jet boaters. Tensions included disputes over whether jet boaters should
have a free reign to access the Hollyford and particularly Lake Alabaster, discussion of the long history of boating in the Hollyford area and the feeling that DOC preferred to cater for trampers rather than jet boaters.

6.5.1 Access to the Hollyford

A number of jet boaters expressed dissatisfaction towards DOC’s policies regarding limiting jet boat access in its Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan. Watson (2001) noted that it can be useful to determine a group perspective on an issue to better understand any sources of conflict. Submissions provided information on a range of perspectives from jet boat associations as well as individuals using jet boats in the Hollyford.

Numerous submitters opposed restrictions on jet boat use and argued that the Little Homer rapids already created a natural barrier which discouraged regular use of the area by a large number of jet boaters. One submitter proposed that restricting access to the Hollyford via the Hollyford River would encourage boaters to attempt to gain access from Martins Bay, which was considerably more dangerous. Another jet boater perceived that the proposed policies threatened access for hunting above Lake Alabaster. “The Pyke above Alabaster can realistically only be hunted by hunters who have access to a jet boat. Even the hunters dropped off by helicopter are not very effective because of the great difficulty walking between hunting sites.”

Recreational Jet Boater B said that DOC was simply attempting to “shut out” private jet boaters, which was inconsistent with its support of the Hollyford Guided Walks jet boat operation.

They’re trying to get rid of the jet boaters but at the end of the day it’s actually their right to go in there. You’ve got a commercial operation jet boating up and down that river, therefore if a commercial operation’s allowed to do it, so is a private person...So if they want to kick out the commercial operation, then they can perhaps do the private ones. But who will they be calling if there are people lost and stuck? ...Don’t use a chopper because that’s noisy as well.

The informant felt that DOC was attempting to build its own “empire”. “All these parks and things, it’s like they’ve got some notion that if they build all these things up
and don’t let anyone in, they’ll be an asset but it’s not an asset if no-one goes to see it, if you haven’t got access.” Another submitter to the Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan opposed the restrictions on boat access but said that he would support a system of restricting jet boat party sizes and dates of entry through the use of a permit system. The submitter did not object to the Department of Conservation having conditions in place which required jet boaters to register prior to operating their craft in the area. Other individuals were more rebellious about DOC’s proposals. Recreational Jet Boater A, whose access into the Hollyford was facilitated by a “mates” arrangement involving free helicopter portaging, said that if DOC decided to limit access to the Hollyford by private jet boat he would continue to boat in the area.

They wouldn’t stop me anyway. Because I’d still go and do it. And there are probably quite a few other people out there who would do the same. ...The area has got to be managed, I know that, we’ve got to look after it, but to close it off and say ‘You can’t do this and you can’t do that’, I can’t see that working.

Recreational Jet Boater B was also vociferous about any future moves to limit private jet boat access. He questioned DOC’s management policies and believed that the department existed to “open these areas up and manage them.”

Managing them isn’t saying you’re not allowed in here. That’s not managing. They’re building a wee empire for themselves, an empire with no-one in it. What’s the point? They’ve got hundreds and hundreds of acres of parks and you’re not allowed to go near them. Pointless. And we’re paying for it.

Jet boaters were frank about their opposition to any move to curtail private jet boaters’ access to the Hollyford. One of their arguments in support of this opinion was the long legacy of boating in the Hollyford Valley.

6.5.2 History of Boat Use in the Hollyford

A number of submitters and both recreational jet boater informants discussed the long history of recreational boating in the Hollyford area, arguing that this legacy gave them a degree of “rights” to use the Hollyford segment of the Fiordland National Park for boating.
Recreational Jet Boater B felt that all New Zealanders ought to be permitted to use national parks for recreation as they wished. He said that DOC staff had also been transported by jet boat in the past to do maintenance on the Hollyford Track. “As for the conservation department trying to stop us from going in there, we’ve got rights to do that because we’ve been doing it for so long. They’ve used jet boats in that area for as long as the track’s been there, almost.”

A number of submissions referred to the long history of boating in the Hollyford. Furthermore, one submitter suggested that tramping in the area required a degree of fitness that not all visitors possessed.

There has been a long heritage of motorised boating in this watershed...Experience of this valley should not be suddenly the exclusive right of those who are lucky enough to have the time and the fitness to walk in on substandard and flood prone tracks.

Also emerging from submissions and the interviews with jet boaters was the feeling that DOC failed to provide for private jet boaters and favoured trampers’ use of the Hollyford expanse of the Fiordland National Park.

6.5.3 Perception of Tramper Monopoly

Jet boaters expressed frustration that trampers were catered for by DOC throughout the country’s network of tracks and national parks whereas jet boaters were limited as to where they could go. Once again, several drew on the notion of having “rights” to access a particular area.

Jet boaters submitted that a scarcity of other suitable areas for jet boating existed in Fiordland. “We have hundreds of recreational walking tracks available and very few rivers available to boating in the Fiordland area”. Another submitter suggested that restricting private boat access up the Hollyford River, when walkers were permitted there, was both discrimination and a breach of the Bill of Rights. Similarly, another submitter wrote:

DOC is proposing to restrict access to jet boats on the Hollyford River to protect the recreational walking opportunities. Jet boating does not
inhibit recreational walking activities. Recreational walkers have access to other walking tracks that are not near jet boating rivers.

Paralleling this comment, one submitter expressed concern that “the rights given to New Zealanders by the founding fathers of the country are piece by piece taken away”. Another wrote “Here we go catering for walkers only! (Again)”. The perception that DOC was catering for the needs of trampers over jet boaters was similarly encapsulated by the following submission:

Putting the walkers’ or trampers’ enjoyment ahead of another visitor to the park shows extreme bias and is not in accordance with the National Parks Act 1980 which states that ‘the intention of the Act is for management plans to achieve an ‘optimum’ level of public access to the park’. It does not say ‘tramping takes precedence over jet boating public.’

Recreational Jet Boater B went even further, stating that DOC’s policies catered for the needs of tourists, rather than New Zealanders. “We’ve got the right to use that park over any tourist.” Many jet boaters submitted that jet boats had little impact on other users of the national park: “Effectively silenced boats have a minimal impact on other park users...The walking track is generally in the bush and out of sight of the river so that trampers would not be affected by any boats in the area.”

A large proportion of private jet boaters clearly shared the opinion that trampers received preferential treatment when it came to DOC’s planning for the Fiordland National Park. These tensions have the potential to be carried over into interactions with trampers when both parties share the DOC huts on the Hollyford Track.

6.5.4 Additional Conflicts between Jet Boaters and DOC

DOC had a number of additional concerns about jet boaters’ use of the Hollyford. DOC expressed dissatisfaction about jet boaters leaving their boat trailers in the Hollyford Road car park which made it overcrowded for other users. Recreational Jet Boaters A and B both said that their parties parked their boat trailers at the nearby airstrip, where they were out of the way, leaving only one vehicle in the car park. A second concern of DOC’s regarding private jet boaters using the Hollyford was that
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this sometimes did not occur “on nature’s terms”. The use of chainsaws in remote areas such as the Upper Pyke to clear logs protruding from rivers was one example of this concern. The use of chainsaws by jet boaters was evidenced during interviews in the present study when one informant produced a video of his jet boating expedition in the Upper Pyke. A chainsaw was produced when the river became unable to be navigated due to large quantities of debris in the boats’ path.

6.6 Additional Sources of Dissatisfaction in the Hollyford

As mentioned in the opening paragraph of this chapter, a number of other sources of dissatisfaction outside of jet boater and hunter activity were recorded in the Hollyford. The graph in Figure 6.1 revealed that the top most dissatisfying experiences in the Hollyford for some individuals involved having a rushed first day on their Hollyford Guided Walks trip, encountering bad weather, sandflies and dirty toilets, and finding full or overcrowded DOC huts on arrival. While the first of these factors is outside the scope of this study and little can be done about the weather or sandflies, the issue of dirty or full toilets is certainly one which can be addressed. A number of respondents also complained that they had not been informed that two huts (Hokuri and Alabaster) would be closed during, or shortly after Easter. This made walking the track particularly difficult for some respondents. The fact that huts were full could have perhaps been anticipated since data collection occurred over the Easter period, which attracted large numbers of walkers. In addition, several complaints were recorded about poor track maintenance. Data collection occurred after a very windy period and several trees had fallen over the track.

Other less commonly cited sources of dissatisfaction included the state of the Demon Trail, a lack of markers on the track, and the price of hut tickets. The Hunter informant, who hunted possums to keep their numbers down, believed that the use of 1080 poison was killing the Hollyford's birdlife.

You know when they’ve poisoned in there because there are no birds around. That’s sad. They reckon it doesn’t kill the birds but we know it does...Just where you stay, you never see any birds...there’s no fantails around and you hardly see a woodpigeon.
Another notable form of dissatisfaction on the Hollyford Track related to aircraft noise. Key informants familiar with the Hollyford were keen to express their views on the adverse effects of aircraft noise, insisting that it was much more of a noise pollutant than jet boats. Aircraft noise did not emerge significantly as a top source of dissatisfaction in the graph in Figure 6.1, but the survey’s General Issues section revealed that 29 per cent of respondents encountered more aircraft noise than they had anticipated they would. (Forty three per cent found the level of aircraft noise to be as they had expected, 19 per cent found it to be less than they had expected and 9 per cent did not know what to expect). Any conclusions drawn from these findings must be tentative as experiencing aircraft noise can be highly dependent on the weather, with fine days sometimes producing convoys of scenic flights down the Hollyford Valley.

Recreational Jet Boater B said that aircraft were nosier than jet boats because they were “in your face” and unlike jet boats had no mufflers. The Hunter informant said that at times he would notice ten to fifteen planes “one after the other” heading down the Hollyford Valley. He distinguished between the noise impact of planes and helicopters. “The helicopters go through and you don’t hear them till they’re over you. The planes you can hear them from miles away – I’ve been here some mornings and it sounds like World War III’s starting up. I’m not joking”. The Hunter said that the Hollyford used to be a “nice quiet valley” even when helicopters were present. In contrast to aeroplanes, he described jet boat noise as sudden, and disappeared quickly. The Hollyford Guided Walks Guide said that aircraft created significantly more noise pollution than jet boats did in the Hollyford. When far from the lakes or rivers, however, he sometimes found it difficult to discern whether audible mechanical noise was in fact a jet boat or an aeroplane.

6.7 Conclusion

Dissatisfying events, interactions and infrastructure did not greatly affect overall satisfaction with visitors’ trips to the Hollyford Track. Sources of dissatisfaction outside of jet boater and hunting activity were diverse, ranging from perceived infrastructural shortcomings to visitors having to deal with the difficulties created by the two hut closures. DOC’s management policies in the Hollyford were also the
focus of concerns, with the use of 1080 poison perceived to be impacting negatively on the birdlife of the area. Dissatisfaction with jet boats did not appear to considerably affect the majority of visitors’ overall levels of satisfaction with the Hollyford. Noise from jet boating activity appears to be creating some disturbance for those seeking wilderness experiences, but this may be more of a cause for concern in the Pyke and upper Lake Alabaster areas than specifically on the Hollyford Track. Social conflict created by jet boating parties appears to be a sporadic but relatively serious cause of conflict. Discontent with the perception that trampers have a monopoly over national parks has created an additional source of conflict that primarily became apparent through the submissions analysis. These sources of conflict, alongside expectations and satisfaction with the Hollyford Track, will be discussed in the subsequent chapter.
Private jet boat activity in the vicinity of the Hollyford Track has implications for other visitors seeking wilderness experiences in this particularly scenic corner of Fiordland National Park. Successful management of jet boat activity requires comprehension of the impacts associated with the activity and the motivations and experiences of the boat users themselves, as well as those whom they impact upon. This chapter will provide an explanation and interpretation of the key findings presented in the three previous chapters. The implications of the findings and their application to the wider issues of recreation conflict, visitor satisfaction and planning for national parks will be explored. In this context, a number of trends have emerged from this study. These will be thematically examined in relation to the three research questions, and will be discussed in the context of the relevant literature. An overview of the research problem in view of the findings is outlined first in order to provide an integrated perspective of the issue.
7.1 Overview

Understanding the nature of conflict arising from the occurrence of jet boat activity in the Hollyford requires a holistic examination of the research problem. The investigation into visitor satisfaction in the Hollyford with specific reference to the impact of jet boat activity produced findings that on the surface may appear to be inconsistent. In reality however, the findings provide a coherent illustration of the nature of this conflict. Overall, visitor satisfaction with experiences of the Hollyford Track was high. Jet boat activity did not feature prominently in the top sources of dissatisfaction about the Hollyford, which just one third of respondents reported to have. However, when presented with further evaluative questions about the impact of jet boat activity, a degree of annoyance surfaced among survey respondents. This suggests that jet boat activity does have a negative impact on some visitors to the Hollyford Track, but in the main, this impact does not translate into a significant adverse effect on visitors’ overall enjoyment. Noticing jet boat activity may be considered to be annoying by some at the moment of detection, but this impact may be short-lived and relativity inconsequential in consideration of visitors’ overall enjoyment of the Hollyford Track.

The survey data collection occurred over a period during which no large parties of jet boaters were present in the Hollyford, although about six single private boats were said to be using the area. Consequently, conflict relating to large groups of jet boaters was anecdotal and was provided by key informants, rather than being witnessed or experienced by survey respondents. However, the findings suggest that the impacts created by large parties of private jet boats may be of greater consequence than the impacts created by single or small parties of jet boats whose occupants appear to have little adverse interaction with other hut users. Adverse impacts created by the jet boating parties appear to be concentrated around their impact on other hut users, rather on the effects of jet boat noise. The motivation for the large groups of jet boaters making expeditions into the Hollyford appears to be more of a social nature, rather than principally for hunting. This distinguishes such parties from those whose primary rationale for having a jet boat in the area appears to be to facilitate access to hunting locations.
Much variation was evident when key informants estimated the numbers of private jet boats in the Hollyford each year. It seems probable that due to the costs and complexities involved in gaining access, large groups are unlikely to travel into the Hollyford more than once or twice a year. The cumulative impact of these expeditions, in consideration of the potential numbers of jet boats in each party and the likelihood of there being at least two passengers in each boat, suggests that there is the capacity for considerable social impact on other users of the Hollyford, and particularly Alabaster Hut. As noted, the issue is better understood in the light of visitor expectations, motivations and satisfaction and these are now considered further.

7.2 Visitor Expectations, Motivations and Satisfaction

The underlying goal of outdoor recreation is to have high quality experiences. Visitor satisfaction provides a sound measure of whether or not this is occurring. Satisfaction is a broad concept that relates to achieving the recreation experiences sought or anticipated. Goal orientation differed particularly among trampers and jet boaters, although distinctions between guided and independent trampers were also apparent. Interestingly, guided walkers, who knew of the existence of the HGW jet boat as it was a part of their trip, expected a greater degree of wilderness than independent trampers. This illustrates the diversity as to what comprises ‘experiencing wilderness’ for individuals, and resonates with the findings of Hall and Kearsley (2001) who recognised that perceptions of wilderness vary widely among visitors to natural areas. Experiencing wilderness was both stated and implicit in individuals’ goals for going to the Hollyford Track. The degree of wilderness that visitors anticipated they would find was of much interest for this study. The fact that 30 per cent encountered more of a feeling of being in the wilderness than they had anticipated, despite many using or seeing jet boats, suggests that jet boating activity may not have a significant impact on individuals' feeling of being in the wilderness.

Because independent trampers’ main reason for visiting the Hollyford Track emerged as ‘getting away from it all’ and a high degree of satisfaction was achieved, it is questionable whether the sighting of a jet boat would have impacted on the attainment of this goal. Survey responses suggested that the sighting of a single jet boat –
particularly when carrying hunters – appears to fit in with many New Zealanders’ perceptions of what to expect in the backcountry. Consequently, sighting single jet boats is unlikely to have impacted on their feeling of having got away from it all or escaped from every day life.

The variations between overseas and New Zealand visitors’ responses to jet boat activity revealed that overseas respondents were slightly more dissatisfied when they encountered jet boats than New Zealanders. Overseas visitors also expected a greater degree of wilderness than New Zealand visitors, although once again, this is difficult to measure as wilderness perceptions, even when descriptive classifications of wilderness are provided, vary greatly among individuals. These two findings raise the issue of expectations in general for international tourists visiting New Zealand’s backcountry areas. New Zealand’s natural landscape is a lucrative asset and its role in promoting New Zealand in the international tourism market is manipulated to maximum effect. Tourism New Zealand’s ‘100% Pure New Zealand’ campaign provides one example of advertising that may create misguided expectations of the naturalness of New Zealand’s tramping tracks. Equally, pre-trip planning and information gathering, which plays a significant role in determining expectations, may be obtained by overseas visitors from different sources than New Zealanders, contributing to the differences in expectations. Tramping other New Zealand tracks may also create certain expectations. On the other hand, the foreign tourists that were more accepting of mechanised noise on the Hollyford Track may not have recognised that national parks are expected by many other visitors to be inherently tranquil places. Jet boat rides are advertised on both the Hollyford and Dart Tracks which could lead visitors to assume that such operations are widely accepted in the backcountry. These variables play a complex role in shaping an individual’s presumptions of an area.

The fact that a number of guided walkers assumed they would see no other walkers on the Hollyford Track suggests that some visitors’ expectations of the Hollyford Track are rather inaccurate, especially in consideration of the fact that Hollyford Guided Walks parties tramp only on the busy Hollyford Road to Alabaster Hut and Martins Bay Lodge to Long Reef sections of the track. Improving visitors’ expectations of an area by providing more precise and explicit information has been recommended as
one means of reducing the dissatisfying wilderness experiences that can be created by having inaccurate assumptions about a location or the other users that may be present. Tal (2004) suggested that providing more accurate descriptions of an area - when this involved informing visitors of possible sources of dissatisfaction - was merely a means of lowering visitors' expectations, and better management of an area to produce higher quality experiences was more favourable.

Positively, visitor expectations of jet boating activity in the Hollyford were mostly as respondents had envisaged. This suggests that a significant degree of awareness about boating occurring in the area exists. Entering the Hollyford region with accurate expectations is again likely to reduce the probability of conflict occurring as a result of unforeseen encounters with motorised boats and their occupants. While the Hollyford Track survey did not explicitly request that respondents outline their goals for their expedition due to the subtleties involved in this process, respondents were questioned about their broad motivations for visiting the area. Visitors' high levels of satisfaction suggest that to a large degree their goals are being met. For the very small number of respondents who indicated that they were 'extremely' annoyed by the presence of jet boats, these individuals' underlying goals will not have been consistent with those of the majority, and probably leaned more towards seeking a 'purist' wilderness experience. Although the 1 per cent of respondents that indicated only slight overall levels of satisfaction with the Hollyford Track had also seen jet boats, it is unwise to make inferences from such small numbers, making these findings of little significance.

Respective visitor types had different reasons for visiting the Hollyford and sometimes held contrasting views on the most appropriate means for using the area, but underlying these dissimilarities was the satisfaction gained by undertaking forms of recreation among spectacular scenery. The fact that a proportion of respondents experienced more wilderness than they had anticipated is also noteworthy. The trampers who noticed the presence of jet boats also often experienced more of a feeling of being in the wilderness than they had expected. Findings suggested that many visitors tended to overestimate the degree of human influence likely to be found on the Hollyford Track by indicating they had experienced more naturalness and less evidence of human activity than they had foreseen.
The satisfaction gained from encountering and learning about other visitor types in the Hollyford was also prominent. Encountering others, particularly hunters, was reported very positively. Guided walkers’ reported interest in encountering hunters demonstrated the positive addition this made to their trips, rather than being a cause for concern. Hunters’ generosity with sharing stories and venison and offering trampers rides in their boats was looked upon positively by trampers, thus illustrating a disadvantage of the use of zoning to separate ‘incompatible’ users. However, it was sometimes thought that not all trampers accepted that other uses of the backcountry outside of tramping have any legitimacy. Hunters have a long legacy of use of New Zealand’s conservation lands and their contribution to the reduction of exotic pests is supported by the Department of Conservation. However, the balance between facilitating hunting activity while ensuring the minimisation of adverse impacts on other users of the park is paramount.

Despite many visitors’ expectations of the Hollyford Track being somewhat inaccurate, satisfying experiences were gained from being among spectacular scenery and experiencing the feeling of being in the wilderness. Jet boating activity, like hunting activity, provided a degree of entertainment value, and was a source of both curiosity and enjoyment. These findings provide support for Manning’s (1986) argument that individual perceptions play an overwhelming role in determining satisfying recreation experiences. Equally, individual perceptions were also a major contributor to experiencing conflict and dissatisfaction on the Hollyford Track.

7.3 Dissatisfaction and evidence of Conflict

Dissatisfying experiences in the Hollyford area recurrently centred on differences in individuals’ perceptions, goals and environmental values. Evidence of both goal interference and social values conflict was apparent. Much of the recreation conflict literature has proposed that outdoor recreation conflict is asymmetrical, particularly when it involves the use of mechanised equipment or new technologies. Interpersonal conflict caused by jet boat activity on the Hollyford Track indeed appears to be asymmetrical – that is, trampers’ pursuits and experiences are affected by the noise and social impacts created by jet boaters but jet boaters are not affected in the same way by trampers. Trout (2001) suggested that recreation conflict that was often
pronounced to be asymmetrical was in fact two-way conflict as it reappeared in policy debates ‘off-site’ at a later stage, when parties attempted to influence the planning process to improve their goals. Trout’s findings have parallels to the present study as conflict that did not surface during key informant interviews with jet boaters did emerge through submissions by jet boaters to the Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan. While this conflict may not necessarily translate into interpersonal conflict, it appears to exist below the surface at a social values level and is unquestionably not asymmetrical.

7.3.1 Annoyance at Jet Boating Activity

Annoyance at jet boating activity on the Hollyford Track was expressed by a very small core of visitors who expressed extreme displeasure, and another small set that expressed very slight disturbance. These degrees of annoyance represent the level of impact tolerance among visitors. Importantly, detecting the presence of jet boats did not always equate to annoyance. These findings point to the variations in individual perceptions towards experiencing motorised noise in the backcountry and lifestyle tolerance towards other user groups. The present study verified that the adverse effects created by motorised boating included noise, disturbance of natural quiet and amenity values, conflict with other types of recreational users and a reduction in perceptions of remoteness. The degree of dissatisfaction that exists implies that further investigation into the nature of discontent on the Hollyford Track may provide DOC with additional information constructive for developing and implementing relevant management policies.

One quarter of the Hollyford survey respondents believed that any amount of jet boat activity would not ruin their trip. This figure included those who had, and had not seen jet boats. However, almost a quarter more were concerned that just double the amount of jet boating activity they had seen would ruin their trip. This study’s findings replicate Graham’s (1999) conclusions that any future increases in jet boat activity would be perceived by visitors to create a negative impact on their experiences of the Dart Track. Furthermore, Cessford (1999) proposed that tolerance of noise effects declined as the effects of noise become more commonly noticed. This has implications for increased levels of jet boat activity in the Hollyford.
Graham’s (1999) investigation into the impact of jet boating activity on passive recreational users of the Dart Track provides a useful comparison for evaluating the effects of jet boating activity on visitors to the Hollyford. Slightly more of the Dart Track respondents who noticed jet boat activity felt annoyed as a consequence of this - 22 per cent compared with 19 per cent in the Hollyford. Slightly more Hollyford respondents had neutral feelings about detecting the presence of jet boats (68 per cent compared to the Dart River’s 66 per cent). The mean degree of annoyance experienced by those annoyed by the jet boats was slightly higher on the Dart Track (4.5 compared to 4.4 on the Hollyford Track). The number of jet boats operating on the Dart Track (forty four commercial boat movements per day) was significantly higher than on the Hollyford, and this is likely to contribute to the fact that only 44 per cent of Hollyford survey respondents detected jet boats compared with 72 per cent of Dart Track respondents.

Visitor annoyance about jet boating on the Dart Track was just 3 per cent above levels recorded in the Hollyford study. However, the Dart River case is significantly closer to DOC’s 25 per cent threshold for quantifying annoyance, trialled to prioritise situations needing attention. The percentage of visitors annoyed by jet boating activity in the Hollyford was 7 per cent below this threshold, suggesting that it is not a matter of immediate concern, insofar as a proliferation of private boating activity is not on the horizon. However, in the case of escalating numbers of recreational jet boats, close monitoring for impacts on visitor satisfaction may be required.

In accordance with Cessford’s (2002) examination of perceptions of mountain biking activity on Queen Charlotte Track, those respondents who saw no jet boats in the Hollyford were more likely to perceive that any boating activity at all would ruin their trip. As these conclusions were drawn without respondents encountering any jet boats, this implies that social value judgements were made when visitors were asked to consider the acceptability of jet boats in the Hollyford or imagine how they would be affected by them. The fact that some respondents saw up to three jet boats yet believed that they would not be annoyed by seeing five times that number illustrates the differences among individuals’ tolerance towards such activity, and suggests that perception and reality can differ considerably. Also akin to Cessford’s (2002) examination of trampers who encountered mountain bikers, those visitors who
physically encountered the ‘problem’ of jet boats on the Hollyford Track were more positive about them than those who had not come across jet boats. Cessford attributed this factor to the occurrence of an “encounter effect” or a coping mechanism that somehow lessened negative feelings towards the other activity. This illustrates the complexities in the discrepancies between visitor perceptions and realities towards recreation encounters.

Other causes of the differences in annoyance may relate to some respondents’ perceptions that the commercial jet boat operated by Hollyford Guided Walks provides a highly utilitarian service for trampers in the Hollyford, making them more tolerant of the noise associated with its operation. The recreational tramper informant exemplified this on the Hollyford Track when his views about the appropriateness of jet boating activity in national parks were displaced by the realisation of the obvious advantages of having a jet boat operating for trampers that sustain injuries on the track.

Just off the Hollyford Track, Lake Alabaster and the Pyke area provide superior opportunities for hunters and jet boaters to enjoy their recreational pursuits. For jet boaters, the remoteness, wilderness adventure and exclusivity that the experience offers provides the motivation for returning. Seeking wilderness and to a degree, remoteness, was a common goal among trampers and jet boaters alike. Seeking remoteness for a tramper may involve a number of days’ walk on a route such as the Pyke, rather than on a high use corridor like the Hollyford Road to Hidden Falls Hut stretch of the Hollyford Track. DOC has expressed concern that to have this sense of remoteness shattered by jet boat noise would be disturbing. Ironically, jet boaters are also seeking remote experiences. Their pursuit of expanses of wilderness where few others are present provides them in effect with their own recreational open space. Viewing the scenery that attracts most visitors to the Hollyford is enhanced by having jet boat access, as two to three days’ walk on the Hollyford Track is in the bush. This factor incorporates an element of exclusivity into the equation, particularly in consideration of the fact that those without a jet boat or the financial means to have one portaged into the Hollyford are unable to participate in these experiences. The fact that a potentially wealthy, or ‘well connected’ minority with acquaintances in helicopter portaging companies gains superior access into pristine wilderness for
undertaking non traditional activities may be regarded by other visitors as unjust, particularly in consideration of the impacts associated with the activities.

The reduction of natural quiet which occurs at the expense of those without motorised equipment may be somewhat offset by the entertainment factor that jet boat activity provides for some visitors. Additionally, any move to reduce jet boating activity in remote areas does not remove the impact of aircraft overflights and their associated noise. Accordingly, attention to jet boats only does not solve any perceived noise problem in this area.

7.3.2 Noise

Noise is a multidimensional problem that has materialised as an issue of relative consequence to some visitors on the Hollyford Track while not affecting others. Survey comments suggested that annoyance towards jet boat noise was linked to perceptions of wilderness and was influenced by party type. The distinction between dissatisfaction arising from the audibility of noise versus the different things that it symbolised to respondents was also apparent. It appears that the issue is less about the amount of noise audible but the context in which it is experienced. This illustrates the complexities involved in planning for noise impacts when individuals demonstrate varying levels of tolerance towards them. Noise effects can be intrusive on the recreation experiences that individuals seek, and can impact on the degree to which visitors achieve satisfying recreation experiences. The fact that a small number of respondents on the Hollyford Track stated that they went to the wilderness to get away from mechanised noise suggests that the social impacts of noise may extend beyond the detection of noise itself. This applies equally to aircraft and jet boat noise. Cessford (2002) recognised that the social impacts of noise were embedded in wider issues of recreation conflict that may relate to perceptions of the acceptability of others' activities. Hearing jet boat noise was for one respondent an indicator of the presence of others with a different understanding of what was acceptable in a backcountry environment.

The operation of the Hollyford Guided Walks commercial jet boat in the Hollyford appears to be widely accepted among survey respondents, key informants and the
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Department of Conservation. The commercial boat makes the Hollyford Track considerably more accessible to trampers than it would be otherwise. The track’s length, requiring four days to walk from the Hollyford Road to Martins Bay, requires eight days for the round trip. This makes completing the tramp not only dependent on a good level of fitness as individuals must carry eight days worth of food, but also on the length of time people have available for such recreational pursuits. An airstrip at Martins Bay permits trampers to fly out by small aeroplane but this is approximately twice the price of the commercial jet boat and normally would not return trampers to their vehicles if left at the Hollyford Road.

The noise created by the commercial jet boat was not a source of conflict on the Hollyford Track for the vast majority of visitors. Additionally, no conflict existed between the commercial and private jet boats, other than exasperation expressed in submissions by private recreational boaters about the commercial boat being permitted while access for private boats would potentially be reduced. This represents an interesting philosophical issue, as the basis for the operation of the commercial boat rests on the benefit it provides visitors, over the adverse impact it may create for some others who would prefer not to see or hear the boat – particularly those who elect not to use it. DOC acknowledges that the operation of the Hollyford Guided Walks boat also has benefits in that it allows DOC to avoid having to upgrade the Demon Trail, which would be a costly exercise. Also noteworthy is that a significant number of independent trampers who go to Martins Bay use the commercial jet boat, making them more likely to accept the noise impacts associated with it.

Noise created by jet boats alongside the Hollyford Track appears to be a cause of significant annoyance for a very small proportion of visitors, but may be more problematic for visitors seeking wilderness characteristics on the Pyke Route. The Hollyford’s popularity with jet boaters lies with the opportunities for exploring such remote areas. Surprisingly, a notable degree of conflict was reported among the recreational jet boaters.
7.3.3 In-Group Conflict and Place Attachment

Palpable divisions were found to exist among the private jet boaters using the Hollyford and its surrounds. This supports the findings of Vaske et al. (2000) who argued that conflict can exist among those participating in the same activity. Aside from the distinctions between the more socially oriented jet boating parties who visit the Hollyford with large groups of friends and partners and the smaller parties of hunters, significant divisions within the social jet boaters were apparent. In-group conflict was identified when one boater accused another of inappropriate behaviour that compromised both individuals’ safety and the reputation of other private jet boaters in the Hollyford, and through the disapproval expressed by the Otago jet boaters about the behaviour of boaters from Canterbury. The jet boaters in the Hollyford clearly do not exist as an organised, coherent body, despite much thematic consistency and repetition within the submissions to the Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan.

Place attachment was also a strong basis for conflict among jet boaters in the Hollyford. One recreational boater’s disappointment at DOC’s policies for investigating limiting private jet boat access arose primarily from a strong sense of place attachment. This appears to have increased his sensitivity towards proposals to reduce jet boaters’ access to the area. A combination of place attachment and history of use, which itself can contribute to place attachment, appeared to be the foundation upon which jet boaters’ beliefs that they had ‘rights’ to access the Hollyford for recreational use rested. In consideration of these factors, the potential for conflict to occur between jet boaters and DOC regarding policy changes is vast. Gibbons and Ruddell (1995) noted that place attachment and place dependence often result when an aspect of a place provides something that is unique. This may be the case for jet boaters in the Hollyford, as one recreational boater asserted that there was “nowhere the same”. Similarly, Jacob and Schreyer’s (1980) notion of resource specificity can be linked to the concept of place attachment. Resource specificity suggests that a particular resource, such as a specific environmental location, provides a unique experience or opportunity for an activity. This was also reflected in Hollyford jet boaters’ concerns that they had been progressively excluded from many other
locations suitable for boating. Also emerging from the findings were several examples of social values conflict.

7.3.4 Social Values Conflict

Social values conflict, which is closely linked to conflicts concerning normative standards, was clearly evident in the present study. Vaske et al. (2000) recognised that when visitors with different ideas about how to use a resource interact, conflict may result. The concern expressed by a DOC staff member sighting evidence of chainsaw use in the remote Upper Pyke region represents a case of social values conflict. As Watson (2001) identified, conflict resulting from this type of occurrence may reflect differences in individuals' normative standards, and can occur without any contact between the individuals or parties involved. It is likely in this case that detecting evidence of chainsawing by jet boaters attempting to improve their boat access represented the presence of groups with significantly different motivations, goals and environmental values, manifested in very dissimilar behaviour to that of the conservation party that was present. In any case, chainsaw damage can be a long term visual impact at odds with any concept of the natural and the remote.

For the Department of Conservation, the use of chainsaws by private jet boaters may represent a violation of the conditions under which one is expected to conduct themselves in a wilderness area. For some recreational jet boaters, open wilderness appears to signify a recreational playground in which facilitating access only improves the recreational opportunities available. The contrasting attitudes of the Department of Conservation and one Hollyford jet boating informant in particular personified polarised ends of the recreationists versus preservationists spectrum described by Tal (2004). The sense of remoteness gained by a tramper undertaking several days' walk into a wilderness area such as that on the Pyke Route may be easily shattered by the presence of a party of jet boats, as indicated by the recreational tramper's discussion of his expectations of jet boat activity in the remote regions adjacent to the Hollyford Track. Interestingly, jet boaters, who may represent a noisy intrusion for a wilderness seeker, are also seeking quietness and remoteness. Jet boating informants enjoyed the fact that they rarely saw other private jet boats in the Hollyford, and few trampers.
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The recreation versus preservation debate is of much relevance in planning for national parks. The Department of Conservation's mandate to provide for recreational use of national parks and other conservation lands sits uneasily with its ultimate responsibilities for protection and conservation of the parks in their natural state, which includes the maintenance and preservation of natural quiet. The complexities of DOC's role appear to be somewhat lost on the individuals positioned at the recreational end of the spectrum. Different attitudes towards the use of the environment were apparent in key informant interviews. The satisfaction that jet boaters gained from the natural environment equalled that of trampers, with a likeminded appreciation of calm waters, quietness and majestic mountains. However, the jet boater informant who described boaters' appreciation of these aspects of the Hollyford area was reluctant to consider the impact of private boating activity on others' enjoyment of the area. This illustrates a form of elitist behaviour where a minority group gains the rewards of impressive scenery and remoteness by being able to access far reaches of the Hollyford and adjacent valleys. This occurs potentially at the expense of the majority who have to endure the noise effects of the jet boats while having to achieve their own satisfying experiences in a more confined space.

The recreationist perspective, classically represented by Recreational Jet Boater B, was true to the characteristics portrayed by Scheg (1998). This informant highlighted the advantages of jet boat activity for use in rescues and portrayed those representing preservationist perspectives as extremists. Also in keeping with Scheg's description, the informant accused trampers of inconsistencies in the fact that they were likely to have travelled to the start of the Hollyford Track in motorised vehicles and may have flown out by aeroplane. The divergences between jet boaters and trampers that were articulated by the informant once again illustrate contrasting sets of values regarding the most appropriate use of the wilderness.

Social values conflict was also apparent in one jet boater's labelling of trampers as 'greenies'. This assumption appeared to be based on suppositions that trampers opposed jet boating activity in the Hollyford. The categorisation of trampers as 'greenies' is similarly based on individual perceptions of others' use of the backcountry. The jet boater's intolerance of this group appeared to be the result of stereotyping rather than actual encounters, and was based on the perception that
trampers had a monopoly over national parks. The jet boater imagined all trampers to be preservationists or purists, an assumption that is largely contrary to the findings of the survey, which indicated that many trampers were not opposed to seeing jet boat activity in the Hollyford. This misplaced attitude has the potential to translate into interpersonal conflict in hut encounters with trampers. His belief about trampers having a monopoly over DOC-managed recreation areas also has a political element. From the perspective of the jet boating public, the fact that DOC, with its ultimate mandate for conservation, is the planner and manager of national parks, may place its neutrality in doubt.

Social values conflict emerging through the submission process illustrates the potential for interpersonal conflict to occur when visitors undertaking different forms of recreation in the same physical space interact. This was illustrated particularly in the case of trampers and jet boaters sharing facilities at Alabaster Hut.

7.3.5 Goal Interference Conflict and Hut Use

Recreation conflict can result when individuals fail to achieve individual goals. The theory of goal interference conflict states that for interpersonal conflict to occur, the physical presence or behaviour of an individual or a group of recreationists must interfere with the goals of another individual or group. Vaske et al. (2000) proposed that when users with different notions on how to use a resource interact, interpersonal conflict may occur. This appears to be true in a number of cases on the Hollyford Track.

One source of dissatisfaction emerging from survey and informant responses centred on encountering full huts. Hut space can be a scarce resource on tracks that do not have booking systems. Trampers often depart from huts early in the morning in order to claim a bed at the next hut before others reach it. The presence of large private jet boat parties has the potential to exacerbate this competition for hut space during busy periods on the Hollyford Track. The fact that jet boating provides both fast and relatively effortless access to huts provides jet boaters with advantages in the contest for hut space during busy periods, which may be perceived as being unfair by trampers. As the DOC Hut Warden indicated, jet boaters can access a large number of
huts, but prefer to congregate in one, apparently for social purposes. Alabaster Hut’s position on the Hollyford Track / Pyke Route junction and the fact that a new hut has just been completed make it a popular and well-situated stop for boaters, trampers and hunters alike.

Discussions of perceptions of crowding as a cause of recreation conflict abound in the literature. Trampers’ expectations that the Hollyford Track is less popular than the Great Walks tracks, combined with the fact that it can be walked year round, may create the expectation that huts will be nearly empty in the off-season. The consequence of trampers encountering full huts usually equates to having to sleep on the floor or continuing to the next hut, which on the Hollyford could be up to five hours’ walk away. Competition for hut space may not always translate into goal interference conflict, although where users feel that others have less ‘right’ to be using a hut, discontent may surface as either interpersonal or social values conflict. One tramper who was displeased at encountering a large party of jet boaters in Alabaster Hut described the situation as being “against the spirit of the track”. While these issues are certainly not exclusive to the Hollyford Track, the issue has the potential to be aggravated by large jet boat parties.

Conflict was also identified by Jacob and Schreyer (1980) to occur when perceived differences in lifestyle existed. Vaske _et al._ (2000) identified that cues relating to a party’s activity distinguished them from others and communicated lifestyle differences. The jet boating fraternity using the Hollyford Track possess an abundance of these cues. Jet boats, boxes of beer, rifles, venison steaks and other hunting and fishing paraphernalia easily differentiates jet boating parties from the comparably lightly laden trampers. Such cues have been found to represent perceived differences in lifestyle, which may include different attitudes towards the environment or motivations for coming to a particular place (Vaske _et al._ 2000). In addition, the behaviour or activities made possible by the additional equipment may create a different atmosphere in the huts than that which would exist if only trampers were present. Electrical generators, lamps and alcohol consumption may represent an unexpected and unwelcome hut experience for the large number of trampers seeking to ‘get away from it all’.
Interpersonal conflict also occurred among jet boaters seeking to congregate in Alabaster Hut and DOC staff working on the Hollyford Track. This was a result of earlier interpersonal conflict between boaters and trampers over sharing hut resources. This illustrates that conflict between jet boaters and DOC occurs in the Hollyford at both an interpersonal level and at a social values level off-site as a result of the proposed policy changes to investigate limiting jet boat activity. Jet boating hunters would also be affected by such policy changes. Interpersonal conflict with hunters was investigated to determine the extent to which conflict occurring between jet boaters and other users was connected to concerns about guns or differences in social values.

7.3.6 Conflict with Hunters

Concern about hunters carrying rifles created a sense of unease among a small minority of trampers on the Hollyford Track. Vaske et al. (2000) identified safety concerns as a potential indicator of goal interference conflict, and Carothers et al. (2001) recognised that safety concerns may also be identified in social values conflict. Key informant interviews revealed that among jet boating parties, it was highly likely that rifles would be present. Conflict with hunters was centred on the fact that they possessed rifles, rather than being connected to the appropriateness of shooting wildlife. Hunters' possession of guns in the DOC huts unnerved a small set of trampers who appeared to be unfamiliar with rifles and feared that they could be somehow triggered, or were concerned that they could be accidentally shot while on the track. One respondent expressed a conflict of social values by articulating his view that weapons had no place in national parks, whose purpose he considered was primarily for scenic walks. Nonetheless, his concerns appeared to be based on a fear of the fact that guns were being carried by strangers.

The sense of unease about having guns in huts may have emerged more strongly had parties of jet boaters consuming alcohol been present. Clearly the combination of groups of people with alcohol and guns in the DOC huts may be a source of significant concern for other users. In consideration of the fact that some trampers, including females, walk alone, encountering parties of males consuming alcohol and carrying guns may be particularly intimidating. While such scenarios did not emerge
in the present study, the potential for this to occur and create substantial concern for personal safety is acknowledged.

The majority of respondents that had encountered hunters had either not been affected by them or had found the interaction to be very positive. Hunters also provided a form of entertainment on the Hollyford Track, or in the case of guided walkers, a rather iconic New Zealand encounter of educational value. No data was received on negative verbal or physical encounters with hunters either in huts or on the track, indicating that conflict is based largely on perceptions of safety. Aside from the small number of safety related concerns, the overwhelming response towards hunters reflected an acceptance of their activities as a part of New Zealand's backcountry landscape. To a degree, this included recognition by some trampers of the convenience of jet boat access for those whose primary activity was hunting. Rather than voicing concerns about animal welfare, respondents who commented on hunters tended to support their activities and believed that they ought to be assisted in their contribution to managing the exotic pests that threaten the integrity of the New Zealand bush experience.

7.4 Conclusion

A variety of encounters and occurrences have produced incidences of recreation conflict on the Hollyford Track. Despite these, overall visitor satisfaction with the track experience is high. Very small numbers of visitors to the Hollyford Track are affected by jet boat activity alongside the track either as a result of noise or the perception that motorised boat activity is inappropriate. More importantly, some trampers are appreciably affected on an infrequent basis by large groups of jet boating parties using Alabaster Hut facilities. The dissimilar behaviour, attitudes and equipment exhibited by jet boaters compounded by a competition for hut resources has the potential to create significant disharmony with trampers.

While the majority of visitors to the Hollyford Track appear to have similar expectations of the degree of human modification and influence that is acceptable on the track, a very small number of visitors appear to have more ‘purist’ expectations, and consider jet boat noise audible from the track to be intrusive. Visitors to the Pyke/Big Bay Route may also perceive social jet boating activity to be unacceptable.
although the significant degree of support for hunting activity may extend to the Pyke area. Social values conflict created by differing perceptions of appropriate uses of the backcountry has the potential to materialise as interpersonal conflict when ‘recreationists’ and ‘preservationists’ encounter each other in the wilderness or in huts.

In summary, much of the conflict occurring on the Hollyford Track lies behind differences in normative or social values about which forms of behaviour are appropriate in the backcountry environment. The crux of the conflict appears to revolve around congregations of social jet boaters, rather than pairs of boating hunters or the Hollyford Guided Walks boat. The noise and social impacts created by large clusters of recreational jet boaters on the Hollyford Track – let alone the Pyke Route - is unlikely to fit in with many visitors’ desires for their wilderness experience.
Recreation conflict involving jet boating activity on the Hollyford Track raises the philosophical issue of for whom national parks are planned in New Zealand. It also highlights the concerns of minorities in conservation planning, which are particularly important where almost one third of the country is managed by a single conservation body. While the pursuit of satisfaction by jet boaters potentially involves a majority of visitors having to endure a degree of noise and social impact, this minority may also justly assert their rights to undertake recreation in public parks in such situations. However, DOC must balance minority recreational interests with whatever constitutes the greatest good for the greatest number - within the rather preservationist framework of the National Parks Act 1980. Understanding the underlying foundations of recreation conflict is of the utmost importance for natural resource managers in order for them to be able to develop appropriate and effective solutions. While zoning to separate ‘incompatible’ users may help resolve an issue resulting from interpersonal conflict, it may do little to assist conflicts underpinned by social value differences, which do not require physical contact to occur. The manner in which conflict is managed also “determines its toxicity”, according to Schneider (2000, p. 130). This makes conflict management exceedingly important.
Before reinforcing the key findings of this research, it is timely to highlight that a number of limitations affected the data collection process. The academic requirements of this study reduced the time available for data collection, which made the survey sample smaller than was desirable. A full season survey taken over the summer period with additional samples at Easter and during the Roar would have provided a more complete understanding of the matter, and would have made conclusions more reliable and trends easier to detect. The use of a quantitative survey to collect complex information about motivations, expectations and satisfaction, despite provision for open ended responses, clearly has limitations. The survey was also disadvantaged by the fact that no large parties of jet boaters were in the vicinity of the Hollyford Track at the time, forcing reliance on key informants' anecdotal evidence of conflict resulting from interaction with these parties.

While additional key informant interviews would have contributed appreciably to the understanding of the effects of jet boating in the Hollyford area, key informants were particularly difficult to locate. The Department of Conservation did not have available the contact details of trampers that had laid complaints about encounters with large parties of jet boaters. Hunters and jet boaters were noticeably hesitant to participate in this study, especially as they perceived the research was being undertaken on behalf of the Department of Conservation and felt that it could threaten their boating opportunities in the Hollyford. Representatives of helicopter portaging companies were equally as reluctant to be interviewed on this topic. The caution expressed by these potential informants about research that involved DOC indicates the manner in which relationships between DOC and some user groups in the Hollyford have become polarised. Nonetheless, the information gathered in this study and the overall findings are robust, providing a good insight into the key dimensions of the research problem.

8.1 Key Findings

This thesis set out to gain an understanding of the impact of jet boating and hunting activity on the satisfaction levels of other visitors to the Hollyford Track. The practical aim of this research was to provide Fiordland National Park planners and
managers with greater insight into the impact of jet boating on other visitors, in order to facilitate informed decision-making.

This study revealed that overall visitor satisfaction with the Hollyford Track is at very positive levels. People generally visit the Hollyford area to explore a new track and enjoy the spectacular scenery. Visitors often find the Hollyford Track to be more untouched by human modification than they had anticipated. Experiencing the feeling of being in the wilderness mostly occurs as much as visitors had expected, or more so. Both hunters and jet boaters provide a source of interest and entertainment for many visitors to the Hollyford, despite a small degree of concern about hunters having guns in the DOC huts. Sighting jet boats and encountering hunters is especially rewarding for guided trampers, who find them of novelty interest. Hunters' activities are widely accepted in the Hollyford and their concern for the environment, story telling, sharing of food and the element of intrigue they add to the New Zealand backcountry experience are characteristics appreciated by trampers.

Jet boating activity creates a small degree of overall annoyance for some Hollyford Track visitors, with nine of the fifty one survey respondents that detected jet boat activity quantifying their annoyance, and of these, just five individuals indicating that they were more than moderately annoyed. Notably, the impact of aircraft activity remains a greater contributor to visitor dissatisfaction on the Hollyford Track than jet boat activity. However, of significance is the adverse impact of private jet boaters in parties of up to ten boats using the Hollyford Track and Pyke areas. The intermittent appearance of such jet boating parties has seemingly created a considerable degree of goal interference and social values conflict for some other visitors to the Hollyford Track. By congregating in one hut, or camping outside it and using the hut's facilities, the presence of large numbers of jet boaters has created considerable tension with some trampers. Overcrowding in the hut, alcohol consumption, the presence of guns and perceived differences in environmental values have contributed to the disharmony. The noise from the parties' jet boats in the remote Pyke region has provided an intrusive disruption for trampers with more 'purist' goals, and those seeking to experience remoteness and natural quiet.
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8.2 Implications for Planning

Understanding the impact of non-natural noise on passive visitors to national parks is an essential component of planning for their recreational use. Protection of natural quiet is becoming an increasingly important focus for Department of Conservation planners as the impact of aircraft overflights and the incidence of motorised recreational activities in national parks increase. The National Parks Act 1980 leans towards the active preservation of natural quiet by stating that national parks are to be preserved as far as possible in their natural state. In order to protect a common resource intrinsic to the national park experience, DOC Southland has placed a new mandate on improving and conserving natural quiet. This has been initiated in the Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan with the aim of allowing visitors to Fiordland National Park to experience a greater degree of untouched nature, both audibly and visually.

Private jet boating in the vicinity of the Hollyford Track offers a superior recreational experience - access to pristine wilderness, majestic scenery and potentially more natural quiet than trampers experience on the Hollyford Track, once boats' engines have been closed off. Planning for natural quiet in national parks may result in noisy or motorised activities being prohibited, or being contained in certain areas. For some visitors, this may provide some comfort in knowing that in the 'wilderness' one can be assured of hearing the sounds of nature. Recreation planning for national parks tends to favour catering for the greatest good for the greatest number, within a conservation framework. Compromises by minorities in the way of the reduction of adverse impacts on other parties wherever possible are appropriate. However, ultimately, the destruction of common resources such as natural quiet may require intervention when individuals seeking personal benefit impose on the rights of others to share those resources.

The contrasting perceptions of those representing the recreationist and preservationist viewpoints regarding the purpose of national parks are not exclusively a New Zealand problem. This planning dilemma appears in national parks throughout the world (Tal, 2004). The Hollyford Track case represents a conflict of recreational interests occurring in one physical space, and it advances the question of what sustainable
national parks ought to resemble. The disparities in visitors’ perceptions about what is acceptable in the wilderness make planning for the backcountry even more problematical. The Recreational Opportunities Spectrum mechanism aims to match settings with activities in order to provide desirable experiences through the manipulation of access, facilities and information (Hall and Kearsley, 2001). The management systems designed to accommodate recreation, tourism and conservation depend heavily on the successful functioning of the Recreational Opportunities Spectrum tool. The recognition that visitors fall into classes of purists allows planning for the highly purist minority to be accommodated in remote wilderness areas while the majority of users will still experience wilderness while using tracks, huts and facilities (ibid.). While jet boating activity may be unacceptable to purist visitors, these users are unlikely to seek such experiences on the Hollyford Track.

Recreation conflicts often can not be fully resolved. However, good planning can assist with the management of conflicts that are grounded in fundamental differences about how national parks ought to be used. The management of jet boating activity in the Hollyford and surrounding region has important consequences for the satisfaction levels of other visitors to the Hollyford Track. The following recommendations are designed to assist with maintaining the high satisfaction levels evident in this study.

8.3 Recommendations

DOC’s proposal in its Draft Fiordland National Park Management Plan to control jet boat access to Lake Alabaster by zoning Lake Alabaster a Remote area is likely to increase recreational jet boating on Lake McKerrow, which also provides excellent boating opportunities. Reducing jet boating activity on Lake Alabaster may improve trampers’ wilderness experiences in this region but may considerably worsen trampers’ experiences of the Hollyford Track, where most visitors are found. Additionally, attempts to reduce the number of jet boats in the Hollyford area do not change the impact of aircraft noise, which has been illustrated in this study to be more significant for visitors on the Hollyford Track than jet boating noise. The following recommendations are proposed.
• Continue monitoring of jet boat activity and visitor satisfaction on the Hollyford Track.

The findings of this study provide a foundation for further examination into perceptions of jet boat activity in the Hollyford area. The small percentage of people who experienced annoyance with jet boats on the Hollyford Track requires monitoring, particularly in consideration of the fact that the number of jet boats and individuals in each party has the potential to increase if policy changes to the Fiordland National Park Management Plan are not implemented. The majority of visitors perceived that increases of jet boating activity to some degree would disturb them, and one quarter of respondents did not wish to see or hear more than two boats. Cessford’s (1999) proposition that annoyance with jet boat noise increases proportionately to the number of people that are aware of jet boats heightens the importance of monitoring any visitor dissatisfaction with jet boat activity. This makes further monitoring into both jet boating activity levels and visitor satisfaction highly important.

• Require jet boaters to reduce party size

As conflict with jet boats appears to centre on large parties of boats, reducing party size is a priority. This will assist in eliminating the types of conflicts such as those reported to occur at Alabaster Hut. Having large parties of jet boaters congregating at one hut has been shown to be an unsatisfactory situation.

• Encourage jet boaters to use McKerrow Island Hut

Encouraging jet boaters to use McKerrow Island Hut, which is seldom used by trampers as it involves crossing part of the Hollyford River, is desirable. Investigating whether jet boaters require any alterations or additional facilities at McKerrow Island Hut may encourage them to use this hut.

In addition to these practical recommendations, it has been noted that relationships between DOC and jet boaters and hunters are rather polarised. Instigating a form of
bridge building and the creation of mutual reassurance between DOC and these parties may facilitate a greater degree of co-operative management of the recreational and hunting interests in Fiordland National Park.

8.4 Future Research

These findings provide a foundation for further examination into perceptions of jet boat activity in the Hollyford area. The scope of this study did not extend outside of the boundaries of the Hollyford Track and as such, a similar investigation undertaken on the more remote Pyke/Big Bay Route may produce a markedly different standpoint on the appropriateness of jet boat activity in these areas. These findings present a very preliminary perspective useful for additional exploration into this matter. This research has also raised some interesting questions about the measurement of conflict. Measuring the impact of jet boat activity on visitor satisfaction must be done sensitively as raising awareness of some individuals' annoyance at jet boats may contribute to an increasing prevalence of annoyance. Measuring visitor satisfaction alone is a complex task but one that is essential in the light of the planning that occurs as a result.

New Zealand's natural environment is a globally significant tourism resource. The scenic splendour and diversity of this country's natural landscape are widely acknowledged. As visitors to New Zealand's national parks increase, the opportunities to experience the sounds of nature are potentially reduced. The effect of mechanised recreational activity has the potential to adversely affect visitors' wilderness perceptions, which could have a profound impact on visitor satisfaction. This research set out to examine the impact of jet boating activity on other visitors to the Hollyford Track. The study has shown that at present, a small proportion of visitors walking the track are adversely affected by the presence of jet boats, but a surprising degree of conviviality exists between trampers and hunters using jet boats. The main source of conflict in the Hollyford surrounds the large parties of jet boaters sharing hut facilities with trampers, and the heart of the issue may lie in significant disparities in opinion about how the natural environment ought to be used. Successful management of this conflict will provide a solid platform for the sustainable management of the Hollyford Track.
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Appendix A

Survey Questionnaire
Hollyford Track Survey 2005: PART 1

This survey is being undertaken to examine people's expectations and experiences of the Hollyford Track. This survey is being undertaken with assistance from the Department of Conservation and will assist the department in managing the track and facilities. Your time in completing this survey is greatly appreciated. All responses are anonymous. Please complete PART 1 of the questionnaire and return it to the person who gave it to you. PART 2 is to be filled in at the end of your time on the Hollyford Track. Once completed, please return it in the freepost envelope attached.

1. Why did you choose to visit the Hollyford track? (Circle ALL that apply).

To explore a new track/area  The scenery
Opportunities for solitude  To encounter wilderness/untouched nature
The challenge  Opportunities to view wildlife
To get away from it all  Hunting opportunities
Fishing opportunities  To access the Pyke Route
To achieve personal goals  For physical exercise
Other (please specify) .......................................................... 

2. Please circle your ONE main reason for visiting the Hollyford.

To explore a new track/area  The scenery
Opportunities for solitude  To encounter wilderness/untouched nature
The challenge  Opportunities to view wildlife
To get away from it all  Hunting opportunities
To access the Pyke Route  To achieve personal goals
For physical exercise  Fishing opportunities
Other (please specify) ....................

3. What are your 3 main activities on this trip? (Rank from 1-3, 1 being most important)

☐ Tramping  ☐ Hunting  ☐ Wildlife viewing/botanising
☐ Rest / relaxation  ☐ Day walk  ☐ Jet boating
☐ Kayaking  ☐ Social event  ☐ Sightseeing
☐ Fishing  ☐ Other (please specify) ........................................

4. Thinking back to how you imagined the Hollyford Track before you arrived, what kind of environment did you expect? (Please circle one number).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
devolved & modified by humans

☐ Don't know

5. How many people did you expect to meet per day on the track? (Don't include people in your own group). Please tick one box.

☐ No-one  ☐ <5  ☐ 5-10  ☐ 11-20
☐ 20+ (please specify) ..........................................................
6. How many people are you travelling with? (Include yourself and any guides).

- 1
- 2-3
- 4-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 20+ (Please specify)

7. If you have a private jet boat with you, how many jet boats are in your party?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5+ (Please specify)

Please tell us a little about yourself:

8. Age

- <19 years
- 20-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60+

9. Gender

- Male
- Female

10. Nationality

11. If New Zealander, where do you live?

- Southland/Otago
- Other South Island
- North Island

12. Have you visited the Hollyford Track before?

- Yes
- No

If yes, how many times?

13. Which of the following best describes your party?

- Guided/commercial walkers
- Independent trampers (family or friends)
- Independent hunters
- Tramping club or organisation
- Other (please specify)

14. How many overnight tramps/walks (in huts or tents) have you completed in the past 12 months?

- None
- 1-2
- 3-5
- 6-10
- More than 10

Thank you for your time. Please hand back your survey to the person who gave it to you.
Hollyford Track Survey 2005: PART 2

The second part of this survey is about your experience on the Hollyford Track. It is to be completed at the end of your trip. Please do not fill it in until your visit to the Hollyford Track is over. Once completed, please place the survey in the envelope provided, and post it back as soon as possible or return it to the Department of Conservation in Te Anau. Thank you.

15. Where did you stay on the Hollyford Track? (Write in the box how many nights you spent in each place that you stayed).
   - Hidden Falls hut
   - McKerrow Island hut
   - Hokuri Hut
   - Olives Hut
   - HVGW huts (Pyke Lodge/Martin’s Bay Lodge)
   - I did not stay the night (I went on a day trip to .............................................)
   - I camped at ..........................................................

16. What forms of transport did you use on this trip? (Circle all that apply)
   - Walking/tramping
   - Commercial jet boat (run by Hollyford Guided Walks)
   - Private jet boat
   - Aeroplane
   - Kayak
   - Helicopter
   - Other (please specify) ..........................................................

17. Were any of the following things different to what you expected on the Hollyford Track? Please read each question and tick one column for each, to show whether the impact was more than, less than or the same as you had expected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL ISSUES</th>
<th>More of this than expected</th>
<th>The same as expected</th>
<th>Less of this than expected</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The feeling of being in the wilderness/ 'getting back to nature'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of non-natural noise (e.g. created by aircraft, motorised boats, construction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evidence of human influence in the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of people you saw on the track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of guided groups using the track (not applicable to guided walkers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of aircraft you noticed (saw or heard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HUT ISSUES
*(For those using DOC huts only)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More of this than expected</th>
<th>The same as expected</th>
<th>Less of this than expected</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of people sleeping in the DOC huts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of hut facilities (beds, kitchen area, toilet, water supply)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of inconsiderate behaviour in the hut (e.g. people being too loud, rude, drinking too much, smoking, using too much space)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. If any of these were VERY different to what you expected, or you found them very unacceptable or unsatisfactory, please explain below.

19. What were the **3 most satisfying things** about your trip to the Hollyford Track, if any?
1. ........................................................................................................................................................................
2. ........................................................................................................................................................................
3. ........................................................................................................................................................................

20. What were the **3 most dissatisfying things** about your visit to the Hollyford Track, if any?
1. ........................................................................................................................................................................
2. ........................................................................................................................................................................
3. ........................................................................................................................................................................

21. Overall, how satisfied have you been with your visit to the Hollyford Track? (Please circle **one** number).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Would you like to make any other comments about the Hollyford Track?
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

23. Did you notice the presence of hunters on the Hollyford track?
Yes  No

24. If you noticed hunters, did this affect you in any way?
Yes  No
If Yes, please explain........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
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Jet Boats
This part of the survey contains questions about jet boat use in the Hollyford area.

25. Did you notice (see or hear) any jet boats during your visit to the Hollyford Track? (Don’t include your own boat if you travelled by boat).
   Yes [ ] No [ ] (go to question 31)

26. Apart from your own boat, how many times did you notice (see or hear)
   a) The Hollyford Walks commercial transport jet boats? (A large 20 seat boat with a canopy roof or a small open red boat) [ ] or [ ] Don’t know.
   b) a private jet boat [ ] or [ ] Don’t know
   c) I noticed [ ] jet boats but I couldn’t tell if they were private or commercial.

27. Has the amount of jet boat activity you noticed on this trip been more or less than you expected?
   [ ] Less than expected [ ] About the same as expected [ ] More than expected
   [ ] Didn’t know what to expect

28. How has seeing or hearing jet boats affected you during this trip to the Hollyford Track?
   [ ] I enjoyed them/found them interesting
   [ ] Neutral (I neither enjoyed them or was bothered by them)
   [ ] I was annoyed by them
   [ ] I don’t know

If you have been annoyed by jet boats on this trip, then please answer the next two questions. Otherwise, go to question 31.

29. How much has jet boat activity annoyed you during this visit? (Please circle one number)
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Hardly annoyed [ ] Extremely annoyed [ ]
   me at all

30. How much have jet boats detracted from your total enjoyment of this visit to the Hollyford Track? (Please circle one number).
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Didn’t detract [ ] Ruined
   at all

31. What amount of jet boat activity would spoil your visit to the Hollyford Track, if any? (Please tick only ONE box)
   [ ] Jet boat activity would not spoil my trip
   [ ] The amount I’ve noticed on this trip (my trip has been spoiled)
   [ ] Double the amount I’ve noticed this trip
   [ ] Five times the amount
   [ ] More than five times the amount
   [ ] Any jet boat activity at all

Thank you for your time
Hunters and private jet boat users

The following questions are for hunters and users of private jet boats in the Hollyford area.

32. If you have a private jet boat with you, how did you bring your boat into the Hollyford?

☐ Boat already moored in Hollyford
☐ Down Hollyford river including helicopter portaging
☐ Down Hollyford river including winching
☐ Via Martin’s Bay/ West Coast
☐ Other (please explain) ............................................................................

33. Are there sufficient facilities for users of jet boats in the Hollyford area?

☐ Yes ☐ No (If so, please explain) ..........................................................

34. Are there sufficient facilities for hunters in the Hollyford area?

☐ Yes ☐ No (If so, please explain) ..........................................................

35. Are there any other issues for hunters and jet boaters using the Hollyford that you would like to comment on? (Please explain)

Thank you for your time
Appendix B

Schedule of Interview Questions
Schedule of Interview Questions

- When did you last visit the Hollyford?
- Had you been there before?
- What were you doing there?
- Why did you choose the Hollyford to undertake this activity?
- What were you expecting to find before you went?
- Did you enjoy your experience?
- Were you satisfied with the experience?

If **satisfied** pursue why, asking questions relating to
- to what extent is this place important or special to you, why?
- to what extent is this place important for the activity you are undertaking, why?
- what specific things does this particular place offer your activity/you?
- what is your history of association with this place/how often do you come here/have you been here?

If **not satisfied** pursue why, asking questions relating to
- What didn’t you enjoy about your trip? (Describe, who, what, when, where why, how)
- How much did this / these factors affect your enjoyment of the trip?
- How could this be resolved (if relevant)?

- **Ask about informant** (demographics, activity style, regularity of chosen activity, importance of that activity).

**Questions about jet boat activity**
- Did you notice any jet boats on your trip? Commercial or private or couldn’t tell?
- How did you notice them (see / hear / smell fuel / see boat trailers at car park)?
- Were you aware that jet boats used the Hollyford?
• (How) did this affect you?
• If found it annoying how annoyed were you, what exactly was annoying and why?
• How many times did you see them?
• Were any of the people sharing your huts using a private jet boat? (Describe)
• Is it ok to have mechanised / motorised vehicles in national parks? Under what circumstances?
• Is it ok to have Jet boats in the Hollyford? Why/ why not, what is their effect on visitors?)

Questions about hunters

• Did you notice any hunters?
• Did this affect you in any way?
• Did you have any interaction with hunters (in huts, while on the track)?
• How did this affect you?
• Should hunters be allowed to hunt in national parks? In the Hollyford? Why/ why not?
• Should hunters be allowed to use tracks and huts that are used predominantly by trampers? Why / why not?
• Should hunters and trampers be sharing the same huts on the Hollyford? Why/ why not?
• Do you consider there to be any differences between hunters any trampers? If so what?
• Do you think there is any conflict occurring between hunters and trampers on the Hollyford? If so what would be the cause of this?

For hut wardens and people with a long association with the Hollyford Track

• Is there conflict between trampers and hunters? Trampers and jet boaters? Other party types?
• Do they ever hear of any complaints / see any behaviour that suggests conflict exists (explain)
• Is there a problem with having private jet boats using the Hollyford (boat noise, hunting in groups, portaging boats, appropriateness of boats in national parks)

• If conflict is perceived: what specific events / circumstances / interaction among different types of people result in conflict, in the informant’s experience?
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