

# **EMERGENCE OF ECOTOURISM IN INDONESIA: A NATIONAL PARK CASE STUDY**

By **Juny P. Mendez** And **Myra P. Gunawan**

Indonesia possesses, in abundance, many types of resource attractions popular in the travel industry. Unique natural and cultural attractions are scattered over all the 27 provinces that comprise the Indonesian Archipelago. Indonesia is turning to its exuberant natural resources and diverse cultural heritage as source of foreign exchange, regional development, job generation and a measure for environmental and cultural preservation. Although only the attractions located in Java and Bali and certain provinces are developed for tourism, many natural resources in remote areas are considered potential tourist attractions (Indonesian Environment & Heritage 1993). The country has created a system of national parks and nature reserves to protect many of these unique natural attractions.

Similar to other developing nations in the region, Indonesia is looking into the types of natural resource based tourism that will help minimize environmental costs and maximize economic benefits, especially in remote rural areas. National parks and equivalent reserves represent one type of attraction that is growing in popularity. A large portion of the tourists attracted to national parks and similar natural areas are popularly termed "ecotourists".

Ecotourism has been regarded as purposeful travel that creates an understanding of cultural and

natural history, while safeguarding the integrity of the ecosystem and producing economic benefits that encourage preservation (Ryel & Grasse 1991). Development of this type of tourism for Indonesia must consider all of the different elements which together comprise the ecotourism phenomenon. This paper aims to provide some insight into the nature of ecotourism, the ecotourists themselves, impacts on the natural resources and impacts on the people living in the often remote areas where the resources are located. A case study of Way Kambas National Park, located in the Lampung Province, is used to illustrate the emergence of eco-tourism in an Indonesian protected area. Research for this case study was conducted in two steps. First, in depth personal interviews were conducted with officials from Way Kambas National Park, the Nature Conservation Institute of the park, and the Lampung Provincial Office of Tourism to obtain qualitative information on the emergence of nature-oriented tourism in Way Kambas National Park. Second, an on-site survey of local vendors, was conducted to collect quantitative information on socio-economic impacts on the local community. Based on findings from these two primary data sources, critical issues in the development of ecotourism were identified.

---

**Juny P. Mendez**

*Trainee from Department of Recreation, Parks, and Tourism,  
Virginia Commonwealth University*

**Myra P. Gunawan**

*Kepala Pusat Penelitian Kepariwisata LP-ITB  
Staf Pengajar Jurusan Teknik Planologi FTSP-ITB*

## **Background of Tourism Development in Indonesia**

Indonesia has concluded the first long term tourism policy development phase (1968/1969 - 1993/1994). Some of the accomplishments of the first long term tourism development phase include: the rehabilitation of historical sites, mainly in Java and Bali, the physical development and establishment of new hotels in the provinces, the development of public and private educational institutions for tourism, and the establishment of the "Ministry of Tourism, Post and Telecommunications" in 1983 (Indonesia Environment & Heritage 1993).

The first Five-year Development Plan for this development phase stressed the importance of international tourism as a factor of economic development for Indonesia, while laying the foundations of a national tourism policy (Hitcock, King & Parnwell 1993). It aimed to increase the number of foreign tourist visits and expenditures and also the number of domestic tourist visits. Measures designed specifically to benefit the foreign tourist sector have included visa exemptions granted to OECD and ASEAN nationals staying less than two months, additional landing rights to foreign airlines granted in the major ports of entry, and the reduction from many to only one license required to build new hotels. This license is obtainable directly from the Directorate General of Tourism (Booth 1993). By the end of 1992 foreign tourists visits had reached 3 million and domestic tourists exceeded 60 million (Indonesia Environment & Heritage 1993).

Facing the second long term tourism policy development phase (1994 - 2019), Indonesia has directed its tourism development objectives towards market globalization, the provision of better standards of living, the upgrade of the tourism product, and the development of unique rural areas for tourism as well as for environmental and cultural preservation. The tourism development policies, particularly for Pelita (stage) VI are identified as: (1) supporting improvement of the quality of life, (2) internationalization, (3) intensifying utilization of technologies in the tourism product component, (4) encouraging area development, especially of remote areas where there are no other resources, and (5) promoting the preservation of natural resources as well as culture (Indonesia Environment & Heritage 1993).

## **Defining Ecotourism**

Ecotourism, also known as nature-oriented tourism, environmental tourism or green tourism is the world's fastest growing component of the tourism industry. It deals with the natural history of an area and is often linked to conservation efforts in protected areas and national parks. It has been defined as a type of tourism in which tourists are interested in experiencing one or more features of a destination's natural history. The experience usually combines recreation, education, and adventure (Laarman 1986; Wilson 1987). The term ecotourist was originally coined by Hector Ceballos. Ceballos defines ecotourism as "traveling to relatively undisturbed and uncontaminated natural areas with the specific objective of studying, admiring, and enjoying the scenery and its wild plants and animals, as well as any existing cultural manifestations found in these areas" (cited in Kusler 1991:xii). Ecotourism then implies that there is an interaction between the visitor and the destination. The tourist does more than visit and admire the resource, there is a learning component involved in the process.

The Ecotourism Society defines ecotourism comprehensively in terms of both the environment and economics, namely, "that ecotourism is purposeful travel to natural areas, to understand the culture and natural history of the environment, taking care not to alter the integrity of the ecosystem, while producing economic opportunities that make the conservation of natural resources beneficial to local people" (The Ecotourism Society 1991:75).

Ecotourism, then, is seen as an economic enterprise fitting with major initiatives to protect biological diversity and find nonconsumptive uses that generate economic benefits in remote areas, especially in the tropics (Laarman & Durst 1987). Nature oriented tourism in the parks requires management of the natural resources. It puts emphasis not only on the timber attributes of the park but also on its wildlife, its beauty, and its ecological, educational and scientific significance. Therefore it is believed that properly implemented ecotourism can integrate conservation and rural development by helping to protect valuable natural areas, by providing revenues for planning and management, and by stimulating economic development through tourism expenditures and providing jobs and markets for local goods (Sherman & Dixon 1991).

## Understanding the Ecotourist

Ecotourists are regarded as desirable and healthy types of visitors to natural areas. They have a strong interest in exploring the natural wonders of the world. They also possess a built-in appreciation for natural history and desire to preserve wildlife and traditional culture (Whelan 1991). The majority of ecotourists are citizens of modern, industrialized nations mainly Europe, North America and Japan. The average ecotourist is a man or a woman familiar with the outdoors who most likely has had previous experience traveling abroad (Laarman & Durst 1987). The ecotourist is typically either a professional or retired frequent traveler who goes longer distances and stays longer than others. Ecotourists usually have obtained a college degree and many have a post graduate degree (Ryel & Grasse 1991). Many ecotourists come from urban or suburban setting, feeling the need to get back in touch with nature and wishing for the challenge and excitement to be found in untamed environments. Ecotourists are also more tolerant of primitive facilities and infrastructure than other travelers (Whelan 1991).

According to Kusler (1991), ecotourist can be classified into three major categories:

1. *"Do-it-yourself" ecotourists*  
They come from all walks of life, travel alone, require relatively inexpensive accommodations, often are repeat visitors, and form the primary base for may long-term ecotourist oriented facilities;
2. *Ecotourists as part of organized tours*  
These make up the majority of ecotourist visitors. They demand relatively high levels of comfort and their trips are often expensive;
3. *University and scientific groups*  
These ecotourists usually seek out sites which are unique from an educational and scientific perspective. They often are long stay, require simple accommodations, require more knowledgeable guides than other ecotourists and are likely to be more environmentally sensitive (Kusler 1991).

Ecotourists have also been classified as "hard" vs "soft" relative to the physical vigor of the experience, and "dedicated" vs "casual" relative to the level of interest in natural history implied by their activity. A hard ecotourist is a visitor who walks miles into developed back lands, sleeps in a campsite or crude shelter and tolerates primitive sanitary conditions. The "soft" dimension is

thought by many to be the largest part of the market. A "soft" ecotourist is a visitor who stays in high-quality accommodations, eats in good restaurants, and prefers to be conveyed in comfortable transport. It is characterized by an interest in natural history that is casual. The "soft" ecotourist mixes nature-oriented visits with other visits that feature shopping, culture, history, deep sea fishing, adventure and other attractions. Also, the physical rigor in the soft dimension is "rather easy" (Laarman 1986; Laarman and Durst 1987).

According to Laarman and Durst (1987), the most popular activities for ecotourists are trekking/hiking, bird watching, nature photography, wildlife safaris, camping, mountain climbing, fishing, river rafting/canoeing/kayaking, and botanical studies.

## Benefits of Ecotourism Development

### Economic Benefits

Ecotourism's contribution to the economy of a region can be observed through tourist expenditures, the multiplier factor and development linkages. The multiplier factor concept derives from the fact that tourism expenditures generate not only direct (primary) flows of money through purchases of goods and services by the tourist, but also indirect (secondary) flows when the initial income recipient re-spends funds received (Healy, 1988). In regard to developmental linkages, nature-oriented tourism is related to the industry's immediate economic return to the economy through receipt of external funds and increased employment.

Local communities have substantially gained economic benefits from nature-oriented tourism. In Kenya ecotourism is big business estimated to generate \$350-400 million (USD) per year, with substantial indirect demand for goods and services produced by the local economy and with job opportunities for local residents (Sherman & Dizon 1991). In Malaysia where nesting turtles are a tourist attraction, "It has been estimated that each leatherback turtle is worth USD 2.5 million in terms of tourism" (Thorsell & Wells 1990: 222). In Rwanda fees paid by carefully monitored viewers of gorillas account for the second largest sources of foreign exchange in the country. (Youth 1990). Saba Marine Park, in the Saba Netherlands Antilles used a combination of user fees, donations, and souvenir sales to support activities; 65% of operating park budget came from fees, donations

and sales. In Yellowstone, the economic contribution of the service-oriented tourism has surpassed that of the Montana region of Yellowstone National Park was USD 140 million, and total economic impact generated was nearly USD 250 million; 5,800 jobs were also generated by tourism (Glick 1991).

## Environmental Benefits

Ecotourism should stimulate among travelers and the inhabitants of the destination an awareness, appreciation and understanding of the ecosystem as well as the need for its preservation (Ryel & Grosse, 1991). Budowski (1976) provides a categorization of a continuum of interaction in the use of the environment as a resource for tourism. He lists the components of the continuum as:

*Tourism-environment in conflict, where tourism has a demonstrable detrimental impact on the environment:*

- *tourism-environment co-existing, where tourism and the environment are neither inter dependent nor interacting;*
- *tourism-environment symbiosis, where tourism and the environment are mutually supportive an management processes are used to benefit the environment whilst offering worthwhile experiences to the tourist (p. 15).*

Saba Marine Park in The Netherlands Antilles is an example of mutually beneficial interaction of nature tourism and ecosystem protection. The revenues from tourism will soon be sufficient to cover management costs (Sherman & Dixon 1991).

## Other Benefits

Ecotourism has been described by Kusler (1991) as being a beneficial form of tourism, because in addition to it's revelue generating potential:

1. It provides incentives to governments, businesses and in some instances private individuals to inventory, plan for and protect natural and cultural resources;
2. It helps educate the citizens of a country about their natural and cultural resources;
3. It helps educate tourists about the natural and cultural assets of the areas to which they travel;
4. It can help a country discover or reaffirm it's national identity by developing pride in it's resources;
5. It offers educational and scientific opportunities;

6. It is labor intensive and can bring local employment to areas in which projects are located;
7. Projects can be located in areas which may previously have been considered as under-developed;
8. It has the potential to be a uniquely 'people to people' tourism.

## Costs of Ecotourism Development

### Economic Cost

Economic development in local communities from ecotourism is achieved most effectively when there is a high consumption of local, high value-added goods and services by these tourists. However, it has been estimated by the World Bank that 55% of the gross income revenues of developing countries leak back to developed nations (cited in Boo 1990). The aim for ecotourism should therefore be to control this potential linkage, and to ensure that local communities are among those that benefit the most economically from ecotourism.

### Environmental Cost

Many kinds of environmental impacts from tourism have been documented. Boo (1990) reported problems of littering, water pollution, and trail erosion. She says methods to quantify the exact level of environmental impacts have not yet been developed for parks in five Latin American countries. Olindo (1991) reported that critical issues were stopping the illegal hunting of wildlife poaching by the local communities and the slaughter of elephants and rhinos for ivory by professional black marketeers and mismanagement of the protected areas. Rovinski (1991) reported on a beachfront park that is experiencing overcrowding, water pollution, trail erosion, and disrupted wildlife behavior. Misuse of the park's resources by the neighboring communities is another problem. Glick (1991) reported site-specific impacts of tourism include the trampling of vegetation, noise pollution, litter and water pollution, forest fires started by careless campers, and attack of animals on humans because of feeding them. Craig-Smith, Fagence and Hauritz (1992) reported the need to be aware that tourism may be a threat to the environment. Tourism attracts visitors and supporting services, thereby extending the influence of potential environmental

damage. The emergence of "green tourism" has refocused attention in tourism planning and development an activity which may be said to harmonize the activities of the tourist with the capacity of the environment.

### **Carrying Capacity**

Carrying capacity is defined as "the maximum level of visitor use an area can accommodate with high levels of satisfaction of visitors and few negative impacts on resources" (Boo 1990). Three types of environmental carrying capacity has been identified researchers: (1) physical capacity, many tourist resources have absolute limits on the number of tourists they can accommodate; (2) ecological capacity, maximum level of tourist use that an area or resource can sustain before ecological damage or decline begins to occur; and (3) perceptual capacity, maximum level of tourists use that an area can withstand before visitors perceive a decline in their attraction to that place.

When tourists exceeding the carrying capacity of an area there are costs. Too much development of sensitive ecological environments can bring result in irreversible damage to these environments. This environmental cost also become an economic cost in the long run because tourists will not return to degraded environments for future visits.

### **Indonesian National Parks and Nature Reserves**

The authority responsible for managing all National Parks and Nature Reserves in Indonesia is the Directorate General Forest Protection and Nature Conservation (Ditjen Perlindungan Hutan dan Pelestarian Alam - PHPA), consists of 4 Directorates, namely the Directorate of Forest Protection, Directorate of Nature Conservation Area Development (Bina Kawasan Pelestarian Alam), Directorate for the Development of Nature Reserve and Flora and Fauna Conservation (Direktorat Bina Kawasan Suaka Alam dan Konservasi Flora dan Fauna) and Directorate for Program Development (Direktorat Bina Progam). The original concept of a protected area in Indonesia differs from that conceived in the Western industrialized nations. According to Hitchcock, King and Parnwell (1993) "the vernacular term invented to describe the parks mitigates against the concept of wilderness: Taman National is the Indonesian translation of national park ... taman is normally trans-

lated as 'garden', and is certainly untainted by the associations of wilderness automatically understood when Westerners think of a national park" (p. 319).

Many national parks in Indonesia were apparently established by people who belonged to the 'preservationists' camp, as until fairly recently no more than lip-service was paid to the concept of encouraging tourism in the parks. It was somehow believed that it was enough to create the basic structure of a park by defining its territory on a map and in the bureaucracy, and visitors would then automatically appear; no effort was put into marketing the parks or into providing suitable accommodation or other facilities (Hitchcock, King & Parnwell, 1988). Old traditional concepts have been pushed aside by Western influences. This has led to the development of national and tourist parks for purpose of conservation, research and recreation in many parts of the country (National Parks and Nature Reserves 1993).

### **The Case of Way Kambas National Park**

Way Kambas National Park, located on the South-east coast of island of Sumatera in Lampung Province, is a 130,000 hectare wildlife reserve managed by Way Kambas Nature Conservation Institute. Since the late 1960's the Way Kambas area has been under great pressure from officials and spontaneous migrants as well as from Jakarta-based developers, loggers and other entrepreneurs. By 1969, 50,000 hectares were logged and in the early and mid 70's three disastrous fires destroyed most of the primary forest, and small pockets only remain in existence (Indonesia National Parks and Nature Reserves 1981). According to forestry officials only 17% of the park is primary forest and 29% consists of marshes. This national park is accessible to the tourists at two restricted development zones: the Way Kambas Elephant Training School and Way Kanan (a wilderness) enclave situated on the Kanan River, a tributary of the Kambas River). Other areas of the park are open to two scientists from Indonesia and other countries strictly for scientific purposes.

Many wildlife species such as the orangutan have disappeared or are confined, is the case of small primates, to the islands of forest that still remain. Settlers have moved in near the boundaries, farming the land adjacent to the park. Wild elephants living in the area destroy the farmers

corps. An elephant school training project funded by the World Wildlife Fund was established to solve the elephant problem. The Elephant training school is located 9 km from the entrance of the Reserve along a second class road. Elephants captured in the wild are putthrough training and assigned a local mahout (trainer).

Way Kanan nature Reserve is 128,000 hectares in size. It is located 13 km through the forest along a gravel road from the main entrance to Way Kambas National Park. Much of the Way Kanan area is swamp forest. Various kinds of wildlife abundant in the reserve include: macaques, wild pigs, butterflies, the Sumatran elephant, tigers, honey bear, and 286 species of birds (Indonesia National Parks and Nature Reserves, 1981).

Way Kambas National Park also has minimal food and lodging services. There are a number of individual local vendors selling food and supplies in the park.

## Methodology

The research methodology of study was divided into: (1) in-depth personal interviews, an information-gathering procedure used in other nature-tourism studies by Durst (1986), Laarman (1986) and Healy (1988), and (2) an on-site questionnaire survey of local vendors.

First, in-depth personal interviews were conducted in February 1994 with two managers of Way Kambas National Park, a representative of the Nature Conservation Institute of the park, an official from the Lampung Provincial Office of Tourism, and a representative of the Tour Guides Association of Lampung Province. The following issues were addressed in the interviews: (1) eco-tourism in Way Kambas, (2) growth opportunities and constraints, (3) infrastructure and facilities, (4) guide services and technical information, (5) admission fees and (6) marketing and promotion.

Although the number of interviews conducted was fairly small number those interviewed represented the most knowledgeable park and tourism officials in the area. The issues mentioned above were consistently addressed in all interviews conducted with these people.

Second, an on-site questionnaire survey of local vendors was also conducted in February 1994 to gather information on concession stands and others selling food and supplies in the park. A purposive sample was drawn from 48 different vendors in the park, 16 with permanent stands

and 32 with nonpermanent stands. The sample size was 20 (10 permanent, 10 non permanent). The questionnaire survey consisted of two types of questionnaires, one for the vendors with permanent stands and another one for vendors with nonpermanent stands. Both questionnaires were written in Bahasa Indonesia and administered by an Indonesian interviewer. The questionnaires were developed to cover the following issues: place of residence, product sold, job generation, family involvement, income generated by concession stand, of concession stand, and demographic characteristics.

## In-Depth Personal Interviews and Observation Results

### Visitation to the Park

International as well as domestic tourists visit Way Kambas National Park. Visitation to the park is highest in the months of November, Desember, January, June and July. According to Way Kambas park and Nature Conservation officials, the majority of international visitors come from France, Germany, The Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Most domestic tourists come from West Java, mainly the capital Jakarta. The tour guide interviewed also indicated Australia, Belgium, Japan and the United States as sources of international tourists. Expatriates are counted as international tourist. Table 1 shows visitation records from the National Conservation Institute at the park. There are trends in visitation from 1985 to 1993 for both domestic and international visitors to Way Kambas National Park. Table 1 indicates a continuous increase in domestic visitation from 1985 to 1991, followed by a decrease in 1992. International tourist visitation was steady at 60 in 1986 but it shows a decrease in the next two years followed by an increase from 1988 to 1992.

**Tabel 1**  
**Visitors to Way Kambas National Park 1985-1993**

Year	International visitors	Domestic visitors	Total visitors
1985	60	934	994
1986	60	1,500	1,560
1987	40	2,783	2,823
1988	25	6,276	6,811
1989	100	11,731	11,831
1990	700	36,490	37,190
1991	1,283	68,175	76,180
1992	1,706	58,789	68,536

Source: National Conservation Institute (SBKSDA) Way Kambas

## **Differences between International and Domestic Tourist in Way Kambas National Park**

Officials from the national park and local tour guides, agree that there are different observed interests between the international and domestic tourists visiting Way Kambas National Park. International tourists show more interest in the wildlife and the adventure experiences at Way Kanan than in the more recreational type experience of the Way Kambas Elephant Training School. They usually spend one or two nights at the reserve (in contrast to shorter stays for domestic tourists), with the exception of cruise tourists who tend to stay from half a day to one day. When international tourists visit the elephant school they are more interested in an elephant safari; they don't like the elephant shows. The type of activities international tourists engage in are bird watching, canoeing, hiking, and wildlife safari. International tourists use the services of tour guides from Bandar Lampung and the park. The tour guide interview also indicated that most international tourists usually purchase souvenirs and food products in the capital of the province, Bandar Lampung, rather than at Way Kambas National Park. A park representative, however, indicated that visitors to Way Kanan purchase food at the Way Kanan concession stand. Also the stand provides meals for visitors spending the night at the park.

On the other hand, domestic tourists are more attracted to the recreational experience of Way Kambas Elephant Training School and they rarely visit Way Kanan Nature Reserve. Domestic tourists usually come in tour groups and do not hire tour guides. They buy more souvenirs and consume food products in the park. Thus, the international tourist's interests are more consistent with the literature describes as ecotourism than are the interests of domestic tourists.

### **Infrastructure and Facilities**

Park officials expressed that there are well-maintained roads providing good access to park from Bandar Lampung. There is also access by boat. There are also five lodging facilities in the park, one at the elephant school and four at Way Kanan. There is a new lodging facility located in the elephant training school as well as one new lodging facility at Way Kanan both recently built with funds provided by the Lampung Province Tourism Office. The five lodging facilities in the park each have four double occupancy rooms. Each room is

rented for a rate of 2,500 Rp. per night. Way Kambas National Park also has the following other developments and facilities: one meeting room, one tourist information/visitor center, one elephant soccer field and grandstand, two elephant swimming pools, and two pier/boat docks.

### **Guide Services**

Guide services to Way Kambas National Park are offered mainly by professional tour guides from Bandar Lampung. There are more than 100 tour guides in Bandar Lampung, four of which are full time guides. Fifty of them are officially recognized as professional tour guides which means they have received training and have obtained a license from the government. Some of the tour guides in Bandar Lampung work in conjunction with travel agencies, others work independently by offering their services to the hotels. In many occasions tour guides from Bandar Lampung function as interpreters between the park rangers and the tourists.

Often Way Kambas National Park employees mainly park rangers work as tour guides. These particular workers possess the empirical knowledge of the park and know their way through the jungle, but in most of the cases have not obtained professional training. The representative of the provincial office of tourism who was interviewed, only 2% of park rangers in Way Kambas National Park have received training as tour guides.

The income gained from tour services at Way Kambas National Park varies depending on the part of the park visited. A tour guide visiting Way Kambas Elephant Training school can make from 15,000 to 35,000 Rp per day, but tour guide visiting Way Kanan can make from 25,000 to 75,000 Rp per day.

### **Park Fees**

There is what is called a Cooperative of Employees at the park which is in charge of collecting and managing all park fees. There are several types of fees at the park. There is an entrance fee of 1,500 Rp charged to international as well as domestic visitors. There is also a fee of 1,500 Rp to watch the elephant attractions, and a fee of 2,500 Rp. to ride the elephants. Fees are also charged to ride boats on the Kanan river. The average fee for a two hour boat ride for four people is 78,000 Rp. This fee includes the boat, fuel and the tour guide service.

## Marketing and Promotion

The Provincial Office of Tourism is the major promoter of Way Kambas National Park. Promotion efforts are mainly channeled through brochures distributed to hotels and travel agencies in Bandar Lampung as well as to travel agencies in Jakarta, Indonesia's capital. Way Kambas National Park has been promoted mainly as a recreational site where visitors can see trained elephants performing different sports (eg. soccer, swimming), and other attractions. Many of the promotional brochures feature an elephant with a soccer ball. Little focus is given to the natural history of the park which based on the literature is more appealing to the ecotourist than the recreational attractions. A representative of the Lampung Tourism Provincial Office pinpointed that there is a lack of marketing research to attract international tourists and a need for joint venture marketing efforts with other government branches and the private sector.

## On-site Questionnaire Survey Results

### Local Vendors in The Park

Table 2 compares permanent stand vendors and nonpermanent stand vendors. It shows the location where the local vendors live, the type of product sold and length of time the vendor's stand has been operating. It shows that 90% of the vendors with permanent stands live in the park or nearby in the Central Lampung District, and all the vendors with nonpermanent stands live nearby to the park, in the Central Lampung District. For both types of vendors, the products sold are mainly food and souvenirs. Table 2 also shows that 20% of nonpermanent vendors take and sell personal photographs to visitors. With respect to time they have been in operation, table 2 shows that more than 88% of the permanent stand vendors interviewed have had their business for more than one year. Approximately 44% of nonpermanent stand vendors have had their business less than one year. More than one member of the family is involved in the permanent stands, 60% of respondents said that their mother manages the stand. It is interesting to point out that more female than male vendors manage permanent stands; this might warrant further research. Nonpermanent stand vendors were

assumed to work alone. Therefore the question regarding which other member of the family manages the stand was omitted from their questionnaire. Thus data is missing.

**Table 2**  
**Local Vendors**  
**in the Way Kambas National Park**

	Permanent stand vendors	Non-permanent stand vendors
<b>Where They Live</b>		
- Central Lampung District	70% (n=7)	100% (n=10)
- Outside Central Lampung	20% (n=2)	0% (n=0)
- Inside Way Kambas	10% (n=1)	0% (n=0)
	-----	-----
	100% (n=10)	100% (n=10)
<b>Type Product Sold</b>		
- Food	50% (n=5)	40% (n=4)
- Souvenirs	30% (n=3)	30% (n=3)
- Food and Souvenirs	20% (n=2)	10% (n=1)
- Photograph of Visitors	0% (n=0)	20% (n=2)
	-----	-----
	100% (n=10)	100% (n=10)
<b>Operation Time</b>		
- Less than six month	11.1% (n=1)	33.3% (n=3)
- Six month to one year	0.0% (n=0)	11.1% (n=1)
- One year to two years	55.6% (n=5)	44.4% (n=4)
- More than two years	33.3% (n=3)	11.1% (n=1)
	-----	-----
	100% (n=10)	100% (n=10)
<b>Who manages the stand</b>		
- Father	20% (n=2)	
- Mother	60% (n=6)	
- Brother/Sister	10% (n=1)	
- All the family	10% (n=1)	
	-----	
	100% (n=10)	

### Vendors Relationship to The Park

The vendors relationship to the park is presented in Table 3. One out of the 10 permanent stands belongs to the Way Kanan (government operated). Over 50% of permanent and nonpermanent vendors in Way Kambas National Park belong to the Cooperative of Employees. Fifty percent of vendors with permanent stands pay rent to Way Kambas National Park. It was assumed that non permanent stand vendors did not rent or build a stand; therefore the question regarding status of concession stand was omitted from questionnaire. Thus data is missing.

The Way Kambas National Park Cooperative of Employees is in charge of collecting of the park fees as previously described.



### Impact of Vendors on the Local Economy

Concession stand vendors also impact the local economy. Table 4 shows that the majority of both permanent and nonpermanent stand vendors earn between 10,000 to 99,999 Rp. in the low season. Overall the permanent stand vendors receive more income than the non permanent vendors.

**Table 3**  
**Vendors Relationship to the Park**

	Permanent stand vendors	Non permanent stand vendors
<b>Status of concession</b> - Stand is rented to the vendor - Stand was built by vendor - Way Kambas Resort stand	50% (n=5) 40% (n=4) 10% (n=1) ----- 100% (n=10)	
<b>Members of Way Kambas Cooperative</b> - Yes - No	60% (n=6) 40% (n=4) ----- 100% (n=10)	50% (n=5) 50% (n=5) ----- 100% (n=10)

**Table 4**  
**Impact of Vendors on the Local Economy**

	Permanent stand vendors	Non permanent stand vendors
<b>Rp. Earned Weekly</b>		
<b>High Season:</b>		
-- less than 10,000	0.0% (n=0)	33.3% (n=3)
-- 10,000 to 49,999	42.9% (n=3)	33.3% (n=3)
-- 50,000 to 99,999	28.6% (n=2)	33.3% (n=3)
-- 100,000 to 149,999	28.6% (n=2)	0% (n=0)
	100.1% (n=7)	99.9% (n=9)
<b>Low Season:</b>		
-- less than 10,000	12.5% (n=1)	44.4% (n=4)
-- 10,000 to 49,999	75.0% (n=6)	55.6% (n=5)
-- 50,000 to 99,999	12.5% (n=1)	0% (n=0)
-- 100,000 to 149,999	0.0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)
	100% (n=8)	100% (n=9)
<b>Job Generated</b>		
<b>Inside Family:</b>		
- One Family member working at stand	55.6% (n=5)	
- Two family members working at stand	22.2% (n=2)	
- More than three family members working at stand	22.2% (n=2)	
	99.9% (n=9)	
<b>Outside Family:</b>		
- One employ working at stand	50% (n=1)	
- Two employees working at stand	50% (n=1)	
	100% (n=2)	

Over 25% of permanent stand vendors earn 100,000 to 149,000 Rp. in the high season, but non of the nonpermanent stand vendors earn this much. None of the permanent vendors earn less than 10,000 Rp. in the high season and only 12,5% earn this little in the low season, but over a third of nonpermanent vendors earn less than 10,000 Rp. in both high and low seasons.

Most of the permanent stand vendors have only family members as employees and not many of them; approximately half employ only on family member. Only two stands sampled employ non-family members, one in one case and two in the other. Nonpermanent stand vendors were assumed to work alone; therefore the question regarding how many other employees work at the stand was omitted from their questionnaire. Thus data is missing.

### Occupation and Gender of Vendors

Two socio-economic characteristics of the vendors were included in the questionnaire: occupation and gender. Table 5 shows that 66% of permanent stand vendors were formerly salesmen or businessmen. Table 5 also shows that over 60% of the nonpermanent stand vendors interviewed are currently full-time salesmen or businessmen. Other occupations represented are farmer and govern-

ment employee. Government employee was only given as a former occupation and only for permanent stand vendors. This indicates that becoming a park vendor may appeal to some as a second career, first after working as a government employee. In the case of permanent stand vendors, 60% of respondents were female, only 40% of nonpermanent stand vendors were female. Based on field observations; it can be assumed that the gender results from the vendors sampled accurately describe the vendors population at the park.

**Table 5**  
**Occupation and Gender of Vendors**

	<b>Permanent stand vendors</b>	<b>Non permanent stand vendors</b>
<b>Farmer occupation</b>		
- Salesmen	66.6% (n=6)	
- Farmer	11.1% (n=1)	
- Government Employee	22.2% (n=2)	
	-----	
	99.9% (n=9)	
<b>Full time occupation</b>		
- Salesmen		62.5% (n=5)
- Farmer		37.5% (n=3)
- Government Employee		0.0% (n=0)
		-----
		100.0% (n=8)
<b>Sex</b>		
- Female	60% (n=6)	40% (n=4)
- Male	40% (n=4)	60% (n=6)
	-----	-----
	100% (n=10)	100% (n=10)

## Summary and Discussion

In summary, the park has experience increasing numbers of visitors, international as well as domestic in the last four years. Way Kambas National Park can also be considered an ecotourist destination in Indonesia at least for the international market. Furthermore, it has the potential for becoming a major ecotourist destination and a good example of ecotourism development for Indonesian national parks and protected areas if ecotourism development is carefully planned.

Visitation records from the National Conservation Institute at the park show an international visitors increase of 423 tourists between 1991 and 1992. Why can international tourists visiting Way Kambas National Park be considered ecotourists? In comparing the international visitors to the park with the understanding of ecotourists presented in the literature many similarities can be drawn. First, international visitors to Way Kambas come from industrialized nations such as Europe, United States and Japan; thus they come from urban or suburban settings looking for new and exciting environment as indicated in the literature. Se-

cond, they tend to stay overnight and longer than other types of tourist such as domestic and cruiseship tourists. It could also be implied that by staying overnight in the types of basic international lodging facilities provided in the park they are more tolerant of these facilities than other international tourists travelers. Third, international tourists have an interest in natural history. International tourists usually hire tour guides from Bandar Lampung or the park itself. They also show more interest in the wildlife and the adventure experience at Way Kanan. This is consistent with preferences of ecotourists described in the literature. Fourth, international visitors to the park engage in activities such as bird watching, canoeing, hiking and wildlife safaris. These four activities are mentioned in the literature as some of the most popular activities for ecotourists. Mainly they come from Jakarta or West Java, bring their families, drive 6-10 hours and stay overnight in the bus for economic reason.

On the other hand, domestic tourists are attracted to the elephant attractions provided at the park. Opposite to the increase in international visitors, the National Conservation Institute recorded a domestic tourist decrease of 9,386 between 1991 and 1992. They are more inclined to a recreational-type experience at the park. Domestic visitors stay shorter periods, and do not use tour guide services. Domestic tourists do not fit the concept of ecotourism. But they do represent a significant group of visitors who impact the local economy by consuming local products such as food and souvenirs.

The fact that there are two different types of tourists visiting Way Kambas National Park indicates that park and tourism officials must take development measures to assure the appropriate use of the park.

The park has already implemented three significant development measures. The park is zoned allowing regular visitors only in two restricted areas of the park, Way Kambas Elephant Training School and Way Kanan. Scientists from Indonesia and other countries are allowed to visit the other park areas for scientific study purposes. Restricted visitor areas contribute the mitigation of negative environmental impacts in the entire park. This approach could be further implemented by alternating the areas which allow for ecotourist visitation. By opening new areas for ecotourists and closing existing ones park officials may prevent overuse of the park. This measure is not recommended for heavy visited areas such as the

elephant school training. Tourist visiting the park for recreational-type experiences should be concentrated at the existing area.

Park managers should focus on development measures that benefit the environment. As pointed out in the literature by Budowski, the optimum interaction in the use of the environment as a resource for tourism is the tourism-environment symbiosis, where tourism and the environment are mutually supportive and management processes are used to benefit the environment whilst offering worthwhile experiences for the tourist.

Lodging facilities at the park are consistent with those used by ecotourists. Few in number and guest capacity, they are designed to fulfill the basic needs of the visitor. Most of the visitors using the lodging facilities are international ecotourists. These facilities, therefore, have been appropriately developed for the needs of ecotourists as described in the literature. Further lodging development in the park must reflect the existing patterns. Lodging fees as well as other park fees are collected by the Cooperative of Employees and re-spent in the park. This indicates one of the local economic benefits of ecotourism.

Food and souvenir vendors with permanent and nonpermanent stands at the park are also appropriately distributed in the park, mainly at the elephant school training. The majority of these vendors earn between 10,000 to 99,999 Rp. in both high and low season. Most of this income contributes to the economy of the local area, because 90% of vendors with permanent stand and all the vendors with nonpermanent stands sampled reported that they live either in the park or nearby in the Central Lampung District. This is indicative of the positive impact on the local economy. Another indicator of their impact to the local economy is job generation. Results from the vendors survey show that most of the permanent stand vendors employ one or more family members. Non-family members are also employed by some vendors. Some elephant-related activities provided for tourists at Way Kambas National Park would normally be considered inappropriate within national parks, and particularly at an area being developed for ecotourism, for the international tourist market. These are the elephant soccer games, where two "teams" of 9 elephants and riders play a game of soccer for spectators with an oversized soccer ball, and elephant swimming exhibitions. These facilities and attractions are now located at the edge of the park boundaries, very accessible to those tourists not par-

ticularly interested in ecotourism. This is an appropriate zoning measure for this type of facility, in contrast to Way Kanan which is appropriately located 15 Km inside of the park. That objective should be not to intensively developed the park interior. Only low levels of development for ecotourism should be allowed in the interior.

National park development policies which permit limited numbers of visitors to the interior of the park to certain zones of access such as at Way Kanan, but which also limit the scale of development within those zones can ensure that promotion of national parks as ecotourism destinations will not have unacceptable negative impacts upon park resources. Sustainable development of national parks for ecotourism should be mutually beneficial to both the tourism industry and the environment in the long run.

### **Recommendations for Further Study**

Based on the study findings, the following are some recommendation for further study. A survey of park visitors (international and domestic) to Way Kambas National Park with respect to their perception of the park and how it should (or should not) be developed, the availability and usefulness of information on the park and their preferred activities. Results will help park planners, developers, and managers to be more responsive to the demands of park visitors. Studies should also be done to develop better promotional and educational materials that will appeal to the ecotourists. Training programs and short courses should also be developed for natural history guides and their natural history education programs.

### **Acknowledgement**

*The authors wish to acknowledge the following people for providing valuable information, collecting data, preparing the instruments, translating the information and revising this paper: Citra, Koko, Ina, Wiwien, research staff, Center for Tourism Studies; Christina, local tour guide; Yaman Azis, promotion staff, Lampung Provincial Tourism Office, Ir. Djoko Setijono, the director of Lampung Provincial Tourism Office, the director of Way Kambas National Park, the guard at Way Kambas, the park ranger at Way Kanan, the director of Bukit Barisan Selatan National Park, Dr. Allan Mills, Professor of Recreation, Parks and Tourism, VCU.*

## References

- Boo, E. 1990. Ecotourism: The Potentials and Pitfalls. Vols. 1 & 2. World Wildlife Fund, Lancaster, PA. : Wickersham.
- Booth, A. 1990. The Tourism Boom in Indonesia. Bulletin of Indonesia Economic Studies 26 (3).
- Budowski, O. 1976. Tourism and Conservation-Conflict, Co-existence or Symbiosis. Environmental Conservation. Vol. 3: 27-31
- Craig-Smith S.J., M. Fagence and K. Hauritz. 1992. Issues Facing Tourism Development in Pacific Island Countries. In Sustainable Tourism Development in Pacific Island Countries, ESCAP Tourism Review No. 9, 1-10 New York: United Nations.
- Durst, P.B. 1988. Natural History and Nature-Oriented Adventure Travel for Rural Development and Wildlands Management. Management Diagnosis of Research Needs and Project Opportunities for Thailand. FPEI Working paper No. 12. Research Triangle Park N.C.: Southeastern Center for Forest Economic Research.
- Glick, D. 1991. "Tourism in Greater Yellowstone: Maximizing the Good, Minimizing the Bad, Eliminating the Ugly." In Nature Tourism, Managing for the Environment, ed. T. Whelan, 58-74. Washington D.C.: Island Press.
- Hitcock, M., V.T. King, and M.J.G. Parnwell. 1993. Tourism in South-East Asia. London: Routledge.
- Healey, R.G. 1988. Economic Consideration in Nature-Oriented Tourism: The Case of Tropical Forest Tourism. FPEI Working paper No. 39. Research Triangle Park N.C.: Southeastern Center for Forest Economic Research.
- Indonesia National Parks and Nature Reserves. 1981
- Kusler, J.A. 1991. Ecotourism and Resource Conservation: A Collection of Papers. Vols. 1 & 2. Madison Wis. : Omnipress.
- Laarman, J.G. 1986. Nature-Oriented Tourism in Costa Rica and Ecuador: Diagnosis of Research Needs and Project Opportunities. FPEI Working Paper No. 6. Research Triangle Park, N.C.: Southeastern Center for Forest Economic Research.
- Laarman, J.G. and P.B. Durst. 1987. Nature Travel in the Tropics. FPEI Working paper No. 23. Research Triangle Park N.C.: Southeastern Center for Forest Economic Research.
- Ministry of Tourism, Post and Telecommunication. 1993. Indonesia Environment & Heritage. Indonesia: Directorate General of Tourism.
- Olindo, P. 1991. "The Old Man of Nature Tourism: Kenya." In Nature Tourism Managing for the Environment ed. T. Whelan, 23-38. Washington D.C.: Island Press.
- Rovinski, Y. 1991. "Private Reserves, Parks, and Ecotourism." In Nature Tourism Managing for the Environment. ed. T. Whelan, 39- 57. Washington D.C.: Island Press.
- Ryel, R. and T. Grasse. 1991. "Marketing Ecotourism: Attracting the Elusive Ecotourists." In Nature Tourism Managing for the Environment. ed. T. Whelan, 164-186. Washington D.C. : Island Press.
- Sherman, P.B. and J.A. Dixon. 1991. "The Economics of Nature Tourism: Determining If It Pays." In Nature Tourism Managing for the Environment. ed. T. Whelan, 89-131. Washington D.C.: Island Press.
- The Ecotourism Society. 1991. "The Ecotourism Society: An Action Agenda." In Ecotourism and Resource Conservation. ed. J.A. Kusler, 75-79. Madison, Wis.: Omnipress.
- Thorsell, J. and S. Wells. 1990. "A Global Overview of Tourism Activities in Coastal marine Parks." In Proceedings of the 1990 Congress on Coastal and Marine Parks, ed. M. Miller and J. Auyon. Newport, Oregon: National Coastal Resources Research and Development Institute.
- Youth, H. 1990. Ecotourism: Loving nature to Death? World Watch. 3(5): 36-37.
- Whelan, T. 1991. "Ecotourism and Its Role in Sustainable Development." In Nature Tourism Managing for the Environment, ed. T. Whelan, 3-22. Washington D.C. : Island Press.
- Wilson, M.A. 1987. Nature Tourism and Enterprise Development in Ecuador. FPEI Working Paper No. 27. Research Triangle Park, N.C.: Southeastern Center for Forest Economic Research.