

TOWARD A MODEL OF BALANCED TOURISM DEVELOPMENT ON BAFFIN ISLAND

Mark J. Okrant
Plymouth State University

Donna Larsen
DataPath Systems

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/ttra>

Okrant, Mark J. and Larsen, Donna, "TOWARD A MODEL OF BALANCED TOURISM DEVELOPMENT ON BAFFIN ISLAND" (2016). *Travel and Tourism Research Association: Advancing Tourism Research Globally*. 8.

https://scholarworks.umass.edu/ttra/2007/Applied_Papers/8

This is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Travel and Tourism Research Association: Advancing Tourism Research Globally by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

Toward A Model of Balanced Tourism Development on Baffin Island

Mark J. Okrant

Professor of Geography and Tourism Development

Plymouth State University

Plymouth, New Hampshire, USA

Donna Larsen

DataPath Systems

Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, Canada

ABSTRACT

A desired outcome of indigenous tourism is culture- or nature-based experiences that hosts and guests are willing to accept and share. However, researchers warn there is a paradox between bringing new economic opportunities into a culture area and sustaining the local culture. This hybrid study investigates three research questions: (1) what forms of tourism have evolved during seven years of existence of Nunavut Territory where tourism is a new industry, the culture traditional, and the environment pristine; (2) how has tourism impacted hamlet life on Baffin Island; and ultimately, (3) how can research findings be utilized to guide tourism providers, marketers, visitors, and host hamlets to develop a product that is economically beneficial but does not undermine the environmental and cultural fabric of the region? This undertaking uses elements of both practitioner and academic research: analysis of the Nunavut Pleasure Traveler Exit Study; pre-visit and post-visit focus groups with first-time visitors to Arctic hamlets aboard the cruise ship MV Explorer; chronicled reflections of visitors to Arctic communities with a minimum of one prior hamlet experience; interviews with Nunavut Tourism, Parks Canada, as well as hamlet and Inuit cooperative officials; interviews of cruise ship operators; a literature search; and empirical observation of cultural and tourism landscapes in Kimmirut and Kinngait. This is the first stage of an on-going applied research effort.

INTRODUCTION

According to Michele McKenzie, President and CEO of the Canada Tourism Commission, experiential travel of various kinds, including aboriginal cultural occasions, is in increasing demand by travelers (McKenzie 2006). It has generated interest in preserving heritage and increasing aspirations for self-advancement and can be a foundation for dialogue between dissimilar peoples. However, researchers and tourism managers warn that inappropriately implemented programs have been a factor in creating stereotypical images and further marginalizing indigenous people, who are forced to reshape their identities through the medium of tourism (Ryan and Aicken 2005). In short, indigenous tourism offers the promise of access to jobs, income and political control, while it threatens the very cultural foundations and natural settings that are craved by visitors. The question is: can a paradigm be developed that enhances guests' experiences while minimizing the threat to their hosts' quality of life?

METHODOLOGY

Baffin Island provides an excellent laboratory in which to study a fledgling tourism industry. The culture on Baffin Island and other parts of Nunavut is traditional and is based upon thousands of years of survival in one of the planet's most extreme and fragile environments. The

island's community economic structures are primarily subsistence-based. As a result, much of the environment remains pristine. The research for this project has been conducted in several layers. The first step was to conduct the Nunavut Pleasure Traveler Exit Study which was designed in cooperation with Nunavut Tourism on behalf of the Nunavut Department of Economic Development and Transportation. As there is no road access into Nunavut, the survey was handed out to visitors traveling on departing flights and cruises. The survey was distributed in two phases on 24 percent of flights and 37 percent of cruises during 2006. In all, 13 percent of passengers and 14 percent of projected visitors were surveyed. The survey collected basic data about travel behavior including spending patterns and destinations visited, as well as the demographic characteristics of visitors. The margin of error was +/-2.6 percent. Summary data from a preliminary analysis of the survey are diffused throughout this presentation (DataPath 2007).

Next, a search of pertinent literature was used to examine the paradox between the desire to bring new economic opportunities into indigenous culture areas and the problem of sustaining that very culture, with particular concern about providing a tourism product that is a positive experience for host and guest populations. Empirical observation, drawing upon more than fifty years of experience studying Arctic and Sub-arctic communities has enabled the researchers to familiarize themselves with the tourism product mix, the infrastructure, as well as signs of discontent in two subject communities, Kinngait [Cape Dorset] and Kimmirut [Lake Harbour], which attracted 3 and 2 percent respectively of all leisure travelers to Nunavut during 2006. Phase one of a set of pre-visit and post-visit focus groups was conducted with first-time visitors to Arctic hamlets aboard the cruise ship *MV Explorer*. The observations of visitors to Arctic communities having more than one prior indigenous hamlet experience were chronicled. Finally, cruise ship operators, Nunavut Territory, Parks Canada, as well as hamlet and Inuit cooperative officials were interviewed, all in an effort to obtain a clearer understanding of the relationship between visitors' expectations and the reality of an indigenous hamlet experience. It is hoped that our findings can help to bridge the gap between the expectations and motives of hosts and guests, thereby creating a better tourism experience for all involved in the process.

BACKGROUND ABOUT NUNAVUT TOURISM

From the time of its foundation in April of 1999, there had been no comprehensive effort to determine the number or character of visitors to the new Nunavut Territory. Recognizing that tourism can be an important tool for the future development of such a large, isolated area, the Territory government contracted with DataPath Systems of Whitehorse to conduct the Nunavut Pleasure Traveler Exit Study. During 2006, an estimated 9,323 people visited the territory of Nunavut, 7,227 (77%) by air and 2,096 (23%) by cruise ship (DataPath 2007, Kenney 2006). The vast majority of air travel was managed by three airlines—First Air, Canadian North, and Calm Air—linking southern Canadian cities with Iqaluit, the capital and largest city of Nunavut, and to 26 smaller communities from there. These travelers visited 1.6 communities on average. Eight cruise ship companies—including Adventure Canada, Cruise North, and Polar Star—sent a total of 27 tours, or “expeditions” into the Arctic during 2006 offering themes ranging from natural to predominantly cultural. In total, 22 itineraries were visited. This latter figure represents an increase of 83 percent over 2005, which had experienced 71 percent growth compared to 2004 (DataPath 2007). 14,500 (est.) landfalls from cruise ships were made in Nunavut during 2006, an average of four landfalls per passenger (Kenney). Not every shore excursion visited a populated area, but most cruise ship patrons experienced wildlife (e.g., bird nesting) as well as the ruins of

ancient indigenous settlements. Passengers who traveled with Adventure Canada visited an average of three communities (Bradley-Swan 2006).

Nearly two-thirds of visitors (62%) to Nunavut were males, averaging 37.5 years in age, although a substantial proportion (43%) was 45-to-64 years old. Canadians engendered the most visits to Nunavut (79%), followed by the United States (14%), and Europe (5%). Americans were far more likely to arrive by cruise (60% vs. 14% of Canadians) and to be visiting for leisure (82% vs. 24% of Canadians). The primary destination of all visitors was Baffin Island (46%) and especially Iqaluit (25%). August (33%) and July (30%) were the two leading months to visit, with two-thirds (67%) of all cruise travel occurring during August. An estimated \$3.5 million CDN was expended in Nunavut during the 2006 travel season, 37 percent of this amount for purposes of leisure, education, and/or visiting friends or relatives. Because 75 percent of all expenditures was for meals and accommodations, air travelers had a much greater impact on local businesses than their cruise counterparts (\$123 CDN per person per night vs. \$16 CDN).

According to the Canada Census, with a population of approximately 27 thousand occupying a desolate, harsh environment of more than 743 thousand square miles, Nunavut has a population density well below one person per square mile. Not surprisingly, this small population is beset by economic difficulties. Typical of populations that occupy extreme environs, the population pyramid is bottom heavy (the Territory's median age is 22 years with 37 percent of the population under the age of 15). Low education achievement (43% of the 20-34 age population has not graduated from high school) and high unemployment (a Territory average of 17%) are problems throughout Nunavut. Tourism development would appear to offer potential solutions to some of the economic problems that Nunavut is experiencing. However, several axioms set forth at a 2003 conference on indigenous tourism hosted by the University of Waikato's Department of Tourism indicate that using tourism to pave the way to prosperity through tourism is not without its own concerns (Ryan and Aicken 2005):

1. there is a *paradox between the desire to bring new economic opportunities into the culture area and the problem of sustaining the very culture* that faces change and commoditization as a result; as a consequence, ongoing conflict between those who wish to preserve versus exploit the people's resources is a byproduct of tourism
2. the *expectations of guests are often at odds from what the hosts are prepared to offer*; education can be used to inform the outside world of what indigenous culture is really like before they arrive; however, indigenous people may find it difficult to control the flow of information that is crucial to proper representation of their cultures and, as a result, guests' expectations
3. the *motives of hosts and guests differ*—indigenous hosts attempt to convey cultural understanding, while many of their guests are only seeking to place another checkmark on a long list of lifetime experiences; an interactive experience is not as important to the majority of visitors as purchasing arts and artifacts; it is this reticence (on the part of guests) toward interaction that undermines the achievement of a "real" cultural experience
4. properly implemented, *tourism can provide experiences for both indigenous and visitor attendees*; this may be accomplished by providing two *parallel, but separate experiences* that take place simultaneously in one locale.

It will be the purpose of this continuing process to determine the applicability of these axioms to the Nunavut experience. Ultimately, the territory should be seeking to identify a paradigm that minimizes risk to both guests' experiences and hosts' quality of life. Properly implemented

tourism necessitates identifying and creating product and marketing mixes that maximize return on investment in a manner that impacts individual communities positively while benefiting the economy of the territory as a whole.

THE SUBJECT HAMLETS—KIMMIRUT AND KINNGAIT

Seven communities on Baffin Island receive regularly scheduled regional air service and have a place on cruise ships' seasonal itineraries. This research will focus upon two communities—Kimmirut and Kinngait.

Located on the south shore of Baffin Island's Meta Incognita Peninsula along the Hudson Strait, Kimmirut [formerly Lake Harbour] has a population of 433. Like most Nunavut hamlets, the population of Kimmirut is very young, with 37.9 percent of the population under the age of 15 years. Also typical of Nunavut hamlets, the lack of economic opportunity is reflected in the high rate of unemployment (19.4%), low per capita income (\$14,688 CDN), and percentage of the 20-34 year old population (40.1%) not completing high school (Statistics Canada 2001). Housing in Kimmirut is crowded, a characteristic shared by most Baffin Island communities, due to a shortage of available units (Krauss 2006). One of the economic anchors of the community is the Kimik Co-operative Association. The co-op, which is a member of Arctic Co-operatives Limited, markets carvings, has a cable television service, fuel delivery service, and video rental business. Its primary function is as a retail co-op. It also operates one of twenty-two Inns North chain hotels owned and operated by co-operatives across Nunavut and the Northwest Territories. The Kimik co-op hotel does not cater to traditional pleasure travelers, but can be used by such visitors. The co-op itself has no direct part in tourism activities within the community. The community of Kimmirut has a Hamlet Council with its own Tourism Committee. The Tourism Committee has been set up to foster and guide tourism within the community. A visitor centre, art gallery, and Guide to Kimmirut Artists are supported by the Katannilik Park Visitor Centre and the Qulirukut Arts and Crafts Society. A former community economic development director initiated the gallery, started a web site, and prepared a brochure (Fisher 2006). While there is no on-going collaboration between the gallery and the co-op, permission to start the gallery was sought and given by both the co-op and the Northern retail store in the hamlet.

Visitors we interviewed were impressed with the quantity and quality of carvings within the community (Hurry 2006). During 2006, Kimmirut received slightly more than 100 cruise ship passengers from two visiting ships, which is close to the community's annual average (Nunavut Cruise Ship Itinerary List). With each visit, hamlet residents met the ship, led a tour of the hamlet, provided a native culture exhibition including throat singing, a drum dance, and Arctic games, then escorted interested people to the community stores, the excellent local visitor centre, an exhibit of seal skin preparation and bannock making, followed by a visit to the community's small but excellent craft store. Most members of cruise parties participated willingly in the program planned by the locals, but some were unaware of the community's reputation for producing traditional carvings. Kimmirut, like most of Nunavut's hamlets, offers the cruise ship companies this package of activities for a shore fee of \$20 to 25 per person (Bradley-Swan 2006). Presently there is no active resistance to having visitors in Kimmirut where the impact of visitor spending is limited to some trickle-down, as most of the dollars spent on carvings, retail goods, and a local home-stay program can only be spent within the community. Some community leaders believe that purchases of arts and crafts constitute a negative development, as some of the visitors' money is being used to purchase drugs and alcohol (Kenney 2006). Therefore, while the majority of Kimmirut residents have the appearance

of accepting tourism, some perceive sales of arts and crafts to be a factor in turning indigenous culture upside down.

Kinngait [also known as Cape Dorset] has had an international reputation as an artist colony dating back to the 1950s. Situated on a small island along the southwest corner of Baffin Island, Kinngait is a modern appearing and relatively large—using an Arctic yardstick—hamlet with gravel roads, small wooden houses, a modern community school, community college campus, stores, nurses station, government offices, and churches. Kinngait's economic condition is worse than that of Kimmirut in spite of its reputation and larger size (1,148 people). 38.1 percent of Kinngait's inhabitants are under the age of 15 years. It has an unemployment rate of 24.2 percent, an even lower per capita income (\$13,936 CDN) than Kimmirut, and more than half (53.8%) of its 20-34 year old population has not completed high school (Statistics Canada 2001). Owing to its status as an artist colony, Kinngait has been included in many more cruise ship itineraries than Kimmirut (e.g., 6 vs. 2 during 2006). While this hamlet also offers tours to visitors off of the cruise ships, the typical passenger is more interested in buying crafts from the West Baffin Eskimo Co-operative than participating in other activities, particularly on those expeditions when Kinngait is not the first hamlet on an expedition's itinerary. There are approximately 100 local artists (Stewart and Draper), with a number of others who supplement their income by carving, so a wide range of subjects and styles of art is available for purchase by visitors (Fisher 2006). This co-op specializes in stone-cut prints, etchings, and carvings, operates a print shop, and serves as the sales outlet for arts and crafts, including carvings, sculptures and lithographs. A private business called Huit Huit Tours looks after air travelers to Cape Dorset. It provides tours of the area and has three fully equipped and comfortably furnished houses with modern amenities including an outfitted kitchen, telephone, cable TV, washer and dryer. Huit Huit recently opened a new hotel on a hillside overlooking the co-op. An existing lodging, the Kinngait Inn, also is privately owned and operated. The co-op itself has no part in operating tourism businesses, however its Retail Division operates a retail store, supervises property rentals, and has a fuel delivery service. But, the co-op's centerpiece is undoubtedly its Producer Arts Division which oversees the studios, produces art and prints, and purchases carvings and sculptures. Dorset Fine Arts, situated in Toronto, is the co-op's own marketing system. This is different from other communities' co-ops which buy carvings then market them through Arctic Co-operatives Limited and its subsidiary company Canadian Arctic Producers, formed in 1965 to serve the arts and crafts production side of co-op business. Unlike Kimmirut, the Kinngait Hamlet Council does not have a tourism committee.

THE IMPACT OF TOURISM IN BAFFIN ISLAND HAMLETS

During 2006, the government of Nunavut invested approximately \$2.2 million CDN to attract visitors to the territory, with a very small amount of money applied toward marketing specific destinations (Lewis 2007). While the Nunavut government is aware of the issues that accompany increasing visitation, efforts to address tourism development are in an infant stage.

Counsel about how Arctic tourism should be implemented comes from a number of scholars and organizations and includes a list of goals (World Wide Fund 2001), a set of principles for development (Milne 2006), and a set of tourism codes of conduct (Mason 1997). The following list highlights several of these:

1. travelers should be educated about the environment and people
2. the rights, cultures, abilities, and aspirations of residents must be protected by having locals play a leading role during the planning process

3. the share of money that is spent, remains in, and benefits communities must be augmented
4. tourism must be developed in a manner that develops social capital and the community's pride of place.

In an effort to determine the degree to which the aforementioned ideas have been addressed, a pair of group activities was conducted among participants in the 2006 Houston Celebration conducted by Adventure Canada. Initially, passengers aboard *The Explorer* who had never visited an Arctic hamlet previous to September 2006 were invited to participate in pre-visit and post-visit focus groups. Six people, three Americans and three Canadians, participated in both focus groups. Each was asked for her/his expectations before experiencing the first of three hamlets visited by *The Explorer*. Questions and responses are provided in Table 1. Because this was a group of otherwise sophisticated travelers, the insight they exhibited is probably superior to typical first-time visitors to the region.

Before going ashore in Kimmirut, members of the focus group had expected to find evidence of a simple, uncomplicated lifestyle. Given the premium placed on survival, they expected a “no-frills” cultural landscape, one in which people would be concerned with basic survival and the tools for subsistence activity. The group expected to see little emphasis placed upon community landscaping within this harsh environment. It was expected that arts and handicrafts would have importance within the community. Of interest, the group had presumed it would find evidence of social discontent and was aware that alcoholism and boredom are prevalent in Arctic communities. However, despite this awareness, there was no anticipation that crimes against person or property would be a problem within the hamlets they were about to visit. Expectations were that there would be little if any tourism infrastructure and little outward attention paid to our presence in the community, other than some initial curiosity. Rather, it was assumed that visitors' needs would be serviced by a handful of people using the local infrastructure [coop, schools, churches] except for the presence of a small gallery or a few roving artists trying to sell their crafts. While the physical attributes of the first Inuit hamlet visited [Kimmirut] met their expectations, some of what the focus group experienced surprised them. The welcome they received as well as the sophistication of the local infrastructure and the quality of the tourism product mix [lodging, museum, two large stores] substantially exceeded their expectations. On the other hand, the evidence of social discontent—substance abuse, vandalism, and teen pregnancies—provided an unexpected, lasting, negative perception.

Second, the reflections of people who had visited Arctic communities on at least one previous occasion were chronicled. This group consisted of two long-time collectors of Inuit art, a board member of the Institute of American Indian Arts [IAIA] Museum, a former resident of Kinngait, and an academic. The former resident of Kinngait described the fact that a stronger government presence and more utilities and housing were evident in the community than years before. In the mid-to-late fifties when he lived in Kinngait, the community had fewer than 150 people (as opposed to 1,148 or more in 2006), and only one two-story building. At that time, most people lived in hunting camps spread out along the southwestern coast of Baffin Island, traveling by boat and tenting in summer and fall, then building igloos for the winter and hunting by dog team. He noted that dog teams are no longer abundant, and are used mainly to facilitate tourism and non-resident sport hunting of polar bears. Finally, although he was not surprised, he was very pleased that *Kinngarmiut* (the people of Cape Dorset) as a whole had not lost their wonderful spirit, despite the fact the community has had to adjust to new political and economic realities impinging upon their daily lives (Houston 2006).

Table 1
Focus Group: First-Time Visitors

<u>Preconceptions</u>	<u>Experiences in 1st Hamlet Visited</u>
1. What do you expect to see in the first hamlet you visited?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ scraped gravel/dirt roads ▶ few houses, no grid or orderly pattern ▶ not landscaped, no tailored yards ▶ single-story houses ▶ snowmobiles and ATVs ▶ functional structures ▶ a church ▶ oil drums attached to houses ▶ uncertainty about command of English ▶ very small art studio 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● hamlet cleaner than expected ● less physical disorder than expected ● art gallery was more extensive than expected ● most people spoke English well
2. What are your expectations about the community's infrastructure?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ a boat or two ▶ oil barrels everywhere ▶ generators for power ▶ mixture of services ▶ satellite dishes ▶ no effort to beautify structures ▶ simple, modular houses ▶ fish, skins stretched out for drying ▶ roads to nowhere ▶ very few dog teams 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● most expectations about infrastructure met ● many boats, snow mobiles, ATVs ● more public services than expected ● more public services than expected ● more public services than expected ● overcrowding in houses ● most houses appeared to have televisions
3. What social conditions do you expect to exist in the community?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ not neat, disorderly ▶ evidence of alcoholism ▶ social disarray ▶ less organized educational activity ▶ no invitations to enter houses ▶ boredom, young people at loose ends ▶ very low crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● evidence of social problems & property crime ● evidence of substance abuse ● much evidence of vandalism ● smoking more rampant than in South ● many teen mothers with young children ● RCMP office not integrated into community ● little pride in the education system
4. How do you think locals will make a living?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ absence of commercial activity ▶ evidence of subsistence activity ▶ artists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● much evidence of subsistence activity ● two large stores in the community ● cooperative-run hotel and restaurant ● numerous artists ● teachers in the public school were not locals
5. What tourism attractions and accommodations will be present?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ art—a small gallery ▶ a cooperative or store ▶ a small visitor center ▶ perhaps a center in combination with store ▶ no hotels or coffee houses ▶ church hall as place to meet visitors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● gallery larger, more modern than expected ● coop and Northern stores large, well-stocked ● modern visitor center with museum ● modern coop-run hotel ● visitors were met in school gymnasium
6. What will attitudes toward visitors be?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ friendly, will smile and say hello ▶ some will be there to greet us, others go about business ▶ some will try to sell us art ▶ some will try to sell us art 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● most of community turned out to welcome visitors, from very young to very old ● everyone genuinely warm and welcoming ● greeting and tour were well organized

The shoreline welcome, hamlet tours, quality of cultural presentations, and the excellent art for purchase all met or exceeded the expectations of this group of *experienced* Arctic travelers. One of the art collectors was “a bit overwhelmed” by the quality and variety of art offered for sale in both Kimmirut and Kinngait. Especially impressive were the small visitor centre, the art display space, and the exhibit of Inuit folk life in Kimmirut. In Kinngait, one could not help but be impressed with the facilities—albeit small spaces—provided for a range of art and handicraft endeavors. Even with all of these positive attributes, there were negative features that caught visitors’ attention. The wide age range of locals who welcomed people at the shore and attended the performances was most impressive, but the overwhelming preponderance of young children was startling (Hurry 2006).

One member of the expedition, a native Alaskan, felt that the tradition of cooperation, dependence on foods obtained from subsistence, and the Inuktitut language were more intact in Nunavut than within most Alaskan hamlets, but there appeared to be less memory of Arctic games and drum dancing in the Nunavut communities visited. She immediately noticed evidence of social dissonance in the form of inbreeding, poverty, and crowded housing (Nason 2006).

Another traveler noted that the purchase of goods in non-degradable containers had made its appearance since her previous travels, resulting in the presence of western-style debris throughout the hamlets that were visited (Anderson). While it was enjoyable to see evidence [small boats, seal skins, komatiks] that subsistence activity still is a mainstay within the local culture, there was a great deal of evidence of the social discontinuity that had been identified by Krauss (2006): boarded up windows, missing glass in school classrooms, graffiti demeaning the police and exalting the outcome of marijuana usage, teen pregnancies, children parenting children, and the extent of sugar-filled treats in the local stores.

In evaluating residents’ attitudes toward tourism, both first-time and experienced visitors found the locals’ attitudes toward passengers to be positive. These experiences support Stewart’s assessment that attitudes will be generally positive as long as there is the perception that residents have control over the activities and tourism growth occurs gradually (Stewart 2005). It is apparent that the community leaders are preparing for tourism to be a factor in their lives for the foreseeable future. Evidence of this includes investments made to develop a visitor centre and craft store, the matching windbreakers and *anoraks* worn by the well-trained young tour guides, and the igloo-like tent for skinning and cooking exhibits at Kimmirut. At Kinngait, an even larger investment has been made in the form of the recently opened, modern hotel overlooking the West Baffin Cooperative (Okrant 2006).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

To date, the geographic isolation, fragile natural resources, lack of sufficient education and hospitality training, and prevalence of traditionalist ways have acted together to protect Baffin Island’s hamlets against the development of large-scale, commercial activities outside of Iqaluit (Milne 2006). However, as the Nunavut government increases the quantity and sophistication of its tourism marketing efforts, greater travel interest undoubtedly will be engendered. These efforts could, in the words of Dunn, “militate against the un-crowded, anti-tourism” (Dunn 2006) nature of this place that, until this time, has been attractive to a small number of visitors. Should the Nunavut government choose to dramatically increase visitation by embellishing the character of indigenous tourism products, thereby stimulating new economic activities within the hamlets, a significant threat to local culture, especially the already dissident population of youths, will result. Therefore, any increase in visitation will necessitate better pre-

arrival preparation [i.e., education] of hosts and guests and more sophisticated planning and local control to ensure that the product promoted is consistent with the abilities and aspirations of host communities, and does not cause the commoditization of indigenous cultures. Further, it will be imperative that a significant share of money that is spent remains within and benefits the hamlets.

In light of the discussion presented in this paper, a second look at the four axioms put forward earlier is warranted:

- Based upon information gathered in the field and in the tourism literature, the *desire to bring new economic opportunities into the Inuit culture area does present a strong potential threat to sustaining the traditional culture.*
- Cruise passengers' *expectations were not at odds from what the hosts were prepared to offer.* This was due to pre-visit preparation [i.e. education] on the part of Adventure Canada as well as the passengers themselves.
- To some degree, *there is a difference in the motives of hosts and guests*, as indigenous hosts attempted to convey cultural understanding, while some of the Adventure Canada passengers were more concerned with collecting Inuit art. Such behavior by a few members of a group of more than 100 visitors is inevitable and will only be exacerbated as the number of visitors increases.
- Properly implemented, *tourism can provide experiences for both indigenous and visitor attendees by providing two parallel, but separate experiences.* This was accomplished in Kimmirut and during a visit to Ivujivik. In each setting, the community presented passengers with an exhibition of Arctic games and other cultural traditions. However, these occasions provided opportunities for hamlet residents to visit with one another, while comparing skills and watching the activities of their energetic, free-spirited children.

FINAL WORD

With a properly implemented tourism development program, a reinvigorated sense of place, strengthened social capital, improved economic wellbeing, and constructive host-guest relations should transpire within Nunavut's hamlets. During 2008, we anticipate conducting a series of meetings within Baffin Island hamlets to determine the full impact of visitation upon these communities. The final phase of this project will be to generate a pair of modules: one to provide prospective visitors with a set of realistic expectations while they are guests in Inuit communities, the second to advise the Nunavut government on how to minimize the disconnection between market initiatives that entice and the reality that awaits visitors to the hamlets.

REFERENCES

- Bates, D.G. (2005). *Human Adaptive Strategies: Ecology, Culture, and Politics*, 3rd ed. Boston: Pearson Education.
- “Code of Conduct for Arctic Tourists” (2001). World Wildlife Fund Arctic Programme. Accessible at [http://assets.panda.org/downloads/codeofconductforarctictourists\(eng\).pdf](http://assets.panda.org/downloads/codeofconductforarctictourists(eng).pdf).
- “Code of Conduct for Tour Operators in the Arctic” (2001). World Wildlife Fund Arctic Programme. Accessible at [http://assets.panda.org/downloads/codeofconductfortouroperatorsintheartctic\(eng\).pdf](http://assets.panda.org/downloads/codeofconductfortouroperatorsintheartctic(eng).pdf).
- Community Profiles* (2001). Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Dunn, G. (2006). “Promotional Issues.” *Extreme Tourism: Lessons from the World’s Cold Water Islands*, ed by G. Baldacchino. Oxford, UK: Elsevier: 15-29.
- Easterling, D (2005). “Residents and Tourism: What is Really at Stake.” *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 18 (4): 49-64.
- Hinch, T. (2001). “Tourism in Canada’s Northwest.” *Going North: Peripheral Tourism in Canada and Sweden*, ed. By B. Sahlberg. Ostersund, Sweden: ETOUR: 105-122.
- Krauss, C. (June 18, 2006). “Seven Years Into Self-Rule, Inuit Are Struggling.” *New York Times*.
- Mason, P. (1997). “Tourism Codes of Conduct in the Arctic and Sub-Arctic Region.” *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 5, 2: 151-165.
- _____, Johnston, M., and Twyman, D (2000). “The World Wide Fund for Nature Arctic Tourism Project.” *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Vol. 8, 4: 305-323.
- McKenzie, Michele (December 28, 2006). *Travel Daily News*: 1.
- Milne, S (2006). “Baffin Island, Nunavut, Canada.” *Extreme Tourism: Lessons from the World’s Cold Water Islands*, ed by G. Baldacchino. Oxford, UK: Elsevier: 88-99.
- Nunavut Exit Study 2006*. DataPath Systems. Jan. 15, 2007.
- Ryan, C. and M. Aicken (2005). *Indigenous Tourism: The Commodification and Management of Culture*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- Sahlberg, B. (2001). *Going North: Peripheral Tourism in Canada and Sweden*. Ostersund, Sweden: European Tourism Research Institute.
- Stewart, E., Draper, J., and Johnston, M (2005). A Review of Tourism Research in the Polar Regions.” *Arctic*. Vol. 58, 4: 1-12.
- Wilkes, R. (2006) “Indigenous Peoples: Canadian and U.S. Perspectives.” *American Behavioral Scientist*. Vol. 50, 4: 423-427.

CHRONICLES

- A. Anderson, Des Moines, Iowa, 24 Sept. 2006.
- C. Bradley-Swan, Mississauga, Ontario, 30 Oct 2006.
- K. Fisher, Kinngait, Nunavut, 27 Nov. 2006.
- J. Houston, Kimmirut, Nunavut, 10 Sept. 2006.
- J. Houston, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 22 Dec 2006.
- M. Hurry, Sarnia, Ontario, 12 Sept. 2006.
- N. Kenney, Iqaluit, Nunavut, 9 Sept. 2006.
- P. Lewis, Iqaluit, Nunavut, 18, Jan. 2007.
- L. Nason, Anchorage, Alaska, 20 Sept. 2006.
- M. Okrant, Plymouth, New Hampshire, 27 Sept. 2006.